

## REQUEST FOR HISTORIC AND SCENIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION ACTION

### **V.A. DELMY SEGOVIA, OWNER/APPLICANT** (PROJECT PLANNER: LAYLEE HOKMOLLAHI)

**PUBLIC HEARING** to consider **Demolition No. 380** – A request to demolish an approximately 640 square-foot guest house, over 50 years of age, located at 1119 North Church Street (APN: 0167-271-11-0000) within the Single-Family Residential (R-1) District. This proposal may qualify for exemption from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) pursuant to Section 15301(I)(4) (Existing Facilities) of the CEQA Guidelines.

HISTORIC AND SCENIC PRESERVATION MEETING: May 4, 2023

---

Planner: Laylee Hokmollahi, Junior Planner

Reviewed by: Brian Foote, City Planner/Planning Manager

#### **PROCEDURE FOR PUBLIC HEARING**

1. Chairperson declares the meeting open as a public hearing.
2. Chairperson calls upon staff for report.
3. Chairperson calls for questions/comments from members of the Commission.
4. Chairperson calls upon applicant, or its representative, for comments/testimony.
5. Chairperson calls for comments/questions/testimony from members of the public (3 minutes per speaker).
6. Chairperson calls upon the applicant, or representative, for rebuttal comments (5 minutes).
7. Chairperson closes the public hearing.
8. Commission considers the motion(s) and votes.

#### **SYNOPSIS**

1. Historic Designation: The structure is not designated as a historic resource, nor is it located within a historic district, designated by the City of Redlands, the State of California, or the United States Government.
2. Existing Land Use: Zoning: Single-Family Residential (R-1) District  
General Plan: Low Density Residential
3. Historic and Scenic Preservation Commission submittal dates:
  - (A) Submittal Dates: March 2, 2023
  - (B) Date Deemed Complete: March 27, 2023
  - (C) Historic and Scenic Preservation Commission Meeting: April 4, 2023

4. Attachments:

- (A) Location Map & Aerial Photograph
- (B) Site Photographs
- (C) Preliminary Environmental Checklist
- (D) Resolution No. 2023-10

## **PROPOSAL / BACKGROUND**

On March 2, 2023, the property owner Delmy Segovia submitted an application to demolish an approximately 640 square-foot guest house, located at 1119 North Church Street (APN: 0167-271-11-0000) within the Single-Family Residential (R-1) District. Based on historic aerial photographs and City directories, the guest house is over 50 years of age and is located at the rear of the property on the northwest side. Presently, the property includes a single-family dwelling, the subject guest house, and three small accessory structures. The applicant proposes to demolish the guest house in order to create space to construct an accessory dwelling unit.

## **SUMMARY**

The San Bernardino County Assessor's Office records indicate that the property was developed with the main dwelling in 1915. The City's Directories begin to list the individuals that were associated with the subject property in 1919. The oldest aerial photograph available for this property is from 1938 and it does not clearly show the guest house. It is unclear when this structure was originally built. A structure in the same location as the guest house first appears on aerial images in 1959. Permit records for this property do not indicate the year it was originally constructed. However, records from 1956 call out building alterations to an existing structure with a 120-foot setback, which appears to be this guest house. The building permit specifies the conversion of an existing structure into a guesthouse.

The buildings on the property are not designated historic resources but demolition of the guesthouse will require review by the Historic and Scenic Preservation Commission in accordance with Redlands Municipal Section 15.44.070 for the demolition of a structure of 50 years of age or older.

## **ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW**

City staff prepared a Preliminary Environmental Checklist for the proposed project in accordance with Section 15.44.060 of the Redlands Municipal Code, which requires an environmental checklist be prepared for all demolition permit applications involving structures over 50 years old. This checklist provides an environmental analysis of the project that confirms that with the Commission's concurrence, the structure is not

considered “historic resource” nor an “eligible resource,” and that demolition of the structure would qualify for a Notice of Exemption pursuant to Section 15301 (Existing Facilities) of the California Environmental Quality Act Guidelines.

Section 15301(l) of the California Environmental Quality Act states that the demolition and removal of individual small structures including accessory structures, is exempt from environmental review. In addition, Section 15064.5 of the California Environmental Quality Act refers to the California Public Resource Code, which provides guidance as to what is considered a “historic resource” or “eligible resource.” The criteria consists of the following:

- It is associated with events which have made a significant contribution to California’s history and cultural heritage.
- It is associated with the lives of persons important to our past.
- The architecture embodies distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method of construction or possesses high artistic values.
- The potential to yield any information important to history or pre-history.

After conducting research for the subject parcel, staff concluded that there is no evidence that the site or structure is associated with any historical event or person that contributes to the history of the United States, California, San Bernardino County, or the City of Redlands. In addition, the structure does not embody any distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, method of construction or high artistic value, nor does the structure present any potential to yield any information important to history or pre-history. Further details of this analysis are included below and in the Preliminary Environmental Checklist Form (Attachment C).

## **ANALYSIS**

The procedures outlined in RMC Section 2.24.090 through Section 2.24.140 apply to the demolition of property recorded in the City of Redlands List of Historic Resources. The subject property is not recorded in the list of local historic resources and is not subject to the procedures in Section 2.24 of the Redlands Municipal Code. However, Section 15.44.070 requires that prior to the demolition of any structure over 50 years old, the Historic and Scenic Preservation Commission is required to determine whether the structure is historically significant. Section 2.62.170 establishes the City’s criteria for historic significance. Below, each City criteria is listed with justification as to why this structure is not historically significant.

**A) Local Criteria for Significance**

*RMC Section 2.62.170(A): It has significant character, interest, or value as part of the development, heritage or cultural characteristics of the City of Redlands, State of California, or the United States.*

The building permit records for this property do not indicate the year the guest house was originally constructed. However, records from 1956 call out building alterations to an existing structure with a 120-foot setback, which appears to be this guest house. The majority of permit records on file are electrical and plumbing permits. Permits that are on file for the subject property include the following:

Table 1: Permit Records

| Permit Type                  | Year Issued                                  | Work Proposed  |
|------------------------------|--|--|
| Building Record              | February 11, 1929                            | New roof, generator repair, etc.   |
| Building Record              | March 22, 1933                               | Repair damage done by fire   |
| Roofing Permit               | March 9, 1943                                | Roof Repair  |
| Electrical Permit            | August 31, 1948                              | Electric wiring  |
| Plumbing Permit              | November 2, 1948                             | Plumbing   |
| Electrical Permit            | May 31, 1949                                 | Electrical wiring for a chicken house                                      |
| Plumbing Permit              | May 12, 1950                                 | Gas outlets  |
| Building Alterations         | March 26, 1956                               | Remodel existing building into guest house                                 |
| Plumbing Permit              | July 26, 1956                                | Plumbing   |
| Electrical Permit            | September 11, 1956                           | Plug, light, switch, etc.  |
| Plumbing Permit              | August 28, 1958                              | Plumbing   |
| Electrical Permit            | September 4, 1959                            | Electrical modifications   |
| Permit and Inspection Record | October 29, 1986                             | Replace wall heater  |
| Roofing permit               | May 16, 1995                                 | Reroof   |
| BRR                          | December 16, 2008<br>Expired: March 10, 2010 | Adding interior closet, replace siding drywall and replacing three windows |
| Roofing Permit               | November 14, 2012                            | 1000 SF Comp Re-roof   |
| B-BSP Solar                  | December 4, 2012                             | Roof mounted P.V. solar system   |
| B-BEP Electrical Permit      | December 17, 2012                            | 200 AMP electrical panel upgrade   |
| B-BSP Solar                  | May 30, 2017                                 | Residential roof mount solar – 22  |

|  |                   |
|--|-------------------|
|  | modules – 6.05 KW |
|--|-------------------|

Based on historic aerial images and building permit records associated with the subject property, the guest house is at least 50 years of age. Staff also conducted research at the A.K. Smiley Library Heritage Room and through newspapers.com. Section 2.62.170.C (below) has more information regarding the individuals that are associated to the subject property. Overall, there is no significant evidence that this specific structure makes a significant contribution to the development, heritage or cultural characteristics of the city, State, or County

*RMC Section 2.62.170(B): It is the site of a significant historic event.*

Based on the research conducted by staff through local and regional newspaper database searches, building records, and ownership history, it has been determined that the property is not the site of a significant historic event.

*RMC Section 2.62.170(C): It is strongly identified with a person or persons who significantly contributed to the culture, history, or development of the city.*

Staff conducted research at the A.K. Smiley Library Heritage Room and through newspaper.com. The table (shown below) lists the residents associated with the subject property based on the information obtained from the City Directories located at the A.K. Smiley Library’s Heritage Room. The following names were associated with 1119 N. Church Street in the Redlands city directories (1919 – 1967) and San Bernardino County Assessor’s office records (1958 – Current).

Table 2: Property Ownership History

| Directory Year | Name(s)                                      | Occupation   | Additional Information                               |
|----------------|--|--|--|
| 1919           | Bell, Colin C (Annie)                        | 1919 – 1923: Orange grower<br>1923 – 1925: Tile Setter | First directory where 1119 N Church Street is found. |
| 1927           | Mallery, Ira S                               | Building Contractor                                    | NA   |
| 1929           | White, Robert (Jennie)                       | Orange grower  | NA   |
| 1941           | Bloomquist, Covert J (Enid)<br>White, Robert | Laboratory<br>Fruit worker                             | NA   |

HISTORIC AND SCENIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION  
DEMOLITION NO. 380  
April 4, 2023

|      |                                       |  |  |
|------|---------------------------------------|--|--|
| 1947 | Andriese, Peter (Augusta)             | Rancher  | NA   |
| 1950 | Meyer, Fred (Margaret)                | Orange grower/chicken rancher                            | NA   |
| 1958 | Youngsma, Kenneth (Matja)             | Aircraft worker  | First owner history listed on San Bernardino County Assessors Office Records |
| 1985 | Youngsma, Matja                       | Occupation not listed on San Bernardino County Assessors | NA   |
| 1996 | Perez, Rudy<br>Cardiel-Perez, Melissa | Occupation not listed on San Bernardino County Assessors | NA   |
| 2005 | Padilla, Job<br>Padilla, Olivia       | Occupation not listed on San Bernardino County Assessors | NA   |
| 2006 | Moreno, Lidia                         | Occupation not listed on San Bernardino County Assessors | NA   |
| 2007 | Wells Fargo Bank                      | Occupation not listed on San Bernardino County Assessors | NA   |
| 2008 | Zaragoza, Eric A                      | Occupation not listed on San Bernardino County Assessors | NA   |
| 2015 | Eagle Vista Equities LLC              | Occupation not listed on San Bernardino County Assessors | NA   |
| 2016 | Segovia, Delmy                        | Occupation not listed on San Bernardino County Assessors | NA   |
| 2020 | Segovia, Delmy and Lilian             | Occupation not listed on San Bernardino County Assessors | Current owners   |

Newspapers from the Redlands Daily Facts indicate Robert White was a doctor who gained fame in World War II as the surgeon on the famous Doolittle raid on Tokyo. Mr. Fred Meyer was an orange grower from 1946 to 1961 and was associated with Redlands Foothill Groves. The individuals that were associated with the subject property had working class occupations and are not known to have significantly contributed to the culture, history, or development of the city.

*RMC Section 2.62.170(D): It is one of the few remaining examples in the city possessing distinguishing characteristics of an architectural type or specimen.*

The guest house contains a horizontal wood exterior, composition shingle roof, medium gable, and a patio entrance. It also has wooden doors, a metal door, windows with wood framing, and two vinyl windows. The variety in material suggests that the building has undergone substantial alterations since its original construction. The guest house as is sits today does not represent any specific architectural style and is does not have any particularly distinguishing characteristics. The structure is not one of the few remaining examples in the city possessing distinguishing characteristics of this architectural type or specimen.

*RMC Section 2.62.170(E): It is a notable work of an architect or master builder whose individual work has significantly influenced the development of the city.*

A local and regional newspaper records database search was conducted for the subject site. The city's building permits do not indicate the builder and architect of the guest house. There is no evidence of this guest house being constructed by a master builder. Given the simplicity of the structure staff assumes that the structure is not the notable work of an architect or master builder.

*RMC Section 2.62.170(F): It embodies elements of architectural design, detail, materials, or craftsmanship that represents a significant architectural innovation.*

As discussed under Section 2.62.170(D) above, the guest house does not embody elements of architectural design, detail, materials, or craftsmanship that represents a significant architectural innovation. It does not have unique features that distinguish this property from others. It does not display any articulation throughout the facades, is comprised of basic materials and has been modified since its original construction.

*RMC Section 2.62.170(G): It has a unique location or singular physical characteristics representing an established and familiar visual feature of a neighborhood, community, or the city.*

The property is located at 1119 North Church Street which is on the west side of Church Street and approximately 200 feet north of East Brockton Avenue. An aerial from 1938 indicates that the property was surrounded by orange groves to the north, south, east, and west. The surrounding characteristics of the neighborhood have changed over the years as the surrounding properties have developed. The surrounding parcels include a theatre to the north, and single-family residences to the south, east, and west. The property is not located within a unique location and the structure is not a familiar visual

feature of the neighborhood, community, or city. The surrounding properties are as follows:

|        | <b>General Plan</b>        | <b>Zoning</b>                              | <b>Land Use</b>           |
|--------|----------------------------|--|---------------------------|
| North: | Medium Density Residential | Multiple-Family Residential (R-2) District | Life House Theatre        |
| South: | Low Density Residential    | Single-Family Residential (R-1) District   | Single-family residential |
| West:  | Medium Density Residential | Multiple-Family Residential (R-2) District | Single-family residential |
| East:  | Low Density Residential    | Single-Family Residential (R-1) District   | Single-family residential |

The site is not located within any registered Historic and Scenic Districts and is not listed as a designated historic resource.

*RMC Section 2.62.170(H): It has unique design or detailing.*

The guest house incorporates horizontal wood siding, composition shingle roof, medium gable with a patio entrance, doors and windows with different material, as well as other simple features. These features are simple in design and would not represent a unique design or detailing specific to this structure. The guest house matches the architectural style of the main dwelling and consist of similar material. The architectural features that are incorporated into the dwelling and the guest house are common features and are not unique to the overall design of the subject property.

*RMC Section 2.62.170(I): It is a particularly good example of a period or style.*

The architectural characteristics of the guest house do not embody distinctive features that represent a particularly good example of a period or style. The guest house incorporates features such as a wood exterior, composition shingle roof, medium gable, and has windows and doors with different material. Site photographs show the structure has been modified over the time. Therefore, the structure which has no unique architectural features, has been altered, and would not be considered a particular good example or one of the best examples of a period or style within Redlands.

*RMC Section 2.62.170(J): It contributes to the historical or scenic heritage or historical or scenic properties of the city (to include, but not be limited to, landscaping, light standards, trees, curbing, and signs).*

The guest house does not contribute in any way to a group of historic or scenic properties within the City. The existing landscaping onsite is very limited. No light



standards, curbing or signs that could be considered significant are present on site. The guest house does not contribute to any scenic heritage or contribute to any scenic properties.

*RMC Section 2.62.170(K): It is located within a historic and scenic or urban conservation district, being a geographically definable area possessing a concentration of historic or scenic properties which contribute to each other and are unified aesthetically by plan or physical development.*

Refer to the response under 2.62.170(J) above. The site is not located within any historic district.

## **B) CEQA Criteria for Significance**

In addition to the City of Redlands criteria, California Public Resources Code Section 5024.1 (Title 14 CCR, Section 4852) also has findings for determining if a building has "Historic Significance." Each of those findings is identified within the Preliminary Environmental Checklist Form (Attachment C) with justification as to why this structure is not historically significant.

*A. Associated with events have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of California History and cultural heritage.*

A thorough record search of local newspapers and City directories did not indicate that this property is associated with any specific events that may have contributed to California's history or cultural heritage.

*B. Is associated with the lives of persons important in our past.*

Please refer to the response provided under Section 2.62.170(C), above. The existing guest house is not associated with the lives of persons important in our past.

*C. Embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method of construction, or represents the work of an important creative individual, or possesses high artistic values.*

Please refer to the response provided under Section 2.62.170(D), above. The structure does not embody distinctive characteristics of any type, period, region, or method of construction, nor does it represent the work of an important creative individual, nor possess high artistic values.

*D. Has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information in prehistory or history.*

The guest house and site have not yielded any information regarding prehistory or history. Based on the review of the criteria above as it relates to the demolition of the structure, it is not historically significant, and approval of the proposed demolition will not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5.

### **C) Conclusion of Analysis**

Based on the listed criteria and their associated responses, staff has determined the guest house is not considered historically significant.

The Historic and Scenic Preservation Commission is authorized to determine the potential historical significance of the structure and the need for any further environmental review, and subsequently approve, condition, or deny the demolition permit application. If the Commission determines that the structure has no historical significance and the permit application is approved, the application is exempt from further review by the City unless an appeal is made to the City Council. If no appeal is filed within the time provided, the Development Services Department may issue the demolition permit in accordance with the Redlands Municipal Code.

If the Commission determines that the structure has historical significance, the Commission would then direct staff to conduct additional environmental review and subsequently approve, condition, or deny the application.

### **STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

Staff recommends that the Historic and Scenic Preservation Commission approve Demolition No. 380 based on the facts presented in this staff report and subject to the recommended Conditions of Approval.

### **MOTION**

If the Historic and Scenic Preservation Commission deems it appropriate, staff recommends the following motion:

“I move that the Historic and Scenic Preservation Commission adopt Resolution No. 2023-10, to determine that Demolition Permit No. 380 is exempt from environmental review under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Section 15301 (Existing Facilities) of the CEQA Guidelines and approve Demolition Permit No. 380 based on the facts within this staff report and subject to the attached Conditions of Approval.”

# ATTACHMENT "A"

Location Map and Aerial Photograph



# Location Map

Demolition No. 380  
 Attachment A-1 : Location Map  
 1119 N. Church Street

This map was produced by the City of Redlands, Geographic Information System. The City of Redlands assumes no warranty or legal responsibility for the information contained on this map. The data used to generate this map is dynamic in nature, therefore the information shown may or may not be the most current.



April 17, 2023

OneStop.mxd



Copyright © 2015



Aerial

Demolition No. 380  
Attachment A-2: Aerial  
1119 N. Church Street

This map was produced by the City of Redlands, Geographic Information System. The City of Redlands assumes no warranty or legal responsibility for the information contained on this map. The data used to generate this map is dynamic in nature, therefore the information shown may or may not be the most current.



April 17, 2023

OneStop.mxd

# ATTACHMENT "B"

Site Photographs



**Easterly Elevation**



**Southerly Elevation**



**Westerly Elevation**



**Northerly Elevation**



# ATTACHMENT "C"

## Preliminary Environmental Checklist

**CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT (CEQA)**

**ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM**

1. Project Title: Demolition No. 380
2. Lead Agency Name and Address:  
City of Redlands  
Development Services Department  
35 Cajon Street, Suite 20  
Redlands, CA 92373  
Mailing Address:  
City of Redlands  
Development Services Dept. – Planning  
P.O. Box 3005  
Redlands, CA 92373
3. Contact Person & Telephone: Laylee Hokmollahi, Junior Planner, (909) 798-7555, ext. 7345
4. Project Location: 1119 North Church Street (Assessor Parcel Number: 0167-271-11-0000)
5. Project Sponsor's Name and Address:  
Delmy Segovia  
1119 North Church Street  
Redlands, Ca 92374
6. General Plan Designation: Low Density Residential
7. Zoning Designation: Single-Family Residential (R-1)
8. Description of Project: The owner, Delmy Segovia, proposes to demolish an approximately 640 square foot guest house, over 50 years of age, located at 1119 North Church Street within the (R-1) single-family residential District (APN: 0167-271-11-0000).
9. Existing On-site Land Use and Setting: The subject property is located at the west side of Church Street and approximately 200 feet north of East Brockton Avenue and is currently developed with a single-family residential dwelling.
10. The surrounding properties are as follow:

|        | <b>General Plan</b>        | <b>Zoning</b>                     | <b>Land Use</b>         |
|--------|----------------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------------|
| North: | Medium Density Residential | Multiple-Family Residential (R-2) | Life House Theatre      |
| South: | Low Density Residential    | Single-Family Residential (R-1)   | Single Family Residence |
| West:  | Medium Density Residential | Multiple-Family Residential (R-2) | Single Family Residence |
| East:  | Low Density Residential    | Single-Family Residential (R-1)   | Single Family Residence |

The site is not located within any registered Historic and Scenic Districts and is not listed as a designated historic resource.

- 11. Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement): None
- 12. Have California Native American tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project area requested consultation pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21080.3.1? If so, has consultation begun?

Not Applicable. This Preliminary Environmental Checklist is being prepared in compliance with Section 15.44.060 of the City of Redlands Municipal Code to confirm exemption from the California Environmental Quality Act, through Section 15301 (Existing Facilities).

**ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:**

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a “Potentially Significant Impact” as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

- |   |  |   |
|---|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics                       | <input type="checkbox"/> Greenhouse Gas Emissions      | <input type="checkbox"/> Population & Housing               |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Agriculture & Forestry Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Hazards & Hazardous Materials | <input type="checkbox"/> Public Services                    |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Air Quality                      | <input type="checkbox"/> Hydrology/Water Quality       | <input type="checkbox"/> Recreation                         |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources             | <input type="checkbox"/> Land Use & Planning           | <input type="checkbox"/> Transportation & Traffic           |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources               | <input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources             | <input type="checkbox"/> Utilities & Service Systems        |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Geology and Soils                | <input type="checkbox"/> Noise                         | <input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance |

**ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATION:**

- On the basis of this initial study, the City of Redlands, as Lead Agency, finds that the proposed structure(s) to be demolished are not a Historical Resource and has no historical significance, as defined in Section 15064.5 of the California Environmental Quality Act Guidelines, and Chapter 15.44 of the Redlands Municipal Code. Consequently, the demolition of the structure(s) is considered to be ministerial and exempt from the preparation of a Negative Declaration or Environmental Impact Report, pursuant to the Section 15301 of the CEQA Guidelines, and the City’s Municipal Code. Further, this initial study has been prepared in accordance with Section 15.44.060 of the Redlands Municipal Code which requires an initial study be prepared for all demolition permit applications involving structures over fifty (50) years old.

*L. Hokmollahi*

Laylee Hokmollahi, Junior Planner  
 City of Redlands  
 April 13, 2023

## EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

- 1) A brief explanation is required for all determinations, except "No Impact" determinations that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A "No Impact" determination is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g. the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A "No Impact" determination should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
- 2) All determinations and discussion must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
- 3) Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be potentially significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries in any section of this Initial Study, then an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) must be prepared to fully analyze the identified issue(s).
- 4) "Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less than Significant Impact." The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from Section XVII, "Earlier Analyses," may be cross-referenced).
- 5) Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration (CEQA Guidelines Section 15063(c)(3)(D)). In such cases, a brief discussion should identify the following:
  - a) Earlier Analyses Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
  - b) Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
  - c) Mitigation Measures. For any effects that are determined to be "Less than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated," describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.

- 6) Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist any and all references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., General Plan maps or exhibits, zoning ordinances, specific plans, etc.). Reference to a previously-prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.
- 7) Supporting Information Sources. A source list should be attached and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion. In this Initial Study, a References section is provided at the end of the document.
- 8) This is only a suggested form, and lead agencies are free to use different formats. However, lead agencies should normally address the questions from this checklist that are relevant to a project's environmental effects in whatever format is selected.
- 9) The explanation of each issue should identify:
  - a) The significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and,
  - b) The mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significance.

| Issues:  | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|
| <b>I. AESTHETICS.</b>  |                                |  |                              |           |
| Would the project:   |                                |  |                              |           |
| a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?  | —                              | —  | —                            | <u>✓</u>  |
| b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway? | —                              | —  | —                            | <u>✓</u>  |
| c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?  | —                              | —  | —                            | <u>✓</u>  |
| d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?                                    | —                              | —  | —                            | <u>✓</u>  |

Aesthetics – Discussion

- a) *No Impact.* The proposed project will not have an adverse effect on a scenic vista or scenic highway. The proposed project is the demolition of a guest house which is not located within a scenic vista or along a scenic highway.
- b) *No Impact.* The proposed project will not damage scenic resources, including trees, rock outcroppings, or historic buildings within a state scenic highway. The property is not located along a state scenic highway and the structure itself is not historic. The structure to be demolished will be a guest house, and there is no known rock outcropping on-site.
- c) *No Impact.* The proposed project will not degrade the existing visual character or affect the quality of the site and its surroundings. The demolition of the guest house would not create a change in the appearance of the surroundings. Overall, the demolition of the subject structure will not substantially degrade the existing visual character of the area.
- d) *No Impact.* The guest house is detached from the main residence and the applicant is proposing to remove the structure from the site. The proposed project will not create a new source of substantial light or glare, which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area.

| Issues:   | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|
| <p><b>II. AGRICULTURE &amp; FOREST RESOURCES.</b> In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry &amp; Fire Protection regarding the state's inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment project; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. Would the project:</p> |                                |  |                              |           |
| <p>a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?</p>   | —                              | —  | —                            | ✓         |
| <p>b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract.</p>   | —                              | —  | —                            | ✓         |
| <p>c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?</p>   | —                              | —  | —                            | ✓         |
| <p>d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?</p>   | —                              | —  | —                            | ✓         |
| <p>e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?</p>   | —                              | —  | —                            | ✓         |

Agriculture & Forest Resources – Discussion

- a) *No Impact.* The project includes the demolition of an approximately 640 square-foot guest house. The property does not include any Prime Farmland; therefore the demolition will not convert Prime Farmland or Unique Farmland of Statewide Importance to a non-agricultural use.
- b) *No Impact.* The demolition will not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract. The property is within the R-1 (Single-Family Residential) District. The demolition does not include any proposal to change the zoning district nor is the property under the Williamson Act contract.
- c) *No Impact.* This demolition is located in an area that is zoned for residential development. The property does not contain any forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production. As such, removal of the structures on the property will not create an impact on forest land or timberland.
- d) *No Impact.* The demolition will not result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use, as the property does not contain any forest land or propose the conversion of any forest land to non-forest use.
- e) *No Impact.* This demolition is located in an area that is surrounded by development. There are currently no agriculture uses that exist onsite or immediately adjacent to the site. The site contains a single-family residence, the subject guest house and three detached accessory structures. Therefore, no impacts will occur to agriculture or forest resources.

| Issues:  | Potentially<br>Significant<br>Impact | Less Than<br>Significant<br>With<br>Mitigation<br>Incorporated | Less Than<br>Significant<br>Impact | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------------------|--|------------------------------------|-----------|
| <b>III. AIR QUALITY.</b>   |                                      |  |                                    |           |
| Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:  |                                      |  |                                    |           |
| a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?  | ___                                  | ___  | ___                                | ✓         |
| b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?   | ___                                  | ___  | ___                                | ✓         |
| c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is nonattainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)? | ___                                  | ___  | ___                                | ✓         |



| Issues:   | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|
| d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?  | —                              | —  | —                            | ✓         |
| e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people? | —                              | —  | —                            | ✓         |

Air Quality – Discussion

- a) *No Impact.* The proposed demolition will not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan. Additionally, the demolition process shall comply with Chapter 15.44 of the Redlands Municipal Code which regulates the demolition of structures.
- b) *No Impact.* The proposed demolition will not violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation.
- c) *No Impact.* The proposed demolition will not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard.
- d) *No Impact.* The proposed demolition will not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. Additionally, the demolition process shall comply with Chapter 15.44 of the Redlands Municipal Code which regulates the demolition of structures.
- e) *No Impact.* The proposed demolition will not create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people. Additionally, the demolition process shall comply with Chapter 15.44 of the Redlands Municipal Code which regulates the demolition of structures.

| Issues: | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---------|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|
|---------|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|

**IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES.**

Would the project:

- a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish & Wildlife or U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service?
 

|   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|
| — | — | — | ✓ |
|---|---|---|---|
- b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the California Department of Fish & Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?
 

|   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|
| — | — | — | ✓ |
|---|---|---|---|

| Issues:  | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|
| c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means? | —                              | —  | —                            | ✓         |
| d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?                                   | —                              | —  | —                            | ✓         |
| e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?  | —                              | —  | —                            | ✓         |
| f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?   | —                              | —  | —                            | ✓         |

#### Biological Resources – Discussion

- a) *No Impact.* The property is located within an urbanized area and the project scope is limited to the demolition of the guest house. This demolition will not have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications. All work completed will be required to adhere to all local, State, and Federal laws.
- b) *No Impact.* There are no riparian habitats or other sensitive natural communities within the project area and no disturbance beyond the limits of the subject property is proposed.
- c) *No Impact.* The proposed project will not have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means. No protected wetlands exist within the subject property.
- d) *No Impact.* The project includes the demolition of an existing guest house within a fully developed residential area and the removal of the structure will not interfere substantially with the movement of any native residential or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites.
- e) *No Impact.* The proposed project will not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance. The proposed project is the demolition of an approximately 640 square-foot guest house and it does not include site clearing or grading. Any removal of the trees is required to be done in compliance with all local, State, and Federal laws.
- f) *No Impact.* The proposed project will not conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat

Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan.

| Issues:  | Potentially<br>Significant<br>Impact | Less Than<br>Significant<br>With<br>Mitigation<br>Incorporat<br>ed | Less Than<br>Significant<br>Impact | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------------------|--|------------------------------------|-----------|
| V. <b>CULTURAL RESOURCES.</b> Would the project:   |                                      |  |                                    |           |
| a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in § 15064.5?    | ___                                  | ___  | ___                                | ✓         |
| b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to § 15064.5? | ___                                  | ___  | ___                                | ✓         |
| c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?        | ___                                  | ___  | ___                                | ✓         |
| d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?                           | ___                                  | ___  | ___                                | ✓         |

Cultural Resources – Discussion

a) *No Impact.* The historical significance of the project has been reviewed pursuant to the findings of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1, Title 14 CCR, Section 4852) which are as follow.

*A. Associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of California History and cultural heritage.*

A thorough record search of local newspapers and City directories did not indicate that this property is associated with any specific events that may have contributed to California’s history or cultural heritage.

*B. Is associated with the lives of persons important in our past.*

Staff conducted research at the A.K. Smiley Library Heritage Room and through newspapers.com. The table (shown below) lists the residents associated with the subject property based on the information obtained from the City Directories located at the A.K. Smiley Library’s Heritage Room. The following names were associated with 1119 N Church Street in the Redlands city directories (1919 – 1967) and San Bernardino County Assessor’s office records (1958 – Current).

Table 2: Property Ownership History

| Directory Year | Name(s)                                      | Occupation   | Additional Information   |
|----------------|--|--|--|
| 1919           | Bell, Colin C (Annie)                        | 1919 – 1923: Orange grower<br>1923 – 1925: Tile Setter   | First directory where 1119 N Church Street is found.                         |
| 1927           | Mallery, Ira S                               | Building Contractor                                      | NA   |
| 1929           | White, Robert (Jennie)                       | Orange grower  | NA   |
| 1941           | Bloomquist, Covert J (Enid)<br>White, Robert | Laboratory<br>Fruit worker                               | NA   |
| 1947           | Andriese, Peter (Augusta)                    | Rancher  | NA   |
| 1950           | Meyer, Fred (Margaret)                       | Orange grower/chicken rancher                            | NA   |
| 1958           | Youngsma, Kenneth (Matja)                    | Aircraft worker  | First owner history listed on San Bernardino County Assessors Office Records |
| 1985           | Youngsma, Matja                              | Occupation not listed on San Bernardino County Assessors | NA   |
| 1996           | Perez, Rudy<br>Cardiel-Perez, Melissa        | Occupation not listed on San Bernardino County Assessors | NA   |
| 2005           | Padilla, Job<br>Padilla, Olivia              | Occupation not listed on San Bernardino County Assessors | NA   |
| 2006           | Moreno, Lidia                                | Occupation not listed on San Bernardino County Assessors | NA   |
| 2007           | Wells Fargo Bank                             | Occupation not listed on San Bernardino County Assessors | NA   |
| 2008           | Zaragoza, Eric A                             | Occupation not listed on San Bernardino County Assessors | NA   |
| 2015           | Eagle Vista Equities LLC                     | Occupation not listed on San Bernardino County Assessors | NA   |

|      |                           |  |                |
|------|---------------------------|--|----------------|
| 2016 | Segovia, Delmy            | Occupation not listed on San Bernardino County Assessors | NA             |
| 2020 | Segovia, Delmy and Lilian | Occupation not listed on San Bernardino County Assessors | Current owners |

Based on the research of public records conducted by Staff, former residents of the subject property were identified. Newspapers from the Redlands Daily Facts indicate Robert White was a doctor who gained fame in World War II as the surgeon on the famous Doolittle raid on Tokyo. Mr. Fred Meyer was an orange grower from 1946 to 1961 and was associated with Redlands Foothill Groves. The individuals that were associated with the subject property had working class occupations and are not known to have significantly contributed to the culture, history, or development of the city.

Research performed by Staff, on the residents of the property revealed no significant information related to the owners or occupants, and the guest house is not believed to be associated with persons important to our past.

*C. Embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method of construction, or represents the work of an important creative individual, or possesses high artistic values.*

The existing guest house is a simple structure, has a simplistic design and appears to have been modified throughout the years based on photos provided by the applicant. The guest house contains a horizontal wood exterior, composition shingle roof, medium gable, and a patio entrance. It also has doors and windows with different materials. The variety in material suggests that the building has undergone substantial alterations since its original construction. The guest house has a simple design and does not represent the work of an important creative individual or possess high artistic values or have distinctive characteristics.

*D. Has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information in prehistory or history.*

The structure and site have not yielded any information regarding prehistory or history. Based on the review of the criteria above as it relates to the demolition of the structure, the structure is not historically significant, and approval of the proposed project will not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5.

- b) *No Impact.* The structure and site have not yielded any information regarding prehistory or history. The guest house will not likely yield information about the past. Therefore, approval of the proposed project will not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5.
- c) *No Impact.* The proposed project will not directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature as ground disturbance is not proposed.
- d) *No Impact.* The proposed project will not disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries.

| Issues:   | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|
| <b>VI. GEOLOGY &amp; SOILS.</b>   |                                |  |                              |           |
| Would the project:  |                                |  |                              |           |
| a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury or death involving:   |                                |  |                              |           |
| i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology, Special Publication 42. | ---                            | ---  | ---                          | ✓         |
| ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?  | ---                            | ---  | ---                          | ✓         |
| iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?  | ---                            | ---  | ---                          | ✓         |
| iv) Landslides?   | ---                            | ---  | ---                          | ✓         |
| b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?   | ---                            | ---  | ---                          | ✓         |
| c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?  | ---                            | ---  | ---                          | ✓         |
| d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?  | ---                            | ---  | ---                          | ✓         |
| e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?  | ---                            | ---  | ---                          | ✓         |

Geology & Soils – Discussion

- a) *No Impact.* The proposed project will not expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving: Rupture of a known earthquake fault; Strong seismic ground shaking; Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction; and, landslides The project is a demolition, which will remove a guest house from the property; therefore, no impact will occur in relation to this issue.
- b) *No Impact.* Disturbance within the project site will be limited to the immediate location surrounding the project and the site is not being cleared or graded as a result of this project. The proposed project will not result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil.
- c) *No Impact.* The site is not located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would

become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse.

- d) *No Impact.* Adoption of the proposed project is not located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property.
- e) *No Impact.* The proposed project does not have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water. In addition, the scope of the project involves demolishing the structure on-site, and does not include the need for septic tanks.

| Issues:   | Potentially<br>Significant<br>Impact | Less Than<br>Significant<br>With<br>Mitigation<br>Incorporat<br>ed | Less Than<br>Significant<br>Impact | No Impact |
|---|--------------------------------------|--|------------------------------------|-----------|
| <b>VII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS.</b> Would the project:  |                                      |  |                                    |           |
| a) Generate gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?                  | —                                    | —  | —                                  | <u>✓</u>  |
| b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purposes of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases? | —                                    | —  | —                                  | <u>✓</u>  |

Greenhouse Gas Emissions – Discussion

- a) *No Impact.* The proposed project will not generate gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment.
- b) *No Impact.* The proposed project will not conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases.

| Issues:  | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|
| <b>VIII. HAZARDS &amp; HAZARDOUS MATERIALS.</b>  |                                |  |                              |           |
| Would the project:   |                                |  |                              |           |
| a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?  | —                              | —  | —                            | <u>✓</u>  |
| b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?  | —                              | —  | —                            | <u>✓</u>  |
| c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?  | —                              | —  | —                            | <u>✓</u>  |
| -d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?                                  | —                              | —  | —                            | <u>✓</u>  |
| e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area? | —                              | —  | —                            | <u>✓</u>  |
| f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?  | —                              | —  | —                            | <u>✓</u>  |
| g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?  | —                              | —  | —                            | <u>✓</u>  |
| h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?   | —                              | —  | —                            | <u>✓</u>  |

Hazards & Hazardous Materials – Discussion

- a) *No Impact.* The proposed project will not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials. Prior to the issuance of a demolition permit, a demolition application shall be submitted to the City of Redlands Building and Safety Division for approval per the regulations set forth in the California Building Code. Additionally, the demolition process shall comply with Chapter 15.44 of the Redlands Municipal Code which regulates the demolition of structures and the



abatement of hazardous materials.

- b) *No Impact.* The proposed project will not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment. Additionally, the demolition process shall comply with Chapter 15.44 of the Redlands Municipal Code which regulates the demolition of structures and the abatement of hazardous materials.
- c) *No Impact.* The proposed project will not emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school. There is a nearby public school, Excelsior Charter High School, which is approximately 300 feet from the proposed project. However, the demolition process will be required to comply with Chapter 15.44 of the Redlands Municipal Code which regulates the demolition of structures and the abatement of hazardous materials.
- d) *No Impact.* The proposed project is not located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5. This was verified by the Envirostor and GeoTracker database, as a result, would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment.
- e - f) *No Impact.* The proposed project is the demolition of a guest house which is not located within the immediate vicinity of a public or private airstrip. Therefore, the project would not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area. The project is not located in an airport land use plan.
- g) *No Impact.* The proposed project will not impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan.
- h) *No Impact.* The proposed project will not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands.

Hydrology & Water Quality – Discussion

| Issues:   | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|
| IX. <b>HYDROLOGY &amp; WATER QUALITY.</b> Would the project:  |                                |  |                              |           |
| a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?   | —                              | —  | —                            | <u>✓</u>  |
| b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)? | —                              | —  | —                            | <u>✓</u>  |
| c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?  | —                              | —  | —                            | <u>✓</u>  |
| d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?   | —                              | —  | —                            | <u>✓</u>  |
| e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?  | —                              | —  | —                            | <u>✓</u>  |
| f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?   | —                              | —  | —                            | <u>✓</u>  |
| g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?  | —                              | —  | —                            | <u>✓</u>  |
| h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?   | —                              | —  | —                            | <u>✓</u>  |
| i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?  | —                              | —  | —                            | <u>✓</u>  |
| j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?   | —                              | —  | —                            | <u>✓</u>  |

- a) *No Impact.* The proposed project is the demolition of an existing guest house. No discharge will be created due to the removal of the structure. The proposed project will not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements.
- b) *No Impact.* The project consists of demolishing a guest house, and is not expected to utilize groundwater supplies. The proposed project will not substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level.
- c, d) *No Impact.* The project is the demolition of a guest house. The site will not be modified beyond the removal of the structure. The proposed project will not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner that would result in flooding on- or offsite.
- e, f) *No Impact.* The proposed project is a demolition and will remove impervious surface area from the site. The proposed project will not create or contribute runoff water, which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff.
- g, h) *No Impact.* The proposed project is the demolition of a guest house and does not propose any new housing. The proposed project will not place structures within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map. The proposed project will not place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect flood flows.
- i) *No Impact.* The proposed project will not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam.
- j) *No Impact.* The project is not located in an area subject to seiche, tsunami, or mudflow. No impact will occur.

| Issues:  | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|
| X. <b>LAND USE &amp; PLANNING.</b> Would the project:  |                                |  |                              |           |
| a) Physically divide an established community?   | —                              | —  | —                            | ✓         |
| c) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to, the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect? | —                              | —  | —                            | ✓         |
| c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?  | —                              | —  | —                            | ✓         |

Land Use & Planning – Discussion

a) *No Impact.* The proposed project will remove an existing structure from the site but will not divide an established neighborhood or other established community.

b, c) *No Impacts.* The proposed demolition will not conflict with any land use plans, General Plan, habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan.

| Issues:   | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|
| XI. <b>MINERAL RESOURCES.</b> Would the project:  |                                |  |                              |           |
| a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?                                | —                              | —  | —                            | ✓         |
| b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan? | —                              | —  | —                            | ✓         |

Mineral Resources – Discussion

a) *No Impact.* The removal of the structure on-site will not change the availability of mineral resources and the project is not located near a mineral resource recovery area. No impact

will occur related to these issues.

- b) *No Impact.* The removal of the structure will not result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral source as delineated on a local general plan, or specific plan.

| Issues:   | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|
| <b>XII. NOISE.</b> Would the project:   |                                |  |                              |           |
| a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?   | —                              | —  | —                            | ✓         |
| b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive ground borne vibration or ground borne noise levels?   | —                              | —  | —                            | ✓         |
| c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?  | —                              | —  | —                            | ✓         |
| d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?  | —                              | —  | —                            | ✓         |
| e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?   | —                              | —  | —                            | ✓         |
| f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?  | —                              | —  | —                            | ✓         |
| a, b) <i>No Impact.</i> The proposed project will not result in exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies. The proposed project will not result in exposure of persons to or generation of excessive ground borne vibration or ground borne noise levels. |                                |  |                              |           |
| c, d) <i>No Impact.</i> The proposed project will not result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project. Project will be required to comply with the City’s Noise Ordinance and no impact will occur related to this issue.  |                                |  |                              |           |
| e) <i>No Impact.</i> The project is not located within two miles of a public airport and is not located within an airport land use plan. The project is located approximately 3 miles southwest of the Redlands Municipal Airport. The proposed project is the demolition of an existing guest house. This demolition would not expose people residing or working in the project area to        |                                |  |                              |           |

excessive noise levels within the vicinity of an airport.

- f) *No Impact.* The proposed project is not within the vicinity of a private airstrip. The proposed project is the demolition of a small guest house, which not expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels from an airstrip.

| Issues:  | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|
| XIII. <b>POPULATION &amp; HOUSING.</b>   |                                |  |                              |           |
| Would the project:   |                                |  |                              |           |
| a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of road or other infrastructure)? | —                              | —  | —                            | ✓         |
| b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?  | —                              | —  | —                            | ✓         |
| c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?  | —                              | —  | —                            | ✓         |

Population & Housing – Discussion

- a) *No Impact.* The proposed project is the demolition of a guest house. No extension of infrastructure is proposed by this project and no population growth is anticipated.
- b) *No Impact.* The proposed project is the demolition of a guest house. The demolition would not result in the displacement of substantial of existing housing or require additional housing to be constructed elsewhere.
- c) *No Impact.* The proposed project will not result in the displacement of a substantial number of people that would require the construction of a replacement housing.

| Issues:   | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|
| <b>XIV. PUBLIC SERVICES.</b><br>Would the project:  |                                |  |                              |           |
| a) Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services: |                                |  |                              |           |
| i) Fire protection?   | ---                            | ---  | ---                          | ✓         |
| ii) Police protection?  | ---                            | ---  | ---                          | ✓         |
| iii) Schools?   | ---                            | ---  | ---                          | ✓         |
| iv) Parks?  | ---                            | ---  | ---                          | ✓         |
| v) Other public facilities?   | ---                            | ---  | ---                          | ✓         |

Public Services – Discussion

a) The proposed project is not expected to impact or result in a need for new or altered public services provided by the City of Redlands, the Redlands Unified School District, or other government agencies. Police and fire protection for the project site are provided by the City of Redlands. The proposed project will not result in the need for new or additional public facilities such as public libraries or meeting facilities. The project will not induce significant residential growth requiring additional school facilities, nor will it directly generate the need for new additional park land. In terms of cumulative effects, the proposed project would not create any public services or facilities issues beyond that anticipated in the *General Plan EIR*. Therefore, no impacts will occur related to these issues.

| Issues:  | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|
| <b>XV. RECREATION.</b><br>Would the project:   |                                |  |                              |           |
| a) Increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated? | ---                            | ---  | ---                          | ✓         |

| Issues:   | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|
| b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which have an adverse physical effect on the environment? | —                              | —  | —                            | <u>✓</u>  |

Recreation – Discussion

- a) *No Impact.* The proposed project is the demolition of a guest house. The removal of the structure on this site will not contribute to an increased demand for recreational facilities.
- b) *No Impact.* The project will not affect existing or planned recreational facilities, nor create a significant new demand for additional recreational facilities. No impact related to this issue would occur.

| Issues: | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---------|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|
|---------|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|

**XVI. TRANSPORTATION & TRAFFIC.**

Would the project:

|   |   |   |   |          |
|---|---|---|---|----------|
| a) Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit? | — | — | — | <u>✓</u> |
| b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?  | — | — | — | <u>✓</u> |
| c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that result in substantial safety risks?  | — | — | — | <u>✓</u> |
| d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?  | — | — | — | <u>✓</u> |



| Issues:  | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|
| e) Result in inadequate emergency access?  | —                              | —  | —                            | ✓         |
| f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities? | —                              | —  | —                            | ✓         |

Transportation & Traffic – Discussion

a-f) *No Impact.* The proposed project is the demolition of a guest house. The removal of this structure would not create additional vehicle trips, or result in changes to vehicle circulation patterns, emergency access, and transit facilities. The demolition of the guest house will not conflict with congestion on any major roads or highways or conflict with any applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of circulation systems.

| Issues: | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---------|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|
|---------|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|

**XVII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES.**

Would the project:

|   |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| a) Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:  | — | — | — | ✓ |
| i) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k); or,<br><br>ii) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resource Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe. | — | — | — | ✓ |

Tribal Cultural Resources – Discussion

- a) *No Impact.* The existing guest house is located at the rear yard. The only structure to be demolished will be a guest house. No subsurface activities will occur as a result of the demolition of the structure on-site, beyond the removal of slabs and foundations. Grading of the site is not proposed in the scope of this demolition.

| Issues:  | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|
| <b>XVIII. UTILITIES &amp; SERVICE SYSTEMS.</b>   |                                |  |                              |           |
| Would the project:   |                                |  |                              |           |
| a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?  | —                              | —  | —                            | <u>✓</u>  |
| b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?                             | —                              | —  | —                            | <u>✓</u>  |
| c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?                                      | —                              | —  | —                            | <u>✓</u>  |
| d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?   | —                              | —  | —                            | <u>✓</u>  |
| e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider, which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments? | —                              | —  | —                            | <u>✓</u>  |
| f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?   | —                              | —  | —                            | <u>✓</u>  |
| g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?  | —                              | —  | —                            | <u>✓</u>  |

Utilities & Service Systems – Discussion

- a, b) *No Impact.* The proposed project is the demolition of a guest house and will not generate any wastewater or result in the construction of new water or wastewater facilities.
- c) *No Impact.* The proposed project will not require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects.
- d) *No Impact.* The demolition project will have no impact on water supplies available. The demolition project will have no impact on water supplies available to serve the needs of

the demolition process.

e) *No Impact.* The demolition project only includes the removal of an existing guest house. As such, the removal of the accessory structure would not result in a need for additional capacity by the wastewater treatment provider (City of Redlands). Any future development of the property will be required to be reviewed to confirm that adequate capacity exists for the desired development.

f, g) *No Impact.* The proposed project will be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project’s solid waste disposal needs. The proposed project will comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste.

| Issues:  | Potentially<br>Significant<br>Impact | Less Than<br>Significant<br>With<br>Mitigation<br>Incorporated | Less Than<br>Significant<br>Impact | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------------------|--|------------------------------------|-----------|
| <b>XIX. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.</b>  |                                      |  |                                    |           |
| a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory? | —                                    | —  | —                                  | ✓         |
| b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (“Cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.)   | —                                    | —  | —                                  | ✓         |
| c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?  | —                                    | —  | —                                  | ✓         |

Mandatory Findings of Significance – Discussion

- a) *No Impact.* The proposed project will not have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory.
- b) *No Impact.* The proposed project is the demolition of an approximately 640 square-foot guest house. This demolition will not have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable.

- c) *No Impact.* The proposed project will not have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly.

## REFERENCES

1. California Department of Conservation. *California Important Farmland Finder*. Available online at: <http://maps.conservation.ca.gov/ciff/ciff.html>
2. City of Redlands (2017, December 5). *City of Redlands 2035 General Plan*. Available online at: <https://www.cityofredlands.org/post/planning-division-general-plan>
3. City of Redlands (2017, July 21). *City of Redlands General Plan Update and Climate Action Plan Environmental Impact Report (SCH No. 2016081041)*. Available online at: <https://www.cityofredlands.org/post/planning-division-general-plan>
4. San Bernardino County Assessor Records, "Property Information Management System", Accessed 12 April 2023. Available online at: <http://www.sbcounty.gov/assessor/pims/PIMSINTERFACE.ASPX>
5. California Department of Toxic Substances Control. *EnviroStor Database*. Available online at: <https://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/>
6. California Department of Transportation. *California Scenic Highway Mapping System*. Available online at: [http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LandArch/16\\_livability/scenic\\_highways/](http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LandArch/16_livability/scenic_highways/)
7. City of Redlands (2017, December 5). *City of Redlands Climate Action Plan*. Available online at: <https://www.cityofredlands.org/post/planning-division-general-plan>
8. Historic Aerials, Accessed 7 April 2023. Available online at: <https://historicaerials.com/>
9. California State Geoportal. "California Fire Hazard Severity Zone Viewer." 2020. <https://gis.data.ca.gov/datasets/789d5286736248f69c4515c04f58f414>
10. Department of Toxic Substances Control. "Envirostor." <https://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/map/?myaddress=Redlands>
11. State Water Resources Control Board. "Geotracker." Accessed 12 April 2023. [https://geotracker.waterboards.ca.gov/profile\\_report.asp?global\\_id=T0607100096](https://geotracker.waterboards.ca.gov/profile_report.asp?global_id=T0607100096)
12. City of Redlands, *City of Redlands List of Historic Resources (2022, April 20)*. Accessed 7 April 2023. Available online at: [https://www.cityofredlands.org/sites/main/files/file-attachments/designated\\_historic\\_resources\\_4-20-2022.pdf?1670369273](https://www.cityofredlands.org/sites/main/files/file-attachments/designated_historic_resources_4-20-2022.pdf?1670369273)
13. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. "National Wetlands Inventory." Accessed 12 April 2023. <https://www.fws.gov/wetlands/data/mapper.html>

## ATTACHMENT "D"

Resolution No. 2023-10 with Exhibit A (Conditions of Approval)

RESOLUTION NO. 2023-10

A RESOLUTION OF THE HISTORIC AND SCENIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF REDLANDS APPROVING DEMOLITION PERMIT NO. 380, TO DEMOLISH AN APPROXIMATELY 640 SQUARE FOOT GUEST HOUSE OVER 50 YEARS OF AGE, LOCATED AT 1119 NORTH CHURCH STREET (APN: 0167-271-11-0000)

WHEREAS, the property owner has submitted an application for Demolition No. 380 to demolish an approximately 640 square foot guest house, over 50 years of age, located at 1119 North Church Street within the Single-Family Residential (R-1) district (APN: 0167-271-11-0000).

WHEREAS, notice of this Historic and Scenic Preservation Commission public hearing was provided in accordance with Redlands Municipal Code Section 15.44; and

WHEREAS, on May 4, 2023, the Historic and Scenic Preservation Commission held a public hearing and considered the staff report, oral report, the testimony and the written evidence submitted by and on behalf of the applicant and by members of the public; and,

WHEREAS, Public Resources Code Section 15301 (Existing Facilities) provides for exemption from environmental review in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act, and the project qualifies for this exemption; and,

WHEREAS, following the public hearing, the Historic and Scenic Preservation Commission determined that the structure does not have historical significance and is exempt from the preparation of a negative declaration or environmental impact report in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Historic and Scenic Preservation Commission of the City of Redlands as follows:

Section 1. The proposed demolition is exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act per Section 15301(1)(4) for existing facilities, and there is no substantial evidence of any potentially significant environmental impacts.

Section 2. The proposed Demolition is hereby approved subject to the conditions of approval contained in Exhibit “A” attached hereto.

Section 3. This Resolution shall become effective upon adoption, and will be subject to a ten (10) day appeal period in accordance with the Redlands Municipal Code.

ADOPTED, SIGNED AND APPROVED this 4<sup>th</sup> day of May, 2023.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Kurt Heidelberg, Chair, Historic and Scenic  
Preservation Commission

ATTEST:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Linda McCasland, Secretary

I, Linda McCasland, Historic and Scenic Preservation Commission Secretary of the City of Redlands, hereby certify that the foregoing resolution was duly adopted by the Historic and Scenic Preservation Commission at its regular meeting thereof held on the 4<sup>th</sup> day of May, 2023.

AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:

ABSTAINED:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Linda McCasland, Historic and  
Scenic Preservation Commission  
Secretary



**EXHIBIT A**  
**CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL**  
Demolition Permit No. 380

1. This approval is to demolish an approximately 640 square foot guest house located at 1119 North Church Street (APN: 0167-271-11-0000) in the Single Family Residential (R-1) District.
2. Prior to demolition, a building permit shall be obtained from the Building & Safety Division.
3. The issuance of any permits shall comply with all provisions of the Redlands Municipal Code, including Chapter 15.44 which regulates the demolition of structures.
4. Unless demolition has commenced pursuant to a building permit, or a time extension is granted in accordance with Code, this application shall expire in eighteen (18) months from the approval date.
5. All demolition activities shall be limited to the hours from 7:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m., Monday through Saturday and prohibited on Sundays and Federal Holidays.
6. The applicant for this permit, and its successors and assigns, shall defend, indemnify and hold harmless the City of Redlands, and its elected officials, officers, agents and employees, from and against any and all claims, actions, and proceedings to attack, set aside, void or annul the approval of this permit by the City, or brought against the City due to acts or omissions in any way connected to the applicant's project that is the subject of this permit. This indemnification shall include, but not be limited to, damages, fees, costs, liabilities, and expenses incurred in such actions or proceedings, including damages for the injury to property or persons, including death of a person, and any award of attorneys' fees. In the event any such action is commenced to attack, set aside, void or annul all, or any, provisions of this permit, or is commenced for any other reason against the City for acts or omissions relating to the applicant's project, within fourteen (14) City business days of the same, the applicant shall file with the City a performance bond or irrevocable letter of credit (together, the "Security") in a form and in an amount satisfactory to the City, to ensure applicant's performance of its defense and indemnity obligations under this condition. The failure of the applicant to provide the Security shall be deemed an express acknowledgement and agreement by the applicant that the City shall have the authority and right, without objection by the applicant, to revoke all entitlements granted for the project pursuant to this permit. The City shall have no liability to the applicant for the exercise of City's right to revoke this permit.

*End of Conditions of Approval*