

RESOLUTION NO. 07-204

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF PASO ROBLES
FOR DEMOLITION APPLICATION 07-004
ADOPTING A NEGATIVE DECLARATION AND
DIRECTING DEMOLITION OF STRUCTURE AT 1921 SPRING STREET
APNs 008-233-010, APPLICANT – TY & JENNIFER CHRISTENSEN

WHEREAS, pursuant to Chapter 17.16 (Demolition of Buildings and Structures) of the Municipal Code, the City Council is being asked to make a determination as to whether the subject building located at 1921 Spring Street, is of historic or architectural significance, and to authorize a demolition permit; and

WHEREAS, Demolition 07-004 is a proposal to demolish 1 single family residence; and

WHEREAS, consistent with the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), an Initial Study has been prepared and the required notice has been published regarding consideration of a Negative Declaration of Environmental Impact; and

WHEREAS, Public Notice of the proposed Negative Declaration and demolition request was given as required by Section 21092 of the Public Resources Code and Section 17.16.050 B(2) of the Paso Robles City Municipal Code; and

WHEREAS, the City Council has the discretion to make a final determination as to the subject buildings historic or architectural significance or non-significance prior to the processing of the demolition permit; and

WHEREAS, although the subject buildings are in the City's Historic Resources Survey and Inventory, they are not on any local, State or National Register of historic structures; and

WHEREAS, although not specifically listed, state law will still require analysis and a determination of historic significance prior to City Council authorizing demolition; and

WHEREAS, based on information contained in a Historic Review dated August 2007 and the Initial Study prepared as provided in Exhibit A, for this project and testimony received as a result of public notice, the City Council finds that the building is not historically or architecturally significant and there would not be a significant impact on the environment if the application was approved.

THEREFORE BE IT HEREBY RESOLVED that based on the City Council of the City of El Paso de Robles, independent judgment, the City Council does hereby approve a Negative Declaration in conjunction with determining that the subject building is not of architectural or historic significance and direct the Building Official to issue a demolition permit for the structure, in accordance with Section 17.16.050 B (2) of the Paso Robles City Municipal Code.

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the City Council of the City of El Paso de Robles at a regular meeting of said Council held on the 2nd day of October 2007 by the following vote:

AYES: Hamon, Nemeth, Picanco, Strong, and Mecham
NOES:
ABSTAIN:
ABSENT:

Frank R. Mecham, Mayor

ATTEST:

Deborah Robinson, Deputy City Clerk

**CITY OF PASO ROBLES – PLANNING DIVISION
INITIAL STUDY**

1. GENERAL PROJECT INFORMATION

PROJECT TITLE: Ostrander Demolition – Demo 07-004

LEAD AGENCY: City of Paso Robles - 1000 Spring Street, Paso Robles, CA 93446

Contact: Darren Nash, Associate Planner
Telephone: (805) 237-3970

PROJECT LOCATION: 1921 Spring Street (APN 008-233-010)

PROJECT PROPONENT: Applicant: Ty & Jennifer Christensen
5655 Encino Avenue, Atascadero, CA 93422

**LEAD AGENCY CONTACT/
INITIAL STUDY PREPARED BY:** Darren Nash, Associate Planner

Telephone: (805) 237-3970
Facsimile: (805) 237-3904
E-Mail: dnash@prcity.com

GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATION: Office Professional / Mixed Use Overlay (OP/M-U)

ZONING: Office Professional (OP)

2. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The proposed project is a request to demolish one older single family residential house that currently existing on property located at 1921 Spring Street. The request is based on the applicants desire to move forward with the construction of a new office professional building with a residential apartment project approved by the Development Review Committee (DRC).

The approximate 1,300 square foot single family residence is included in the City's Historic Building Inventory. Although the building is in the inventory, the inventory does not provide an architectural historic analysis of structures and therefore does not indicate if structures are historically significant. Therefore, an historic analysis was prepared by a qualified architectural historian to evaluate the historic significance of the existing structures on the properties.

The historic analysis evaluated the structures relative to the criteria established by the Secretary of Interior Standards and Guidelines for placing structures on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) and the California Register of Historic Resources (CRHR), and the California Environmental Quality Act.

Resolution No. 07-206, Attachment 1, adopted 10/02/2007

To qualify as an historic structure a building must meet one of the following criteria and maintain enough visual integrity to support the criteria under which it qualifies. The criteria are identified by the California Public Resources Code, Section 5024.1 Title 14 covering the eligibility of a property to determine if it

1. Is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of California's history and cultural heritage (may be of national, state or local interest).
2. It is associated with the lives of persons important in our past.
3. Embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, or represents the work of an important creative individual, or possesses high aesthetic value.
4. Has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

The conclusions of the Report indicates that "after review of the four CEQA requirements for determining the structure's potential historicity, it is determined, that the building at 1921 Spring Street does not meet the thresholds identified either by the National Parks Service Criteria or by local criteria for any preservation action. If the owners wish to demolish said structure, its removal will not constitute a significant loss to the history of Paso Robles." See Historic Review Report attached as Attachment A.

3. OTHER AGENCIES WHOSE APPROVAL MAY BE REQUIRED (For example, issuance of permits, financing approval, or participation agreement):

None.

4. EARLIER ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS AND RELATED ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTATION:

This Initial Study incorporates by reference the City of El Paso de Robles General Plan Environmental Impact Report (EIR) (SCH#2003011123).

5. CONTEXT OF ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS FOR THE PROJECT:

This Initial Study relies on expert opinion supported by the facts, technical studies, and technical appendices of the City of El Paso de Robles General Plan EIR. These documents are incorporated herein by reference. They provide substantial evidence to document the basis upon which the City has arrived at its environmental determination regarding various resources.

6. PURPOSES OF AN INITIAL STUDY

The purposes of an Initial Study for a Development Project Application are:

- A. To provide the City with sufficient information and analysis to use as the basis for deciding whether to prepare an Environmental Impact Report, a Mitigated Negative Declaration, or a Negative Declaration for a site specific development project proposal;
- B. To enable the Applicant of a site specific development project proposal or the City as the lead agency to modify a project, mitigating adverse impacts before an Environmental Impact Report is required to be prepared, thereby enabling the proposed Project to qualify for issuance of a Negative Declaration or a Mitigated Negative Declaration;
- C. To facilitate environmental assessment early in the design of a project;

- D. To eliminate unnecessary EIRs;
 - E. To explain the reasons for determining that potentially significant effects would not be significant;
 - F. To determine if a previously prepared EIR could be used for the project;
 - G. To assist in the preparation of an Environmental Impact Report if one is required; and
 - H. To provide documentation of the factual basis for the finding of no significant effect as set forth in a Negative Declaration or a Mitigated Negative Declaration prepared for the a project.
- 7. EXPLANATION OF ANSWERS FOUND ON THE ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM**

A. Scope of Environmental Review

This Initial Study evaluates potential impacts identified in the following checklist.

B. Evaluation of Environmental Impacts

1. A brief explanation is required for all answers to the questions presented on the following Environmental Checklist Form, except where the answer is that the proposed project will have “No Impact.” The “No Impact” answers are to be adequately supported by the information sources cited in the parentheses following each question or as otherwise explained in the introductory remarks. A “No Impact” answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to the project. A “No Impact” answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors and/or general standards. The basis for the “No Impact” answers on the following Environmental Checklist Form is explained in further detail in this Initial Study in Section 9 (Earlier Environmental Analysis and Related Environmental Documentation) and Section 10 (Context of Environmental Analysis for the Project).
2. All answers on the following Environmental Checklist Form must take into account the whole action involved with the project, including implementation. Answers should address 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. “Potentially Significant Impact” is appropriate, if an effect is significant or potentially significant, or if the lead agency lacks information to make a finding of insignificance. If there are one or more “Potentially Significant Impact” entries when the determination is made, preparation of an Environmental Impact Report is warranted.
4. Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigated” 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 9 (Earlier Environmental Analysis and Related Environmental Documentation) 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. Section 15063(c)(3)(D). See Section 4 (Earlier Environmental Analysis and Related Environmental Documentation) and Section 11 (Earlier Analysis and Background Materials) of this Initial Study.

Resolution No. 07-206, Attachment 1, adopted 10/02/2007

6. References to the information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances) have been incorporated into the Environmental Checklist Form. See Section 11 (Earlier Analysis and Related Environmental Documentation). Other sources used or individuals contacted are cited where appropriate.
7. The following Environmental Checklist Form generally is the same as the one contained in Title 14, California Code of Regulations; with some modifications to reflect the City's needs and requirements.
8. Standard Conditions of Approval: The City imposes standard conditions of approval on Projects. These conditions are considered to be components of and/or modifications to the Project and some reduce or minimize environmental impacts to a level of insignificance. Because they are considered part of the Project, they have not been identified as mitigation measures. For the readers' information, the standard conditions identified in this Initial Study are available for review at the Community Development Department.
9. Certification Statement: The statements made in this Initial Study and those made in the documents referenced herein present the data and information that are required to satisfy the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) – Statutes and Guidelines, as well as the City's Procedures for Implementing CEQA. Further, the facts, statements, information, and analysis presented are true and correct in accordance with standard business practices of qualified professionals with expertise in the development review process, including building, planning, and engineering.

8. ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

The proposed project may potentially affect the environmental factors checked below, and may involve at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact" or is "Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated," if so indicated on the following Environmental Checklist Form (Pages 8 to 15)

- Land Use & Planning
- Transportation/Circulation
- Public Services
- Population & Housing
- Biological Resources
- Utilities & Service Systems
- Geological Problems
- Energy & Mineral Resources
- Aesthetics
- Water
- Hazards
- Cultural Resources
- Air Quality
- Noise
- Recreation
- Mandatory Findings of Significance

9. ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATION: On the basis of this initial evaluation: I find that:


The proposed project could not have a significant effect on the environment; and, therefore, a **NEGATIVE DECLARATION** will be prepared.

Although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because the mitigation measures described on an attached sheet have been added to the project. Therefore, a **MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION** will be prepared.

The proposed project may have a significant effect on the environment; and, therefore an **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT** is required.

The proposed project may have a significant effect(s) on the environment, but one or more effects (1) have been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and (2) have been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets, if the effect is a "potentially significant impact" or is "potentially significant unless mitigated."

Therefore, an **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT** is required, but it will analyze **only** the effect or effects that remain to be addressed.

Signature: 
Darren Nash, Associate Planner

Date: _____
September 12, 2007

10 Environmental Checklist Form Resolution No. 07-206, Attachment 1, adopted 10/02/2007

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	-----------

I. LAND USE AND PLANNING. Would the Proposal:

- a) Conflict with general plan designation or zoning?
(Sources: 1 & 8)

Discussion: The proposed project will not conflict with the General Plan or zoning district since the architectural historic analysis indicates that the subject structures are not historically significant, and there will not be an impact to cultural historic resources and relevant policies.

- b) Conflict with applicable environmental plans or policies adopted by agencies with jurisdiction over the project?
(Sources: 1 & 3)

Discussion: The proposed project complies with the EIR recently certified for the City General Plan Update, 2003 and other adopted environmental policies that apply to this project.

- c) Be incompatible with existing land uses in the vicinity?
(Sources: 1 & 3)

Discussion: Demolition of structures will allow future development to occur compatible with land uses in the vicinity.

- d) Affect agricultural resources or operations (e.g., impacts to soils or farmlands, or impacts from incompatible uses)?

Discussion: The project site is an urban infill property with no agricultural uses, resources or operations on near the property.

- e) Disrupt or divide the physical arrangement of an established community (including a low-income or minority community)?
(Sources: 1 & 3)

Discussion: Demolition of structures at this location will create vacant properties between existing development, thus it would not disrupt or divide the surrounding community, but will provide opportunity for compatible, suitable development within the established community.

II. POPULATION AND HOUSING. Would the proposal:

- a) Cumulatively exceed official regional or local population projections? (Sources: 1 & 3)

Discussion: Demolition of structures could not affect an increase in population.

- b) Induce substantial growth in an area either directly or indirectly (e.g., through projects in an undeveloped area or extension of major infrastructure)? (Sources: 1 & 3)

Discussion: Demolition of structures could not induce growth.

10 Environmental Checklist Form Resolution No. 07-206, Attachment 1, adopted 10/02/2007

	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant	Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	-------------------------	-------------------------	--------------------------------	------------------------------	-----------

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):

- c) Displace existing housing, especially affordable housing? (Sources: 1, 3, & 5)

Discussion: There are currently 4 residences located on the site, which are market rate dwellings. The zoning allows up to 20 units per acre, and the property owner has entitlement to develop 9 residences, thus demolition of these structures will not displace existing housing.

III. GEOLOGIC PROBLEMS. Would the proposal result in or expose people to potential impacts involving:

- a) Fault rupture? (Sources: 1, 2, & 3)

Discussion: The potential for and mitigation of impacts that may result from fault rupture in the project area are identified and addressed in the General Plan EIR, pg. 4.5-8. There are two known fault zones on either side of this valley. The Rinconada Fault system runs on the west side of the valley. The San Andreas Fault is on the east side of the valley and runs through the community of Parkfield east of Paso Robles. The City of Paso Robles recognizes these geologic influences in the application of the Uniform Building Code to all new development within the City. Review of available information and examinations indicate that neither of these faults is active with respect to ground rupture in Paso Robles. Soils reports and structural engineering in accordance with local seismic influences would be applied in conjunction with any new development proposal. Based on standard conditions of approval, the potential for fault rupture and exposure of persons or property to seismic hazards is not considered significant. In addition, per requirements of the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zones, only structures for human habitation need to be setback a minimum of 50 feet of a known active trace fault.

- b) Seismic ground shaking? (Sources: 1, 2, & 3)

Discussion: The City is located within an active earthquake area that could experience seismic ground shaking from the Rinconada and San Andreas Faults. The proposed structure will be constructed to current UBC codes. The General Plan EIR identified impacts resulting from ground shaking as less than significant and provided mitigation measures that will be incorporated into the design of this project including adequate structural design and not constructing over active or potentially active faults.

- c) Seismic ground failure, including liquefaction? (Sources: 1, 2 & 3)

Discussion: Per the General Plan EIR, the project site is located in an area with soil conditions that have a potential for liquefaction or other type of ground failure due to seismic events due to soil conditions. The EIR identifies measures to reduce this potential impact, which will be incorporated into this project. This includes a requirement to conduct a site-specific analysis of liquefaction potential. Based on analysis results, the project design and construction will include specific design requirements to reduce the potential impacts on structures due to liquefaction to a less than significant level.

- d) Seiche, tsunami, or volcanic hazard? (Sources: 1, 2, & 3)

- e) Landslides or Mudflows? (Sources: 1, 2, & 3)

10 Environmental Checklist Form Resolution No. 07-206, Attachment 1, adopted 10/02/2007

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	-----------

	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

Discussion: d. and e. The project site is not located near bodies of water or volcanic hazards, nor is the site located in an area subject to landslides or mudflows.

f) Erosion, changes in topography or unstable soil conditions from excavation, grading, or fill? (Sources: 1, 2, 3, & 4)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

Discussion: Per the General Plan EIR the soil condition is not erosive or otherwise unstable. As such, no significant impacts are anticipated.

g) Subsidence of the land? (Sources: 1, 2, & 3)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

Discussion: See Item c.

h) Expansive soils? (Sources: 4)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
----------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Discussion: Not applicable.

i) Unique geologic or physical features? (Sources: 1 & 3)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

Discussion: There are no unique geologic or physical features on or near the project site.

IV. WATER. Would the proposal result in:

a) Changes in absorption rates, drainage patterns, or the rate and amount of surface runoff? (Sources: 1, 3, & 7)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Discussion: Items a – i: Demolition of structures could not impact water resources, except to allow for (temporary) increased on-site water absorption, water recharge, and water filtration.

b) Exposure of people or property to water related hazards such as flooding? (Sources: 1, 3, & 7)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

Discussion: There is no potential to expose people or property to water related hazards due to this project since it is not in a flood zone.

c) Discharge into surface waters or other alteration of surface water quality (e.g., temperature, dissolved oxygen or turbidity)? (Sources: 1, 3, & 7)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Discussion: See a. above.

10 Environmental Checklist Form Resolution No. 07-206, Attachment 1, adopted 10/02/2007

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
d) Changes in the amount of surface water in any water body? (Sources: 1, 3, & 7) <i>Discussion: There is no water body on or near the project site.</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Changes in currents, or the course or direction of water movement? (Sources: 1, 3, & 7) <i>Discussion: This project could not result in changes in currents or water movement since there is no water course in the vicinity that could be affected by this project.</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Change in the quantity of ground waters, either through direct additions or withdrawals, or through interception of an aquifer by cuts or excavations or through substantial loss of groundwater recharge capability? (Sources: 1,3, & 7) <i>Discussion: The proposed project does not directly withdraw water resources.</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Altered direction or rate of flow of groundwater? (Sources: 1, 3, & 7) <i>Discussion: This project could not result in alterations to the direction or rate of groundwater flow since this project does not directly extract groundwater or otherwise significantly affect these resources.</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
h) Impacts to groundwater quality? (Sources: 1, 3, & 7) <i>Discussion: The project will not affect groundwater quality since this project does not directly extract groundwater or otherwise affect these resources.</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
i) Substantial reduction in the amount of groundwater otherwise available for public water supplies? (Sources: 1, 3, & 7) <i>Discussion: Refer to response f.</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

V. AIR QUALITY. Would the proposal:

a) Violate any air quality standard or contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation? (Sources: 1, 3, & 7) <i>Discussion: The demolition of structures will need to obtain applicable permits and comply with site disturbance regulations from the San Luis Obispo County Air Pollution Control District in compliance with the Districts demo regulations per the adopted Clean Air Plan prior to commencing activities. Therefore, impacts to air quality from this project will be less than significant.</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

10 Environmental Checklist Form Resolution No. 07-206, Attachment 1, adopted 10/02/2007

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	-----------

- b) Expose sensitive receptors to pollutants? (Sources: 1, 3, & 7)

Discussion: There are no sensitive receptors such as schools, hospitals, etc. within the near vicinity that could be impacted by this project.

- c) Alter air movement, moisture, or temperature? (Sources: 1, 3, & 7)

Discussion: This project does not have the potential to significantly alter air movement, moisture, or temperature.

- d) Create objectionable odors?

Discussion: This project does not have the potential to create objectionable odors.

VI. TRANSPORTATION/CIRCULATION. Would the proposal result in:

- a) Increased vehicle trips or traffic congestion? (Sources: 1, 3, & 7)

Discussion: The project would result in short-term, temporary increase in truck traffic to haul away debris. This traffic would not significantly affect the existing traffic congestion or level of service in the vicinity.

- b) Hazards to safety from design features (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)? (Sources: 1, 3, & 7)

Discussion: The proposed project does not include road improvements that may result in safety hazards or in incompatible uses.

- c) Inadequate emergency access or inadequate access to nearby uses? (Sources: 1, 3, & 7)

Discussion: The project is adequately served by public streets for emergency services.

- d) Insufficient parking capacity on-site or off-site? (Sources: 1, 3, 7, & 8)

Discussion: The project does not require on or off site parking.

- e) Hazards or barriers for pedestrians or bicyclists? (Source: 7)

Discussion: The project does not have hazards or barriers for pedestrians or bicyclists.

10 Environmental Checklist Form Resolution No. 07-206, Attachment 1, adopted 10/02/2007

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

- f) Conflicts with adopted policies supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)? (Sources: 1 & 8)

Discussion: The project would not conflict with or otherwise affect adopted policies supporting alternative transportation.

- g) Rail, waterborne or air traffic impacts?

Discussion: The project could not affect rail, waterborne or air traffic.

BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. Would the proposal result in impacts to:

- Endangered, threatened or rare species or their habitats (including but not limited to: plants, fish, insects, animals, and birds)?

Discussion: There are no endangered, threatened or rare species or their habitats located on the project site. Thus, there could not be potential impacts to endangered, threatened or rare species or their habitats.

- b) Locally designated species (e.g., heritage trees)?

Discussion: There are no locally designated species, including oak trees on the project site.

- c) Locally designated natural communities (e.g., oak forest, coastal habitat, etc.)?

Discussion: See item b. above.

- d) Wetland habitat (e.g., marsh, riparian and vernal pool)?

Discussion: There are no wetland habitats on or near the project site.

- e) Wildlife dispersal or migration corridors?

Discussion: The site is not part of a wildlife dispersal or migration corridor.

VIII. ENERGY AND MINERAL RESOURCES. Would the proposal:

- a) Conflict with adopted energy conservation plans? (Sources: 1 & 7)

Discussion: This project could not conflict with adopted energy conservation plans.

10 Environmental Checklist Form Resolution No. 07-206, Attachment 1, adopted 10/02/2007

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	-----------

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| b) Use non-renewable resources in a wasteful and inefficient manner? (Sources: 1 & 7) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: The project will not use non-renewable resource in a wasteful and inefficient manner.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| c) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of future value to the region and the residents of the State? (Sources: 1 & 7) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: The project is not located in an area of a known mineral resources that would be of future value to the region and the residents of the State.

IX. HAZARDS. Would the proposal involve:

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) A risk of accidental explosion or release of hazardous substances (including, but not limited to: oil, pesticides, chemicals or radiation)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: The project will not result in a risk of accidental explosion or release of hazardous substances since demolition project do not generally uses these types of substances. The applicant will need to comply with SLOAPCD regulations regarding asbestos removal should this material be encountered in the structures. Therefore, impacts resulting from potential release of hazardous materials will be less than significant.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| b) Possible interference with an emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? (Sources: 1 & 7) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: The project will not interfere with an emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan since it is not a designated emergency response location to be used for staging or other uses in an emergency.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| c) The creation of any health hazard or potential hazards? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: see a. above.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| d) Increased fire hazard in areas with flammable brush, grass, or trees? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: The project site is not located in an area with the potential for increased fire hazards.

X. NOISE. Would the proposal result in:

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Increases in existing noise levels? (Sources: 1, 7, & 8) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: The project will not likely result in a significant increase in operational noise levels. It may result in short-term construction noise. However, construction noise will be limited to specific daytime hours per city regulations.

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	-----------

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| b) Exposure of people to severe noise levels? (Source: 3) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

The project site is not located in the vicinity where it would expose people to severe noise levels.

XI. PUBLIC SERVICES. Would the proposal have an effect upon, or result in a need for new or altered government services in any of the following areas:

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Fire protection? (Sources: 1, 3, 6, & 7) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Police Protection? (Sources: 1, 3, & 7) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Schools? (Sources: 1, 3, & 7) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Maintenance of public facilities, including roads?
(Sources: 1, 3, & 7) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| e) Other governmental services? (Sources: 1,3, & 7) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion: a.-e. The project applicant will be required to pay development impact fees as established by the city per AB 1600 to mitigate impacts to public services as applicable.

XII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the proposal result in a need for new systems or supplies, or substantial alterations to the following utilities:

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Power or natural gas? (Sources: 1, 3, & 7) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Communication systems? (Sources: 1, 3, & 7) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Local or regional water treatment or distribution facilities?
(Sources: 1, 3, & 7) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Sewer or septic tanks? (Sources: 1, 3, 7, & 8) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| e) Storm water drainage? (Sources: 1, 3, & 7) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| f) Solid waste disposal? (Sources: 1, 3, & 7) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| g) Local or regional water supplies? (Sources: 1, 3, & 7) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion: a.-g. The project will not result in the need for new systems or supplies, or result in substantial alterations to utilities and service systems. Solid waste will be disposed of and taken to the local land fills and meet the criteria outlined by the Air Pollution Control District (APCD).

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	-----------

XIII. AESTHETICS. Would the proposal:

- a) Affect a scenic vista or scenic highway? (Sources: 1, 3, & 7)

Discussion: The project is not located in a scenic vista or scenic highway area.

- b) Have a demonstrable negative aesthetic effect? (Sources: 1, 3, & 7)

Discussion: This project will result in a more positive effect since it will remove dilapidated buildings in the downtown.

- c) Create light or glare? (Sources: 1, 3, 7, & 8)

Discussion: Not applicable since no development is proposed with this demolition.

XIV. CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the proposal:

- a) Disturb paleontological resources? (Sources: 1, 3, & 7)

- b) Disturb archaeological resources? (Sources: 1, 3, & 7)

Discussion: a.-b. The project site is not located in an area with know paleontological or archaeological resources. If these types of resources are found during grading and excavation, appropriate procedures will be followed including halting activities and contacting the County Coroner, and follow standard mitigation procedures.

- c) Affect historical resources? (Sources: 1, 3, & 7)

Discussion: Although the building is mentioned in the City's Historic Resources Survey and Inventory, it is not on any local, State or National Register of historic structures. An Historic Review Report was prepared for the building at this site. The Report analyzed and evaluated the structures and the specific criteria used to determine if structures are eligible to be listed on either a local, State or National Register. The conclusions of the Report indicates that "after review of the four CEQA requirements for determining the structure's potential historicity, it is determined, that the building at 1921 Spring Street does not meet the thresholds identified either by the National Parks Service Criteria or by local criteria for any preservation action. If the owners wish to demolish said structure, its removal will not constitute a significant loss to the history of Paso Robles." See Historic Review Report attached as Attachment A.

- d) Have the potential to cause a physical change which would affect unique ethnic cultural values? (Sources: 1, 3, & 7)

Discussion: See c. above.

- e) Restrict existing religious or sacred uses within the potential impact area? (Sources: 1, 3, & 7)

Discussion: Discussion: There are no known religious or sacred uses on or near the project site.

10 Environmental Checklist Form Resolution No. 07-206, Attachment 1, adopted 10/02/2007

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	-----------

XV. RECREATION. Would the proposal:

- a) Increase the demand for neighborhood or regional parks or other recreational facilities? (Sources: 1, 3, & 7)

Discussion: The project will not significantly affect the demand for parks and recreational facilities.

- b) Affect existing recreational opportunities? (Sources 1, 3, & 7)

Discussion: The project will not affect existing recreational opportunities.

MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.

- 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? (Sources: 1 & 3)

Discussion: The project does 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.

- Does the project have the potential to achieve short-term, to the disadvantage of long-term environmental goals? (Sources: 1 & 3)

Discussion: The project will not likely have a potential to achieve short-term, to the disadvantage of long-term environmental goals.

- 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.) (Sources: 1 & 3)

Discussion: The project will not result in significant cumulative impacts.

- Does the project have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly? (Sources: 1 & 3)

Discussion: The project will not result in substantial adverse environmental impacts on human beings, either directly or indirectly.

11. EARLIER ANALYSIS AND BACKGROUND MATERIALS
Resolution No. 07-206, Attachment 1, adopted 10/02/2007

Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, one or more effects have been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063 (c)(3)(D). The earlier documents that have been used in this Initial Study are listed below.


Reference Number	Document Title	Available for Review At
1	City of Paso Robles General Plan	City of Paso Robles Community Development Department 1000 Spring Street, Paso Robles, CA 93446
2	Seismic Safety Element for City of Paso Robles	City of Paso Robles Community Development Department 1000 Spring Street, Paso Robles, CA 93446
3	Final Environmental Impact Report City of Paso Robles General Plan	City of Paso Robles Community Development Department 1000 Spring Street, Paso Robles, CA 93446
4	Soil Survey of San Luis Obispo County, California Paso Robles Area	USDA-NRCS, 65 Main Street-Suite 108 Templeton, CA 93465
5	Uniform Building Code	City of Paso Robles Community Development Department 1000 Spring Street, Paso Robles, CA 93446
6	City of Paso Robles Standard Conditions of Approval For New Development	City of Paso Robles Community Development Department 1000 Spring Street, Paso Robles, CA 93446
7	City of Paso Robles Zoning Code	City of Paso Robles Community Development Department 1000 Spring Street, Paso Robles, CA 93446
8	City of Paso Robles, Water Master Plan	City of Paso Robles Community Development Department 1000 Spring Street, Paso Robles, CA 93446
9	City of Paso Robles, Sewer Master Plan	City of Paso Robles Community Development Department 1000 Spring Street, Paso Robles, CA 93446
10	Federal Emergency Management Agency Flood Insurance Rate Map	City of Paso Robles Community Development Department 1000 Spring Street, Paso Robles, CA 93446

Attachments:

Attachment A – Historic Study

August 28, 2007

Planning Department
City of Paso Robles
Attn: Darren Nash, Associate Planner



RE: Historic Review
1921 Spring Street
Paso Robles, CA 93446

The applicant is requesting to demolish and replace the small house located at the above address (parcel # 9-142-01). This unit is identified in the City Historic Resources Inventory (6/30/1984) as built in 1924. It therefore meets the 50 year test that requires further analysis before action is taken which might destroy the structure's historicity (if any). Its potential historic/architectural importance according to the historic inventory is that it is "An unusual style of bungalow. This house has endured the zoning changes occurring around it and still retained its style, adding to the harmony of the street." Since the unit has been identified on the historic inventory, the City has requested additional review to determine if the proposed action will be consistent with City ordinances and California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requirements.

Evaluation of Criteria

To qualify as an historic structure a building must meet one of the following criteria and maintain enough visual integrity to support the criteria under which it qualifies. The criteria are identified by California Public Resources Code, Section 5024.1 Title 14 covering the eligibility of a property to determine if it

1. Is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of California's history and cultural heritage (may be of national, state or local interest).
2. Is associated with the lives of persons important in our past.
3. 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 value.
4. Has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

Description of Residential Unit and City Context:

The unit is a single story, approximately 1300 square foot residential unit. The surrounding area along Spring Street includes both traditional and contemporary architectural styles. On the west side of Spring Street, almost all the residential

Resolution No. 07-206, Attachment 1, adopted 10/02/2007

structures are currently used for commercial purposes and have maintained many of their original features well throughout the years. The lots are similar in size, with the exception of the house on the southern corner.

On the east side of Spring Street, the structures vary in architectural style and character, and are also used for commercial purposes. The styles range from simple Mediterranean, to Craftsman, to contemporary. The street section also narrows as one head south, about half-way down the 1900 block of Spring Street. The structure at 1921 Spring Street is generally of a craftsman architectural style and is adjacent to an older single family residence the south and a small house now converted to a business on the north. The general features of the units are shown in the photographs of Figures 1 and 2. The 1984 Historic Inventory is included here as Attachment A.

Evaluation of Structure's Historicity

The scope of this report was to evaluate the structure based upon existing published information such as the *Historic Buildings within the City of Paso Robles* (1993) and the 'Self-Guided Walking Tour of Historic Buildings – El Paso de Robles', (2006). Further a discussion was held with Norma Moyer (Director of Paso Robles Main Street and a recognized person with a multiple generational knowledge of Paso Robles history) to determine if she was aware of any oral or non recorded history that was not contained in the above mentioned documents. Additional research was conducted at the Cal Poly reference library which contains historic directories of residential occupancy for the years spanning 1950 through 1959. This analysis did not include a chain of title documentation.

Review of these historic resources confirms that the only reasonably applicable criteria would be the first wherein the structure might be associated with the pattern of local community development along north Spring Street in the 1920s-30s. There is no record of this structure being associated with persons of importance in our past, nor does it embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or region or method of construction that would make it meet the relatively high standards of criteria #3 (See interpretative guidelines by National Park Service Bulletin #15.) Finally, it has not yielded nor is it likely to yield information important in prehistory or history.

The focal issue then, becomes whether the structure qualifies as being part of the local pattern of history with significance to understanding the development of Paso Robles as a community? The structure, while retaining many of its architectural characteristics (roof forms and some front entry detailing as well as window treatment), is not listed in any of the above documents as being worthy of consideration in terms of its specific architectural character or as being a specific and unique example of the craftsman style of architecture. While the structure is consistent with the surrounding neighborhood in architectural features and size, there are no historic documents approved by the City of Paso Robles which set forth any City preservation criteria nor that identify this northern portion of Spring Street as being an historic district with relevance to the City's local pattern of development.

In conclusion this structure does not meet any of the identified CEQA historic criteria for historic eligibility.

Evaluation of Property's Integrity

While the structure does not meet the basic threshold criteria for any further preservation action, it may be helpful to provide a brief comment on the structure's architectural integrity even though it is not required.

The integrity criteria were developed to assist in determining whether a knowledgeable person could sense the history of a structure as one approached it. Thus if a structure has historical merit but does not retain enough integrity to link it with the events that are associated with it, it does not merit a further response under CEQA. These criteria, however, must be applied within the context in which the structure gained its historic character and its ability to convey its historicity.

In this instance, and in some cases since 1984 when the referenced historic resources survey was made, there have been changes to the 1924 structure.

1. The front multi-paned glass and wooden screen doors of the unit have been replaced with solid face, newer wood doors very out of character with the craftsman concepts of design.
2. The two low, symmetrical triangular dormers on the east (front) side of the house have been removed.
3. The porch is no longer brick, but has been replaced with concrete.
4. The lower portions of the house have been resided with scored plywood.

These changes can be seen in the photos of Figure 1 and 2.


In conclusion, to the typical knowledgeable viewer, while this unit is visually typical of a small pre-World War II bungalow, only the general roof forms, entry columns and cornice returns and the window forms and shingles at the upper gables remain of the original design remain. This structure would not have enough architectural integrity to support further preservation.

Conclusions

After review of the four CEQA requirements for determining the structure's potential historicity, it is determined, that the building at 1921 Spring Street does not meet the thresholds identified either by the National Park Service Criteria or by local criteria for any preservation action. If the owner wishes to demolish said structure, its removal will not constitute a significant loss to the history of Paso Robles.

Preparer's Qualifications

Research for this report was conducted by or under the supervision of Andrew Merriam, recognized as an historic architect by the City of Paso Robles. Mr. Merriam is a consulting planner with the Wallace Group and has been conducting historic studies in the Central Coast Area since 1987. Previous historic evaluations include the Harford Pier (Port San Luis Harbor District), the Avila School House, Grocery Store and San Luis Yacht Club, as well as the Loomis Building and Masonic Lodge in Arroyo Grande. Mr. Merriam served as Chairman of the City of San Luis Obispo's Cultural Heritage Committee when the historic districts and preservation criteria were adopted. He is also the architect of record in the restoration of the Point San Luis Lightstation.



Front side



Back side



WALLACE GROUP

FIGURE 1
1921 SPRING STREET - HISTORIC ANALYSIS
PASO ROBLES, CA


AUGUST
2007



Left side



Right side



WALLACE GROUP

FIGURE 2
1921 SPRING STREET - HISTORIC ANALYSIS
PASO ROBLES, CA

AUGUST
2007

Ser. No. _____
 HABS _____ HAER _____ NR 4c SHL _____ Loc. _____
 UTM: A 10/709095/3945640 B _____
 C _____ D _____

HISTORIC RESOURCES INVENTORY


IDENTIFICATION

1. Common name: _____
2. Historic name: _____
3. Street or rural address: 1921 Spring Street (159/4)
 City Paso Robles, CA Zip 93446 County San Luis Obispo
4. Parcel number: 8-233-10
5. Present Owner: M. Quenzer Address: 344 14th St.
 City Paso Robles, CA Zip 93446 Ownership is: Public _____ Private X
6. Present Use: Residential Original use: Same

DESCRIPTION

- 7a. Architectural style: Bungalow
- 7b. Briefly describe the present physical description of the site or structure and describe any major alterations from its original condition:

This rectangular, Kelley-stone and stucco-on-frame house, with its composition shingled roof, has some interesting features. The south gable end has an external, stucco fireplace. Two low symmetrical triangular dormers emerge on the east side. A cross gable peak, at center of roof, also faces east. These gables have boxed cornices. The raised brick porch has a ceiled overhang with a centered, truncated gable pediment. Face is wide vertical slats, making a vent. Porch supports are large, tapering round wood columns. Front entry has dual, symmetrical doors with multi-paned glass and wooden screen doors. Windows are French style. Yard is open, shrubs up next to the house.



8. Construction date:
 Estimated 1924 Factual _____
9. Architect Unknown
10. Builder Unknown
11. Approx. property size (in feet)
 Frontage _____ Depth _____
 or approx. acreage 0.16
12. Date(s) of enclosed photograph(s)
8/20/82

Resolution No. 07-206, Attachment 1, adopted 10/02/2007

13. Condition: Excellent ___ Good Fair ___ Deteriorated ___ No longer in existence ___
14. Alterations: _____
15. Surroundings: (Check more than one if necessary) Open land ___ Scattered buildings ___ Densely built-up ___
Residential Industrial ___ Commercial Other: _____
16. Threats to site: None known ___ Private development Zoning Vandalism ___
Public Works project ___ Other: _____
17. Is the structure: On its original site? Moved? ___ Unknown? ___
18. Related features: _____

SIGNIFICANCE

19. Briefly state historical and/or architectural importance (include dates, events, and persons associated with the site.)

An unusual style of bungalow, this house has endured the zoning changes occurring around it and still retained its style, adding to the harmony of the street.

20. Main theme of the historic resource: (If more than one is checked, number in order of importance.)
Architecture Arts & Leisure ___
Economic/Industrial ___ Exploration/Settlement ___
Government ___ Military ___
Religion ___ Social/Education ___

21. Sources (List books, documents, surveys, personal interviews and their dates).

Tax Assessor's Records, 1946
Field surveys: 1982, 1984
Sanborn Map: Jan 1926

22. Date form prepared 6-30-84
By (name) Carl Morehouse
Organization Planning Department
Address: 1030 Spring Street
City Paso Robles, CA Zip 93446
Phone: 805/238-1529



ADDRESS - 1921 SPRING ST.

SHEET 1 OF 1 SHEET

DESCRIPTION OF BUILDING

CONST. CLASS	FOUNDATION	EXTERIOR	LIGHTING		ROOM AND FINISH DETAIL												
			ROOMS	FLOORS	FLOOR FINISH	TRIM	INTERIOR FINI:										
ARCHITECTURE	Reinforced	Stucco on LATHS KELLE	Electric	ROOMS	B	1	2	Material	Grade	TRIM	Walls	Ceiling					
D.L. (B) 1 story	Concrete	Stucco on LATHS KELLE	Electric	All													
TYPE (USE)	LI, X Med, Wvy	B&B, T&G	Many, Special	Ent. Hall													
X Single	STRUCTURAL	Brick	PLUMB. ROUGH	Bed				OAK	A	O.P.	PLASTER						
Duplex	X Frame		Poor, Good	Bed				LINO	"	"	H.P.	H.P.					
Flat		Veneer						OAK	"	"	PLASTER						
Apartment	Sheathing	ROOF	X Water Heater	Bath													
Court		Flat 1/4	X Automatic														
Motel	B&B, T&G	X Goble M 1/4	X Gas, Elect.														
Units	Brick	Hip 1/4	AIR - COND.	Kitchen				LINO	"	"	H.P.	H.P.					
STRUCTURE	Concrete Block	Shed	Heating, Cooling, Humid., Clean'g	Drain Bd.	Material	WOOD	Lgth	8	Fe.	Splash	12" E/W						
Light	X Sub Floor	Dormers	Gravity, Forced	BATH DETAIL													
Sub-Standard	2X6X24		X Fireplace	No.	FINISH		FIXTURES			SHOWER							
X Standard	Insulated	Gutters	Wall Unit	1	Floors	Walls	Wc.	La.	Tub	Type	Grade	St.	OT	GD	Fin.		
Above Standard	Walls	X Shingle	Floor Unit	2	LINO	H.P.	1	1	1	MOD	O&D						
Special	Ceilings	Tile	Zone Unit	3													
WORKMANSHIP	Windows	Tile Trim	X Central Unit	SPECIAL FEATURES													
Interior	Double Hung	Composition	Oil Burner	X Book Cases	Built-in Beds		Venetian Blinds										
X Average	X French	Comp. Shingle	M-D.T.U.	Buffers													
Superior	Steel Sash																

CONSTRUCTION RECORD					APPR.	NORMAL % GOOD				RATING (E,G,A,F,P)					
Permit No.	For	Amount	Date	Effective Year	YEAR	Age	Remaining Life	Table	%	Cond.	Arch. Att.	Func. Plan	Con-form.	Storage Space	Space Closet
			1924	1924	1946	22	29.5	R50	63	G	G	G	G	A	A

COMPUTATION											
Appraiser & Date		HJM - 4-10-1945									
Unit	Area	Unit Cost	Cost	Unit Cost	Cost	Unit Cost	Cost	Unit Cost	Cost	Unit Cost	Cost
Basement	1288	3.65	4679								
Fireplace	222	1.00	222								
Air Cond.			100								
Garage	470	1.00	470								
Walks	288	.15	43								
TOTAL			5664								
NORMAL % GOOD			63								
R.C.L.N.D.			3568								

MEMO

To: 1921 Spring Street File; attn: Darren Nash
From: Andrew Merriam, Historic Architect
Date: October 2, 2007
RE: Supplemental Information on the Historic Evaluation

1) Regarding determination of persons of potential note:

Our review found minimal information in the written and oral record. The Paso Robles Building Department has no record of this building prior to a 1984 application for remodeling by a contractor. Time was spent at the Cal Poly Library reviewing their Paso Robles directories. The Cal Poly records yielded the name of Paaske, RN who evidently lived in the home for at least 8 years (but was not necessarily the owner). There were no records prior to 1950. The owner at the time of the 1980's inventory was M. Quenzer. In an oral interview with Norma Moye, recognized as one of the most knowledgeable people in Paso Robles on matters of local history, Norma was able to add little additional information either from her historic files or from her memory of the local area. She did not recall anyone who had lived at that residence. As I recall her comments were that this portion of Spring Street was not particularly associated with major developments in the history of Paso Robles other than the extension of the main street of town as the former State Route. The fourth source that was checked was the published literature on local history plus Myron Angel's history of early San Luis Obispo County. No comments about people or even structures that came within several blocks of the Spring Street Residence were found. Based upon the lack of any information from these sources, no further search was made.

2) Regarding the architectural character:

While the structure at 1921 Spring Street does have some interesting characteristics as noted in the historic inventory, it does not meet the standard threshold requirements for embodying "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 value" as typically identified in the extensive review of this issue in the National Park Service Bulletins and commentary. While the entry has a chopped gable roof with an arched ceiling supported on slender columns making it unique in this neighborhood, it is really the only significant distinguishing characteristic. Further the NPS standards apply to the whole structure unless there are very unusual circumstances such as age, first use of the form, unique relationship to the innovation of a master designer or craftsman etc. In conclusion, in my professional opinion and experience, the architectural threshold was not reached. Further, there has been a significant loss of integrity in the remodeling process over the years such that the original architectural character has not been maintained to any degree of significance, even if that threshold had been reached.

If you have other questions, please do not hesitate to call me at 544-4011 (The Wallace Group)