

Response to Comments Matrices – Long Beach Historic District Design Guidelines
Group 2: Belmont Heights, Hellman Street Craftsman, Rose Park, and Rose Park South

BELMONT HEIGHTS

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

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

Addressed By: Alejandro Plascencia, Alison Spindler (Long Beach Development Services), Amanda Yoder Duane (GPA Consulting)

Response to Comments – John McKenna (Belmont Heights)				
Comment No.	Page or Section No.	Comment	Response Code	Response
1	N/A	Thank you for forwarding me a copy of the proposed design guidelines revisions for the Belmont Heights district. In general, I found them very well drafted, with a lot of sensitivity to the Secretary of the Interior's standards, as well as for the needs of owners who need to modestly adjust their structures to everyday use.	C	Thank you!
2	Porches and Entryways/ Decorative Features	I think there could be some adjustments to more adequately address properties such as mine, which are Mediterranean revival, or Spanish Colonial, or a combination thereof, and therefore contributing, but not of primary concern as are the bungalows. I am not suggesting that these structures are not being addressed--they are. The section dealing with porches, railings and embellishments seems more	A	Chapter 4 is being drafted in sections like Chapter 3. Each section will address a common Long Beach architectural style. Spanish Colonial Revival and Mediterranean Revival are included in these styles, but were not publicly available at the time of comment. As the section drafts are completed, they will be posted on the City's website.

Response to Comments – John McKenna (Belmont Heights)				
Comment No.	Page or Section No.	Comment	Response Code	Response
		focused on the bungalows; as tilework, ironwork, and other decorations seem to exist in the neighborhood on these structures more than is suggested as appropriate in the guidelines.		Each section of Chapter 4 will include things like porch railings and supports, decorative features, and the like, to illustrate compatible features for each style.
3	N/A	I don't have chapters 2 and 4 to refer to where these issues may be addressed. If its not too much trouble, I'd appreciate your forwarding those chapters to me as chapter 3 does refer the reader to those chapters for more information.	A	Drafts of Chapters 2 and 4 had not yet been posted when the Belmont Heights draft was opened to public comment. The draft of Chapter 2 has been posted, and draft sections of Chapter 4 are being posted as they are completed.

BELMONT HEIGHTS

Project: Long Beach Historic District Design Guidelines

Document/Draft: Belmont Heights Design Guidelines

Commenter: [REDACTED]

Response Codes:

A = Accept Comment (correct, add, clarify).

B = Will Not Incorporate

C = No Change Needed

Addressed By: Alejandro Plascencia, Alison Spindler (Long Beach Development Services), Amanda Yoder Duane (GPA Consulting)

Response to Comments – [REDACTED] (Belmont Heights)				
Comment No.	Page or Section No.	Comment	Response Code	Response
1	Windows	I didn't find the information about replacing windows to be very clear. The guidelines say that windows damaged beyond repair should be replaced in kind, including the same material. Does that mean we would not be able to replace single-pane glass with dual-pane? Are the rules different for the front of the house/what's visible from the street versus the side or back of the house? Is it permissible to upgrade to dual-pane even if the windows are not damaged? As I'm sure you're aware, these homes are not well-insulated (or really insulated at all). I already have gaps around the window frames that let in air when the windows are 'closed' and parts of the wooden window frames were literally crumbling off as I was cleaning the exterior of the windows recently. Those windows/frames may likely be original to the house, which was built in 1929, so a fair amount of wear and tear/deterioration is to be expected. Someday, I'd love to have more energy-efficient windows that match the current design of the house as closely as possible, but from the draft guidelines I don't have a	A	<p>Chapter 2 (a draft of which may not have been publicly available at the time of comment) includes additional information about energy efficient window replacements. A reference to this will be added to the appropriate section in each district chapter to direct readers to this important information.</p> <p>Homeowners are encouraged to maintain, repair, and retrofit historic windows with energy efficiency measures such as interior shutters, weather stripping, insulating shades, etc., rather than replacing them with new windows.</p> <p>In some cases, particularly with fixed or casement windows, it may be possible to install dual pane glazing within the original window with a thick enough muntin, or to add a pane of glass on the inside; however, this is a much more complicated project for a double-hung window and may not be feasible.</p>

Response to Comments – [REDACTED] (Belmont Heights)

Comment No.	Page or Section No.	Comment	Response Code	Response
		clear understanding about whether that's an option. I want to have an attractive home and neighborhood, but I also want to help the planet and have a comfortable, energy-efficient house. I used to own a 1925 Craftsman in Sacramento and replacing the old windows with dual-pane ones not only made a big difference in energy-efficiency and reduced the street noise in the house, the new windows looked identical to the old ones. Can the guidelines provide some additional clarification about energy-efficient options?		
2	N/A	<p>The draft guidelines say "All rear additions should be compatible with, yet distinguishable from, the original historic building." While I understand that you would want to distinguish the true historic structure from any additions, I disagree with that concept. I personally have no space to ever make an addition on my tiny lot, but I think additions should match the existing structure as closely/seamlessly as possible; permits and other records can track what was added/changed and when.</p> <p>Along those lines, I heard the story about the woman who wanted to add an overhang to her porch (which, as I understand it, had been there previously, though was perhaps not part of the original structure). She spent quite a bit of money to have architectural drawings done for something that would match the character of the house. I hope something has been worked out with her in the intervening time, but it was my understanding that permission for the overhang was denied, however she would have been allowed to put up a tarp "because that's temporary." If all that is</p>	B	<p>The language included in the draft guidelines emphasizing that additions should be distinguishable from the original construction is derived from the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation, which is the set most applicable to the types of changes being made to buildings in historic districts. These standards are the established best-practices for the treatment of historic buildings. Standard 9 reads: <i>New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work will be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.</i></p> <p>https://www.nps.gov/tps/standards/four-treatments/treatment-rehabilitation.htm</p> <p>I cannot speak to the porch overhang story; however, major exterior changes to the front elevation and primary entrance would generally not be permitted</p>

Response to Comments – [REDACTED] (Belmont Heights)

Comment No.	Page or Section No.	Comment	Response Code	Response
		true, I think the idea has been taken too far. A well thought out overhang designed to match the character of the house is far preferable to some tacky tarp. The main reason she wanted the overhang was to provide relief from the afternoon sun and again, I believe both energy efficiency and personal comfort should be factors in these decisions.		<p>within a historic district. That said, each case is different, and the outcomes may differ depending on the resource, the goals of the project, and district in which it is located.</p> <p>These guidelines are being created to help guide the design process. They are intended to be reviewed before designing a proposed project, in the hopes of preventing situations like the one described.</p>
3	N/A	It was also not clear to me whether certain changes to the exterior of a home, if they are not extensive and/or not visible from the street, would need to have approval. For example, if you wanted to add (not what I would call an "addition") or relocate a door or window. Perhaps that could be clarified.	A	Chapter 1 (a draft of which may not have been publicly available at the time of comment) includes examples of Major/Minor alterations and what the approval process will involve. The draft has since been posted to the City's website.
4	TOC	I realize this is still a draft document, but on an editorial note, the page numbers in the table of contents are off.	A	Page numbering will be carefully reviewed.
5	N/A	Finally, I don't know what your policy is when accepting complaints about non-compliance. I have heard from people in my neighborhood about residents receiving warning letters from the commission threatening fines (apparently based on complaints from neighbors). Two neighbors I spoke with said they got warning letters but no one had ever spoken with them prior to that. I think a lot of times people are truly just unaware of the restrictions. If someone notices a possible violation, they should be encouraged to speak with the homeowners before filing an official complaint to make sure the homeowners are aware of the	C	<p>In order to raise awareness about City requirements, the City sends annual notices to historic district, and historic landmark property owners. The purpose of the notice is as an annual reminder of the special permits required for historic properties.</p> <p>The Development Services Department routinely encourages communication between property owners as a first step in resolving nuisance violations.</p>

Response to Comments – [REDACTED] (Belmont Heights)				
Comment No.	Page or Section No.	Comment	Response Code	Response
		guidelines; it's the polite and neighborly thing to do before people get threatened with fines.		

BELMONT HEIGHTS

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

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

Addressed By: Alejandro Plascencia, Alison Spindler (Long Beach Development Services), Amanda Yoder Duane (GPA Consulting)

Response to Comments – Belmont Heights Community Association				
Comment No.	Page or Section No.	Comment	Response Code	Response
1	4	Accessory buildings – pgph2: “The accessory building must be constructed in such a way that it does not obscure or damage any existing character-defining features or structures.”	B	“Should” retained in order to be consistent with the suggestive vs. mandatory language that has been established throughout the guidelines.
2	4	Front Setback - “Any change to the setback from the street on the primary elevation ... is not permitted.	A	This language was revised as part of the review process for other districts. The change has been incorporated for Belmont Heights and will be applied throughout the rest of the districts.
3	6	Porte-Cocheres, Trellises, and Decks - pgph2: “Adding a new feature that would require removing an existing historic feature is not permitted.”	A	Incorporated.
4	15	Side addition - pgph 1: “Side additions are not permitted”	A	This language was revised as part of the review process for other districts.
5	16	Side/Read additions – pgph2: “The addition must not envelope or be larger than the existing building.”	B	“Should” retained in order to be consistent with the suggestive vs. mandatory language that has been established throughout the guidelines.

Response to Comments – Belmont Heights Community Association

Comment No.	Page or Section No.	Comment	Response Code	Response
6	16	Chimneys pgph 1: "Adding a chimney to a building without sufficient evidence to suggest that it existed historically is not permitted." "Removing an original chimney is also not permitted..."	A	<p>Language revised to:</p> <p>Original chimneys should not be removed or altered.</p> <p>If the feature is no longer desired, inactive chimneys may be sealed, as long as their original external appearance is retained. The design, size, height, or dimensions of the chimney should not be changed.</p>
7	17	Wood siding pgph1: "Removal of sound historic building material during replacement of damaged materials is not permitted."	A	Language revised to "sound building material should not be removed during replacement of damaged material."
8	18	Stucco Cladding pgph 2: "Wholesale replacement of the exterior stucco on elevations Is not permitted when the new finish is substantially different from the existing finish."	A	This language has been revised to read "Replacing historically appropriate cladding with a new, incompatible material is not permitted" as part of a previous round of review.
9	19	Windows pgph2: "The size of the window opening may not be altered to accommodate the new window; rather, the window must be sized to fit the historic opening." "The historic window surrounds must be preserved."	A	<p>The language: "The size of the window opening should never be altered to accommodate a new window; rather, the window should be sized to fit the historic window opening." was added to this section of the guidelines as part of a previous round of review.</p> <p>Language about window surrounds has been incorporated.</p>

Response to Comments – Belmont Heights Community Association

Comment No.	Page or Section No.	Comment	Response Code	Response
10	20	P20 Door Replacement pgph1: "In the event that an existing original.... Requires placement, it must be replaced in kind or replaced with a door that is compatible with the building's architectural style." "Likewise, altering the door opening Is not permitted."	A	The language: "In the event that an original or historically appropriate door on any elevation is demonstrated to be damaged beyond repair and needs to be replaced, it should be replaced in kind. Use the historic door to guide the new design, or refer to the appropriate section in <i>Chapter 4: Architectural Style Guides</i> for additional information on compatible windows." and "The size of the door opening should never be altered to accommodate a new door; rather, the door should be sized to fit the historic opening." was added to this section of the guidelines as part of a previous round of review.
11	21	P21 Security Doors The BHCA would like staff to find one or two security doors that would be acceptable for a contributing building. Our residents do use screen doors for cooling down the house, but we recognize that using a wood screen door is a safety concern.	A/B	There are very limited products on the market that would not detract from the appearance of a contributing structure. However, adding interior locks or wireless security systems can be used to provide additional security to a historically appropriate wood screen door and not be visually intrusive.

HELLMAN STREET CRAFTSMAN

Project: Long Beach Historic District Design Guidelines **Document/Draft:** Hellman Street Craftsman Design Guidelines

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

Addressed By: Alejandro Plascencia, Alison Spindler (Long Beach Development Services), Amanda Yoder Duane (GPA Consulting)

Response to Comments – Craftsman Village Community Association				
Comment No.	Page or Section No.	Comment	Response Code	Response
1	1	Isaias Hellman residence? Which address?	A	Information revised for correctness.
2	2	Prepend “Most of” onto beginning of first sentence of 2nd paragraph.	A	Added.
3	2	Include description of Toledo Walk from Hellman Street to the alley.	A	Added.
4	2	Add alley between 9th & 10th Streets.	A	Added
5	2	Delete upper left photograph and lower right photograph. Add two photographs provided by neighborhood volunteers. (1 & 2)	B	This section has been revised to include an additional map rather than photographs of properties in the district.
6	3	“Most of” prepended to beginning of paragraph 1.	A	Added. Note: this text has been reorganized under the “District Description” section.
7	3	Add sentence to end of paragraph 3 describing lots on Toledo Walk.	A	Paragraph revised to: “The lot sizes in the Hellman Street Craftsman Village Historic District are generally rectangular, but vary somewhat in size. The lots on either side of Toledo Walk are among the smallest in the district. Most of the lots in the district are uniform rectangles in size, but Hellman Street is oriented along a diagonal. Thus, lots facing Hellman Street are angled slightly along one edge, forming a trapezoidal shape.”

Response to Comments – Craftsman Village Community Association				
Comment No.	Page or Section No.	Comment	Response Code	Response
8	4	<p>Paragraph 1, substitute the 2nd sentence with the following:</p> <p>“When an accessory building is built on a lot it should be designed with features and materials compatible with the primary building on the lot.”</p>	A	<p>Revised to:</p> <p>“When designing an accessory building to a contributing property, it should be compatible with the features, materials, and style of the primary building on the lot.</p> <p>For example, when designing an accessory building for a Craftsman or similar style contributor, consider including design elements such as a gabled roof with open eaves and shingles, wood siding, and rectangular door and window openings; for a Spanish Colonial Revival or similar style contributor, consider including design elements such as flat roofs with clay tile accents, stucco cladding, and rectangular door and window openings.”</p>
9	4	Paragraph 2, 1st sentence, delete “should be” and replace with “must be”.	B	“Should” retained in order to be consistent with the suggestive vs. mandatory language that has been established throughout the guidelines.
10	4	Paragraph 2, 2nd sentence, deleted “never recommended”, should be “not allowed”.	A	<p>This language has been revised to:</p> <p>“Adding a new building or feature that would require removal of an existing, historic building or feature is not permitted.” As part of a previous round of review.</p>
11	4	Paragraph 2, 3rd sentence, “not be appropriate”, should be “is not permissible”.	A	<p>Revised to:</p> <p>Adding a new building or feature that would require removal of an existing, historic building or feature is not permitted. For example, removing a historic detached garage to replace it with a new garage would not be permitted.</p>
12	4	Paragraph 3 1st sentence “should be”, must be changed to “must be”.	B	“Should” retained in order to be consistent with the suggestive vs. mandatory language that has been established throughout the guidelines.

Response to Comments – Craftsman Village Community Association				
Comment No.	Page or Section No.	Comment	Response Code	Response
13	4	Paragraph 3 2nd sentence “should not be” must be changed to “must not be”.	B	“Should” retained in order to be consistent with the suggestive vs. mandatory language that has been established throughout the guidelines.
14	4	Paragraph 4, 1st sentence: Reword to account for original homes without 30’ setbacks, e.g. Toledo Walk, Hoffman, corner lots, homes facing Orange Ave, and others.	A	Text revised to: “Most contributing buildings within the Hellman Street Historic District have a consistent setback of approximately 30’ from the street. Some buildings, such those on corner properties or along Toledo Walk, may have a shallower front setback. However, the setbacks are generally consistent and uniform in appearance.”
15	4	Paragraph 4, sentence 2, “is not recommended” must be changed to “is not allowed”.	A	I believe this is referring to paragraph 5. Page 4. This language has been revised to: “Any change to the setback from the street on the primary elevation would cause a disruption in the visual continuity of the district, and is not permitted.” during a previous round of review.
16	5	Paragraph 1, sentence 2, “should not be” must be replaced “must not be relocated”	B	“Should” retained in order to be consistent with the suggestive vs. mandatory language that has been established throughout the guidelines.
17	5	Image 1 caption, “can disrupt” should be changed to “disrupts” and entire sentence needs to be appended with “and will not be permitted.”	A	This graphic has been removed and replaced with a more helpful illustration that shows images of compatible driveways.

Response to Comments – Craftsman Village Community Association				
Comment No.	Page or Section No.	Comment	Response Code	Response
18	6	Paragraph 2 sentence 2 must be removed and replaced with: “While porte-cocheres may not have existed historically for a majority of the contributing homes in the Hellman Street Craftsman Historic District, they did exist on some of the homes, most notably at 821 and 827 Orange. Other original porte-cocheres have been removed. Where evidence can be seen that portecochers existed, they should be replicated as accurately as possible. “	A	Language revised to: Porte-cochères are not an original feature for the majority of contributing properties in the Hellman Street Craftsman Historic District; however, historic examples do exist. In some cases, original porte-cochères may have been removed. If sufficient historic evidence exists to suggest that an original porte-cochère was removed, property owners are encouraged to restore the feature.
19	6	Insert photo of 821 Orange (3)	A	Full-view photo of 821 Orange from GPA’s survey work has been added.
20	6	Paragraph 2, sentence 3 “is not recommended” should be “is not allowed”.	A	Language revised to: The introduction of a porte-cochère to the front elevation that did not exist historically is not permitted, to avoid conjecture or creating a false sense of history.

Response to Comments – Craftsman Village Community Association				
Comment No.	Page or Section No.	Comment	Response Code	Response
21	6	Paragraph 3, sentence 1, must be deleted. There are many examples in the district of trellises / pergolas on the primary elevation that are original. [Insert photo of 1203 e 8th St].	A	<p>Language revised to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The addition of a trellis (or pergola) is not permitted on the front elevation without sufficient evidence to suggest it existed historically. <p>Trellises or pergolas are not an original feature for the majority of contributing properties in the Hellman Street Craftsman Historic District; however, historic examples do exist. In some cases, original trellis-type features may have been removed. If sufficient historic evidence exists to suggest that an original feature was removed, property owners are encouraged to restore the feature.</p> <p>The introduction of a trellis-type feature to the front elevation that did not exist historically is not permitted, to avoid conjecture or creating a false sense of history.</p>
22	6	Paragraph 3, add final sentence stating: “Appropriately scaled pergolas and trellises that are incorporated into landscaping and fencing generally do not detract from the historic character of the neighborhood.”	B	<p>The height of structures is restricted in the front yard setback. No new trellises/pergolas are possible along the property line.</p> <p>No tall free-standing structures in the front, prioritize to the rear.</p>
23	6	Paragraph 4, sentence 3, “is never recommended” should be changed to “is not allowed”.	A	Adding a new feature that would require removing an existing historic or character defining feature is never recommended;
24	6	Paragraph 3, sentence 4, insert the words, “non-original” between existing and trellises.	A	Revised.

Response to Comments – Craftsman Village Community Association				
Comment No.	Page or Section No.	Comment	Response Code	Response
25	8	2nd paragraph, 1st sentence: Insert comma at end of sentence and include following wording “following all city codes regarding height and setback”.	A	The language: “The design and placement of any fencing may be subject to other City requirements not listed within these guidelines.” Has been added to address the comment and be consistent with language found throughout the guidelines.
26	8	2nd para, 2nd sentence “strongly discouraged” must be changed to “not allowed”.	A	The language has been revised to: “The use of incompatible, heavy, and visually disruptive fencing materials such as concrete block, chain link, or wrought iron and masonry units is not permitted. These materials often appear temporary, and are rarely visually compatible with historic styles.” as part of another round of review.
27	8	2nd para, 3rd sentence “never recommended” must read “not allowed”.	A	This sentence was a little redundant has since been revised for better flow. Please see response to comment 26 for the revised language.
28	8	Strike top photograph and replace with photograph provided. (4)	B	The photo provided is not a particularly compatible fencing option. The guidelines have been revised to be more clear, and to encourage more traditional, vertically oriented fencing.
29	9	2nd paragraph, 1st sentence: where is “Chapter 2”.	C	A draft of Chapter 2 (which may not have been publicly available at the time of comment) has since been posted on the City’s website.
30	9	4th paragraph, 1st sentence: “should be” change to “must be”	B	“Should” retained in order to be consistent with the suggestive vs. mandatory language that has been established throughout the guidelines.
31	11	Replace middle picture with photo provided. (5)	B	The language of this section has been revised and the center photo illustrating that type of overhang was no longer needed.

Response to Comments – Craftsman Village Community Association				
Comment No.	Page or Section No.	Comment	Response Code	Response
32	12	Paragraph 4. Delete the 1st sentence. Replace with: “Many of the homes in the Hellman Street Craftsman Village Historic District have front porch railing consisting of large horizontal beams running between the posts. some have original low walls with large massing, constructed of cement and stucco that reflect the Mission style. “Other homes in the neighborhood either have no railings or walls made of similar materials to the home.	A	Paragraph revised to: Many porches within the Hellman Street Historic District have porch railings that consist of horizontal beams running between the porch supports or piers. Other porches are not surrounded by any railing at all, while some are surrounded by low walls that are clad in stucco or match the exterior cladding. These walls should be treated the same as the exterior cladding, as described later in these guidelines, and should not be covered with any other material.
33	12	Paragraph 5, sentence 1, “not recommended” changed to “not allowed”.	B	There are instances in which a railing may need to be introduced, such as for handicap accessibility or safety. For that reason, there is flexibility with this guideline and mandatory language was not used.
34	13	Paragraph 5, sentence 1: “ins not recommended” to “is not allowed”.	A	The language has been revised to: “The concrete steps and porch floor should remain. Installing incompatible new steps or covering the existing steps and porch floor with a new material or texture, such as tile, pavers, or fieldstone veneer, on a street-facing elevation is not permitted.” As part of a previous round of review.
35	13	Paragraph 6, sentence 2. “should not” changed to “must not”.	B	“Should” retained in order to be consistent with the suggestive vs. mandatory language that has been established throughout the guidelines.
36	14	Replace picture (has vinyl windows and cinder block wrought iron fence!) with provided photograph. (6)	A	Full-view photo of 820 Hoffman from GPA’s survey work has been added.
37	15	Paragraph 3, sentence 3, “not recommended” to “not allowed”.	A	This language has been revised as part of a previous round of review.

Response to Comments – Craftsman Village Community Association				
Comment No.	Page or Section No.	Comment	Response Code	Response
38	15	Paragraph 6, sentence 1, delete “yet distinguishable from”.	B	<p>The language included in the draft guidelines emphasizing that additions should be distinguishable from the original construction is derived from the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation, which is the set most applicable to the types of changes being made to buildings in historic districts. These standards are the established best-practices for the treatment of historic buildings. Standard 9 reads: <i>New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work will be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.</i></p> <p>https://www.nps.gov/tps/standards/four-treatments/treatment-rehabilitation.htm</p>
39	15	Paragraph 6, Delete sentence 4. (assuming period after “original historic building” in sentence 1.	B	Please see response to Comment 38.

Response to Comments – Craftsman Village Community Association				
Comment No.	Page or Section No.	Comment	Response Code	Response
40	16	REMOVE the photograph and add photo (7). Caption should reflect the Sec. Of Interior’s intent– use like materials, massing, roof line, window details. Board and batten are not use of like materials.	A/B	<p>The use of board and batten on an addition to a wood-clad building would likely satisfy the Secretary of the Interior’s standards for additions, as would using clapboard of a slightly different width or profile.</p> <p>The image in question was initially chosen because, for a layperson, it was very clearly an addition while still being compatible, and helped to illustrate a concept that can be difficult to wrap one’s mind around.</p> <p>Another compatible method of differentiating an addition would be through the use of a piece of vertical wood trim. A photo illustrating this method has been inserted in place of the original. The photo provided by the commenter pictured a similar example, but was obscured by fence.</p>
41	18	4th paragraph 2nd sentence “less-compatible” with “non-compatible”. Page 19	A	<p>The language has been revised to:</p> <p>“However, there are windows that have been incompatibly replaced with aluminum or vinyl.”</p> <p>as part of a previous round of review.</p>
42	19	paragraph 1, 3rd sentence Insert word “wooden” between “new” and “window”.	B	The existing language allows for any situations in which the original window might not be wood, such a steel casement window.
43	19	Paragraph 1, 4th sentence: “Where is the architectural style guide, where is Chapter 4?”	C	Chapter 4 is being drafted in sections like Chapter 3. Each section will address a common Long Beach architectural style. As the section drafts are completed, they will be posted on the City’s website.
44	19	Paragraph 2, sentence 1: “should not” replaced with “must not”.	B	“Should” retained in order to be consistent with the suggestive vs. mandatory language that has been established throughout the guidelines.

Response to Comments – Craftsman Village Community Association				
Comment No.	Page or Section No.	Comment	Response Code	Response
45	20	Delete all 4 photos. The first looks like a fire code violation, all of the examples are unattractive, and the inclusion of the photographs makes it seem as if bars on windows are acceptable.	A/B	The images have been revised to show more attractive examples of security bars. Window grilles are frequently seen on Spanish Colonial Revival and similar styles, and may be a compatible security measure.
46	21	Paragraph 2, sentence 4, “is not recommended” must be changed to “is strictly forbidden”.	A	Revised to: “Otherwise altering a door opening to accommodate features such as sidelights, fanlights, or transoms that did not historically exist is not permitted.” Note: This language has been reorganized under Door Openings.
47	21	Paragraph 4, sentence 1, “never recommended” to “never allowed”.	A	The language has been revised to: “Changing the size, shape, number, or location of door openings on elevations visible from the street is not permitted.” as part of a previous round of review.
48	23	Paragraph 2, sentence 1, does not end.	A	Corrected; the guidelines content will be carefully reviewed before re-submittal.

49	25	<p>Paragraph 1. The Planning Department of the City of Long Beach has records of all permitted construction. The Planning Department records are the repository of alterations and is a source that should be used for distinguishing original construction versus new construction. The materials should be the same – if the original building has horizontal siding , use siding. Massing, window details should be very close to original</p>	<p>The language included in the draft guidelines explaining that new construction should be distinguishable from the original construction is derived from the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation, which is the set most applicable to the types of changes being made to buildings in historic districts, including infill construction. See highlighted portion: <i>The Standards apply to historic buildings of all periods, styles, types, materials, and sizes. They apply to both the exterior and the interior of historic buildings. The Standards also encompass related landscape features and the building’s site and environment as well as attached, adjacent, or related new construction.</i></p> <p>These standards are the established best-practices for the treatment of historic buildings. Standard 9 reads: <i>New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work will be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment:</i> https://www.nps.gov/tps/standards/four-treatments/treatment-rehabilitation.htm</p> <p>While directed more at planners/city staff, Eleanor Gorskis’s “Regulating New Construction in Historic Districts,” published by the National Trust for Historic Preservation, does provide some additional insight on various approaches to infill construction, and why replication in new construction is not ideal: http://forum.savingplaces.org/HigherLogic/System/DownloadDocumentFile.ashx?DocumentFileKey=b34c5c17-9200-eb32-b433-339d7918855f</p>
----	----	---	---

ROSE PARK & ROSE PARK SOUTH

Project: Long Beach Historic District Design Guidelines **Document/Draft:** Rose Park District Guidelines

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

Addressed By: Alejandro Plascencia, Alison Spindler (Long Beach Development Services), Amanda Yoder Duane (GPA Consulting)

Comment No.	Page or Section No.	Comment	Response Code	Response
1	N/A	Recommendation: Title "Guidelines for Property Owners and Property Managers" owning property in Historic Districts. A City of Long Beach municipal program	B	This title suggests the inclusion material that is not within the scope or intent of the Design Guidelines.
2	N/A	Recommendation: Map of each historic district with contact to confirm property status	A	This information has been added to Chapter 1, a draft of which may not have been publicly available at the time of comment. .
3	N/A	Recommendation: Rules when selling a property in an historic district e.g. notification of realtor. If adjacent to historic district rules for developers. Selling of multi-unit structures, etc.	B	While this information is important to disseminate and does affect properties in the historic districts, the purpose and intent of the Design Guidelines is to provide property owners, planning staff and design professionals with tools and guidance for making alterations to and maintaining historic properties.
4	N/A	Materials lists by type of facade element	A	This comment is somewhat unclear; however, Chapter 4 is currently being drafted in sections and will include a section on each of the most prevalent architectural styles found in Long Beach. Each section will include information about the history/origin/influences of the style, as well as detailed information on characteristics like roofing, exterior cladding, decorative features, and so on, which may address this comment.
5	N/A	Discrete "to-do's" by contributing, noncontributing.	A	While the majority of the guidelines are geared towards contributing properties, additional details

Comment No.	Page or Section No.	Comment	Response Code	Response
				have been added regarding alterations to non-contributing properties, including photo examples. Throughout the guidelines, property owners are encouraged to reverse incompatible changes. Sufficient reversal of these alterations may result in a non-contributor being considered contributing.
6	N/A	Summary of not permitted changes	C	This comment appears to go hand-in-hand with comment 13, regarding a “cheat sheet” for not permitted changes across districts. Please see comment 13.
7	N/A	Review process described with a review form or list of steps.	C	Chapter 1 (a draft of which may not have been publicly available at the time of comment) describes the review process. The draft has since been posted to the City’s website.
8	N/A	Enforcement process described. When and how is inspection done for an ‘approved’ change.	C	Chapter 1 (a draft of which may not have been publicly available at the time of comment) describes the enforcement procedure. The draft has since been posted to the City’s website.
9	N/A	How fines and penalties work.	C	Please see response to comment 8.
10	N/A	Index	C	An index may be generated once all the materials have been drafted; in the meantime, publicly available portions of the document are organized in outline format on the City of Long Beach website, found here: http://www.lbds.info/planning/historic_preservation/historic_district_guidelines.asp
11	N/A	FAQ’s - to reinforce common misunderstandings, for example who this document applies to, what structures are included, where to call or visit or email for further information. Who oversees this program	C	Chapter 1 (a draft of which may not have been publicly available at the time of comment) addresses the purpose of the document, how to use it, etc. The draft has since been posted to the City’s website.
12	N/A	Description of CHC and Historic Preservation Staff.	C	This information has been incorporated into Chapter 1, a draft of which was not available at the time of this comment.

Comment No.	Page or Section No.	Comment	Response Code	Response
				Fourth floor, meet with Historic Preservation staff that work in the planning bureau within the department of development services.
13	N/A	Cheat Sheet of common not permitted changes across all historic districts	C	This would certainly be a helpful quick-reference tool, and its creation may be explored once all of the guidelines have been written.
14	N/A	Case study for common applications by historic district, e.g. in Rose Park South there are requests to build a 2nd story unit.	A	Applicants bring in a wide variety of proposed modifications and additions for the district; each case is reviewed on a case-by-case basis against this document and Sec'y of the interior's standards. However, more details on second story additions and pictorial examples have been provided.
15	N/A	Clarify enforcement process and how property owners are notified. Otherwise it is a city program that is not enforced, i.e. it is optional	C	Chapter 1 (a draft of which may not have been publicly available at the time of comment) describes the enforcement procedure. The draft has since been posted to the City's website.
16	N/A	Change point of view to property owner. Currently it is owner occupied-centric. Major improvement would be to educate/regulate the investor-owner to maintain standards.	A	The language has been revised from "homeowner" to "property owner" as part of a previous round of review, for the reasons you've described.
17	N/A	Reconcile Sec'y of Interior Requirements. Reconcile need to match exterior with historically appropriate elements with need to 'distinguish' an addition per Sec'y of Interior requirements.	C	These guidelines reflect the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Historic Preservation, which call for an ability to distinguish new elements while blending appropriately with the historic character.
18	N/A	Integrate with other city programs e.g. General Plans, Public Works, Need for Historic Surveys for commercial property construction. For example lacks integration with public works e.g. intersections, curbs, lighting	C	These Guidelines are intended for the preservation of private property within the historic districts. Public Works is a separate department that deals with the public property, including intersections, curbs, and lighting.
19	N/A	Needs to fit with 2035 plan. Currently lacks of integration with 2035 plan	C	Historic District Guidelines are in addition to all other zoning and planning regulations. The City currently has a Historic Preservation Element that is a part of the General Plan. The City is currently preparing an update to its Land Use Element of the General Plan and

Comment No.	Page or Section No.	Comment	Response Code	Response
				adoption of a new Urban Design Element. These General Plan Elements are not in conflict with the Historic Preservation Element and the Design Guidelines.
20	N/A	<p>Evaluation Plan Needs an evaluation plan, at a minimum on a yearly basis. For example,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Impact of CHC decisions on integrity of each historic district• Amount and type of communication with property owners in each district• Examples of innovation e.g. increasing multi-unit participation• Review of when resident/neighborhood input was included in the CHC decision process.	C	<p>CHC Year-End Review is a document that is prepared annually and summarizes and highlights key projects. This information is made readily available to the public.</p> <p>In addition, the CHC meetings are recorded, and all agendas and recordings are made publicly available.</p>