

## **1.0 Executive Summary**

---





## **1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

### **1.1 PROJECT LOCATION**

The City of Long Beach (City) is located in the southern portion of Los Angeles County, overlooking the Pacific Ocean and San Pedro Bay (approximately 22 miles south of downtown Los Angeles). The proposed 2810 East 1st Street Project (herein referenced as the “Project”) is located north of Ocean Boulevard, between Temple Avenue and Orizaba Avenue, within Long Beach’s Bluff Park Historic District.

### **1.2 PROJECT SUMMARY**

The residence located at 2810 East 1st Street was originally constructed in 1921. In 1982, the Bluff Park Historic District was designated with the 2810 East 1st Street residence identified as a contributing structure. On October 15, 2005, a Certificate of Appropriateness was approved allowing a 523-square foot addition and removal of the rough-textured stucco on the existing residential structure. In December 2005, permitted construction work was initiated. Upon removal of the rough-textured stucco, most of the lath detached from the framing, leaving the framing bare. Termite damage and dry rot in the framing were also discovered during the stucco removal. The former property owner notified the City and requested a Certificate of Appropriateness for demolition and new construction. Since 2005, the residence has remained in its current state.

## **PROJECT CHARACTERISTICS**

The applicant proposes to restore the existing structure, using over 90 percent of the onsite materials; refer to Exhibits 3-3 and 3-4. The proposal involves the use of 100 percent of the existing foundation and over 80 percent of the existing framing. Missing doors and windows would be replaced with circa 1920s materials. The following summarizes the proposed restoration/reconstruction:

#### **Structural**

- Foundation: Retain and reuse 100 percent of the existing foundation, and sister a new engineered foundation for structural support.
- Roof Framing: Frame roof as per original design and structural upgrades.
- Roofing: Reuse 90 percent of the existing onsite adobe circa 1920’s roofing materials and replace the missing 10 percent adobe with imported circa 1920’s roofing materials.
- Garage: Retain and maintain the existing garage.
- Garage Roof: Repair and terrain grade the existing garage roof to prevent water intrusion.
- Front Porch: Retain, restore, maintain, and reuse the front porch.
- Framing: Chemically treat all framing for wood destroying organisms using Vikane Gas Fumigant (Sulfuryl Fluoride).<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Fluoride Action Network Website, <http://www.fluoridealert.org/pesticides/sulfuryl.f.vikane.epa.htm>, Accessed January 22, 2013.



- Timbers and Wood: Remove the existing dry rotted wood, replace with new structural wood, and sister the existing timbers, per engineering standards.

### Interior

- Coved Ceiling: Retain interior coved ceiling in living room and dining area.
- Flooring: Install period correct oak flooring.
- Simple Living Home: The roof is designed to accommodate a rain water receptacle. The interior is designed to create heating, cooling zones, and low energy lighting throughout. The goal is to minimize costly off site energy and materials, use all available onsite materials, and take full advantage of economical passive energy systems.

### Exterior

- Exterior Doors: Exterior doors circa 1920's.
- Exterior Doors: Repair, restore, and reuse the existing exterior doors, and replace the missing doors with circa 1920s.
- Windows: Repair, restore, and reuse the existing windows, and replace the missing windows with circa 1920s.
- Garage Doors: Provide new garage doors circa 1920s.
- Front Metal Gates and Door Screen: Retain, repair and restore matching metal gates at front of property and front door screen.
- Architectural Detail: Restore architectural detail as per historical photos and onsite framing details.
- Exterior Colors: Use approved exterior colors and stucco.

### Hardscape/Landscape/Fencing

- Driveway and Walkways: Retain, maintain, and reuse the existing driveways and walkways; retain and grade the west side walkway.
- Fencing: Retain, maintain, repair, and reuse the existing fencing.
- Concrete Steps: Retain and repurpose for restoration the concrete steps located at south side of the house.
- Landscaping: Retain and maintain the orange tree and bougainvillea bushes.

### Utilities

- Water and Sewer Lines: Retain, maintain, repair, and reuse the existing water and sewer lines.
- Gas Lines: Test, repair, and retain the existing gas lines.

## **1.3 PROJECT GOALS/OBJECTIVES**

Pursuant to *CEQA Guidelines* Section 15124(b), the EIR project description must include “[a] statement of objectives sought by the proposed project....The statement of objectives should include the underlying purpose of the project.”



The proposed Project objectives are:

- Eliminate a damaged, partially disabled and blighting structure from the Bluff Park Historic District.
- Restore/reconstruct the single family residence on a previously occupied site, using the maximum amount of on-site original materials that is feasible.
- Develop a “new” single-family residence with modern amenities while maintaining the District’s historical significance, character, and quality by using architectural styles, materials, and features from the 1920s, the District’s period of significance.

## **1.4 SUMMARY OF PROJECT ALTERNATIVES**

### **“NO PROJECT/NO BUILD” ALTERNATIVE**

The partial demolition of the structure that occurred in 2005 left the residence without interior/exterior walls and roof. As a result of this demolition and further physical deterioration of the remaining structure, the current structure exists only as bare wood framing, with several windows remaining in their frames, on a concrete foundation. Termite damage and dry rot are also present in the framing. Exhibit 5.1-3, North Elevation of Project Site – Existing Conditions, illustrates the existing structure.

Under the No Project/No Build Alternative, the site would remain in its current condition. The single-family residence would not be reconstructed/restored to its historic exterior appearance and character. The existing historic materials, features, and elements would not be restored and those that were destroyed or lost would not be reconstructed. None of the proposed Project components described in Section 3.0, Project Description, would be implemented with the No Project/No Build Alternative.

### **“NO PROJECT/EXISTING ZONING” ALTERNATIVE**

The Project site is zoned R-2-L District, which is a two-family residential district with large lots; Long Beach Municipal Code Section 21.31.020.J. The No Project/Existing Zoning Alternative involves maximum build-out under the property's underlying R-2-L zoning restrictions, which include: 40 percent maximum lot coverage; two-story height maximum; 8.0 percent usable open space minimum; and enforcement of all setbacks. This Alternative would involve complete demolition of all on-site improvements and the construction of a two-story, 35-foot-tall single-family development measuring 5,144 square feet (2,392-square-foot first floor and 2,752-square-foot second floor). The Alternative also includes an attached two-car garage (360 square feet).

### **“MARCH 2011 PROJECT” ALTERNATIVE**

The March 2011 Project Alternative would involve complete demolition of all on-site improvements and construction of a two-story, 29-foot-tall single-family development measuring 3,689 square feet (1,899-square-foot first floor and 1,790-square-foot second floor). This



development would also include an attached two-car garage (453 square feet) and a workshop (289 square feet) at the rear of the garage.

This Alternative reflects a March 2011 Certificate of Appropriateness submittal (HP11-0060) that underwent review by the Cultural Heritage Commission at an October 2011 study session. The Certificate of Appropriateness was not approved and the proposal never implemented due to opposition/concerns expressed by the Commission.

## **“ENVIRONMENTALLY SUPERIOR” ALTERNATIVE**

An EIR must identify an “environmentally superior” alternative and, where the No Project Alternative is identified as environmentally superior, the EIR is then required to identify an environmentally superior alternative from among the others evaluated. The determination of an environmentally superior alternative is based on the consideration of how the alternative: fulfills the Project objectives; reduces significant unavoidable impacts; or substantially reduces the impacts to the surrounding environment.

According to CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(e), “No Project” Alternative, “if the environmentally superior alternative is the “no project” alternative, the EIR shall also identify an environmentally superior alternative among the other alternatives.”

Table 7-1, *Comparison of Alternatives*, summarizes the comparative analysis presented above (i.e., the alternatives compared to the proposed Project). Review of Table 7-1 indicates both the No Project/No Build Alternative and the No Project/Existing Zoning Alternative are environmentally inferior to the Project. In addition, the March 2011 Project Alternative is also environmentally inferior to the Project.

In consideration of the factors noted above, no Environmentally Superior alternatives have been identified.

## **1.5 SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES**

Potential Impacts	Project Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<b>CULTURAL RESOURCES</b>		
Project implementation could cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource.	CUL-1 Qualified Preservation Professional: Prior to issuance of the Certificate of Appropriateness, the City shall require that a Preservation Professional who meets the Secretary of the Interior’s Professional Qualifications Standards in Architectural History or Historic Architecture review and approve all project plans. The City shall approve the selection of the Preservation Professional. The Preservation Professional shall operate under the	Less Than Significant Impact.



Potential Impacts	Project Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
	<p>direction of the Project sponsor. The City shall not approve plans or materials related to the Project without the prior approval of the Preservation Professional.</p> <p>CUL-2 Compliance to Standard 3: During construction, the Project sponsor shall work closely with the Preservation Professional to ensure that work needed to stabilize, consolidate, and/or conserve materials and features will be physically and visually compatible, identifiable upon close inspection, and properly documented for future research. This may include visually differentiating new work from old work (e.g., window replacement), consolidating historic materials to the most important and/or visually distinctive areas (e.g., roof tile), and/or documenting the placement of historic and non-historic materials and features (e.g., framing members).</p> <p>CUL-3 Compliance to Standard 6: Prior to issuance of the Certificate of Appropriateness, the Project sponsor shall work closely with the Preservation Professional to determine the extent of deterioration in existing features and the feasibility of repairing deteriorated features. Appropriate treatments for deteriorated features shall be determined according to the applicable Preservation Briefs and the Preservation Tech Notes that are provided by the National Park Service in its Technical Preservation Services. Specifically, the Project sponsor and the Preservation Professional shall investigate the existing foundation, framing, roof tiles, and windows. All treatments of deteriorated features shall be carefully documented.</p> <p>CUL-4 Compliance to Standard 7: Prior to issuance of the Certificate of Appropriateness, the Project sponsor shall work closely with the Preservation Professional to</p>	



Potential Impacts	Project Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
	<p>determine the appropriate replacements for missing features. This shall include careful study of photographic and physical evidence of the subject building, as well as careful study of other buildings (such as 5624 Magnolia Avenue in Riverside, California) that are known to be very similar to the subject property in its intact state. Wherever possible, the Project shall include replacement of missing features with new ones that are historically compatible. In addition, the Project sponsor shall replace all existing non-original windows at the primary façade with replacements that are historically compatible with the original design of the building. All replacement features shall be carefully documented.</p> <p>CUL-5 Compliance to Standard 8: Prior to issuance of the Certificate of Appropriateness, the Project sponsor shall work closely with the Preservation Professional to determine appropriate chemical and physical treatments, and to undertake them using the gentlest means possible. This shall include, but may not be limited to, treatment of a structural fumigant to eradicate structure-infesting insects.</p>	
<p>Project implementation combined with cumulative projects could result in cumulatively considerable impacts to cultural resources.</p>	<p>No mitigation is required.</p>	<p>Less Than Significant Impact.</p>