



Los Angeles CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

200 N. Spring Street, Room 272, Los Angeles, California, 90012-4801, (213) 978-1300
www.lacity.org/PLN/index.htm

Determination Mailing Date: AUG 27 2010

CASE NO. CPC-2010-943-HPOZ
CEQA: ENV-2010-0944-CE

Applicant: City of Los Angeles

Location: generally bounded by the Pasadena/110 Freeway, Berenice Avenue and the eastern side of Avenue 66 to the east; Glenalbyn Drive, Marmion Way, Avenue 56 and Avenue 63 to the west; the City of Pasadena to the north; and by Avenue 35 to the south
Council District: 1 (Reyes) and 14 (Huizar)
Request(s): Establishment of Highland Park HPOZ expansion to include the Garvanza neighborhood, and renaming to "Highland Park – Garvanza HPOZ"

At its meeting on August 12, 2010, the following action was taken by the City Planning Commission:

1. **Approved** the Historic Resources Survey for the proposed Garvanza expansion area and the area restudied within the existing Highland Park HPOZ.
2. **Approved** the establishment of the proposed Highland Park-Garvanza HPOZ area as shown in the attached zone change map.
3. **Found** that the staff-recommended boundaries of the proposed Highland Park-Garvanza HPOZ are appropriate and that the proposed Historic Preservation Overlay Zone meets one or more of the required criteria pursuant to the Los Angeles Municipal Code Section 12.20.3 F 3 (c).
4. **Approved** the Staff Report and Exhibits as the City Planning Commission's Report.
5. **Adopted** Categorical Exemption No. ENV-2010-0944-CE.
6. **Adopted** the attached Findings.

RECOMMEND THAT THE CITY COUNCIL:


1. **Concur** in the above action of the City Planning Commission relative to its approval of the proposed HPOZ Expansion.
2. **Adopt** the attached Findings of the City Planning Commission relative to the HPOZ Expansion.
3. **Adopt** the attached Ordinance for the change of zone to [Q]C4-1XL-HPOZ, OS-1XL-HPOZ, R1-1-HPOZ, RD1.5-1-HPOZ, RD2-1-HPOZ.
4. **Direct** staff to update the appropriate zoning and other maps in accordance with this action.
5. **Adopt** Categorical Exemption No. ENV-2010-944-CE.

Fiscal Impact Statement: There is no General Fund impact as administrative costs are recovered through fees.

This action was taken by the following vote:

Moved: Burton
Seconded: Romero
Ayes: Cardoso, Epstein, Kezios, Woo
Absent: Freer, Orozco, Roschen

Vote: 6-0


James Williams, Commission Executive Assistant I
City Planning Commission

If you seek judicial review of any decision of the City pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure Section 1094.5, the petition for writ of mandate pursuant to that section must be filed no later than the 90th day following the date on which the City's decision became final pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure Section 1094.6. There may be other time limits which also affect your ability to seek judicial review.

Attachments: Findings, Ordinance(s), Map(s), Environmental Document(s)
Planning Assistant: Jason Chan

ORDINANCE NO. _____

An ordinance amending Section 12.04 of the Los Angeles Municipal Code by amending the zoning map.

THE PEOPLE OF THE CITY OF LOS ANGELES DO ORDAIN AS FOLLOWS:


Section __. Section 12.04 of the Los Angeles Municipal Code is hereby amended by changing the zone classifications of property shown upon a portion of the Zoning Map incorporated therein and made a part of Article 2, Chapter 1 of the LAMC, so that such portion of the Zoning Map shall conform to the zoning on the map attached hereto and incorporated herein by this reference.



NOT TO SCALE

CPC 2010-0943 HPOZ

081710



Area Mapped

Sec. _____. The City Clerk shall certify to the passage of this ordinance and have it published in accordance with Council policy, either in a daily newspaper circulated in the City of Los Angeles or by posting for ten days in three public places in the City of Los Angeles: one copy on the bulletin board located at the Main Street entrance to the Los Angeles City Hall; one copy on the bulletin board located at the Main Street entrance to the Los Angeles City Hall East; and one copy on the bulletin board located at the Temple Street entrance to the Los Angeles County Hall of Records.

I hereby certify that this ordinance was passed by the Council of the City of Los Angeles, at its meeting of _____.

JUNE LAGMAY, City Clerk

By _____
Deputy

Approved _____

Mayor

Pursuant to Section 558 of the City Charter,
the City Planning Commission on August 12, 2010,
recommended this ordinance be adopted by the City Council.



James Williams, Commission Executive Assistant I
City Planning Commission

File No. _____

FINDINGS

1. General Plan Consistency.

The proposed Highland Park-Garvanza HPOZ is in substantial conformance with the purposes, intent, and provisions of the General Plan, and is in conformity with public necessity, convenience, general welfare and good zoning practice in that it implements the following objectives of the Conservation and Land Use Elements of the General Plan.

Conservation Element of the General Plan: Cultural and Historical Objective

Objective: Protect important cultural and historical sites and resources for historical, cultural, research, and community educational purposes.

Policy: Continue to protect historic and cultural sites and/or resources potentially affected by proposed land development, demolition or property modification activities.

Program 1: Development permit processing, monitoring, enforcement, and periodic revision of regulations and procedures.

Program 3: Continue to survey buildings and structures of any age in neighborhoods throughout the city in order to develop a record that can be used in the present and future for evaluating their historic and cultural value as individual structures and within the context of surrounding structures.

Program 4: Continue to establish Historical Preservation Overlay Zones (HPOZ) throughout the city.

The proposed Project implements and is consistent with the three Programs mentioned above. Adoption of an HPOZ will require that the Director of Planning review requests for major modifications to contributing structures, major additions, and new infill construction with recommendations from the HPOZ Board, through a clear and transparent process. The Draft Survey has accurately inventoried contributing structures in Garvanza and found the area eligible for HPOZ.

Northeast Los Angeles Community Plan (Land Use Element of the General Plan), adopted June 15, 1999

Objective 1-3: *To preserve and enhance neighborhoods with a distinctive and significant historic or architectural character.*

Policy 1-4.1: *Encourage identification and documentation of historic and architectural resources in the Plan area.*

Policy 1-4.2: *Protect and encourage reuse of historic resources in a manner*

that maintains and enhances the historic appearance of structures and neighborhoods.

Objective 14-1: *To ensure that the Plan Area's significant cultural and historical resources are protected, preserved, and/or enhanced.*

Policy 14-1.1: *Establish one or more Historic Preservation Overlay Zones (HPOZ) to protect and enhance the use of historic structures and neighborhoods.*

The Community Plan recognizes the historic value of various neighborhoods within the Northeast Plan Area, and encourages the adoption of new HPOZ's to protect the integrity of these communities. The proposed Project has identified, evaluated and acknowledged Garvanza's history and context by investigating and generating a Historic Context Statement and by assessing the contributing / non-contributing status of hundreds of properties.

2. **Boundaries.** The proposed Highland Park - Garvanza HPOZ is generally bounded by the Pasadena/110 Freeway, Berenice Avenue and the eastern side of Avenue 66 to the east; Glenalbyn Drive, Marmion Way, Avenue 56 and Avenue 63 to the west; the City of Pasadena to the north; and by Avenue 35 to the south. These boundaries are irregular at all parameters. The Garvanza expansion area is generally bounded by the eastern side of Avenue 66 to the east; Avenue 63 to the west; City of Pasadena to the north; and York Boulevard to the south. The project also includes re-study and re-designation of parcels contained in the existing Highland Park HPOZ and which are bounded by the Pasadena/110 Freeway to the southeast; Avenue 64 to the west; York Boulevard to the north; and Marmion Way to the southwest.

It is important to note that the original study area boundaries were larger than those currently recommended for adoption. Upon completion of the Historic Resources Survey, it was found that entire original study area would not be eligible for HPOZ status due to a significant loss of integrity of individual resources and of the overall character of the area, particularly at the southern and northern boundaries of the survey area. This loss of integrity of area character can mostly be attributed to post-World War II development (particularly in the northern part of the survey area) and infill projects. However, the reduced area currently being recommended retains high levels of contributing structures and is deemed eligible for HPOZ designation.

3. **Context Statement.** The City contracted with Architectural Resources Group to conduct a Historic Resources Survey for the Garvanza area, including the re-study of an area within the existing Highland Park HPOZ. The Context Statement of the Garvanza Historic Resources Survey (**Exhibit G**) supports findings that structures within the expansion area are significant, as set forth in Subsection 12.20.3 F.3 of the LAMC. The Garvanza expansion area consists of 757 parcels of which 60% have been deemed through the Survey as contributors or altered-contributors. The Survey expansion area contains a mixture of single-family homes and some multi-family structures. The area is roughly bounded by the City of Pasadena to the north, the eastern side of Avenue 66 to the east, York Boulevard to the south and Avenue 63 to the west.

Through the Survey, Garvanza has been identified as significant because it relates directly to the early phases of residential development in Los Angeles, historically located adjacent to streetcar lines and, later, one of the City's arterial freeways (State Route 110). Garvanza is also notable for its association with the Arts and Crafts movement of the lower Arroyo Seco, acting as the epicenter of activity of some of that era's most influential artisans. Architecturally, Garvanza is significant for its concentration of buildings dating to the late-nineteenth and early 20th century, with building styles relating to the Victorian, Arts and Crafts and Period Revival modes. Positioned at the very edge of the Arroyo Seco, the proposed Garvanza expansion area reflects the natural character of its site, with irregularly-shaped lots governed more by topography than street grid, the abundant use of Arroyo stone as a building material, plentiful trees and plantings, and buildings positioned on inclines or in crevasses.

The Historic Resources Survey has established the Period of Significance for Garvanza as structures built between 1876-1941. There are three overarching contexts, and sub-themes, from which the Period of Significance was created:

Context: Early residential development (1876-1912)

Theme: Transportation: Railroads and Streetcars

Theme- Sub-divider and the Subdivision

Context: Continued Residential Development (1913-1941)

Theme: Transportation: The Automobile

Theme: The 1920's Boom Years

Context: Architecture (1876-1941)

Theme: Early Architectural Styles (1876-1905)

Theme: The Arts and Crafts Movement (1895-1918)

Theme: Period Revival Styles (1915-1941)

Theme: Early Modern Style (1935-1941)

Theme: Important Architects and Builders (1876-1941)

In addition, there are seven Historic Cultural Monuments within the proposed expansion boundaries.

In conclusion, due to the fact that it has a majority of contributing resources, sufficient overall district integrity, and significance relating to the contexts and themes called out in the historic context statement, Garvanza has a notable concentration of resources relating to the earliest phases of residential development in Los Angeles and is of significant value to the history of the City as a whole. Application of HPOZ regulations to the subject area is appropriate for retaining and enhancing the integrity of this area.

4. **Findings of Contribution.** The Garvanza Historic Resources Survey expansion area comprises 757 parcels, 60% of which have been identified as Contributors or Altered-Contributors.

As set forth in Subsection 12.20.3 of the Los Angeles Municipal Code (LAMC), Contributing Elements (structures, landscaping, natural features or sites) within

the involved area or the area as a whole shall meet one or more of the following criteria:

- (1) *adds to the historic architectural qualities or historic associations for which a property is significant because it was present during the period of significance, and possesses historic integrity reflecting its character at that time;*
- (2) *owing to its unique location or singular physical characteristics, represents an established feature of the neighborhood, community or city; or*
- (3) *retaining the structure, building, landscaping, or natural feature would help preserve and protect an historic place or area of historic interest in the City.*

As set forth in Subsection 12.20.3 E.5 of the LAMC, for a building, structure, Landscaping, or Natural Features to be considered contributing, each feature must be recognized through a historic resource survey and distinguished as contributing by one or more of the following criteria:

Contributing 1: Adds to the historic architectural qualities or historic associations for which a property is significant because it was present during the period of significance, and possesses historic integrity reflecting its character at that time;

Contributing 2: Owing to its unique location or singular physical characteristics, represents an established feature of the neighborhood, community or city; or

Contributing 3: Retaining the structure would help preserve and protect an historic place or area of historic interest in the City.

The Department of City Planning utilized the Secretary of Interior's National Register Bulletin 151 and the Standards for Rehabilitation, used by all professional historians and architectural historians undertaking historic resource surveys, to determine whether alterations were reversible. The relevant text in National Register Bulletin 151 providing guidance for evaluating altered structures² is as follows:

"A property important for illustrating a particular architectural style or construction technique must retain most of the physical features that constitute that style or technique. A property that has lost some historic materials or details can be eligible [read: contributing] if it retains the majority of the features that illustrate its style in terms of the massing, spatial relationships, proportion, pattern of windows and doors, texture of materials, and ornamentation. The property is not eligible [read: non-contributing], however, if it retains some basic features conveying massing but has lost the majority of the features that once characterized its style...If the historic exterior building

¹ U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service. National Register Bulletin 15: How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation. Date of Publication: 1990, revised 1991, 1995, 1997, 1998.

² Ibid. Pages 47 and 48.

material is covered by non-historic material (such as modern siding), the property can still be [contributing] if the significant form, features, and detailing are not obscured.”

There are two key components in determining reversibility: 1) Does the structure still retain basic features that identify it with the Period of Significance? and 2) Have the alterations been undertaken in such a way that if removed in the future, the form and the integrity of the property still remains?

Contributing-Altered Structure is a building or structure with minor alterations, but contributes because it was built within the period of significance and the nature and extent of the alterations are deemed to be easily reversible by the Survey; a Contributing-Altered Structure may also have major alterations but is deemed to contribute on the basis of having been constructed within the period of significance and the nature and extent of alterations are deemed reversible in the Historic Resources Survey.

Examples of typical alterations to *Contributing-Altered Structures* include:

- Porches which have been enclosed without damaging the original porch configuration, floor or supports.
- Windows which have been replaced without altering the placement, size, and fenestration patterns of the building's façade.
- Addition of faux historic or incompatible elements which can be removed.
- Non-original cladding, such as stucco, which may cover original cladding.

As set forth in Subsection 12.20.3 E.5 of the LAMC, a *Non-Contributing* element is any building, structure, natural feature, lot or landscaping designated as such in the Survey. For the purposes of the Survey, a resource was designated as Non-Contributing if it was built outside the Period of Significance, has undergone irreversible alterations, or if the character is incompatible with respect to the massing, scale and materials used. Some examples of alterations to Non-Contributing Structures include:

- Removal of elements which identify a building's architectural style
- Alterations to a building's original fenestration patterns, such as placement, size, and the removal of historic frames.
- Substantial changes to a building's overall massing or footprint, such as rooftop additions and other structural additions.

A *Vacant Lot* was considered to be any parcel that does not contain an identifiable Contributing or Non-Contributing Element. Vacant lots are designated as non-contributing for the purposes of HPOZ administration.

A category of *Not Visible* lots was created, as some lots are obscured by the topography and dense, mature vegetation. Since no accurate visual surveying could be conducted, Not Visible lots are designated as non-contributing for the purposes of HPOZ administration.

Historic Resources Survey Results: Expansion Area

As mentioned previously, the Survey findings indicate that the original ICO boundary contains an insufficient number of contributors and altered-contributors to support the creation of an HPOZ; however, the present boundary proposal reflects a reduction from the original boundaries and contains an adequate concentration of properties identified as contributors and altered-contributors.

The proposed Garvanza expansion area consists of 757 parcels. Of this total number, 456 structures, or 60%, have been identified as Contributors or Altered-Contributors, 280 structures, or 37% are designated as Non-Contributing, 11 structures, or 2% are Not Visible, and 10 parcels, or 1% are designated as a Vacant Lot.

Historic Resources Survey Results: Overlap / Re-Study Area

The original City Council motion contemplated a small portion of the existing Highland Park HPOZ for possible annexation into the Garvanza HPOZ; however, the merging of Garvanza and Highland Park has rendered annexation irrelevant and this area has now been treated as a re-study of an already-existing HPOZ. The re-study area is generally bounded by Avenue 64 to the west, Marmion Way to the southwest, the Pasadena/110 Freeway to the southeast, and York Boulevard to the north.

The Survey identified nine (9) properties in this area for re-designation from non-contributors to contributors or to altered contributors. There were no properties identified for re-designation from contributor (or altered-contributor) to non-contributor. These re-designations were certified as part of the Garvanza Historic Resources Survey by the Cultural Heritage Commission on July 29, 2010.

Expansion and renaming of the Highland Park HPOZ

The Highland Park HPOZ was adopted in 1994 and currently consists of 3,243 parcels. Of these parcels, 1,842, or 57%, are Contributors or Altered-Contributors; 1,341 or 41% are designated as Non-Contributing; and 60, or 2% have no data provided. The proposed "Highland Park-Garvanza HPOZ" contains a total of 4,000 parcels. Of this total, 2,298 parcels, or 57%, will be listed as contributors; and 1,702, or 43%, will be listed as non-contributors. Note that of the 1,702 parcels within the "Highland Park – Garvanza HPOZ" that are designated as non-noncontributors, 1,621 were identified by a Survey as non-contributors; 60 parcels have no Survey data available; 11 parcels are not visible; and 10 parcels are vacant. In conformance with the definition for "Contributor" pursuant to Los Angeles Municipal Code Section 12.20.3, parcels that cannot be identified as "Contributor" (i.e. not visible, have no data available, or they are vacant), are deemed "Non-Contributor."

The Department of City Planning recommends that the boundary for the Garvanza expansion area be merged with the existing boundary of the Highland Park HPOZ and to certify the corresponding Survey. In addition to helping fulfill HPOZ streamlining goals, the merger is supported by similar time periods of significance, architectural styles, and close geographic proximity of Garvanza and Highland Park. Staff also recommends the renaming of the Highland Park HPOZ and respective HPOZ Board to the "Highland Park-Garvanza HPOZ" to reflect the new boundaries, identities, and area of administration per Subsection 12.20.3 D.1. One HPOZ Board will review all cases within the merged boundaries.

5. **Cultural Heritage Commission.** The Cultural Heritage Commission toured the Garvanza Historic Resources Survey area on June 17, 2010. This was followed by a Cultural Heritage Commission (CHC) Hearing held on July 29, 2010 at City Hall. All public testimony at the hearing was in support of the proposal. At the hearing, CHC certified the Historic Resources Survey and staff-recommended boundaries; adopted the new name "Highland Park – Garvanza HPOZ" to include the expansion area; found the project to be categorically exempt under CEQA; and adopted staff findings as CHC findings. CHC also recommended that the City Planning Commission approve the establishment of the staff-recommended boundaries for the area containing the existing Highland Park HPOZ and the Garvanza expansion area.
6. **California Environmental Quality Act.** The Proposed expansion is exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act of 1970 (CEQA), pursuant to Article 19, Section 15308, Class 8 and Article 19, Section 15331, Class 31 of the State CEQA Guidelines, and was issued a Categorical Exemption ENV-2010-0944-CE on July 6, 2010.

Planning staff has conducted research and concluded that Categorical Exemptions Class 8 and 31 of the State CEQA Guidelines are appropriate and the exceptions to the use of categorical exemptions do not apply. Categorical Exemption, Article 19, Section 15308, Class 8 "consists of actions taken by regulatory agencies, as authorized by state or local ordinance, to assure the maintenance, restoration, enhancement, or protection of the environment where the regulatory process involves procedures for protection of the environment". Categorical Exemption, Article 19, Section 15331, Class 31 "consists of projects limited to maintenance, repair, stabilization, rehabilitation, restoration, preservation, or reconstruction of historical resources in a manner consistent with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Buildings (1995), Weeks and Grimmer". A number of cities in California have used either or both of these categorical exemptions in the establishment of their historic districts. Pasadena, Berkeley, and Santa Rosa have used Class 8. Long Beach, San Diego, and Santa Monica have used Class 31 and Oakland has used both Class 8 and Class 31.

Individual construction projects that are subject to the HPOZ are still required to go through project specific environmental review if required under CEQA. Thus, the amendment of an HPOZ does not supersede the California Environmental Quality Act, or other Los Angeles Municipal Code requirements.

State of California CEQA Guidelines, Article 19, Section 15308, Class 8 *“consists of actions taken by regulatory agencies, as authorized by state or local ordinance, to assure the maintenance, restoration, enhancement, or protection of the environment where the regulatory process involves procedures for protection of the environment”.*

The Garvanza Historic Resources Survey in conjunction with the establishment of a Historic Preservation Overlay Zone over the proposed expansion area will help regulate construction activities to ensure the protection of a city historic resource: the Highland Park – Garvanza neighborhood. Without regulation of construction activities in Highland Park – Garvanza, the historic integrity of the neighborhood could be lost through incompatible alterations and new construction and the demolition of irreplaceable historic structures. The criteria used to review proposed projects within a Historic Preservation Overlay Zone are the Secretary of the Interior's Guidelines for Rehabilitation. The use of Categorical Exemption Class 8 from the State CEQA Guidelines is consistent with other California jurisdictions, which find that the regulations placed upon historic districts is necessary for the protection of the environment and will make sure that maintenance, repair, restoration, and rehabilitation does not degrade the historic resource.

State of California CEQA Guidelines, Article 19, Section 15331, Class 31 *“consists of projects limited to maintenance, repair, stabilization, rehabilitation, restoration, preservation, or reconstruction of historical resources in a manner consistent with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Buildings (1995), Weeks and Grimmer”.*

The establishment of the Highland Park – Garvanza HPOZ falls under Categorical Exemption Class because all exterior projects will be reviewed for conformity with the Secretary of Interior Standards for Rehabilitation. Utilizing these standards, properties can be adapted for modern living without degrading the historic integrity of the resource. All projects subject to HPOZ review will be analyzed for consistency with the with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation, thus protecting Highland Park – Garvanza from construction activities that could damage its historic integrity and ensuring that maintenance, repair, stabilization, rehabilitation, restoration, preservation, conservation or reconstruction is conducted in a historically appropriate manner.

Planning staff evaluated all the potential exceptions to the use of Categorical Exemptions for the proposed project per Section 15300.2 of the State CEQA Guidelines and determined that none of these exceptions apply as explained below:

Cumulative Impact - The exception applies when, although a particular project may not have a significant impact, the impact of successive projects, of the same type, in the same place, over time is significant.

The proposed expansion of the Highland Park-Garvanza HPOZ does not include any new construction or upzoning; rather, it is a mechanism to protect and preserve existing neighborhoods. Individual projects that may be initiated in the future will have its own environmental review. In addition, there are no other

preservation initiatives in this portion of the City of Los Angeles.

Significant Effect - This exception applies when, although the project may otherwise be exempt, there is a reasonable possibility that the project will have a significant effect due to unusual circumstances. Examples include projects which may affect scenic or historical resources.

As with the existing 24 HPOZs in the City, the proposed Highland Park-Garvanza HPOZ would not result in any potential environmental impacts, but rather through its design regulations would protect an identified historic resource. To ensure that the project will not have any significant impacts due to unusual circumstances that have not been considered, Planning Staff evaluated all categories on the Initial Study Checklist including: Aesthetics, Agricultural, Air Quality, Biological, Cultural Resources, Geology and Soils, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Hydrology and Water Quality, Land Use and Planning, Mineral Resources, Noise, Population and Housing, Public Services, Recreation, Transportation/Circulation, Utilities, and Mandatory Findings of Significance.

Scenic Highway - Projects that may result in damage to scenic resources within a duly designated scenic highway

The proposed Highland Park-Garvanza HPOZ does not contain any scenic highways or scenic resources.

Hazardous Waste Site - Projects located on a site or facility listed pursuant to California Government Code 65962.5

The Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) has not listed any parcel in the Highland Park-Garvanza HPOZ as a hazardous material site.

Historical Resources - Projects that may cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource.

The proposed project would not cause an adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in State CEQA 15064.5; rather, the proposed project would protect identified historic structures through the Historic Preservation Overlay Zone (HPOZ).

The proposed Highland Park-Garvanza HPOZ would establish permanent regulations on alterations, renovations, and additions for parcels within its boundaries, consistent with the Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation.



ITEM 6



LOS ANGELES CITY PLANNING DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION REPORT

CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

DATE: August 12, 2010
TIME: after 8:30 a.m.*
PLACE: City Hall, 10th Floor, Room 1010
200 N. Spring Street
Los Angeles, CA 90012

PUBLIC HEARING COMPLETED:
July 7, 2010

CHC HEARING COMPLETED:
July 29, 2010

Expiration Date: None

CASE NO. CPC-2010-0943-HPOZ

Expansion of the existing Highland Park HPOZ and re-naming to Highland Park-Garvanza HPOZ

CEQA: ENV-2010-0944-CE

Council Districts: 1 & 14

Community Plan Areas: Northeast Los Angeles

Area Planning Commission: East Los Angeles

Neighborhood Council: Arroyo Seco, Historic Highland Park, Lincoln Heights

Plan Land Use: Low Medium II Residential, Low Residential, Very Low, Neighborhood Commercial, Public Facilities and Open Space.

Zones: PF-1, OS1-XL, R1-1, RD1.5-1, RD2-1, [Q]C4-1XL

Applicant: City of Los Angeles

PROPOSED PROJECT:

Expansion of the existing Highland Park HPOZ to include the Garvanza Expansion area and re-naming to "Highland Park-Garvanza HPOZ."

PROJECT LOCATION:

The proposed Highland Park-Garvanza HPOZ is generally bounded by the Pasadena/110 Freeway, Berenice Avenue and the eastern side of Avenue 66 to the east; Glenalbyn Drive, Marmion Way, Avenue 56 and Avenue 63 to the west; the City of Pasadena to the north; and by Avenue 35 to the south.

REQUESTED ACTIONS


Approval of the expansion of the existing Highland Park HPOZ to include Garvanza and renaming of the resulting HPOZ to "Highland Park – Garvanza HPOZ."

RECOMMENDED ACTIONS

1. **Approve** the Survey for the proposed Garvanza expansion area and the area restudied within the existing Highland Park HPOZ;
2. **Recommend** that City Council expand the existing Highland Park HPOZ to include the Garvanza expansion area;
3. **Recommend** that City Council delete "Highland Park HPOZ" and adopt "Highland Park-Garvanza HPOZ" as the new name for the merged areas, and apply this name to all relevant aspects of HPOZ administration, including renaming of the HPOZ Board to the "Highland Park-Garvanza HPOZ Board";
4. **Approve** the establishment of the proposed Highland Park-Garvanza HPOZ area and recommend that the City Council establish the staff-recommended boundaries as those shown in **Exhibit D**;

5. **Find** that the staff-recommended boundaries of the proposed Highland Park-Garvanza HPOZ are appropriate and that the proposed Historic Preservation Overlay Zone meets one or more of the required criteria pursuant to Los Angeles Municipal Code Section 12.20.3 F 3 (c);
6. **Approve** this Staff Report and Exhibits as the City Planning Commission Report;
7. **Adopt** Categorical Exemption No.ENV-2010-0944-CE (**Exhibit E**);
8. **Adopt** the attached Findings.


VINCENT P. BERTONI, AICP
Acting Director of Planning


Faisal Roble, Senior City Planner

Report reviewed by:


Rogelio Flores, City Planner
Telephone: (213) 978-1479

Report prepared by:


Jason Chan, Planning Assistant
Telephone: (213) 978-3307

ADVICE TO PUBLIC: *The exact time this report will be considered during the meeting is uncertain since there may be several other items on the agenda. Written communications may be mailed to the *Commission Secretariat, 200 North Spring Street, Los Angeles, CA 90012* (Phone No. 213-978-1300). While all written communications are given to the Commission for consideration, the initial packets are sent to the week prior to the Commission's meeting date. If you challenge these agenda items in court, you may be limited to raising only those issues you or someone else raised at the public hearing agendized herein, or in written correspondence on these matters delivered to this agency at or prior to the public hearing. As a covered entity under Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act, the City of Los Angeles does not discriminate on the basis of disability, and upon request, will provide reasonable accommodation to ensure equal access to this programs, services and activities. Sign language interpreters, assistive listening devices, or other auxiliary aids and/or other services may be provided upon request. To ensure availability of services, please make your request not later than three working days (72 hours) prior to the meeting by calling the Commission Secretariat at (213) 978-1300.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Project Analysis.....A-1

 Project Summary
 Background
 Issues
 Conclusion

Findings.....F-1

 General Plan/Charter Findings
 CEQA Findings

Public Hearings and Communications.....P-1

EXHIBITS

- Exhibit A:** Map of the Garvanza expansion area
- Exhibit B:** Map of the existing Highland Park HPOZ
- Exhibit C:** Map of the re-study area, with existing and new HPOZ designations
- Exhibit D:** Map of the proposed Highland Park – Garvanza HPOZ
- Exhibit E:** ENV-2010-0944-CE and Narrative
- Exhibit F:** HPOZ Ordinance
- Exhibit G:** Historic Context Statement

PROJECT ANALYSIS

PROJECT SUMMARY

The proposed project consists of the expansion of the existing Highland Park Historic Preservation Overlay Zone (HPOZ) to include a portion of the Garvanza neighborhood, and the re-naming of the HPOZ to Highland Park-Garvanza HPOZ.

In 2007, citing the historic character of the Garvanza neighborhood, City Council adopted a motion directing the Planning Department to assess the potential and make a recommendation for adopting a Historic Preservation Overlay Zone (HPOZ) in Garvanza, a neighborhood located a few blocks northeast of the existing Highland Park HPOZ and entirely within the boundaries of the Northeast Los Angeles Community Plan. At that time, the City Council also adopted an Interim Control Ordinance (ICO) to establish temporary regulations on building permits within a specified geographic area in order to enable the Planning Department to conduct a historic resources survey, which is a required step in the process of assessing whether the area is eligible for HPOZ designation.

In 2009, the Draft Survey was completed and its findings indicated that a portion of the ICO area would be eligible for HPOZ designation on the basis of concentration and integrity of historic structures within it.

Staff now recommends HPOZ designation for a portion of the ICO area. Due to the City's financial conditions and in conjunction with citywide HPOZ streamlining efforts, staff recommends that the area be designated as an HPOZ through an expansion of the existing, geographically proximal Highland Park HPOZ, rather than through the creation of a new, stand-alone HPOZ for Garvanza.

EXISTING LAND USE AND ZONING

Subject Properties: The Garvanza expansion area encompasses over 750 parcels. Assigned General Plan Land Uses include Low Medium II Residential, Low Residential, Very Low, Neighborhood Commercial, Public Facilities and Open Space. Zones include PF-1, OS1-XL, R1-1, RD1.5-1, RD2-1, and [Q]C4-1XL. Application of HPOZ regulations to properties does not change the designated land use of any property, underlying zone, or initiate any new development.

BACKGROUND

History

In July 2007, the City Council adopted a motion initiated by Councilmember Huizar (Council District 14), instructing the Planning Department to initiate and complete proceedings to establish an HPOZ for the Garvanza neighborhood. The motion identified Garvanza as one of the oldest communities in Council District 14, featuring many Craftsman and Victorian styled homes and buildings constructed in the early 1900s. The motion specified boundaries for the study area as follow: City of Pasadena to the north; Metro Gold Line (Light Rail Line) right-of-way bridge to the south; the eastside of avenue 66 to the east; and the eastside of Figueroa proceeding to the Westside of Avenue 63 at York to the west. The City Council motion additionally indicated that Judson Studios and Thorne Street should be included in the historic resources investigations, since they are considered elemental to Garvanza.

In October 2007, the City Council adopted an ICO that established temporary regulations on building permits for the study area described above, in order to enable the Planning Department to conduct a historic resources Survey, whose results would be used to develop recommendations for a

Garvanza HPOZ boundary and designation of individual properties for application of permanent land use regulations.

The City contracted with Architectural Resources Group (ARG) to develop the Survey (which includes the Historic Context Statement). The Survey was conducted June 2008 to May 2009 pursuant to the procedures of the HPOZ ordinance set forth in Section 12.20.3 F.3 of the Los Angeles Municipal Code (LAMC). The Planning Department was unable to complete the necessary Survey review prior to the expiration date of the original ICO; this was due to the City's budget austerity measures and related staffing constraints. In response to this, City Council adopted a new ICO in October 2009 to allow for more time for the Planning Department to carry out the necessary activities. This new ICO was extended once more in March 2010 and is set to expire in October 2010. No further ICO extensions are legally allowed. The boundaries for all ICOs (including ICO extensions) have remained the same as in the original motion.

Survey

The original Survey evaluated nearly 1,000 parcels to develop a proposed designation for each property as "contributing" or "non-contributing." Section 12.20.3 of the LAMC defines contributing structures as any building, structure, landscaping, natural feature identified on the Historic Resources Survey as contributing to the historic significance of the HPOZ, including a building or structure which has been altered, where the nature and extent of alterations are determined reversible by the Historic Resources Survey. Contributors are either built during the period of significance of the area, represent an established feature of the community, or contribute to the historic character of the area. Non-contributors are usually built after the HPOZ period of significance, are incompatible in character or style with the area, or lack historic integrity.

The Survey found that the original survey area (as delineated in the ICOs) would not be eligible for HPOZ designation due to insufficient historic integrity. However, the Survey found that a reduced boundary, containing approximately 750 parcels, would be eligible for HPOZ designation due to an adequate concentration of contributing properties.

It is important to note that in addition to the 750 parcels above, the Survey re-studied a few parcels that currently lie within the existing Highland Park HPOZ. The designations for nine of these parcels changed from its non-contributing status listed in the Highland Park Survey to contributing status. By way of background, the initial intention was for these "overlap" parcels to be annexed by a new, stand-alone Garvanza HPOZ because these parcels are more closely associated with Garvanza than with Highland Park; however, this issue has been rendered obsolete by the proposed expansion of the Highland Park HPOZ to include Garvanza.

As currently proposed, the Garvanza portion of the proposed Highland Park – Garvanza HPOZ is composed mainly of single family residences that were constructed between 1900 and 1930. There are a number of resources dating to the late nineteenth century. The period of significance has been defined as 1876-1941 to capture the resources relating to the period of development which has been identified as significant in the historic context statement; after 1941, the character of the area began to change with the development of open space and some infill. Most buildings in this area were constructed in styles associated with the Victorian, Arts and Crafts, and Period Revival modes of architecture. There are some early modern styles represented and a small amount of infill from the later part of the twentieth century. There are a few commercial buildings in the district, mainly centered on York Boulevard, and three religious buildings scattered throughout. Garvanza Park is located at the western edge of the proposed HPOZ. The district is characterized not only by its buildings but also by such features as asphalt streets with concrete sidewalks and landscaped

parkways, abundant trees, the extensive use of Arroyo stone in retaining walls and perimeter walls, and hilly topography.

In the Spring of 2010, the Planning Department began a program to streamline HPOZs on a citywide basis, partly in response to the City's ongoing budget and staffing constraints. One of the streamlining goals was to minimize the creation of new HPOZ Boards. In line with this goal, in the Spring of 2010 the Planning Department proposed expansion of the Highland Park HPOZ to include Garvanza. This would enable the City to avoid the need to create a new HPOZ Board and absorb new administrative burdens. The merged HPOZ will share a single HPOZ Board to represent both Highland Park and Garvanza areas and will enable the City to minimize the impact of a new HPOZ on the City's staffing and budget.

Current Status

The Department of City Planning conducted a Public Workshop on June 23, 2010 at the Highland Park Senior Center. The Workshop enabled affected and interested individuals to review the Draft Survey findings (including proposed HPOZ boundaries and individual property designations). During the Workshop, the public was encouraged to submit comments and/or proposed corrections to the Survey. Additionally, City staff distributed information and was available to answer questions. Forty-Seven (47) persons signed into the meeting.

A Public Hearing was held on July 7, 2010 at the Highland Park Senior Center and 47 attendees signed in. Out of 14 commenters, 13 voiced support for the Proposed Project, while 1 voiced opposition. In addition, approximately 35 letters of support were submitted electronically, prior to the Public Hearing. Comments submitted indicate general support for the Highland Park-Garvanza HPOZ as proposed.

A Cultural Heritage Commission (CHC) Hearing was held on July 29, 2010 at City Hall. All public testimony at the hearing was in support of the proposal. On a 3-0 vote, the CHC certified the Historic Resources Survey and staff-recommended boundaries; adopted the new name to include the expansion area; found the project to be categorically exempt under CEQA; and adopted staff findings as CHC findings. CHC also recommended that the City Planning Commission approve the establishment of the staff-recommended boundaries for the area containing the existing Highland Park HPOZ and the Garvanza area as a merged area.

ISSUES

Proposed HPOZ Boundaries

Concern was expressed that a group of 23 parcels was omitted from the recommended HPOZ Boundaries. Since these 23 parcels contain a few historic buildings and structures, request was made to consider adding them into the proposed HPOZ boundaries. The parcels in question are bounded by York Boulevard to the north, Avenue 64 to the east, Marmion Way to the South, and the parcels on the western side of Avenue 63. The grouping is anchored by a prominent building at 6336 York Boulevard.

Staff Analysis

Staff analyzed the Survey data for the 23 parcels in question and found that approximately 30% of them were contributing structures (7 out of 23 parcels), a percentage that indicates the area has lost most of its historic integrity and would therefore detract rather than add to the historic integrity of Garvanza and Highland Park as a whole. For those properties deemed as contributing that are

surrounded by high concentrations of non-contributors, staff would recommend strategies more appropriate to single-parcel preservation than HPOZs, such as Historic Cultural Monument designation.

Effect on property rights, administration, and revitalization of the area

A property owner felt that the existence of an HPOZ would slow or prevent new construction and necessary improvements to existing structures, thereby limiting property owner's rights.

Staff Analysis

HPOZ jurisdiction is limited only to design and solely to exterior work. HPOZs do not supersede regulations provided in the Municipal Code and do not prohibit new construction, additions, alterations, or demolitions, but require that exterior work be reviewed for consistency with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards or the governing Preservation Plan in order to make certain that exterior changes maximize retention of historic materials, thereby protecting the historic integrity of the property and its environment. The Citywide HPOZ Ordinance will serve as the implementation tool for the proposed Highland Park-Garvanza HPOZ until a Preservation Plan is adopted by the City Planning Commission.

CONCLUSION

The boundaries shown in the attached exhibits presently recommended by the Planning Department reflect the above summary as well as outcomes from the Historic Resources Survey. Specifically, the Survey findings indicate that the proposed boundary (which is reduced from that outlined in the ICOs) contains an area that is eligible for HPOZ designation.

In addition to helping fulfill HPOZ streamlining goals and objectives (as mentioned above), the merging of the Garvanza expansion area with the existing Highland Park HPOZ is supported by their close geographic proximity; and by similar periods of historical significance and architectural styles in both areas. Comments received during a public workshop and formal public hearing indicate broad support for this strategy.

The Planning Department recommends that the City Planning Commission: approve the Survey for the proposed Garvanza expansion area and the area restudied within the existing Highland Park HPOZ; recommend that City Council expand the existing Highland Park HPOZ to include the Garvanza expansion area; recommend that City Council delete *Highland Park HPOZ* and adopt "Highland Park-Garvanza HPOZ" as the new name for the merged areas and apply this name to all relevant aspects of HPOZ administration, including renaming of the HPOZ Board; approve the establishment of the proposed Highland Park-Garvanza HPOZ area and recommend that the City Council establish the staff-recommended boundaries as those shown in **Exhibit D**; find that the staff-recommended boundaries of the proposed Highland Park-Garvanza HPOZ are appropriate and that the proposed Historic Preservation Overlay Zone meets one or more of the required criteria pursuant to Los Angeles Municipal Code Section 12.20.3 F 3 (c); approve this Staff Report and Exhibits as the City Planning Commission Report; adopt Categorical Exemption No.ENV-2010-0944-CE (**Exhibit E**); and adopt the attached Findings as Findings of the City Planning Commission.

FINDINGS

1. General Plan Consistency.

The proposed Highland Park-Garvanza HPOZ is in substantial conformance with the purposes, intent, and provisions of the General Plan, and is in conformity with public necessity, convenience, general welfare and good zoning practice in that it implements the following objectives of the Conservation and Land Use Elements of the General Plan.

Conservation Element of the General Plan: Cultural and Historical Objective

Objective: Protect important cultural and historical sites and resources for historical, cultural, research, and community educational purposes.

Policy: Continue to protect historic and cultural sites and/or resources potentially affected by proposed land development, demolition or property modification activities.

Program 1: Development permit processing, monitoring, enforcement, and periodic revision of regulations and procedures.

Program 3: Continue to survey buildings and structures of any age in neighborhoods throughout the city in order to develop a record that can be used in the present and future for evaluating their historic and cultural value as individual structures and within the context of surrounding structures.

Program 4: Continue to establish Historical Preservation Overlay Zones (HPOZ) throughout the city.

The proposed Project implements and is consistent with the three Programs mentioned above. Adoption of an HPOZ will require that the Director of Planning review requests for major modifications to contributing structures, major additions, and new infill construction with recommendations from the HPOZ Board, through a clear and transparent process. The Draft Survey has accurately inventoried contributing structures in Garvanza and found the area eligible for HPOZ.

Northeast Los Angeles Community Plan (Land Use Element of the General Plan), adopted June 15, 1999

Objective 1-3: *To preserve and enhance neighborhoods with a distinctive and significant historic or architectural character.*

Policy 1-4.1: *Encourage identification and documentation of historic and architectural resources in the Plan area.*

Policy 1-4.2: *Protect and encourage reuse of historic resources in a manner that maintains and enhances the historic appearance of structures and neighborhoods.*

Objective 14-1: *To ensure that the Plan Area's significant cultural and historical resources are protected, preserved, and/or enhanced.*

Policy 14-1.1: *Establish one or more Historic Preservation Overlay Zones (HPOZ) to protect and enhance the use of historic structures and neighborhoods.*

The Community Plan recognizes the historic value of various neighborhoods within the Northeast Plan Area, and encourages the adoption of new HPOZ's to protect the integrity of these communities. The proposed Project has identified, evaluated and acknowledged Garvanza's history and context by investigating and generating a Historic Context Statement and by assessing the contributing / non-contributing status of hundreds of properties.

- 2. Boundaries.** The proposed Highland Park - Garvanza HPOZ is generally bounded by the Pasadena/110 Freeway, Berenice Avenue and the eastern side of Avenue 66 to the east; Glenalbyn Drive, Marmion Way, Avenue 56 and Avenue 63 to the west; the City of Pasadena to the north; and by Avenue 35 to the south. These boundaries are irregular at all parameters. The Garvanza expansion area is generally bounded by the eastern side of Avenue 66 to the east; Avenue 63 to the west; City of Pasadena to the north; and York Boulevard to the south. The project also includes re-study and re-designation of parcels contained in the existing Highland Park HPOZ and which are bounded by the Pasadena/110 Freeway to the southeast; Avenue 64 to the west; York Boulevard to the north; and Marmion Way to the southwest.

It is important to note that the original study area boundaries were larger than those currently recommended for adoption. Upon completion of the Historic Resources Survey, it was found that entire original study area would not be eligible for HPOZ status due to a significant loss of integrity of individual resources and of the overall character of the area, particularly at the southern and northern boundaries of the survey area. This loss of integrity of area character can mostly be attributed to post-World War II development (particularly in the northern part of the survey area) and infill projects. However, the reduced area currently being recommended retains high levels of contributing structures and is deemed eligible for HPOZ designation.

- 3. Context Statement.** The City contracted with Architectural Resources Group to conduct a Historic Resources Survey for the Garvanza area, including the re-study of an area within the existing Highland Park HPOZ. The Context Statement of the Garvanza Historic Resources Survey (**Exhibit G**) supports findings that structures within the expansion area are significant, as set forth in Subsection 12.20.3 F.3 of the LAMC. The Garvanza expansion area consists of 757 parcels of which 60% have been deemed through the Survey as contributors or altered-contributors. The Survey expansion area contains a mixture of single-family homes and some multi-family structures. The area is roughly bounded by the City of Pasadena to the north, the eastern side of Avenue 66 to the east, York Boulevard to the south and Avenue 63 to the west.

Through the Survey, Garvanza has been identified as significant because it relates directly to the early phases of residential development in Los Angeles, historically located adjacent to streetcar lines and, later, one of the City's arterial freeways (State Route 110). Garvanza is also notable for its association with the Arts and Crafts movement of the lower Arroyo Seco, acting as the epicenter of activity of some of that era's most influential artisans. Architecturally, Garvanza is significant for its concentration of buildings dating to the late-nineteenth and early 20th century, with building styles relating to the Victorian, Arts and Crafts and Period Revival modes. Positioned at the very edge of the Arroyo Seco, the proposed Garvanza expansion area reflects the natural character of its site, with irregularly-shaped lots governed more by topography than street grid, the abundant use of Arroyo stone as a building material, plentiful trees and plantings, and buildings positioned on inclines or in crevasses.

The Historic Resources Survey has established the Period of Significance for Garvanza as structures built between 1876-1941. There are three overarching contexts, and sub-themes, from which the Period of Significance was created:

Context: Early residential development (1876-1912)
 Theme: Transportation: Railroads and Streetcars
 Theme- Sub-divider and the Subdivision

Context: Continued Residential Development (1913-1941)
 Theme: Transportation: The Automobile
 Theme: The 1920's Boom Years

Context: Architecture (1876-1941)
 Theme: Early Architectural Styles (1876-1905)
 Theme: The Arts and Crafts Movement (1895-1918)
 Theme: Period Revival Styles (1915-1941)
 Theme: Early Modern Style (1935-1941)
 Theme: Important Architects and Builders (1876-1941)

In addition, there are seven Historic Cultural Monuments within the proposed expansion boundaries.

In conclusion, due to the fact that it has a majority of contributing resources, sufficient overall district integrity, and significance relating to the contexts and themes called out in the historic context statement, Garvanza has a notable concentration of resources relating to the earliest phases of residential development in Los Angeles and is of significant value to the history of the City as a whole. Application of HPOZ regulations to the subject area is appropriate for retaining and enhancing the integrity of this area.

4. **Findings of Contribution.** The Garvanza Historic Resources Survey expansion area comprises 757 parcels, 60% of which have been identified as Contributors or Altered-Contributors.

As set forth in Subsection 12.20.3 of the Los Angeles Municipal Code (LAMC), Contributing Elements (structures, landscaping, natural features or sites) within the involved area or the area as a whole shall meet one or more of the following criteria:

- (1) *adds to the historic architectural qualities or historic associations for which a property is significant because it was present during the period of significance, and possesses historic integrity reflecting its character at that time;*
- (2) *owing to its unique location or singular physical characteristics, represents an established feature of the neighborhood, community or city; or*
- (3) *retaining the structure, building, landscaping, or natural feature would help preserve and protect an historic place or area of historic interest in the City.*

As set forth in Subsection 12.20.3 E.5 of the LAMC, for a building, structure, Landscaping, or Natural Features to be considered contributing, each feature must be recognized through a historic resource survey and distinguished as contributing by one or more of the following criteria:

Contributing 1: Adds to the historic architectural qualities or historic associations for which a property is significant because it was present during the period of significance, and possesses historic integrity reflecting its character at that time;

Contributing 2: Owing to its unique location or singular physical characteristics, represents an established feature of the neighborhood, community or city; or

Contributing 3: Retaining the structure would help preserve and protect an historic place or area of historic interest in the City.

The Department of City Planning utilized the Secretary of Interior's National Register Bulletin 151 and the Standards for Rehabilitation, used by all professional historians and architectural historians undertaking historic resource surveys, to determine whether alterations were reversible. The relevant text in National Register Bulletin 151 providing guidance for evaluating altered structures² is as follows:

"A property important for illustrating a particular architectural style or construction technique must retain most of the physical features that constitute that style or technique. A property that has lost some historic materials or details can be eligible [read: contributing] if it retains the majority of the features that illustrate its style in terms of the massing, spatial relationships, proportion, pattern of windows and doors, texture of materials, and ornamentation. The property is not eligible [read: non-contributing], however, if it retains some basic features conveying massing but has lost the majority of the features that once characterized its style... If the historic exterior building material is covered by non-historic material (such as modern siding), the property can still be [contributing] if the significant form, features, and detailing are not obscured."

There are two key components in determining reversibility: 1) Does the structure still retain basic features that identify it with the Period of Significance? and 2) Have the alterations been undertaken in such a way that if removed in the future, the form and the integrity of the property still remains?

Contributing-Altered Structure is a building or structure with minor alterations, but contributes because it was built within the period of significance and the nature and extent of the alterations are deemed to be easily reversible by the Survey; a *Contributing-Altered Structure* may also have major alterations but is deemed to contribute on the basis of having been constructed within the period of significance and the nature and extent of alterations are deemed reversible in the Historic Resources Survey.

Examples of typical alterations to *Contributing-Altered Structures* include:

- Porches which have been enclosed without damaging the original porch configuration, floor or supports.
- Windows which have been replaced without altering the placement, size, and fenestration patterns of the building's façade.
- Addition of faux historic or incompatible elements which can be removed.
- Non-original cladding, such as stucco, which may cover original cladding.

As set forth in Subsection 12.20.3 E.5 of the LAMC, a *Non-Contributing* element is any

¹ U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service. National Register Bulletin 15: How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation. Date of Publication: 1990, revised 1991, 1995, 1997, 1998.

² Ibid. Pages 47 and 48.

building, structure, natural feature, lot or landscaping designated as such in the Survey. For the purposes of the Survey, a resource was designated as Non-Contributing if it was built outside the Period of Significance, has undergone irreversible alterations, or if the character is incompatible with respect to the massing, scale and materials used. Some examples of alterations to Non-Contributing Structures include:

- Removal of elements which identify a building's architectural style
- Alterations to a building's original fenestration patterns, such as placement, size, and the removal of historic frames.
- Substantial changes to a building's overall massing or footprint, such as rooftop additions and other structural additions.

A *Vacant Lot* was considered to be any parcel that does not contain an identifiable Contributing or Non-Contributing Element. Vacant lots are designated as non-contributing for the purposes of HPOZ administration.

A category of *Not Visible* lots was created, as some lots are obscured by the topography and dense, mature vegetation. Since no accurate visual surveying could be conducted, Not Visible lots are designated as non-contributing for the purposes of HPOZ administration.

Historic Resources Survey Results: Expansion Area

As mentioned previously, the Survey findings indicate that the original ICO boundary contains an insufficient number of contributors and altered-contributors to support the creation of an HPOZ; however, the present boundary proposal reflects a reduction from the original boundaries and contains an adequate concentration of properties identified as contributors and altered-contributors.

The proposed Garvanza expansion area consists of 757 parcels. Of this total number, 456 structures, or 60%, have been identified as Contributors or Altered-Contributors, 280 structures, or 37% are designated as Non-Contributing, 11 structures, or 2% are Not Visible, and 10 parcels, or 1% are designated as a Vacant Lot.

Historic Resources Survey Results: Overlap / Re-Study Area

The original City Council motion contemplated a small portion of the existing Highland Park HPOZ for possible annexation into the Garvanza HPOZ; however, the merging of Garvanza and Highland Park has rendered annexation irrelevant and this area has now been treated as a re-study of an already-existing HPOZ. The re-study area is generally bounded by Avenue 64 to the west, Marmion Way to the southwest, the Pasadena/110 Freeway to the southeast, and York Boulevard to the north.

The Survey identified nine (9) properties in this area for re-designation from non-contributors to contributors or to altered contributors. There were no properties identified for re-designation from contributor (or altered-contributor) to non-contributor. These re-designations were certified as part of the Garvanza Historic Resources Survey by the Cultural Heritage Commission on July 29, 2010.

Expansion and renaming of the Highland Park HPOZ

The Highland Park HPOZ was adopted in 1994 and currently consists of 3,243 parcels. Of these parcels, 1,842, or 57%, are Contributors or Altered-Contributors; 1,341 or 41% are

designated as Non-Contributing; and 60, or 2% have no data provided. The proposed "Highland Park-Garvanza HPOZ" contains a total of 4,000 parcels. Of this total, 2,298 parcels, or 57%, will be listed as contributors; and 1,702, or 43%, will be listed as non-contributors. Note that of the 1,702 parcels within the "Highland Park – Garvanza HPOZ" that are designated as non-noncontributors, 1,621 were identified by a Survey as non-contributors; 60 parcels have no Survey data available; 11 parcels are not visible; and 10 parcels are vacant. In conformance with the definition for "Contributor" pursuant to Los Angeles Municipal Code Section 12.20.3, parcels that cannot be identified as "Contributor" (i.e. not visible, have no data available, or they are vacant), are deemed "Non-Contributor."

The Department of City Planning recommends that the boundary for the Garvanza expansion area be merged with the existing boundary of the Highland Park HPOZ and to certify the corresponding Survey. In addition to helping fulfill HPOZ streamlining goals, the merger is supported by similar time periods of significance, architectural styles, and close geographic proximity of Garvanza and Highland Park. Staff also recommends the renaming of the Highland Park HPOZ and respective HPOZ Board to the "Highland Park-Garvanza HPOZ" to reflect the new boundaries, identities, and area of administration per Subsection 12.20.3 D.1. One HPOZ Board will review all cases within the merged boundaries.

5. **Cultural Heritage Commission.** The Cultural Heritage Commission toured the Garvanza Historic Resources Survey area on June 17, 2010. This was followed by a Cultural Heritage Commission (CHC) Hearing held on July 29, 2010 at City Hall. All public testimony at the hearing was in support of the proposal. At the hearing, CHC certified the Historic Resources Survey and staff-recommended boundaries; adopted the new name "Highland Park – Garvanza HPOZ" to include the expansion area; found the project to be categorically exempt under CEQA; and adopted staff findings as CHC findings. CHC also recommended that the City Planning Commission approve the establishment of the staff-recommended boundaries for the area containing the existing Highland Park HPOZ and the Garvanza expansion area.
6. **California Environmental Quality Act.** The Proposed expansion is exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act of 1970 (CEQA), pursuant to Article 19, Section 15308, Class 8 and Article 19, Section 15331, Class 31 of the State CEQA Guidelines, and was issued a Categorical Exemption ENV-2010-0944-CE on July 6, 2010.

Planning staff has conducted research and concluded that Categorical Exemptions Class 8 and 31 of the State CEQA Guidelines are appropriate and the exceptions to the use of categorical exemptions do not apply. Categorical Exemption, Article 19, Section 15308, Class 8 "consists of actions taken by regulatory agencies, as authorized by state or local ordinance, to assure the maintenance, restoration, enhancement, or protection of the environment where the regulatory process involves procedures for protection of the environment". Categorical Exemption, Article 19, Section 15331, Class 31 "consists of projects limited to maintenance, repair, stabilization, rehabilitation, restoration, preservation, or reconstruction of historical resources in a manner consistent with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Buildings (1995), Weeks and Grimmer". A number of cities in California have used either or both of these categorical exemptions in the establishment of their historic districts. Pasadena, Berkeley, and Santa Rosa have used Class 8. Long Beach, San Diego, and Santa Monica have used Class 31 and Oakland has used both Class 8 and Class 31.

Individual construction projects that are subject to the HPOZ are still required to go through project specific environmental review if required under CEQA. Thus, the amendment of an HPOZ does not supersede the California Environmental Quality Act, or other Los Angeles Municipal Code requirements.

State of California CEQA Guidelines, Article 19, Section 15308, Class 8 *"consists of actions taken by regulatory agencies, as authorized by state or local ordinance, to assure the maintenance, restoration, enhancement, or protection of the environment where the regulatory process involves procedures for protection of the environment"*.

The Garvanza Historic Resources Survey in conjunction with the establishment of a Historic Preservation Overlay Zone over the proposed expansion area will help regulate construction activities to ensure the protection of a city historic resource: the Highland Park – Garvanza neighborhood. Without regulation of construction activities in Highland Park – Garvanza, the historic integrity of the neighborhood could be lost through incompatible alterations and new construction and the demolition of irreplaceable historic structures. The criteria used to review proposed projects within a Historic Preservation Overlay Zone are the Secretary of the Interior's Guidelines for Rehabilitation. The use of Categorical Exemption Class 8 from the State CEQA Guidelines is consistent with other California jurisdictions, which find that the regulations placed upon historic districts is necessary for the protection of the environment and will make sure that maintenance, repair, restoration, and rehabilitation does not degrade the historic resource.

State of California CEQA Guidelines, Article 19, Section 15331, Class 31 *"consists of projects limited to maintenance, repair, stabilization, rehabilitation, restoration, preservation, or reconstruction of historical resources in a manner consistent with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Buildings (1995), Weeks and Grimmer"*.

The establishment of the Highland Park – Garvanza HPOZ falls under Categorical Exemption Class because all exterior projects will be reviewed for conformity with the Secretary of Interior Standards for Rehabilitation. Utilizing these standards, properties can be adapted for modern living without degrading the historic integrity of the resource. All projects subject to HPOZ review will be analyzed for consistency with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation, thus protecting Highland Park – Garvanza from construction activities that could damage its historic integrity and ensuring that maintenance, repair, stabilization, rehabilitation, restoration, preservation, conservation or reconstruction is conducted in a historically appropriate manner.

Planning staff evaluated all the potential exceptions to the use of Categorical Exemptions for the proposed project per Section 15300.2 of the State CEQA Guidelines and determined that none of these exceptions apply as explained below:

Cumulative Impact - The exception applies when, although a particular project may not have a significant impact, the impact of successive projects, of the same type, in the same place, over time is significant.

The proposed expansion of the Highland Park-Garvanza HPOZ does not include any new construction or upzoning; rather, it is a mechanism to protect and preserve existing neighborhoods. Individual projects that may be initiated in the future will have its own environmental review. In addition, there are no other preservation initiatives in this portion of the City of Los Angeles.

Significant Effect - This exception applies when, although the project may otherwise be exempt, there is a reasonable possibility that the project will have a significant effect due to unusual circumstances. Examples include projects which may affect scenic or historical resources.

As with the existing 24 HPOZs in the City, the proposed Highland Park-Garvanza HPOZ would not result in any potential environmental impacts, but rather through its design regulations would protect an identified historic resource. To ensure that the project will not have any significant impacts due to unusual circumstances that have not been considered, Planning Staff evaluated all categories on the Initial Study Checklist including: Aesthetics, Agricultural, Air Quality, Biological, Cultural Resources, Geology and Soils, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Hydrology and Water Quality, Land Use and Planning, Mineral Resources, Noise, Population and Housing, Public Services, Recreation, Transportation/Circulation, Utilities, and Mandatory Findings of Significance.

Scenic Highway - Projects that may result in damage to scenic resources within a duly designated scenic highway

The proposed Highland Park-Garvanza HPOZ does not contain any scenic highways or scenic resources.

Hazardous Waste Site - Projects located on a site or facility listed pursuant to California Government Code 65962.5

The Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) has not listed any parcel in the Highland Park-Garvanza HPOZ as a hazardous material site.

Historical Resources - Projects that may cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource.

The proposed project would not cause an adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in State CEQA 15064.5; rather, the proposed project would protect identified historic structures through the Historic Preservation Overlay Zone (HPOZ).

The proposed Highland Park-Garvanza HPOZ would establish permanent regulations on alterations, renovations, and additions for parcels within its boundaries, consistent with the Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation.

PUBLIC HEARING AND COMMUNICATIONS

Summary of Cultural Heritage Commission Hearing

The public hearing on this matter was held at Room 1010 in Los Angeles City Hall on July 29, 2010.

Present: approximately 15 members of the public were in attendance at the Hearing.

Speakers: a total of approximately eight speakers expressed support for the project. No speakers expressed opposition.

Other Communications Received: no additional written or electronic communications were received in relation to Planning Department recommendations for Cultural Heritage Commission consideration.

General Comments: support was repeatedly expressed on the basis of the integrity and historicity of Garvanza and the need to protect and maintain its sense of place.

Summary of Points in Favor:

- Garvanza deserves to be protected because of its historic integrity;
- The proposed expansion will protect and preserve the historic neighborhood character.

Summary of Points in Opposition

- None.

Summary of Hearing Officer Public Hearing

The public hearing on this matter was held at the Highland Park Senior Center on July 7, 2010.

Present: 47 attendees signed in.

Speakers: thirteen (13) expressed support for the project, while one (1) expressed opposition.

Other Communications Received: Approximately 35 letters were submitted electronically prior to the Public Hearing. All letters expressed support for the proposed project.

General Comments: The general comments mentioned the Survey was not as detailed as it could be. In addition, comments were directed towards a specific subdivision case within the existing ICO that is still open with the City Planning Department's Division of Land.

Summary of Points in Favor:

- Garvanza deserves to be protected because of its historic integrity.
- Other HPOZs in Los Angeles have increased property values and have helped to maintain a cohesive neighborhood character.
- The proposed expansion will protect and preserve the historic neighborhood character and limit demolitions.
- The Highland Park HPOZ has a clear process for renovations and additions that assist in creating successful projects and this process should be expanded to Garvanza.

Summary of Points in Opposition

- An HPOZ could prevent or slow new construction and necessary improvements to existing structures, thereby limiting property owner's rights.

Summary of Workshop

A Public Workshop on this matter was held at the Highland Park Senior Center on June 23, 2010.

Present: 47 attendees signed in.

Speakers: Not Applicable (Open House format).

Other Communications Received: Approximately 35 letters were submitted electronically prior to the Public Hearing. All letters expressed support for the proposed project.

General Comments: The general comments mentioned the Survey was not as detailed as it could be. In addition, comments were directed towards a specific subdivision case within the existing ICO that is still open with the City Planning Department's Division of Land.

Summary of Comments in Favor:

- Garvanza deserves to be protected because of its historic integrity.
- Other HPOZs in Los Angeles have increased property values and have helped to maintain a cohesive neighborhood character.
- The proposed expansion will protect and preserve the historic neighborhood character and limit demolitions.
- The Highland Park HPOZ has a clear process for renovations and additions that assist in creating successful projects and this process should be expanded to Garvanza.


Summary of Comments in Opposition

- An HPOZ could prevent or slow new construction and necessary improvements to existing structures, thereby limiting property owner's rights.

Correction Forms to Survey Designations

None submitted or received.




 NOT TO SCALE
 CPC 2010-0943 HPOZ
AV 00130

Legend

Highland Park Re-Study Area: Proposed Changes to Historic Status


- Contributing Feature
- Non-Contributing Feature
- No Data



HIGHLAND PARK RE-STUDY AREA - PROPOSED CHANGES TO HISTORIC STATUS



EXHIBIT D



DRAFT - HIGHLAND PARK - GARVANZA HPOZ



EXHIBIT E

COUNTY CLERK'S USE	CITY OF LOS ANGELES OFFICE OF THE CITY CLERK ROOM 615, CITY HALL EAST LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90012 CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT <h2 style="text-align: center;">NOTICE OF EXEMPTION</h2> (Article 19 of the California CEQA Guidelines)	CITY CLERK'S USE
--------------------	--	------------------

Submission of this form is optional. The form shall be filed with the County Clerk, 12400 E. Imperial Highway, Norwalk, CA 90650, pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21152 (b). Pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21167 (d), the filing of this notice starts a 35-day statute of limitations on court challenges to the approval of the project. Failure to file this notice with the County Clerk results in the statute of limitations being extended to 180 days.

LEAD CITY AGENCY: City of Los Angeles Department of City Planning	COUNCIL DISTRICT 1, 14
--	---------------------------

PROJECT TITLE: Expansion and renaming of the Highland Park Historic Preservation Overlay Zone (HPOZ) to "Highland Park - Garvanza Historic Preservation Overlay Zone (HPOZ)"	LOG REFERENCE ENV-2010-944-CE CPC 2010-943-HPOZ
---	---

PROJECT LOCATION: The proposed project is adoption of an expansion to the Highland Park Historic Preservation Overlay Zone (HPOZ) and related renaming of the resulting expanded HPOZ to "Highland Park - Garvanza HPOZ." The expansion area is generally bounded by the eastern side of Avenue 66 to the east; Avenue 63 to the west; City of Pasadena to the north; and York Boulevard to the south.

The project also includes certification of the Garvanza Historic Resources Survey, which, in addition to assessing the expansion area described above, provides an update for a portion of the existing Highland Park HPOZ. This portion is generally bounded by the Pasadena/110 Freeway to the southeast; Avenue 64 to the west; York Boulevard to the north; and Marmion Way to the southwest.

The resulting, overall expanded HPOZ ("Highland Park - Garvanza HPOZ") is generally bounded by the Pasadena/110 Freeway, Berenice Avenue and the eastern side of Avenue 66 to the east; Glenalbyn Drive, Marmion Way, Avenue 56 and Avenue 63 to the west; the City of Pasadena to the north; and by Avenue 35 to the south. The boundaries are irregular at all parameters.

DESCRIPTION OF NATURE, PURPOSE, AND BENEFICIARIES OF PROJECT:

Establishment of an expanded Historic Preservation Overlay Zone (HPOZ) to include the Garvanza neighborhood within the existing Highland Park Historic Preservation Overlay Zone.

NAME OF PERSON OR AGENCY CARRYING OUT PROJECT, IF OTHER THAN LEAD CITY AGENCY:

CONTACT PERSON Jason Chan	AREA CODE 213	TELEPHONE NUMBER 978-3307	EXT.
------------------------------	------------------	------------------------------	------

EXEMPT STATUS: (Check One)

	STATE CEQA GUIDELINES	STATE EIR GUIDELINE
<input type="checkbox"/> MINISTERIAL		Sec. 15268
<input type="checkbox"/> DECLARED EMERGENCY		Sec. 15269
<input type="checkbox"/> EMERGENCY PROJECT		Sec. 15269

GENERAL EXEMPTION

Sec. 15061 (b) (3)

CATEGORICAL EXEMPTION

Article 19 , Sec. 15308
& 15331


Sec. 15300 *et seq.*

Classes 8 & 31 Category _____ (California CEQA Guidelines)

OTHER (See Public Resources Code Sec. 21080 (b) and set forth state and city guideline provision.

JUSTIFICATION FOR PROJECT EXEMPTION: See attached narrative.

IF FILED BY APPLICANT, ATTACH CERTIFIED DOCUMENT OF EXEMPTION FINDING.

SIGNATURE 		TITLE Planning Assistant		DATE July 6, 2010			
FEE: N/A		RECEIPT NO. N/A		REC'D. BY N/A		DATE N/A	

DISTRIBUTION: (1) County Clerk, (2) City Clerk, (3) Agency Record
Form Gen. 183 (Rev. 8-90) (Appendix A) (C.S. 4/98) (P.C. 5/02)

THE APPLICANT CERTIFIES THAT HE OR SHE UNDERSTANDS THE FOLLOWING:

Completion of this form by an employee of the City constitutes only a staff recommendation that an exemption from CEQA be granted. A Notice of Exemption is only effective if, after a public review and any required public hearings, it is adopted by the City agency having final jurisdiction (including any appeals) over the project application. If a CEQA exemption is found inappropriate, preparation of a Negative Declaration or Environmental Impact Report will be required. IF THE INFORMATION SUBMITTED BY THE APPLICANT IS INCORRECT OR INCOMPLETE SUCH ERROR OR OMISSION COULD INVALIDATE ANY CITY ACTIONS ON THE PROJECT, INCLUDING CEQA FINDINGS.

*Jason Chan
NAME (PRINTED)


*
SIGNATURE

CATEGORICAL EXEMPTION NARRATIVE HIGHLAND PARK HPOZ EXPANSION AND RENAMING TO "HIGHLAND PARK – GARVANZA HPOZ"

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The proposed project is adoption of an expansion to the Highland Park Historic Preservation Overlay Zone (HPOZ) and related renaming of the resulting expanded HPOZ to "Highland Park - Garvanza HPOZ." The expansion area is generally bounded by: the eastern side of Avenue 66 to the east; Avenue 63 to the west; City of Pasadena to the north; and York Boulevard to the south. The project also includes certification of the Garvanza Historic Resources Survey, which, in addition to assessing the expansion area described above, provides an update for a portion of the existing Highland Park HPOZ generally bounded by the Pasadena/110 Freeway to the southeast; Avenue 64 to the west; York Boulevard to the north; and Marmion Way to the southwest.

The resulting, overall expanded HPOZ ("Highland Park - Garvanza HPOZ") is generally bounded by the Pasadena/110 Freeway, Berenice Avenue and the eastern side of Avenue 66 to the east; Glenalbyn Drive, Marmion Way, Avenue 56 and Avenue 63 to the west; the City of Pasadena to the north; and by Avenue 35 to the south. The boundaries are irregular at all parameters.

BACKGROUND

In July 2007, the City Council adopted a motion instructing the Planning Department to initiate and complete proceedings to establish an HPOZ, incorporating general boundaries to include City of Pasadena to the north; Metro (Gold Line Light Rail Line) right-of-way bridge to the south; the eastside of Avenue 66 to the east; and the eastside of Figueroa proceeding to the Westside of Avenue 63 at York to the west. The City Council motion indicated that Judson Studios and Thorne Street should be included in studies, since they are considered a part of the Garvanza neighborhood.

Following on the July 2007 motion, the City Council adopted an Interim Control Ordinance (ICO) in October, 2007 to establish temporary regulations on building permits within the area included in the boundaries described above, in order to enable the Planning Department to conduct a historic resources survey for Garvanza and provide subsequent recommendations for permanent land use regulations in the area based on the survey's findings. The ICO was set to expire in October 2009.

In September, 2009, on the basis of ongoing budget austerity measures and related staffing constraints in the City, the City Council adopted a motion instructing the Planning Department to develop a new Interim Control Ordinance in order to allow for more time to complete the Garvanza Historic Resources Survey and related recommendations for HPOZ adoption. In October 2009, the City Council adopted the new ICO with the same boundaries as those in the first ICO. The Council's actions had the full support from Council Districts 1 and 14, as well as a variety of community stakeholders, including the Highland Park Heritage Trust.

Due to the ongoing budget austerity measures and related staffing constraints in the City, in the Spring of 2010, the Planning Department, with Council and community support, began to undertake a program to streamline HPOZs on a citywide basis. One of the goals of the streamlining goals was to minimize the creation of new HPOZ Boards. In line with this effort and with the support of the stakeholders mentioned above, the Planning Department is now proposing the expansion of the existing Highland Park HPOZ to include Garvanza and for the

new overall HPOZ to share a single HPOZ Board, as opposed to creating a stand-alone Garvanza HPOZ with a new, separate Board. This will help to minimize the potential impact of a new HPOZ area on the City's budget and staffing constraints.

SURVEY FINDINGS

The recommended boundaries have been reduced from those described in the original ICOs (above), in order to exclude properties that either did not relate to the historical context themes or that have suffered a dramatic loss of integrity. This includes streets that were developed in the postwar era (particularly in the northern part of the Interim Control Ordinance area); the area south of Marmion Way, which has suffered a dramatic loss of integrity due to alternations to individual buildings; and most of York Boulevard, which is predominantly commercial in character and has been significantly altered or redeveloped in the past several decades.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

Based on recent litigation on the appropriate level of environmental review for HPOZs, Planning staff has conducted considerable additional research and concluded that Categorical Exemptions Class 8 and 31 of the State CEQA Guidelines are appropriate and the exceptions to the use of categorical exemptions do not apply.

Categorical Exemption, Article 19, Section 15308, Class 8 "consists of actions taken by regulatory agencies, as authorized by state or local ordinance, to assure the maintenance, restoration, enhancement, or protection of the environment where the regulatory process involves procedures for protection of the environment". Categorical Exemption, Article 19, Section 15331, Class 31 "consists of projects limited to maintenance, repair, stabilization, rehabilitation, restoration, preservation, or reconstruction of historical resources in a manner consistent with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Buildings (1995), Weeks and Grimmer". A number of cities in California have used either or both of these categorical exemptions in the establishment of their historic districts. Pasadena, Berkeley, and Santa Rosa have used Class 8. Long Beach, San Diego, and Santa Monica have used Class 31 and Oakland has used both Class 8 and Class 31.

Individual construction projects that are subject to the HPOZ are still required to go through project specific environmental review if required under CEQA. Thus, the amendment of an HPOZ does not supersede the California Environmental Quality Act, or other Los Angeles Municipal Code requirements.

State of California CEQA Guidelines, Article 19, Section 15308, Class 8 *"consists of actions taken by regulatory agencies, as authorized by state or local ordinance, to assure the maintenance, restoration, enhancement, or protection of the environment where the regulatory process involves procedures for protection of the environment"*.

The Garvanza Historic Resources Survey in conjunction with the establishment of a Historic Preservation Overlay Zone over the proposed expansion area will help regulate construction activities to ensure the protection of a city historic resource: the Highland Park – Garvanza neighborhood. Without regulation of construction activities in Highland Park – Garvanza, the historic integrity of the neighborhood could be lost through incompatible alterations and new construction and the demolition of irreplaceable historic structures. The criteria used to review proposed projects within a Historic Preservation Overlay Zone (HPOZ) are the Secretary of the Interior's Guidelines for Rehabilitation. The use of Categorical Exemption Class 8 from the State CEQA Guidelines is consistent with other California jurisdictions, which find that the regulations placed upon historic districts is necessary for the protection of the environment and

will make sure that maintenance, repair, restoration, and rehabilitation does not degrade the historic resource.

State of California CEQA Guidelines, Article 19, Section 15331, Class 31 *"consists of projects limited to maintenance, repair, stabilization, rehabilitation, restoration, preservation, or reconstruction of historical resources in a manner consistent with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Buildings (1995), Weeks and Grimmer".*

The establishment of the Highland Park – Garvanza HPOZ falls under Categorical Exemption Class because all exterior projects will be reviewed for conformity with the Secretary of Interior Standards for Rehabilitation. Utilizing these standards, properties can be adapted for modern living without degrading the historic integrity of the resource. All projects subject to HPOZ review will be analyzed for consistency with the with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation, thus protecting Highland Park – Garvanza from construction activities that could damage its historic integrity and ensuring that maintenance, repair, stabilization, rehabilitation, restoration, preservation, conservation or reconstruction is conducted in a historically appropriate manner.

Planning staff evaluated all the potential exceptions to the use of Categorical Exemptions for the proposed project per Section 15300.2 of the State CEQA Guidelines and determined that none of these exceptions apply as explained below:

Cumulative Impact - *The exception applies when, although a particular project may not have a significant impact, the impact of successive projects, of the same type, in the same place, over time is significant.*

The proposed expansion of the Highland Park-Garvanza HPOZ does not include any new construction or upzoning; rather, it is a mechanism to protect and preserve existing neighborhoods. Individual projects that may be initiated in the future will have their own environmental review. In addition, there are no other preservation initiatives in this portion of the City of Los Angeles.

Significant Effect - *This exception applies when, although the project may otherwise be exempt, there is a reasonable possibility that the project will have a significant effect due to unusual circumstances. Examples include projects which may affect scenic or historical resources.*

Similarly to the other twenty-five HPOZs that currently exist in the City, the proposed Highland Park-Garvanza HPOZ would not result in any potential environmental impacts, but rather through HPOZ-based design regulations would protect identified historic resources. To ensure that the project will not have any significant impacts due to unusual circumstances that has not been considered, Planning Staff evaluated all categories on the Initial Study Checklist including: Aesthetics, Agricultural, Air Quality, Biological, Cultural Resources, Geology and Soils, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Hydrology and Water Quality, Land Use and Planning, Mineral Resources, Noise, Population and Housing, Public Services, Recreation, Transportation/Circulation, Utilities, and Mandatory Findings of Significance.

Scenic Highway - *Projects that may result in damage to scenic resources within a duly designated scenic highway*

The proposed Highland Park-Garvanza HPOZ does not contain any scenic highways or scenic resources.

Hazardous Waste Site - *Projects located on a site or facility listed pursuant to California Government Code 65962.5*

The Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) has not listed any parcel in the proposed Highland Park-Garvanza HPOZ as a hazardous material site.

Historical Resources - Projects that may cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource.

The proposed project would not cause an adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in State CEQA 15064.5; rather, the proposed project would protect identified historic structures through the Historic Preservation Overlay Zone (HPOZ).

The proposed Highland Park-Garvanza HPOZ HPOZ would establish permanent regulations on alterations, renovations, and additions for parcels within its boundaries, consistent with the Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation.

ORDINANCE NO. 175891

A proposed ordinance amending Section 12.20.3 of the Los Angeles Municipal Code to modify procedures within the Historic Preservation Overlay Zones.

THE PEOPLE OF THE CITY OF LOS ANGELES
DO ORDAIN AS FOLLOWS:

Section 1. Section 12.20.3 of the Los Angeles Municipal Code is amended to read:

SEC. 12.20.3. "HP" HISTORIC PRESERVATION OVERLAY ZONE. The following regulations shall apply in an HP Historic Preservation Overlay Zone:

A. Purpose. It is hereby declared as a matter of public policy that the recognition, preservation, enhancement, and use of buildings, structures, Landscaping, Natural Features, and areas within the City of Los Angeles having Historic, architectural, cultural or aesthetic significance are required in the interest of the health, economic prosperity, cultural enrichment and general welfare of the people. The purpose of this section is to:

1. Protect and enhance the use of buildings, structures, Natural Features, and areas, which are reminders of the City's history, or which are unique and irreplaceable assets to the City and its neighborhoods, or which are worthy examples of past architectural styles;
2. Develop and maintain the appropriate settings and environment to preserve these buildings, structures, Landscaping, Natural Features, and areas;
3. Enhance property values; stabilize neighborhoods and/or communities, render property eligible for financial benefits, and promote tourist trade and interest;
4. Foster public appreciation of the beauty of the City, of the accomplishments of its past as reflected through its buildings, structures, Landscaping, Natural Features, and areas;
5. Promote education by preserving and encouraging interest in cultural, social, economic, political and architectural phases of its history;

6. Promote the involvement of all aspects of the City's diverse neighborhoods in the historic preservation process; and

7. To ensure that all procedures comply with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

B. Definitions. For the purposes of this ordinance, the following words and phrases are defined:

1. **ADDITION** is an extension or increase in floor area or height of a building or structure.

2. **ALTERATION** is any exterior change or modification of a building, structure, Landscaping, Natural Feature or lot within a Historic Preservation Overlay Zone including but not limited to changing exterior paint color, removal of significant trees or Landscaping, installation or removal of fencing, and similar Projects, and including street features, furniture or fixtures.

3. **BOARD** is the respective Historic Preservation Board as established by this section.

4. **CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS** is an approved certificate issued for the construction, Addition, demolition, Reconstruction, Alteration, removal, or relocation of any publicly or privately owned building, structure, Landscaping, Natural Feature, or lot within a Historic Preservation Overlay Zone that is identified as a Contributing Element in the Historic Resources Survey for the zone, including street features, furniture or fixtures.

5. **CERTIFICATE OF COMPATIBILITY** is an approved certificate issued for the construction of a new building or structure on a lot, or building replacement of an element, identified as Non-Contributing, or not listed, in the Historic Resources Survey for the zone.

6. **CONTRIBUTING ELEMENT** is any building, structure, Landscaping, Natural Feature identified on the Historic Resources Survey as contributing to the Historic significance of the Historic Preservation Overlay Zone, including a building or structure which has been altered, where the nature and extent of the Alterations are determined reversible by the Historic Resources Survey.

7. **CULTURAL** is anything pertaining to the concepts, skills, habits, arts, instruments or institutions of a given people at any given point in time.

8. HISTORIC is any building, structure, Landscaping, Natural Feature, or lot, including street features, furniture or fixtures which depicts, represents or is associated with persons or phenomena which significantly affect or which have significantly affected the functional activities, heritage, growth or development of the City, State, or Nation.

9. HISTORICAL PROPERTY CONTRACT is a contract, between an Owner or Owners of a Historical-Cultural Monument or a Contributing Element and the City of Los Angeles, which meets all requirements of California Government Code Sections 50281 and 50282 and 19.140 *et seq.* of the Los Angeles Administrative Code.

10. HISTORIC RESOURCES SURVEY is a document, which identifies all contributing and non-contributing buildings, structures and all contributing Landscaping, Natural Features and lots, individually or collectively, including street features, furniture or fixtures, and which is certified as to its accuracy and completeness by the Cultural Heritage Commission.

11. LANDSCAPING is the design and organization of landforms, hardscape, and softscape, including individual groupings of trees, shrubs, groundcovers, vines, pathways, arbors, *etc.*

12. MAINTENANCE AND REPAIR is any work done to correct the deterioration, decay of, or damage to a building, structure or lot, or any part thereof, including replacement in-kind where required, and which does not involve a change in the existing design, materials, or exterior paint color.

13. MONUMENT is any building, structure, Landscaping, Natural Feature, or lot designated as a City Historic-Cultural Monument.

14. NATURAL FEATURE is any significant tree, plant life, geographical or geological feature identified individually or collectively on the Historic Resources Survey as contributing to the Cultural or Historical significance of the Historic Preservation Overlay Zone.

15. NON-CONTRIBUTING ELEMENT is any building, structure, Natural Feature, lot, or Landscaping, that is identified in the Historic Resources Survey as a Non-Contributing Element, or not listed in the Historic Resources Survey.

16. OWNER is any person, association, partnership, firm, corporation or public entity identified as the holder of title on any property as shown on the records of the City Clerk or on the last assessment roll of the County of Los Angeles, as applicable. For purposes of this section, the term Owner shall also refer to an

appointed representative of an association, partnership, firm, corporation, or public entity which is a recorded Owner.

17. PRESERVATION ZONE is any area of the City of Los Angeles containing buildings, structures, Landscaping, Natural Features or lots having Historic, architectural, Cultural or aesthetic significance and designated as a Historic Preservation Overlay Zone under the provisions of this section.

18. PROJECT is the Addition, Alteration, construction, demolition, Reconstruction, Rehabilitation, relocation, removal or Restoration of the exterior of any building, structure, Landscaping, Natural Feature, or lot, within a Preservation Zone, except as provided under Subsection H. A Project may or may not require a building permit, and may include but not be limited to changing exterior paint color, removal of significant trees or Landscaping, installation or removal of fencing, replacement of windows and/or doors which are character-defining features of architectural styles, changes to public spaces and similar activities.

19. RECONSTRUCTION is the act or process of reproducing by new construction the exact form, features and details of a vanished building, portion of a building, structure, landscape, Natural Feature, or object as it appeared at a specific period of time, on its original or a substitute lot.

20. REHABILITATION is the act or process of returning a property to a state of utility, through repair or Alteration, which makes possible an efficient contemporary use while preserving those portions or features of the property which are significant to its Historical, architectural and Cultural values.

21. RENTER is any person, association, partnership, firm, corporation, or public entity which has rented or leased a dwelling unit or other structure within a Preservation Zone for a continuous time period of at least three years. For purposes of this section, the term renter shall also refer to an appointed representative of an association, partnership, firm, corporation, or public entity which is a renter.

22. RESTORATION is the act or process of accurately recovering the form, features and details of a property as it appeared at a particular period of time by means of the removal of later work or by the replacement of missing earlier work.

23. RIGHT-OF-WAY is the dedicated area that includes roadways, medians and/or sidewalks.

C. Relationship to Other Provisions of the Code. Whenever the City Council establishes, adds land to, eliminates land from or repeals in its entirety a Preservation Zone, the provisions of this section shall not be construed as an intent to abrogate any other provision of this Code. When it appears that there is a conflict, the most restrictive requirements of this Code shall apply, except for a requirement in this section, which may compromise public safety if enforced.

D. Historic Preservation Board.

1. Establishment and Composition. There is hereby established for each Preservation Zone a Historic Preservation Board. Each Board shall have, as part of its name, words linking it to its area of administration and distinguishing it from all other boards. A Board shall be comprised of five members. At least three members shall be Renters or Owners of property in the Preservation Zone. For the purposes of this subsection, a Preservation Zone shall be considered predominantly residential when the total number of residentially zoned lots is greater than the combined total of lots in all other zone classifications. In predominantly residential Preservation Zones, at least three members shall be Owners or Renters who reside in the Preservation Zone. When property is owned or rented by corporations, governments or other organizations, the Board members may be appointees of those organizations. In the event a Preservation Zone is established for an area insufficient in size to provide for a Board whose members meet the requirements of this subsection, for appointment purposes only, the area may be expanded to include the community plan area in which the Preservation Zone is located. In the event a Board still cannot be comprised of members who meet the requirements of this subsection, the Cultural Heritage Commission shall assume all the powers and duties otherwise assigned to the Board for the Preservation Zone, until a Board can be established.

2. Term of Membership. Members of the Board shall serve for a term of four years. Members of the Board whose terms have expired may continue to serve on the Board until their replacements are appointed.

3. Appointment of Members. To the maximum extent practicable, members shall be appointed as follows:

(a) One member having extensive real estate or construction experience shall be appointed by the Mayor.

(b) One member who is a Renter or Owner of property in the Preservation Zone shall be appointed by the councilmember of the district in which the Preservation Zone is located. In cases where the Preservation Zone is located in more than one council district, the appointment shall be made by

the councilmember representing the greatest land area in the Preservation Zone. In predominantly residential Preservation Zones, the Owner or Renter shall also be a resident of the Preservation Zone.

(c) Two members, one of which shall be an architect licensed by the State of California, shall be appointed by the Cultural Heritage Commission. In the event only one appointment under (a) or (b) above is a Renter or Owner in the Preservation Zone, then at least one of the appointees of the Cultural Heritage Commission shall be a Renter or Owner of property in the Preservation Zone. In the event neither of the appointments under (a) or (b) above is an Owner of property in the Preservation Zone, then at least one of the appointees of the Cultural Heritage Commission shall also be an Owner of property in the Preservation Zone. In predominantly residential Preservation Zones, the Owners or Renters shall also be residents of the Preservation Zone.

(d) One member, who is an Owner of property in the Preservation Zone, shall be appointed by the Board. The Board shall consider appointee suggestions from the Certified Neighborhood Council representing the district in which the Preservation Zone is located. In predominantly residential Preservation Zones, the Owners or Renters shall also be residents of the Preservation Zone. In cases where the Preservation Zone is located in an area represented by more than one Neighborhood Council, the appointee suggestions shall be made by the Neighborhood Council representing the greatest land area in the Preservation Zone. In those Preservation Zones containing no Certified Neighborhood Councils, or if, after notification of a vacancy by the Planning Department, the Certified Neighborhood Council fails to make suggestions within 30 days, or at least one Certified Neighborhood Council meeting has been held, whichever occurs first, the Board may make its appointment without delay.

All members shall have demonstrated a knowledge of, and interest in, the culture, buildings, structures, Historic architecture, history and features of the area encompassed by the Preservation Zone and, to the extent feasible, shall have experience in historic preservation. The appointing authorities are encouraged to consider the cultural diversity of the Preservation Zone in making their appointments. Appointees serve at the pleasure of the appointing authority and the appointment may be rescinded at any time prior to the expiration of a member's term.

4. **Vacancies.** In the event of a vacancy occurring during the term of a member of the Board, the same body or official, or their successors, who appointed the member shall make a new appointment. The new appointment shall serve a four year term beginning on the date of appointment. Where the member is required

to have specified qualifications, the vacancy shall be filled with a person having these qualifications. If the appointing authority does not make an appointment within 60 days of the vacancy, the President of the City Council shall make a temporary appointment to serve until the appointing authority makes an appointment to occupy the seat.

5. Expiration of Term. Upon expiration of a term for any member of the Board, the appointment for the next succeeding term shall be made by the same body or official, or their successors, which made the previous appointment. No member of a Board shall serve more than two consecutive four year terms.

6. Boardmember Performance. Boardmembers shall be expected to regularly attend scheduled Board meetings and fully participate in the powers and duties of the Board. Appointees serve at the pleasure of the appointing authority and the appointment may be rescinded at any time prior to the expiration of a member's term. A Boardmember with more than three consecutive unexcused absences or eight unexcused absences in a year period from regularly scheduled meetings may be removed by the appointing authority. Excused absences may be granted by the Board chair. In the event a Boardmember accrues unexcused absences, the Board shall notify the appointing authority.

7. Organization and Administration. Each Board shall schedule regular meetings at fixed times within the month with a minimum of two meetings a month. Meetings may be canceled if no deemed complete applications are received at least three working days prior to the next scheduled meeting. There shall be at least one meeting a year. The Board shall establish rules, procedures and guidelines as it may deem necessary to properly exercise its function. The Board shall elect a Chairperson and Vice-Chairperson who shall serve for a one year period. The Board shall designate a Secretary and Treasurer who shall serve at the Board's pleasure. Three members shall constitute a quorum. Decisions shall be determined by majority vote of the Board. Public minutes and records shall be kept of all meetings and proceedings showing the attendance, resolutions, findings, determinations and decisions, including the vote of each member. To the extent possible, the staffs of the Department of City Planning and Cultural Affairs Department may assist the Board in performing its duties and functions.

8. Power and Duties. When considering any matter under its jurisdiction, the Board shall have the following power and duties:

(a) To evaluate any proposed changes to the boundaries of the Preservation Zone it administers and make recommendations to the City Planning Commission, Cultural Heritage Commission and City Council.

(b) To evaluate any Historic resources survey, resurvey, partial resurvey, or modification undertaken within the Preservation Zone it administers and make recommendations to the City Planning Commission, Cultural Heritage Commission and City Council.

(c) To study, review and evaluate any proposals for the designation of Historic-Cultural Monuments within the Preservation Zone it administers and make recommendations to the Cultural Heritage Commission and City Council, and to request that other City departments develop procedures to provide notice to the Boards of actions relating to Historic-Cultural Monuments.

(d) To evaluate applications for Certificates of Appropriateness or Certificates of Compatibility and make recommendations to the Director or the Area Planning Commission.

(e) To encourage understanding of and participation in historic preservation by residents, visitors, private businesses, private organizations and governmental agencies.

(f) In pursuit of the purposes of this section, to render guidance and advice to any Owner or occupant on construction, demolition, Alteration, removal or relocation of any Monument or any building, structure, Landscaping, Natural Feature or lot within the Preservation Zone it administers. This guidance and advice shall be consistent with approved procedures and guidelines, and the Preservation Plan, or in absence of a Plan, the guidance and advice shall be consistent with the Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings.

(g) To tour the Preservation Zone it represents on a regular basis, to promote the purposes of this section and to report to appropriate City agencies matters which may require enforcement action.

(h) To assist in the updating of the Historic Resources Survey for the Preservation Zone utilizing the criteria in Subsection F 3 (c), below.

(i) To make recommendations to decision makers concerning façade easements, covenants, and the imposition of other conditions for the purposes of historic preservation.

(j) To make recommendations to the City Council concerning the utilization of grants and budget appropriations to promote historic preservation.

(k) To employ its own staff or hire consultants as may be required in the performance of its duties.

(l) To accept donations from outside sources to be utilized for historic preservation efforts, and to maintain public records accounting for the funds.

(m) To assist in the preparation of a Preservation Plan, which clarifies and elaborates upon these regulations as they apply to the Preservation Zone, and which contains the elements listed in Subsection E 3.

9. Conflict of Interest. No Boardmember shall discuss with anyone the merits of any matter pending before the Board other than during a duly called meeting of the Board or subcommittee of the Board. No member shall accept professional employment on a case that has been acted upon by the Board in the previous 12 months or is reasonably expected to be acted upon by the Board in the next 12 months.

E. Preservation Plan. A Preservation Plan clarifies and elaborates upon these regulations as they apply to individual Preservation Zones. A Preservation Plan is used by the Director, Board, property Owners and residents in the application of preservation principles within a Preservation Zone.

1. Preparation of a Preservation Plan. A draft Preservation Plan shall be made available by the Board for review and comment to property Owners and Renters within the Preservation Zone.

(a) **Creation of a Preservation Plan where a Board exists.** Where established, a Board, with the assistance of the Director, shall prepare a Preservation Plan, which may be prepared with the assistance of historic preservation groups.

(b) **Creation of a Preservation Plan where no Board exists.** Where no Board exists, or has yet to be appointed, the Director, in consultation with the Councilmember(s) representing the Preservation Zone, may create a working committee of diverse neighborhood stakeholders to prepare a Preservation Plan for the Preservation Zone. This committee shall not assume any duties beyond preparation of the Preservation Plan.

2. Approval of a Preservation Plan.

(a) **Commission Hearing and Notice.** A draft Preservation Plan shall be set for a public hearing before the City Planning Commission or a hearing officer as directed by the City Planning Commission prior to the Commission

action. Notice of the hearing shall be given as provided in Section 12.24 D 2 of this Code.

(b) Cultural Heritage Commission Recommendation. The Cultural Heritage Commission shall submit its recommendation regarding a proposed Preservation Plan within 45 days from the date of the submission to the Commission. Upon action, or failure to act, the Cultural Heritage Commission shall transmit its recommendation, comments, and any related files to the City Planning Commission.

(c) Decision by City Planning Commission. Following, notice and public hearing, pursuant to Subsection E 2 (a), above, the City Planning Commission may make its report and approve, approve with changes, or disapprove a Preservation Plan.

3. Elements. A Preservation Plan shall contain the following elements:

(a) A mission statement;

(b) Goals and objectives;

(c) A function of the Plan section, including the role and organization of a Preservation Plan, Historic Preservation Overlay Zone process overview, and work exempted from review, if any, and delegation of Board authority to the Director, if any;

(d) The Historic Resources Survey;

(e) A brief context statement which identifies the Historic, architectural and Cultural significance of the Preservation Zone;

(f) Design guidelines for Rehabilitation or Restoration of single and multi-family residential, commercial and other non-residential buildings, structures, and public areas. The guidelines shall use the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings; and

(g) Preservation incentives and adaptive reuse policies, including policies concerning adaptive reuse projects permitted under Section 12.24 X 12 of this Code.

4. Modification of a City Planning Commission Approved Preservation Plan. After approval by the City Planning Commission, a Preservation Plan shall

be reviewed by the Board at least every two years. Any modifications to the Plan resulting from the review shall be processed pursuant to the provisions of Subsection E, above.

F. Procedures for Establishment, Boundary Change or Repeal of a Preservation Zone.

1. Requirements. The processing of an initiation or an application to establish, change the boundaries of or repeal a Preservation Zone shall conform with all the requirements of Section 12.32 A through D of this Code and the following additional requirements.

2. Initiation of Preservation Zone.

(a) By City Council, the City Planning Commission, the Director of Planning and the Cultural Heritage Commission. In addition to the provisions of LAMC 12.32 A, the Cultural Heritage Commission may initiate proceedings to establish, repeal, or change the boundaries of a Preservation Zone. Upon initiation by City Council, the City Planning Commission, the Director of Planning, or the Cultural Heritage Commission, a Historic Resources Survey shall be prepared, pursuant to Subdivision 3, below.

(b) By Application. The proceedings for the establishment of a Preservation Zone may also be initiated by Owners or Renters of property within the boundaries of the proposed or existing Preservation Zone, pursuant to Section 12.32 S 1 (c)(2) of this Code.

(1) An Historic Resources Survey shall not be prepared for a proposed Preservation Zone until such an application is verified by the Planning Department to contain the signatures of at least 75 percent of the Owners or lessees of property within the proposed district, pursuant to the requirements of Section 12.32 S 1 (c)(2) of this Code.

(2) The application shall not be deemed complete until the requirements of Subsection F 2 (b)(1), above are met and an Historic Resources Survey for the proposed Preservation Zone has been certified by the Cultural Heritage Commission pursuant to Subdivision 4 (a), below.

3. Historic Resources Survey.

(a) Purpose. Each Preservation Zone shall have an Historic Resources Survey, which identifies all Contributing and Non-Contributing Elements and is

certified as to its accuracy and completeness by the Cultural Heritage Commission.

(b) Context Statement. In addition to the requirements above, the historic resource survey shall also include a context statement supporting a finding establishing the relation between the physical environment of the Preservation Zone and its history, thereby allowing the identification of Historic features in the area as contributing or non-contributing. The context statement shall represent the history of the area by theme, place, and time. It shall define the various Historical factors which shaped the development of the area. It shall define a period of significance for the Preservation Zone, and relate Historic features to that period of significance. It may include, but not be limited to, Historical activities or events, associations with Historic personages, architectural styles and movements, master architects, designers, building types, building materials, landscape design, or pattern of physical development that influenced the character of the Preservation Zone at a particular time in history.

(c) Finding of Contribution. For the purposes of this section, no building, structure, Landscaping, or Natural Feature shall be considered a Contributing Element unless it is identified as a Contributing Element in the historic resource survey for the applicable Preservation Zone. Features designated as contributing shall meet one or more of the following criteria:

(1) adds to the Historic architectural qualities or Historic associations for which a property is significant because it was present during the period of significance, and possesses Historic integrity reflecting its character at that time; or

(2) owing to its unique location or singular physical characteristics, represents an established feature of the neighborhood, community or city; or

(3) retaining the building, structure, Landscaping, or Natural Feature, would contribute to the preservation and protection of an Historic place or area of Historic interest in the City.

(d) Modification of a Previously Certified Historic Resources Survey. The City Council, City Planning Commission, or Director may find that a previously certified Historic Resource Survey needs to be modified, and may call for a revision, re-survey, or partial re-survey to a previously certified survey. Modifications, including boundary changes, re-surveys, partial re-surveys, and minor corrections of a previously certified Historic Resources Survey shall be processed as follows:

(1) Revisions involving a boundary change, expansion, or contraction of a Preservation Zone shall be certified by the Cultural Heritage Commission as to the accuracy of the survey, and shall be forwarded to the City Planning Commission and the City Council for final approval.

(2) Revisions involving a re-survey or partial re-survey of an existing Preservation Zone shall be certified by the Cultural Heritage Commission as to the accuracy of the survey, and shall be forwarded to the City Planning Commission for final approval.

(3) The correction of technical errors and omissions in a previously certified Historic Resource Survey can be made by the Director based on input from the Cultural Heritage Commission.

4. Approval Process.

(a) Cultural Heritage Commission Determination. The Cultural Heritage Commission shall certify each Historic Resources Survey as to its accuracy and completeness, and the establishment of or change in boundaries of a Preservation Zone upon (1) a majority vote and (2) a written finding that structures, Landscaping, and Natural Features within the Preservation Zone meet one or more of criteria (1) through (3), inclusive, in Subdivision 3 (c) of Subsection F within 45 days from the date of the submission to the Commission. This time limit may be extended for a specified further time period if the Cultural Heritage Commission requests an extension, in writing, from the City Planning Commission. Upon action, or failure to act, the Cultural Heritage Commission shall transmit their determination, comments, and any related files to the City Planning Commission for recommendation.

(b) City Planning Commission Approval. The City Planning Commission shall make its report and recommendation to approve, approve with changes, or disapprove the consideration to establish, repeal, or change the boundaries of a Preservation Zone, pursuant to Section 12.32 C of this Code. In granting approval, the City Planning Commission shall find that the proposed boundaries are appropriate and make the findings of contribution required in Subsection F 3 (c). The City Planning Commission shall also carefully consider the Historic Resources Survey and the determination of the Cultural Heritage Commission. The Director and the City Planning Commission may recommend conditions to be included in the initial Preservation Plan for a specific Preservation Zone, as appropriate to further the purpose of this section.

(c) City Council. Pursuant to Section 12.32 C 7 of this Code, the City Council may approve or disapprove the establishment, repeal, or change in the boundaries of a Preservation Zone. The City Council may require that a specific Preservation Zone does not take effect until a Preservation Plan for the Preservation Zone is first approved by the City Planning Commission.

G. Review of Projects in Historic Preservation Overlay Zones. All Projects within Preservation Zones, except as exempted in Subsection H, shall be submitted in conjunction with an application, if necessary, to the Department of City Planning upon a form provided for that purpose. Upon receipt of an application, the Director shall review a request and find whether the Project requires a Certificate of Appropriateness, pursuant to Subsection K; a Certificate of Compatibility, pursuant to Subsection L; or is eligible for review under Conforming Work on Contributing Elements, pursuant to Subsection I; or Conforming Work on Non-Contributing Elements, pursuant to Subsection J.

H. Exemptions. The provisions of this ordinance shall not apply to the following:

1. The correction of Emergency or Hazardous Conditions where the Department of Building and Safety, Housing Department, or other enforcement agency has determined that emergency or hazardous conditions currently exist and the emergency or hazardous conditions must be corrected in the interest of the public health, safety and welfare. When feasible, the Department of Building and Safety, Housing Department, or other enforcement agency should consult with the Director on how to correct the hazardous condition, consistent with the goals of the Preservation Zone. However, any other work shall comply with the provisions of this section.

2. Department of Public Works improvements located, in whole or in part, within a Preservation Zone, where the Director finds:

(a) That the certified Historic Resources Survey for the Preservation Zone does not identify any Contributing Elements located within the Right-of-Way and/or where the Right-of-Way is not specifically addressed in the approved Preservation Plan for the Preservation Zone; and

(b) Where the Department of Public Works has completed the CEQA review of the proposed improvement, and the review has determined that the improvement is exempt from CEQA, or will have no potentially significant environmental impacts.

The relevant Board shall be notified of the Project, given a description of the Project, and an opportunity to comment.

3. Work authorized by an approved Historical Property Contract by the City Council, or

4. Where a building, structure, Landscaping, Natural Feature or Lot has been designated as a City Historic-Cultural Monument by the City Council, unless proposed for demolition.

However, those properties with Federal or State historic designation which are not designated as City Historic-Cultural Monuments or do not have a City Historical Property Contract are not exempt from review under this ordinance.

5. Where the type of work has been specifically deemed Exempt from review as set forth in the approved Preservation Plan for a specific Preservation Zone.

I. Conforming Work on Contributing Elements. Conforming Work on Contributing Elements includes Restoration work, Maintenance and Repair, Additions of less than 250 square feet with no increase in height and which are not located within the front yard or street-side yard, and demolition taken in response to natural disaster. Conforming Work meeting the criteria set forth in this subsection shall not require a Certificate of Appropriateness for Contributing Elements pursuant to Subsection K.

1. Procedure. Pursuant to Subsection G, the Director shall forward applications for Conforming Work on Contributing Elements to the Board for conformance review and sign off. The Board may delegate its review authority to the Director of Planning as specified in the Preservation Plan approved for the Preservation Zone.

2. Review Criteria. A request for Conforming Work on Contributing Elements shall be reviewed for conformity with the Preservation Plan for the Preservation Zone, or if none exists, the Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings, and at least one of following conditions:

(a) Where the building, structure, Landscaping, or Natural Feature within the Preservation Zone is being restored to its original appearance; or

(b) Where a building, structure, Landscaping, or Natural Feature within a Preservation Zone has been damaged by fire, earthquake or other natural disaster to the extent that it cannot be repaired or restored with reasonable diligence and where demolition of the structure, Landscaping, Natural Feature or Lot is being requested (subject to the provisions of Public Resources Code Section 5028, where applicable);

(c) Where Maintenance or Repair work is undertaken with respect to any building, structure, Landscaping, Natural Feature or lot, or the work does not require the issuance of a building permit, pursuant to Section 91.106.2 of this Code; or

(d) Where the Project consists of an Addition of less than 250 square feet to any building, structure, the Addition is not located within the front yard or street-side yard, and no increase in height is proposed.

3. Time to Act. The Board shall act on the request for Conforming Work on Contributing Elements at its next agendized Board meeting within 21 days of the Director deeming an application complete, unless the applicant and the Director mutually agree in writing to an extension of time. The applicant may request a transfer of jurisdiction to the Director if the Board fails to act within 21 days. Applications reviewed under Conforming Work shall be agendized by the Board.

4. Certification. The Board shall review and sign off a request for Conforming Work on Contributing Elements if it finds that the work meets the criteria as set forth in Subdivision 2, above. The Board does not have the authority to impose conditions on Conforming Work. If the Board finds that the work does not meet the criteria, as set forth in Subdivision 2, above, it shall specify in writing as to why.

5. If an application fails to conform to the criteria of Conforming Work on Contributing Elements, an applicant may elect to file for review under the Certificate of Appropriateness procedure pursuant to Subsection K.

J. Conforming Work on Non-Contributing Elements. Conforming Work on Non-Contributing Elements includes work undertaken on any building, structure, Natural Feature, lot, or Landscaping, that is not listed as a Contributing Element in the Historic Resources Survey, or that is not listed in the Historic Resources Survey; except that, the construction of a new building or building replacement, or the demolition of buildings or structures not listed as Contributing Elements shall not qualify as conforming work on Non-Contributing Elements. The relocation of buildings or structures dating from the Preservation Zone's period of significance onto a lot designated as a Non-Contributing Element in a Preservation Zone, are eligible for review under Conforming Work on Non-Contributors.

1. Procedure. Pursuant to Subsection G, the Director shall forward applications for Conforming Work on Non-Contributing Elements to the Board for conformance review and sign off. The Board may delegate its review authority to the Director as specified in the Preservation Plan approved for the Preservation Zone.

2. Review Criteria. A request for Conforming Work on Non-Contributing Elements shall be signed off by the Board if they find: the work involves the relocation of buildings or structures dating from the Preservation Zone's period of significance onto a lot in the Preservation Zone; or the work is undertaken solely on a feature within the Preservation Zone that is identified as Non-Contributing in the Historic Resources Survey, or not listed in the Historic Resources Survey, and the work does not involve the construction of a new building, building replacement or demolition.

3. Time to Act. The Board shall act on a request for Conforming Work on Non-Contributing Elements at its next agendaized Board meeting within 21 days of the Director deeming an application complete, unless the applicant and the Director mutually agree in writing to an extension of time. The applicant may request a transfer of jurisdiction to the Director if the Board fails to act within the specified time. Applications reviewed under Conforming Work shall be agendaized by the Board.

4. Certification. The Board shall review and sign off a request for Conforming Work on Non-Contributing Elements if it finds that the work meets the criteria as set forth in Subdivision 2, above. The Board does not have the authority to impose conditions on Conforming Work. If the Board finds that the work does not meet the criteria, as set forth in Subdivision 2, above, it shall specify in writing as to why.

5. If an application fails to conform to the criteria of Conforming Work on Non-Contributing Elements, an applicant may elect to file for review under the Certificate of Compatibility procedure pursuant to Subsection L.

K. Certificate of Appropriateness for Contributing Elements.

1. Purpose. It is the intent of this section to require the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness for any Project affecting a Contributing Element, except as set forth in Subdivision 2(b), below. It is the further intent of this section to require a Certificate of Appropriateness for some Projects which may, or may not, require a building permit, including, but not limited to, changing exterior paint color, removal of significant trees or Landscaping, installation or removal of fencing, window and door replacement which are character-defining features of architectural styles, changes to public spaces and similar Projects. However, an applicant not approved under Subsection I may elect to file for a Certificate of Appropriateness.

2. Requirements.

(a) Prohibition. No person shall construct, add to, alter, demolish, relocate or remove any building, structure, Landscaping, or Natural Feature designated as contributing in the Historic Resources Survey for a Preservation Zone unless a Certificate of Appropriateness has been approved for that action pursuant to this section, with the exception of Conforming Work on Contributing Elements, which shall not require a Certificate of Appropriateness. No Certificate of Appropriateness shall be approved unless the plans for the construction, demolition, Alteration, Addition, relocation, or removal conform with the provisions of this section. Any approval, conditional approval, or denial shall include written findings in support.

(b) Conforming Work. Nothing in this section shall be construed as to require a Certificate of Appropriateness for the ordinary Maintenance and Repair of any exterior architectural feature of a property within a Preservation Zone, which does not involve a change in design, material, color, or outward appearance. Work meeting the criteria for Conforming Work on Contributing Elements shall not require a Certificate of Appropriateness.

3. Procedures For Obtaining A Certificate of Appropriateness.

(a) Any plan for the construction, Addition, Alteration, demolition, Reconstruction, relocation or removal of a building, structure, Landscaping, or Natural Feature, or any combination designated as contributing in the Historic Resources Survey for a Preservation Zone shall be submitted, in conjunction with an application, to the Department of City Planning upon a form provided for that purpose. Upon an application being deemed complete by the Director, one copy each of the application and relevant documents shall be mailed by the Department of City Planning to both the Cultural Heritage Commission and to each Boardmember for the Preservation Zone for evaluation.

(b) Cultural Heritage Commission and Board Recommendations. After notice and hearing pursuant to Subsection M below, the Cultural Heritage Commission and the Board shall submit its recommendation to the Director as to whether the Certificate should be approved, conditionally approved or disapproved. In the event that the Cultural Heritage Commission or Board does not submit its recommendations within 30 days of the postmarked date of mailing of the application from the City Planning Department, the Cultural Heritage Commission or Board shall be deemed to have forfeited all jurisdiction in the matter and the Certificate may be approved, conditionally approved or disapproved as filed. The applicant and the Director may mutually agree in writing to a longer period of time for the Board to act.

(c) Director and Area Planning Commission Determination. The Director shall have the authority to approve, conditionally approve or disapprove a Certificate of Appropriateness for construction, Addition, Alteration or Reconstruction. The Area Planning Commissions shall have the jurisdiction to approve, conditionally approve or disapprove a Certificate of Appropriateness for demolition, removal or relocation.

(d) Time to Act. The Director or Area Planning Commission, whichever has jurisdiction, shall render a determination on any Certificate of Appropriateness within 75 days of an application being deemed complete, unless the applicant and the Director mutually consent in writing to a longer period. A copy of the determination shall be mailed to the applicant, the Board, the Cultural Heritage Commission and any other interested parties. No Certificate of Appropriateness shall be issued until the appeal period, as set forth in Subsection N has expired or until any appeal has been resolved.

(e) Other City approvals. The requirements for a Certificate of Appropriateness are in Addition to other City approvals (building permits, variances, *etc.*) or other legal requirements, such as Public Resources Code Section 5028, which may be required. The time periods specified above may be extended if necessary with the written mutual consent of the applicant and the Director.

4. Standards for Issuance of Certificate of Appropriateness for Construction, Addition, Alteration, or Reconstruction. The Director shall base a determination whether to approve, conditionally approve or disapprove a Certificate of Appropriateness for construction, Addition, Alteration or Reconstruction on each of the following:

(a) If no Preservation Plan exists; whether the Project complies with Standards for Rehabilitation approved by the United States Secretary of the Interior considering the following factors:

- (1)** architectural design;
- (2)** height, bulk, and massing of buildings and structures;
- (3)** lot coverage and orientation of buildings;
- (4)** color and texture of surface materials;
- (5)** grading and site development;

- (6) Landscaping;
- (7) changes to Natural Features;
- (8) antennas, satellite dishes and solar collectors;
- (9) off-street parking;
- (10) light fixtures and street furniture;
- (11) steps, walls, fencing, doors, windows, screens and security grills;
- (12) yards and setbacks; or
- (13) signs; and

(b) Whether the Project protects and preserves the Historic and architectural qualities and the physical characteristics which make the building, structure, landscape, or Natural Feature a Contributing Element of the Preservation Zone; or

(c) If a Preservation Plan exists; whether the Project complies with the Preservation Plan approved by the City Planning Commission for the Preservation Zone.

5. Standards for Issuance of Certificate of Appropriateness for Demolition, Removal or Relocation. Any person proposing to demolish, remove or relocate any contributing building, structure, Landscaping, or Natural Feature within a Preservation Zone not qualifying as Conforming Work on Contributing Elements shall apply for a Certificate of Appropriateness and the appropriate environmental review.

No Certificate of Appropriateness shall be issued to demolish, remove or relocate any building, structure, Landscaping, Natural Feature or Lot within a Preservation Zone that is designated as a Contributing Element and the application shall be denied unless the Owner can demonstrate to the Area Planning Commission that the Owner would be deprived of all economically viable use of the property. In making its determination, the Area Planning Commission shall consider any evidence presented concerning the following:

(a) An opinion regarding the structural soundness of the structure and its suitability for continued use, renovation, Restoration or Rehabilitation from a

licensed engineer or architect who meets the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualification Standards as established by the Code of Federal Regulation, 36 CFR Part 61. This opinion shall be based on the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Architectural and Engineering Documentation with Guidelines;

(b) An estimate of the cost of the proposed Alteration, construction, demolition, or removal and an estimate of any additional cost that would be incurred to comply with the recommendation of the Board for changes necessary for it to be approved;

(c) An estimate of the market value of the property in its current condition; after completion of the proposed Alteration, construction, demolition, or removal; after any expenditure necessary to comply with the recommendation of the Board for changes necessary for the Area Planning Commission to approve a Certificate of Appropriateness; and, in the case of a proposed demolition, after renovation of the existing structure for continued use;

(d) In the case of a proposed demolition, an estimate from architects, developers, real estate consultants, appraisers, or other real estate professionals experienced in Rehabilitation as to the economic feasibility of Restoration, renovation or Rehabilitation of any existing structure or objects. This shall include tax incentives and any special funding sources, or government incentives which may be available.

L. Certificate of Compatibility for Non-Contributing Elements.

1. Purpose. The construction of a new building or structure on a lot designated as a Non-Contributing Element, the replacement of existing Non-Contributing Elements, the relocation of buildings or structures not dating from the Preservation Zone's period of significance onto a lot designated as a Non-Contributing Element, and the demolition of any building or structure on a lot designated as a Non-Contributing Element, shall require a Certificate of Compatibility to assure compatibility with the character of the Preservation Zone and to assure that the construction or demolition work is undertaken in a manner that does not impair the essential form and integrity of the Historic character of its environment. An applicant not approved under Subsection J may elect to file for a Certificate of Compatibility.

Other types of work solely involving Non-Contributing Elements, including the relocation of buildings or structures dating from the Preservation Zone's period of significance onto a lot designated as a Non-Contributing Element, are eligible for review under Conforming Work on Non-Contributors as set forth in

Subsection J. The Director shall review a request, pursuant to Subsection G and find whether the application is eligible for Conforming Work on Non-Contributors as outlined in Subsection J or requires a Certificate of Compatibility.

2. Prohibition. No person shall construct a new building or structure on a lot designated as a Non-Contributing Element, replace any existing building or structure designated as a Non-Contributing Element or not listed in the Historic Resources Survey for the Preservation Zone or demolish any building or structure on a lot designated as a Non-Contributing Element unless a Certificate of Compatibility has been approved for that action pursuant to this section. No Certificate of Compatibility shall be approved unless the plans for construction, replacement or demolition conforms with the provisions of this section. Any approval, conditional approval, or denial shall include written findings in support.

3. Procedures For Obtaining A Certificate of Compatibility.

(a) Any plan for the construction of a new building or structure on a lot designated as a Non-Contributing Element, the replacement of existing Non-Contributing Elements, the relocation of buildings or structures not dating from the Preservation Zone's period of significance onto a lot designated as a Non-Contributing Element, or the demolition of any building or structure on a lot designated as a Non-Contributing Element, shall be submitted, in conjunction with an application, to the Department of City Planning upon a form provided for that purpose. Upon an application being deemed complete by the Director, one copy of the application and relevant documents shall be mailed by the Department of City Planning to each Boardmember of the Preservation Zone for evaluation.

(b) **Board Recommendation.** After notice and hearing pursuant to Subsection M below, the Board shall submit its recommendation to the Director as to whether the Certificate of Compatibility should be approved, conditionally approved, or disapproved within 30 days of the postmarked date of mailing of the application from the City Planning Department. In the event the Board does not submit its recommendation within 30 days, the Board shall forfeit all jurisdiction. The applicant and the Director may mutually agree in writing to a longer period of time for the Board to act.

(c) **Director Determination.** The Director shall have the authority to approve, conditionally approve or disapprove a Certificate of Compatibility for the construction of a new building or structure on a lot designated as a Non-Contributing Element, the replacement of existing Non-Contributing Elements, the relocation of buildings or structures not dating from the

Preservation Zone's period of significance onto a lot designated as a Non-Contributing Element, or the demolition of any building or structure on a lot designated as a Non-Contributing Element.

(d) Time to Act. The Director shall render a determination on a Certificate of Compatibility within 75 days of an application being deemed complete, unless the applicant and the Director mutually consent in writing to a longer period. A copy of the determination shall be mailed to the applicant, the Board, and any other interested parties. No Certificate of Compatibility shall be issued until the appeal period, as set forth in Subsection N, has expired or until any appeal has been resolved.

(e) Other City approvals. The requirements for a Certificate of Compatibility are in addition to other City approvals (building permits, variances, *etc.*) and other legal requirements, such as Public Resources Code Section 5028, which may be required. The time periods specified above may be extended if necessary with the written mutual consent of the applicant and the Director.

4. Standards for Issuance of Certificate of Compatibility for New Building Construction or Replacement, and the Relocation of Buildings or Structures Not Dating from the Preservation Zone's Period of Significance Onto a Lot Designated as a Non-Contributing Element. The Director shall base a determination whether to approve, conditionally approve or disapprove a Certificate of Compatibility on each of the following:

(a) If no Preservation Plan exists; whether the following aspects of the Project do not impair the essential form and integrity of the Historic character of its surrounding built environment, considering the following factors;

- (1)** architectural design;
- (2)** height, bulk, and massing of buildings and structures;
- (3)** lot coverage and orientation of buildings;
- (4)** color and texture of surface materials;
- (5)** grading and lot development;
- (6)** Landscaping;
- (7)** changes to Natural Features;

(8) steps, walls, fencing, doors, windows, screens, and security grills;

(9) yards and setbacks;

(10) off street parking;

(11) light fixtures and street furniture;

(12) antennas, satellite dishes and solar collectors; or

(13) signs.

New construction shall not destroy Historic features or materials that characterize the property. The design of new construction shall subtly differentiate the new construction from the surrounding Historic built fabric, and shall be contextually compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features of nearby structures in the Preservation Zone; or

(b) whether the Project complies with the Preservation Plan approved by the City Planning Commission for the Preservation Zone.

5. Certificates of Compatibility for the Demolition of Non-Contributing Elements. After notice and hearing pursuant to Subsection M below, the Board shall submit its comments on a request to demolish a Non-Contributing Element, considering the impact(s) of the demolition of the Non-Contributing Element to the essential form and integrity of the Historic character of its surrounding built environment within 30 days of the postmarked date of mailing of the application from the City Planning Department. In the event the Board does not submit its comment within 30 days, the Board shall forfeit all jurisdiction. The applicant and the Director may mutually agree in writing to a longer period of time for the Board to comment.

M. Notice and Public Hearing. Before making its recommendation to approve, conditionally approve or disapprove an application pursuant to this section for a Certificate of Appropriateness or Certificate of Compatibility, the Board shall hold a public hearing on the matter. The applicant shall notify the Owners and occupants of all properties abutting, across the street or alley from, or having a common corner with the subject property at least ten days prior to the date of the hearing. Notice of the public hearing shall be posted by the applicant in a conspicuous place on the subject property at least ten days prior to the date of the public hearing.

(1) A copy of the Board's recommendation pursuant to Subsection K 3 (b) regarding a Certificate of Appropriateness or Subsection L 3 (b) regarding a Certificate of Compatibility shall be sent to the Director.

(2) A copy of the final determination by the Director, or Area Planning Commission shall be mailed to the Board, to the Cultural Heritage Commission, to the applicant, and to other interested parties.

N. Appeals. For any application for a Certificate of Appropriateness pursuant to Subsection K or a Certificate of Compatibility pursuant to Subsection L, the action of the Director or the Area Planning Commission shall be deemed to be final unless appealed. No Certificate of Appropriateness or Certificate of Compatibility, shall be deemed approved or issued until the time period for appeal has expired.

(1) An initial decision of the Director is appealable to the Area Planning Commission.

(2) An initial decision by the Area Planning Commission is appealable to the City Council.

An appeal may be filed by the applicant or any aggrieved party. An appeal may also be filed by the Mayor or a member of the City Council. Unless a Board member is an applicant, he or she may not appeal any initial decision of the Director or Area Planning Commission as it pertains to this section. An appeal shall be filed at the public counter of the Planning Department within 15 days of the date of the decision to approve, conditionally approve, or disapprove the application for Certificate of Appropriateness or Certificate of Compatibility. The appeal shall set forth specifically how the petitioner believes the findings and decision are in error. An appeal shall be filed in triplicate, and the Planning Department shall forward a copy to the Board and the Cultural Heritage Commission. The appellate body may grant, conditionally grant or deny the appeal. Before acting on any appeal, the appellate body shall set the matter for hearing, giving a minimum of 15 days notice to the applicant, the appellant, the Cultural Heritage Commission, the relevant Board and any other interested parties of record. The failure of the appellate body to act upon an appeal within 75 days after the expiration of the appeal period or within an additional period as may be agreed upon by the applicant and the appellate body shall be deemed a denial of the appeal and the original action on the matter shall become final.

O. Authority of Cultural Heritage Commission not Affected. Notwithstanding any provisions of this section, nothing here shall be construed as superseding or overriding the Cultural Heritage Commission's authority as provided in Los Angeles Administrative Code Sections 22.132 and 22.133.

P. Publicly Owned Property. The provisions of this section shall apply to any building, structure, Landscaping, Natural Feature or lot within a Preservation Zone which is owned or leased by a public entity to the extent permitted by law.

Q. Enforcement. The Department of Building and Safety, the Housing Department, or any successor agencies, whichever has jurisdiction, shall make all inspections of properties which are in violation of this section when apprized that work has been done or is required to be done pursuant to a building permit. Violations, the correction of which do not require a building permit, shall be investigated and resolved jointly by the Planning Department, the Department of Building and Safety, the Housing Department, or any successor agencies, whichever has jurisdiction, and if a violation is found, the Planning Department may then request the Department of Building and Safety, the Housing Department or any successor agencies to issue appropriate orders for compliance. Any person who has failed to comply with the provisions of this section shall be subject to the provisions of Section 11.00 (m) of this Code. The Owner of the property in violation shall be assessed a minimum inspection fee, as specified in Section 98.0412 of this Code for each site inspection.


R. Injunctive Relief. Where it appears that the Owner, occupant or person in charge of a building, structure, Landscaping, Natural Feature, lot or area within a Preservation Zone threatens, permits, is about to do or is doing any work or activity in violation of this section, the City Attorney may forthwith apply to an appropriate court for a temporary restraining order, preliminary or permanent injunction, or other or further relief as appears appropriate.

S. Termination. Any Certificate of Appropriateness, Certificate of Compatibility, or Conforming Work which has been approved under the provisions of this section shall expire 24 months from the date of issuance if the work authorized is not commenced within this time period. Further, the Certificate of Appropriateness, Certificate of Compatibility, or Conforming Work will expire if the work authorized is not completed within five years of the date of issuance.


Sec. 2. The City Clerk shall certify to the passage of this ordinance and have it published in accordance with Council policy, either in a daily newspaper circulated in the City of Los Angeles or by posting for ten days in three public places in the City of Los Angeles: one copy on the bulletin board located in the Main Street lobby to the City Hall; one copy on the bulletin board located at the ground level at the Los Angeles Street entrance to the Los Angeles Police Department; and one copy on the bulletin board located at the Temple Street entrance to the Los Angeles County Hall of Records.

I hereby certify that this ordinance was passed by the Council of the City of Los Angeles, at its meeting of MAR 19 2004

J. MICHAEL CAREY, City Clerk


By 
Deputy

Approved MAR 30 2004


Mayor

Approved as to Form and Legality

Rockard J. Delgado, City Attorney

By 
SHARON SIEDORF CARDENAS
Assistant City Attorney

Date MAR 03 2004

File No(s). CF 02-0926; CPC 2003-1501 CA

Pursuant to Charter Section 559, I approve this ordinance on behalf of the City Planning Commission and recommend it be adopted

February 27, 2004

see attached report.


CON HOWARD
Director of Planning

DECLARATION OF POSTING ORDINANCE


I, MARIA C. RICO, state as follows: I am, and was at all times hereinafter mentioned, a resident of the State of California, over the age of eighteen years, and a Deputy City Clerk of the City of Los Angeles, California.

Ordinance No. 175891 - Amending Section 12.20.3 of the L.A.M.C. to modify procedures within the Historic Preservation Overlay Zones - CPC 2003-1501 CA - a copy of which is hereto attached, was finally adopted by the Los Angeles City Council on March 19, 2004, and under the direction of said City Council and the City Clerk, pursuant to Section 251 of the Charter of the City of Los Angeles and Ordinance No. 172959, on April 2, 2004, I posted a true copy of said ordinance at each of three public places located in the City of Los Angeles, California, as follows: 1) One copy on the bulletin board at the Main Street entrance to Los Angeles City Hall; 2) one copy on the bulletin board at the ground level Los Angeles Street entrance to the Los Angeles Police Department; and 3) one copy on the bulletin board at the Temple Street entrance to the Hall of Records of the County of Los Angeles.

Copies of said ordinance were posted conspicuously beginning on April 2, 2004 and will be continuously posted for ten or more days.

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

Signed this 2nd day of April 2004 at Los Angeles, California.


Maria C. Rico, Deputy City Clerk

Ordinance Effective Date: May 12, 2004 Council File No. 02-0926

(Rev. 3/21/03)

State of California— The Resources Agency
DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION

Primary #
HRI

PRIMARY RECORD

Trinomial #
NRHP Status Code 5D3

Other Listings Review Code Reviewer Date

Page 1 of 25

*Resource Name or # (Assigned by recorder) Proposed Garvanza HPOZ

P1. Other Identifier: Garvanza

*P2. Location: Not for Publication Unrestricted *a. County Los Angeles
and (P2c, P2e, and P2b or P2d. Attach a Location Map as necessary.)
*b. USGS 7.5' Quad _____ Date _____ T _____ ; R _____ % of _____ % of Sec _____ B.M.
c. Address various City Los Angeles Zip 91344
d. UTM: (Give more than one for large and/or linear resources) Zone _____ ; _____ mE/ _____ mN
e. Other Locational Data: (e.g., parcel #, directions to resource, elevation, etc., as appropriate)

*P3a. Description: (Describe resource and its major elements. Include design, materials, condition, alterations, size, setting, and boundaries)


Located approximately six miles northeast of downtown Los Angeles, Garvanza is primarily made up of single-family residences with some multi-family, commercial and institutional (religious) buildings. It contains 640 legal parcels. The proposed Garvanza HPOZ is bounded roughly by North Avenue 66 to the east, State Route 110 to the southeast, Marmion Way to the south, N. Avenue 64 to the southwest, North Avenue 63 to the west, and the City of Pasadena boundary to the north. The boundary is irregular at all parameters. Garvanza is situated at the edge of the lower Arroyo Seco, which gives it a slightly irregular topography that slopes northwesterly, increasing in grade at the northern part of the district as it nears Poppy Peak. The eastern and southern edges of the district are characterized by their adjacency to the Arroyo; these boundaries are naturally defined by dramatic topographical declines. The proposed HPOZ is composed mainly of single-family residences that were constructed between 1900 and 1930. There are a number of resources from the late nineteenth century. The period of significance has been defined as 1876- ~~1941~~ to capture the resources relating to the period of development which has been identified as significant in the historic context statement; after 1945, the character of the area began to change with the development of open space and some infill. (continued page 3)

HP2. Single-Family Residences; HP6. 1-3 Story Commercial Building; HP16. Religious Building; HP31. Urban Open Space; HP39. Other

*P3b. Resource Attributes: (List attributes and codes)

*P4. Resources Present: Building Structure Object Site District Element of District Other (isolates, etc.):

*P5a. Photograph or Drawing (Photograph required for buildings, structures or objects)



P5b. Description of Photo: (view, date, accession #) _____

*P6. Date Constructed/Age and Sources:

Historic
 Prehistoric Both
1876-1941

LA County Assessor Data

*P7. Owner and Address:

Not recorded

*P8. Recorded by: Name, affiliation, and address)

Katie Horak
Architaeological Resources Group, Inc
65 North Raymond Avenue, # 220
Pasadena, CA 91103

*P9. Date Recorded: 5/4/09

*P10. Survey Type: (Describe)

Intensive
 Reconnaissance

*P11. Report Citation: (Cite survey report and other sources, or enter "none.") Garvanza Historic Resources Survey Report

*Attachments: NONE Location Map Sketch Map Continuation Sheet Building, Structure & Object Record
 Archaeological Record District Record Linear Feature Record Milling Station Record Rock Art Record
 Artifact Record Photographic Record Other (List) _____

***P3a. Description (continued from page 1):**

Most buildings in the proposed HPOZ were constructed in styles associated with the Victorian, Arts and Crafts, and Period Revival modes of architecture. There are some early modern styles represented and a small amount of infill from the later part of the twentieth century. There are a few commercial buildings in the district, mainly centered on York Boulevard, and three religious buildings scattered throughout. Garvanza Park is located at the western edge of the proposed HPOZ. The district is characterized not only by its buildings but also by such features as asphalt streets with concrete sidewalks and landscaped parkways, abundant trees, the extensive use of Arroyo stone in retaining walls and perimeter walls, and its hilly topography.

***D6. Significance (continued from page 2):**

As a result of this 2009 Historic Resources Survey, Garvanza was determined to be eligible for HPOZ status as representative of the earliest phases of residential development in the City of Los Angeles. Situated adjacent to streetcar lines, Garvanza was one of the first suburbs to have been developed in the northeast section of the City. Further, Garvanza retains a large number of resources relating to the Victorian, Arts and Crafts, and Period Revival modes of architecture. Garvanza's Arts and Crafts legacy is particularly notable; its position in the lower Arroyo Seco attracted artisans in search of a diverse and natural landscape while maintaining proximity to the offerings of the city.

The contexts or themes for Garvanza are:

- Context: Early Residential Development (1876-1912)
Theme: Transportation (Railroads, Streetcars)
Theme: Land Use: The Subdivider and the Subdivision
- Context: Continued Residential Development (1913-1941)
Theme: Transportation (Automobile)
Theme: 1920s Boom Years
- Context: Architecture (1876-1941)
Theme: Early Architectural Styles (1876-1905)
Theme: Arts and Crafts Movement (1895-1918)
Theme: Period Revival Styles (1915-1941)
Theme: Early Modern Styles (1935-1941)

In Garvanza, associated property types present are single-family residences, multi-family residences, and commercial and institutional (religious) buildings. Additionally, several natural and agricultural features (such as the Lindsay olive trees off Elder Street) are present. The period of significance has been identified as 1876-1941.

Background: Early History of Garvanza

The neighborhood of Garvanza is located in the northeast section of the City of Los Angeles, a region that was originally inhabited by the Chumash Indians and, later, the Tongva Indians. Settling here for some 1,000 years before the arrival of European settlers in the eighteenth century, the Tongva were eventually renamed the Gabrielino Indians for their proximity to the Mission San Gabriel. It is estimated that approximately five thousand Tongva resided in the region when the Spanish began the mass colonization of native peoples under the mission system in the eighteenth century.¹ In 1769, the Spanish explorer Gaspar de Portolá led an expedition from Baja California to the northern territories; during his travels he camped along the riverbanks of the Arroyo Seco ("dry stream"), the name he allegedly gave to the waterway that runs from the San Gabriel Mountains to what is now known as the Los Angeles River. A significant feature in the regional landscape, the Arroyo flowed through canyons, flatlands and hillsides covered with wildflowers and trees.

¹ From Cogweb, a website dedicated to topics of Cognitive Cultural Studies, edited by Frances Steen of the University of California, Los Angeles. "Tongva (Gabrielinos)," 2006. <<http://cogweb.ucla.edu/Chumash/Tongva.html>>.

DISTRICT RECORD

Page 5 of 25

*NRHP Status Code 5D3*Recorded by Katie Horak, Architectural Resources Group, Inc.*Date 5/4/09

X Continuation Update

also served the area; its Pasadena line ran along Roble Avenue and Marmion Way just south of York and carried passengers, freight and mail between the two cities.

The location of railroad lines and stations in Southern California greatly influenced the alignment of new subdivisions such as Garvanza. Land barons hosted excursions to their tracts to speculators, offering free picnic lunches and rail fare. These "boom towns" stretched east from Los Angeles, which was at that time centered at today's downtown, into the San Gabriel Valley. Rapid residential development in these areas was due, in large part, to the accessibility of public transit, which enabled downtown workers to live in the outer lying regions of the city.

The Subdivider and the Subdivision

Due to its large geographical area and continuous development over a long period of time, Garvanza is a neighborhood of many subdivisions, large and small. Only Ralph Rogers and the Campbell-Johnstons, the two parties responsible for the largest subdivisions in Garvanza, will be discussed.

Ralph Rogers

Born in Nashville, Tennessee c. 1850 and raised in Texas, Ralph Rogers and his family traveled to California in 1868. Rogers himself arrived in the then small town of Los Angeles in 1875 and, similar to other men of the era, entered the real estate business. As part of Rogers, Booth & Company, he had a downtown office at 134 North Main Street. An ambitious individual, Rogers was "identified with the first cable line, the opening of land just northwest of Bunker Hill, the foundation of the old Pacific Savings Bank and the development of Garvanza."⁷ He was also influential in the development of Eagle Rock and Glendale, having purchased real estate there and having served as the director of both the Los Angeles and Glendale Railway Company and the Los Angeles and Raymond Railway Company. In addition to his Los Angeles ventures, Rogers developed the town of Thermalito in Oroville, California.

The Garvanza Land Company, a partnership that included Ralph Rogers, his brother W. E. Rogers, James Booth, and W. F. McClure, was established to advertise and sell property in the new suburban development purchased from Glassell and Chapman. Rogers' Mountain Water Company supplied the water for Garvanza, which was in place when the area was subdivided.

Campbell-Johnstons

Alexander Robert Campbell-Johnston was born in Scotland in the early nineteenth century. His father was Sir Alexander Johnston, the Chief Justice of Ceylon, and his maternal grandfather was Sir William Campbell, the Duke of Argyll and the last British governor of colonial South Carolina. Campbell-Johnston worked as a British diplomat and resided in England with his wife Frances Ellen and their children. With property holdings in Australia, South Africa and Liberia, the family came to California in the early 1880s and purchased Carlotta Ranch in Madera County, near Fresno. Leaving their sons to manage the property, the Campbell-Johnstons returned to England. The development boom that soon began in Southern California convinced the couple to return to the state in 1883. Settling on more than 2,200 acres of property on the Prudent Beaudry tract, the Campbell-Johnstons named the land San Rafael Ranch and hired the son of Alexander's cousin, Robert H. Lindsay, to manage it. The southern boundary of the ranch was the present-day Meridian Street. Britons and Californians worked the land, and sheep and cattle grazed grassy fields at a time when most of the surrounding area was largely undeveloped. The foreman lived in the Folk Victorian style cottage at 1151 North Avenue 64; constructed in 1885, the house is one of the earliest surviving buildings in the project study area. As with their first California land purchase, the Campbell-Johnstons returned to England shortly thereafter, leaving their sons Augustine, Alexander Napier, and Conway Seymour to help manage the ranch.

On a trip to the ranch in 1888, Alexander Robert died after a sudden illness. Frances brought his remains to England, where she commissioned the architect Arthur Edmund Street to design a church in the memory of her husband.⁸ Local architect, Ernest Coxhead adapted the plans for a second church in Southern California. By that time, the town of Garvanza directly to the south of the Campbell-Johnston ranch had been established, and she intended the church for their use. Completed in

⁷ "Pioneer Realty Man is Called," *Los Angeles Times*, 29 December 1915, II9.

⁸ The church was modeled after St. Mary's Church near Dorkey, Surrey, England.

DISTRICT RECORD

Page 7 of 25

*NRHP Status Code 5D3

*Recorded by Katie Horak, Architectural Resources Group, Inc. *Date 5/4/09 X Continuation Update

Lots on North Avenue 66 drew some of the area's most prominent citizens; one of the partners of the Garvanza Land Company, William F. McClure, was the State Engineer in California from 1912 to his death in 1926 and resided at 432 North Avenue 66 (c. 1890).¹⁷ Many physicians also lived in the neighborhood; a surgeon, Dr. Franklin S. Whaley, lived at the Italianate style residence at 6434 Crescent Street where he also performed surgeries in the kitchen.¹⁸ According to local historian Charles Fisher, the builders of 200 North Avenue 66 were Reverend Anna Howard Shaw and Cora Scott Pond, leading suffragettes in the United States; Shaw was the first woman to be ordained a Methodist minister in America.¹⁹ Pond lived in Garvanza with her family at 6400 Roble Ave (demolished).²⁰ Other notable residents included pioneer artist and teacher William Lees Judson, who lived at 206 Thorne Street; his son Walter, who lived at 218 Thorne Street (demolished), and worked as an art glass manufacturer in the family business; architect Robert E. Williams of Train & Williams at 840 North Avenue 66; and architect Frederic M. Ashley at 740 North Avenue 66.²¹ Both Williams and Ashley designed their own residences.

Commercial Development

Railroad tracks laid along Pasadena Avenue (now York Boulevard) encouraged the early commercial and residential development of the thoroughfare. Important in the development of boom towns were lavish hotels designed in fashionable East Coast styles; speculators hoped that tourists to the region would stay for a few days and decide to purchase land. The Garvanza Villa Hotel, built in the same year as the initial subdivision, was located at the corner of Avenue 63 and Pasadena Avenue. The grand Victorian-era hotel was later destroyed by fire; a bench made of Arroyo stones that stood near the structure and served as a stop for the Sierra Madre Stage still survives on Avenue 63. In addition to the hotel, a post office, the Garvanza train station and several other structures including wood-frame houses occupied the lots on Pasadena Avenue and the immediate area. Late twentieth-century commercial development on York Boulevard has replaced much of this historic building stock; a rare survivor from this early period of development is a two-story mixed-use building at 118 South Avenue 64 (constructed 1900), near the corner of York Boulevard.

Institutional Development

Although Garvanza is primarily a residential district, institutional buildings have played an important role in the history and development of the neighborhood. The Church of the Angels on the Campbell-Johnston Ranch, as previously discussed, is the earliest surviving of these in the area, dating to 1889. This Episcopal house of worship was initially located a little more than a mile from Garvanza, but due to massive development that occurred in the following decades it now sits directly adjacent to neighborhood residences. Construction of additional churches also took place in the heart of the town. These include the Garvanza Methodist Episcopal Church (1889) at 117 North Avenue 66 and the Arts and Crafts style Garvanza Congregational Church (1908) at 6408 Ruby Street. The church at 117 North Avenue 66 was replaced by a second Garvanza Methodist Church constructed on the same site in 1922; the building, which fronts the current York Boulevard, was designed in the Spanish Colonial Revival style with Churrigueresque style ornament.

The Los Angeles College of Fine Arts, which had evolved from the University of Southern California's Art Department, was located at 200 North Avenue 66 from 1901 to 1920. Situated adjacent to the streetcar tracks on Roble Avenue, the college was readily accessible to those who came to the Arroyo to study its natural beauty as part of their art education. The College, which played a large role in the development of the Arts and Crafts movement in Garvanza, will be further discussed below.

Associated Property Types

Property types associated related to the context of Early Residential Development in Garvanza prior to 1912 include single-family residences, commercial buildings, and institutional (religious) buildings.

¹⁷ HCM No. 107: Residence (adopted 11/15/1972).

¹⁸ HCM No. 528: Dr. Franklin S. Whaley Residence (adopted 4/23/1991).

¹⁹ Tina Gulotta-Miller, e-mail to author, 9 November 2008.

²⁰ 1910 United States Census.

²¹ HCM No. 62: Judson Studios (adopted 8/13/1969); HCM No. 411: Robert Edmund Williams House (Hathaway Home for Children) (adopted 1/18/1989); HCM No. 402: Frederic M. Ashley House (adopted 12/9/1988).

DISTRICT RECORD

Page 9 of 25

*NRHP Status Code 5D3*Recorded by Katie Horak, Architectural Resources Group, Inc.*Date 5/4/09

X Continuation Update

1921, and 47,000 in 1922. The year 1923 was the peak year of the boom, with an astonishing 62,500 new building permits for an estimated \$200 million in construction.²⁶

Residential development in Garvanza during the 1920s was on par with that of the rest of the city. Between 1920 and 1925, approximately 170 buildings were constructed, marking the second highest amount of growth after the period between 1905 and the 1912. Small subdivisions were created between Avenue 63 and Cresthaven Drive north of Planada Avenue in 1923 and 1930. Garvanza residents in the 1920s were primarily working class and living in modest one-story houses. Professions included different types of salesmen, public school teachers, manufacturers, laborers in the building trades, railroad employees, and artists. Many of these individuals commuted to areas such as downtown Los Angeles via trolleys, buses or their automobiles. A strong concentration of houses owned by the more affluent residents appears to have been constructed along North Avenue 66 and at the corner lots of the other north-south avenues. Nationally-renowned Dr. Henry Smith Williams resided at 200 North Avenue 66 in the 1930s; specializing in hematology and authoring a large number of science-related articles in medical journals and other sources such as *Harper's Magazine*, Williams held a number of important positions in New York City before arriving in Southern California.²⁷ His sister, Harriet W. Myers, who lived at 306 North Avenue 66 (later renumbered 311), was the founder of the first Los Angeles chapter of the National Audubon Society.²⁸ She and her husband William, president of a real estate company, had been living there since at least 1909 and were likely the original owners.

Artist William Lees Judson, and architects Robert E. Williams and Frederic M. Ashley continued to live in Garvanza during this period.²⁹ By 1930, however, Williams had moved to 802 North Avenue 66 and his previous residence was converted into a sanitarium for children.³⁰ Sanitariums were common in Southern California starting in the last quarter of the nineteenth century when "health seekers" came to the region to benefit from its temperate climate and clean air. The majority of these health resorts were dedicated to the treatment of respiratory diseases such as asthma and tuberculosis, and some of these were founded specifically for children. The topography of Garvanza lent itself well to this type of institution, as the northern section--where the house was located--was higher in altitude than land to the south, thus affording patients more opportunity for purer mountain air. Land directly to the north and east of the house was also undeveloped at this time, and would remain so until the 1950s. In 1930, there were approximately 50 children, primarily under the age of ten, staying at the Garvanza sanitarium, and they were cared for by nurses and administrative staff who also lodged there.

Institutional Development

In addition to the churches already established in the area, the Spanish Colonial Revival-style Lutheran Church of the Good Shepherd complex was constructed at 6338 North Figueroa Street in 1934.

Commercial Development

Commercial development in Garvanza continued well into the middle of the twentieth century, centered primarily on York Boulevard and stretching north on North Avenue 64. As previously stated, much of the commercial building stock from the prewar period has been demolished to make way for new commercial construction.

Associated Property Types

Property types associated related to the context of Early Residential Development in Garvanza between 1913 and 1920 include single-family residences, multi-family residences, commercial buildings, and institutional (religious) buildings.

²⁶ Ibid.

²⁷ "Painless Childbirth," *Sunset: The Pacific Monthly*, (Vol. 33, July-December 1914), 401.

²⁸ Frank M. Chapman, ed., "Bird Lore," *National Committee of the Audubon Societies of America*, (Vol. XI, 1909), 278; Tina Gulotta-Miller, e-mail to author, 12 November 2008. According to local historian Charles Fisher, many of the north-south streets in Garvanza were renumbered c. 1920, with odd-numbered addresses becoming even-numbered, and vice versa. The address change for Myers' residence occurred by 1920, as the 1910 United States Census listed the house number as 306 and the 1920 census recorded it as 311.

²⁹ According to Charles Fisher in the HCM Application for the Ashley house.

³⁰ 1930 United States Census.

DISTRICT RECORD

Page 11 of 25

*NRHP Status Code 5D3

*Recorded by Katie Horak, Architectural Resources Group, Inc. *Date 5/4/09 X Continuation Update

- Complex roofs forms, often gabled and hipped
- Decorative brackets at boxed eaves
- Wood sash windows, often one-over-one or multi-paned
- Leaded glass
- Three-sided bay windows
- Partial-width or wraparound porches, often with decorative spindled posts and friezes
- Paired or single doors, often with sidelights and transoms
- Wood siding, often a combination of clapboard and decorative shingles
- Half-timbering in gables
- Brick chimneys

Folk Victorian

The Folk Victorian style was prevalent in the United States from 1879 to 1910. The first Folk Victorian structures appeared in Los Angeles around the mid-1880s.

The Folk Victorian style is largely the product of the railroads and the Industrial Revolution. The elaborate turned and carved wooden decorative elements emblematic of this style were made inexpensive by the development of the assembly line and the steam engine. Therefore, even relatively modest homes could sport elaborate decoration.

The Folk Victorian style is characterized by porches with spindlework detailing, an intricately cut perforated gables (gingerbread trim), and an asymmetrical façade. The buildings are one or two stories, generally with gabled roofs, wide overhanging eaves with decorative brackets, and tall narrow windows.³³

Common character defining features of the Folk Victorian style include:

- Gabled or hipped roofs, often cross-gabled
- Wood sash windows, often one-over-one or two-over-two
- Partial-width porches, often with spindled posts and decorative brackets
- Paired or single doors, often with transoms
- Wood siding, often clapboard and/or shingles

American Foursquare

The Foursquare style dates from 1900-1920. It was common in Los Angeles from the turn of the last century through the nineteen-teens.

The Foursquare is a residential style related to the Craftsman and Prairie styles. It became a very popular style in American suburban development because it lent itself to low-cost design that maximized square footage while presenting a sober and dignified appearance.

The Foursquare is generally two stories, with a simple square or rectangular footprint, a low-pitched, often hipped roof, a front dormer, and a substantial porch.³⁴

Common character defining features of the American Foursquare style include:

- Typically two stories
- Box-like shape
- Hipped roof with centered dormer
- Wide, overhanging eaves, often boxed
- Full- or partial-width porch

³³ Ibid, 31.

³⁴ Ibid, 32.

Kevin Starr: "for the rocks and chaparral of the Arroyo Seco brought the ecology of the untamed interior right into the suburbs." Starr continues, "To build homes on the Arroyo, as did these bohemians, was to embrace the symbol of desert wilderness and to glory in Southern California's resistant, elemental texture."³⁸ One artisan, the printer Clyde Browne, utilized stones from the Arroyo to build his residence and workshop San Encino Abbey (1915), which was designed to appear as a medieval monastery with Spanish influence.³⁹ Though the property at 6211 Arroyo Glen Street is located outside the proposed HPOZ boundaries, Browne had a pervasive influence on the surrounding area as a local artisan and a teacher.

William Lees Judson

Garvanza's position in the Arts and Crafts movement was firmly rooted by the artisans who called the neighborhood home at the turn of the twentieth century. Perhaps one of the first to arrive was William Lees Judson, who saw the Arroyo Seco for the first time in 1893. Judson, who was born in England and educated in New York and Paris, had come to California from Chicago in bad health. Like so many others at this time, he felt the healthful air of the west would cure him and, in fact, it did, as he lived for another 25 years on the Arroyo.

In Paris, Judson had been enamored with the "sunkissed, light-emblazoned and color-illuminated canvases" of the Impressionists, and he found the California landscape to be the perfect subject for his own work.⁴⁰ Judson taught art almost immediately upon his arrival in Los Angeles, teaching privately at first and later at the College of Fine Arts of the University of Southern California. USC's main campus was established in 1880 just south of downtown Los Angeles, but the College of Fine Arts appears to have been conceived as a satellite campus from the beginning. By the turn of the century, Judson had the backing of the University to construct a new College of Fine Arts campus building in Garvanza. An article in the *Los Angeles Times* from 1901 states the following:

Grading and excavating have begun for Professor W. L. Judson's studio and art school, which is to stand on a bluff overlooking the Arroyo, at the west end of the electric railway viaduct, and that beautiful site soon will be adorned with a structure of classic outline and original design. Professor Judson is an art instructor at the University of Southern California, and has a studio in a downtown office building, but when the new structure is completed... all his classes will meet in Garvanza, where the opportunities for nature study are unsurpassed.⁴¹

Like the artists of the Hudson River School before them, Judson and his students could enjoy a studio out-of-doors, with the dramatic landscapes of the Arroyo at their doorsteps.

In addition to serving as professor and later dean of the USC College of Fine Arts, Judson established the Judson Art Glass Company in downtown Los Angeles. Together with his three sons—Walter H., J. Lionel, and Paul—Judson saw a need for a local stained glass studio to provide window design and fabrication for the homebuilders of the era. In 1920, USC made a major push to consolidate its satellite campuses into the main University Park Campus, and at this time the College of Fine Arts relocated and the Judson Studios took over the former College building on the Arroyo. The Judson Studios continues to be family run and is still located at this Garvanza location, on South Avenue 66.

George Wharton James

By most accounts, the Arroyo Culture was "not so much an organized movement as it was a shared lifestyle signifying a related variety of local values."⁴² However, it had an outspoken protagonist and promoter in George Wharton James, a Methodist minister who settled in Pasadena after a sickly youth in England. Together with William Lees Judson and other local craftspeople, James founded the Arroyo Guild of Fellow Craftsmen—a collective of artisans dedicated to the "design of beautiful things."⁴³ The Arroyo Guild took upon itself the role of purveyor of the Arts and Crafts movement as locally translated in the Arroyo, and issued a quarterly journal called the *Arroyo Craftsman*. Although losing steam almost as soon as it had begun (only one issue would ever go to press), the concept behind the journal was roughly parallel to that of Gustav Stickley's *Craftsman Journal*, for which James was a western correspondent. Its sole issue contained articles about Native

³⁸ Kevin Starr, *Inventing the Dream: California through the Progressive Era* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1985), 107.

³⁹ HCM No. 106: San Encino Abbey (adopted 11/15/1972).

⁴⁰ Starr, *Inventing the Dream*, 120.

⁴¹ "Garvanza: New Art Building," *Los Angeles Times* (May 13, 1901): 13.

⁴² From the one and only issue of the *Arroyo Craftsman*, October 1909 (reprinted by Judson Studios, 1999). Page 52.

⁴³ *Ibid.*, 108.

DISTRICT RECORD

Page 15 of 25

*NRHP Status Code 5D3

*Recorded by Katie Horak, Architectural Resources Group, Inc.

*Date 5/4/09

X Continuation

Update

- Partial- or full-width porches
- Square or battered porch supports
- Single door entrances, often with glazing
- Hipped or gabled low-pitched roofs
- Dormers
- Wide, overhanging eaves with exposed rafters and purlins
- Wood clapboard and/or wood shingle siding
- Extensive use of rubble stone at foundation and porch rail/supports

Tudor Style

The first Tudor Revival buildings in the United States were built in the late 1890s. In Los Angeles, the first Tudor style buildings were built in the early 1900s, and the style was popular through the 1920s.

The Tudor style is another architectural style that grew out of the 19th century movement away from the 'modern' industrial revolution and towards a more "romantic" historicism. The style is based on late Medieval English cottage styles. The English Revival Cottage is a smaller version of the Tudor with brick walls instead of stucco and less half-timbering.

Tudor style structures are typically two or three stories, with a steeply-pitched hipped roof with side gables; stucco; half-timbering; tall, narrow, diamond-paned windows; and a massive chimney. The English Cottage [a variation on the Tudor style] is usually one to two stories, [with a] steeply-pitched, hipped roof, brick with some half-timbering, and diamond-paned windows.⁴⁶

Common character defining features of the Tudor Revival style include:

- Asymmetrical facades
- Wood sash windows, often with a multi-paned upper sash
- Leaded glass, often in a diamond pattern
- Windows arranged in bands
- Paired or single doors
- Hipped roofs, often steeply pitched with multiple gables
- Built-up roofing, imitating thatch
- Facades clad with stucco, brick and stone, often with decorative wood half-timbering

Mission Revival

The Mission Revival style was born in California in the 1880s. It has been an enduring architectural style, and examples of the style continue to be constructed in the present day, although in much smaller numbers than in its heyday in the nineteen teens and twenties.

The Mission Revival style owes its popularity in large part to the publication of "Ramona" in the late 19th century, the release of the Mary Pickford film of the same name in 1910, and the consequent romanticization of the Mission era in California and resurgence of interest in the Spanish heritage of the southwestern United States.

Mission Revival style residential structures are typically one to two-stories; have low-pitched roofs with gables and wide eaves; [shaped parapets]; arched arcades enclosing large, front porches; a mixture of small square windows and long, rectangular windows; quatrefoils; Moorish detailing; and often towers.⁴⁷

⁴⁶ Ibid, 54.

⁴⁷ Ibid, 42.

DISTRICT RECORD

Page 17 of 25

*NRHP Status Code 5D3

*Recorded by Katie Horak, Architectural Resources Group, Inc. *Date 5/4/09 X Continuation Update

Fine Arts/Judson Studios at 200 South Avenue 66 was destroyed by fire in 1910, Train & Williams was commissioned to design the building that survives today. Williams also lived in one of his designs, the Craftsman style residence at 840 North Avenue 66 (1905) in the northern section of the neighborhood, which employed stained glass windows from the Judson Studios. Permit research revealed that other Train & Williams commissions in the area were residences located at 636, 760, and 901 North Avenue 66, and at 912 North Avenue 64. The firm also designed the front porch addition to the George W. Wilson Estate at 616 North Avenue 66, which is the only element of the once-grand house that survived a fire in 1989.⁵³

Period Revival Styles (1915-1940)

In general, the styles of the Arts and Crafts mode waned in the late nineteen-teens, making way for the Period Revival styles that were popular in the 1920s boom years. The Craftsman bungalow, however, which is closely associated with the Arts and Crafts movement, had staying power; modest one and one-and-a-half story Craftsman bungalows prevailed well into the 1920s, losing steam before the end of that decade. While the Arts and Crafts movement is widely considered to be the first wave of architectural modernism in the United States, the Period Revival styles that followed signaled a backwards turn to more a derivative building vocabulary. These buildings drew from the full spectrum of European and Colonial American residential styles, producing small-scale versions of Old World monuments. Period Revival styles found in Garvanza include Spanish Colonial Revival and Tudor Revival.

Like their predecessors, Garvanza's Period Revival residences were typically one or one-and-a-half stories tall. This period also produced a number of multi-family dwellings, including duplexes and bungalow courts.

Spanish Colonial Revival

The Spanish Colonial Revival style dates from 1915 to the present. In Los Angeles, the style dates from the late nineteen-teens, and continues in popularity today.

The Spanish Colonial Revival grew out of a renewed interest in the Spanish Missions in the Southwest and the Monterey Revival. The architectural features of this style are intended to reflect traditional Spanish architecture with local building materials, such as Adobe brick or stucco.

Spanish Colonial structures are typically one or two stories and rectangular in floor plan. The buildings have low-pitched, tiled roofs, recessed openings, decorative ironwork and gardens.⁵⁴

The Spanish Colonial Revival style was one of the most prevalent residential styles of the 1920s. This style, which elaborated on the Hispanicism of the Mission Revival style, became profoundly popular after its appearance at the Panama-California Exposition held in San Diego in 1915. The Exposition was designed by architect Bertram Goodhue, who felt that the richness of Spanish architecture found in Latin America was an appropriate precedent in the development of a regional style for Southern California.

Common character defining features of the Spanish Colonial Revival style include:

- Windows with arched openings
- Partial-width porches, often recessed with arched entries
- Stepped or sloped parapets
- Gabled or flat roofs
- Stucco cladding
- Clay tile roof cladding
- Clay tile decorative elements, such as vents and entrance hoods
- Decorative ironwork

⁵³ HCM No. 418: (Site of) George W. Wilson Estate (adopted 2/17/1989).

⁵⁴ Ibid, 52.

DISTRICT RECORD

Page 19 of 25

*NRHP Status Code 5D3

*Recorded by Katie Horak, Architectural Resources Group, Inc. *Date 5/4/09 X Continuation Update

- Double-hung wood or steel casement windows
- Projecting bays
- Partial-width porches, often with simple wood posts
- Gabled or hipped roofs
- Combination of exterior cladding materials, including stucco, wood clapboard, brick and shingle

Important Builders

Garvanza residents continued to hire speculative builders to design their houses in the 1920s boom years up until World War II. These local builders included F. D. Harrington, A. E. Finley, Charles Conrad, Charles Elder, E. L. Rockenbach, and Chester T. Bennett. Little biographical information could be found about these builders.

Subsequent Development in Garvanza, 1945 to present

Only a handful of buildings were constructed in Garvanza during the United States involvement in World War II. Postwar construction in the project study area is scattered and is largely infill that replaced older buildings to accommodate a higher density of inhabitants. Several multi-family residences constructed in the 1960s and 1970s dot the neighborhood.

As the busiest thoroughfare in the district, York Boulevard has changed dramatically since the town was first subdivided in 1886. With the exception of the two Hipped Roof Cottages and the Hansamul Church between Avenues 65 and 66, the street is characterized by several structures and parking lots built from the 1960s to the present day; most house fast-food chains and other commercial businesses.

The identity of Garvanza as its own community gradually vanished after the creation of Greater Highland Park in the early 1920s; the group, which also included the surrounding communities of Highland Park, Annandale, Hermon, and York Valley, was formed, in part, to create stronger representation in city government.⁵⁷ In the following decades, the Garvanza area was known to most people as Highland Park. In 1997, however, the efforts of the Highland Park Heritage Trust (a local preservation advocacy group) to revive the name Garvanza were successful, as the City of Los Angeles officially recognized Garvanza as a distinct neighborhood.

Integrity Assessment

The following is an assessment of the integrity of the proposed Garvanza HPOZ:

Location

Location is the place where the historic property was constructed or the place where the historic event occurred. Garvanza is located in northeastern Los Angeles, approximately six miles northeast of downtown. Its location has not changed since its original subdivision and subsequent construction.

Design

Design is the combination of elements that create the form, plan, space, structure, and style of a property or district. The majority of buildings within the proposed Garvanza HPOZ were constructed in the late nineteenth century and the first few decades of the twentieth century. Architectural styles include those of the Victorian, Arts and Crafts, and Period Revival modes. Although several grand residences have been constructed in the area over the period of its development, Garvanza is and was historically home to residents of the middle class, and its buildings are typically modest examples of architectural styles rather than exemplary of artistic largess.

In the years since the culmination of the proposed Garvanza HPOZ's period of significance, there have been several changes to individual buildings which have altered their original design. Of the 391 contributing buildings in the proposed Garvanza

⁵⁷ Greater Highland Park was formed by 1923, as its name appears in "The Five Friendly Valleys: The Story of Greater Highland Park," Highland Park Branch, Security Trust & Savings Bank Publicity Department (1923); "Pasadena Avenue, Garvanza Have Illustrious Past," Highland Park News-Herald, 1948.

DISTRICT RECORD

Page 21 of 25

*NRHP Status Code 5D3

*Recorded by Katie Horak, Architectural Resources Group, Inc. *Date 5/4/09 X Continuation Update

detached garages; and concrete slab sidewalks, at times with landscaped parkways (typically grass and mature trees). Additionally, Garvanza retains its association with the Arts and Crafts movement in the lower Arroyo due to the continued existence of Judson Studios and a number of buildings constructed in styles associated with the movement. Therefore, the proposed Garvanza HPOZ's integrity with regard to association remains intact.

In summary, the proposed Garvanza HPOZ's integrity with regard to location and association is high. Its integrity with regard to design, setting, materials, workmanship and feeling is moderate. Therefore, ARG has determined that although it has been somewhat diminished, the proposed Garvanza HPOZ retains sufficient integrity to portray its significance.

Finding of Significance

ARG has determined that the entire Garvanza survey area as originally scoped (1,238 parcels) does not appear eligible for HPOZ status. Upon completion of the intensive survey, ARG had an initial finding of approximately 34% Contributing, 56% Non-Contributing, and 10% Not Visible. Upon reviewing these initial findings, and in consultation with the OHR and Council District 14, ARG worked to identify a reduced district, omitting areas that either did not relate to the contexts and themes called out as significant in the historic context statement or had suffered a dramatic loss of integrity. Areas that were cropped out included: streets that were developed in the postwar era (particularly in the northern part of the survey area); the area south of Marmion, which has suffered a dramatic loss of integrity due to alterations to individual buildings; and most of York Boulevard, which has been significantly altered in the past several decades. In omitting these areas, ARG has identified a reduced district that appears eligible for HPOZ status.

The proposed Garvanza HPOZ meets the local criteria for designation and retains sufficient integrity to portray its significance. All structures within the proposed HPOZ boundaries were evaluated against the delineated eligibility standards, and it was determined that a majority are Contributing resources to the HPOZ. Specifically, of the 640 parcels within the Garvanza survey area, 391 were found to be Contributing (61%) and 235 were found to be Non-Contributing (37%). Within the boundaries, there are five vacant lots and nine properties that are not visible (2%). Of the 391 Contributors, 216 were given the status of Altered Contributor due to their sustaining of minor, reversible alterations.

Please see Appendix E of the accompanying report for a complete list of all buildings within the proposed Garvanza HPOZ with their associated status codes.

***D7. References (continued from page 2)**

AJT. "Garvanza." *Los Angeles Times*. 5 November 1888: 6.

AJT. "Garvanza." *Los Angeles Times*. 7 November 1888: 7.

Anderson, Antony E. "Art and Artists." *Los Angeles Times*. 28 April 1907: V12.

Anderson, Antony E. "Art and Artists." *Los Angeles Times*. 17 May 1908: V12.

"Another Street Railroad." *Los Angeles Times*. 5 October 1886: 3.

Apostol, Jane. *Painting with Light: A Centennial History of the Judson Studios*. (Los Angeles: Historical Society of Southern California, 1997).

"Architectural Style History." *Draft Preservation Plan Workbook*. City of Los Angeles. Sect. 6.1.0. (2003).

Arroyo Craftsman. (Los Angeles: Arroyo Guild, October 1909) (reprinted by Judson Studios, 1999).

"Arroyo Seco Parkway." *The Historic American Engineering Record*. HAER No. CA-265: 7.

DISTRICT RECORD

Page 23 of 25

*NRHP Status Code 5D3

*Recorded by Katie Horak, Architectural Resources Group, Inc. *Date 5/4/09 X Continuation Update

Friedricks, William B. *Henry E. Huntington and the Creation of Southern California*. (Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1992).

"Garvanza." *Los Angeles Times*. 1 January 1886: 8.

"Garvanza." *Los Angeles Times*. 27 March 1892: 1.

"Garvanza." *Los Angeles Times*. 9 October 1893: 7.

"Garvanza Annexed." *Los Angeles Times*. 24 May 1899: 7.

"Garvanza: New Art Building." *Los Angeles Times*. 13 May 1901: 13.

"Garvanza Wants Electric Mules." *Los Angeles Times*. 19 February 1902: A2.

"Garvanza's Boom." *Los Angeles Times*. 24 March 1887: 4.

Gebhard, David and Robert Winter. *An Architectural Guidebook to Los Angeles*. (Salt Lake City: Gibbs Smith, 2003).

Gold, Matea. "An Old Neighborhood is Officially Reborn." *Los Angeles Times*. 23 November 1997: 1.

Gulotta-Miller, Tina. "Victory for Garvanza Residents." *Our Cornerstone*. Vol. XII. (September-October 2007).

Holder, Charles Frederick, ed. "San Rafael Ranch." *The California Illustrated Magazine*. (October 1891-May 1892): 20.

Library of Congress, American Memory Collection. <memory.loc.gov>. Various historic photographs.

Los Angeles Bureau of Engineering, Central Records. Historic tract maps.

Los Angeles County, Office of the Recorder. Various deeds and conveyances.

Los Angeles Public Library Photo Collection. Various historic photographs.

McAlester, Virginia and Lee. *A Field Guide to American Houses*. (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2003).

Moss, Edwin. "Sixty Years: The Church of the Angels: The Bishop's Chapel." (s.n., 1951).

Nelson, Howard J. *The Los Angeles Metropolis*. (Dubuque, Iowa: Kendall/Hunt Publishing Co., 1983).

"New Parkway Dedicated." *Los Angeles Times*. 12 November 1940: 6.


"New Railroad." *Los Angeles Times*. 30 August 1902: A2.

Office of Historic Resources, Department of City Planning, City of Los Angeles. Various Historic-Cultural Monument Applications on file.

"Open to Garvanza." *Los Angeles Times*. 3 September 1894: 6.

"Pioneer Realty Man is Called." *Los Angeles Times*. 29 December 1915: II9.

"Railroad Matters." *Los Angeles Times*. 26 September 1886: 6.



Case Number:
CPC-2010-943-HPOZ
Determination Letter Mailing
MAILING DATE: **Aug. 27, 2010**

GIS/Fae Tsukamoto
City Hall, Room 825
Mail Stop 395

Council District 1
City Hall, Room 410
Mail Stop 201

Jason Chan
City Hall, Room 667
Mail Stop 395

Council District 14
City Hall, Room 465
Mail Stop 223

Charles J. Fisher
140 S. Ave. 57
Highland Park, CA 90042

Carmela Gomez
1326 N. Ave. 54
Los Angeles, CA 90042

Tina Gulotta-Miller
6433 Crescent St.
Los Angeles, CA 90042

Nicole Possert
124 Roselawn Pl.
Los Angeles, CA 90042

Rosa Rivas
6312 Ruby St.
Los Angeles, CA 90042