

Proposed Changes to General Plan Historic Preservation Element

Stakeholder Recommendations Matrix Provided by Council Member Frye				
Number	Page	Policy	Wording Change	Staff Response
HISTORIC PRESERVATION ELEMENT				
1	HP-10	Discussion	Surveys are enhanced and the results are more meaningful when consultation with historic preservation , culture, ethnic, racial groups, community and neighborhood groups and leaders are included as part of the background research and context statements.	<i>Pro: would expand consultation as part of survey effort; Con: wording is awkward.</i> Staff supports the change in concept and has made edits to result in expanded consultation.
2	HP-12	HP-A.2.a	Promote early conflict resolution Resolve conflicts between the preservation of historical resources and alternative land uses. At the Community Plan level, amend laws, regulations and policies so that zoning and community plans are consistent with the existing established historic character of older neighborhoods.	<i>Pro: Language is improved in first sentence. Con: Second sentence predisposes an outcome that may not be appropriate for all neighborhoods and the language is vague.</i>
3	HP-12	HP-A.2.b.	Encourage the consideration of Consider historical and cultural resources early in the development review process by promoting utilizing the preliminary review process and early consultation with home property owners, community groups, historic preservation groups, land developers, and Native American. and the building industry.	<i>Pro: Language at beginning of sentence is improved and expands early consultation proces . Con: removing land developers and the building industry from the consultation process would exclude an important component of the preliminary review process.</i>
4	HP-12	HP-A.2.c	Include historic preservation concepts and identification of historic buildings, structures, sites and neighborhoods and non-residential historical resources in the community plan update process.	No change proposed.
5	HP-12	HP-A.2.d	Identify Conservation Areas at the community plan level, based on historical resources surveys, that maintain community character and provide a buffer transition area between designation or potential historical district and areas expected to redevelop at higher densities. Create design guidelines in Community Plant to ensure that new development within Conservation Areas is compatible with the established historic character of adjacent designated and potential historic districts and neighborhoods. Additional discussion and policies on conservation areas can be found in the (see also Urban Design Element, Policy UD-A.7.)	<i>Pro: Language discusses need to conserve neighborhood character at the community plan level of review. Con: Approach is too broad as it brings urban design into the Hstoric Preservation Element (HPE.)</i> Staff supports the current language, with reference made to the Urban Design Element and discussion of urban design and neighborhood character principles provided there.
6	HP-12	HP-A.2.f.	Require approved and draft historic surveys to be used in the planning process when development permits are reviewed for properties 45 years and older.	<i>Pro: would increase use of survey data in project review; Con: mandates use of data whether or not survey is approved .</i>

7	HP-12	HP-A.2.g.	Require adequate and regular training and updates of appropriate planning, development and code compliance staff on new federal, state and local historic preservation ordinances, regulations, guidelines and resources.	<i>Pro: would increase staff knowledge related to historic preservation practice. Con: General Plan is not appropriate venue to address training . It is appropriately addressed in the Work Program and through the Budget process.</i>
8	HP-13	HP-A.4.e.	Include Native American monitors during all phases of the investigation of archaeological resources including survey, testing, evaluation, data recovery and construction monitoring. Include community, neighborhood , cultural, and historic preservation groups in all phases of planning and implementing historic surveys.	<i>Pro: would increase participation in of important stakeholders in the planning and implementing historic surveys. Con: proposal identifies change to language specifically related to Native American involvement in archaeological studies. Staff has made the proposed change to Policy HP-A.4b.</i>
9	HP-14	HP-A.5.a	Designate important historical resources using the City's adopted designation criteria, State Register criteria, and National Register criteria.	<i>Pro: proposed language is less ambiguous .</i>
10	HP-14	HP-A.5.c.	Protect and preserve historic building , sidewalk stamps, street signs, lampposts, street trees and other landscape and cultural landscape elements that contribute to the historic character of a neighborhood.	<i>Pro: proposed language is less ambiguous .</i>
11	HP-17	HP-B.2.	Promote the maintenance, restoration and rehabilitation of historical resources and conservation areas through a variety of financial and development incentives.....	<i>Pro: may broaden protection of neighborhood character. Con: conservation areas do not retain sufficient historic integrity to be considered a historical resource and inclusion in the HPE would not be appropriate .</i>
12	HP-17	HP-B.2.g Allow the use of a Neighborhood Development Permits with a finding that the proposed reuse does not adversely affect the Community plan or General Plan that calls for preservation because it would be beneficial in this regard.	<i>Pro: proposed language is less ambiguous.</i>
13	HP14	HP-A.5.d	Enforce the Historical Resources Regulations and Guidelines of the Land Development Code that are aimed at identifying and preserving historical resources. Update these regulations and guild lines as needed to maintain adequate protection of historical resources. Set policies that proactively preserve designated or potential historic resources and minimize demolition and destruction of historic resources by favoring preservation when conflicts in codes, regulations or policies exist.	<i>Pro: Language may result in increased protection of historical resources. Con: Language is too broad as it includes potential historic resources and is vague. It predisposes an outcome that may not be appropriate in all circumstances. The Land Development Code addresses demolition and substantial alteration of designated historical resources.</i>
14	HP17	HP B.g.	...The use of Neighborhood Development Permits with a finding that the proposed reuse does not adversely affect the community plan or General plan that calls for preservation would be beneficial in this regard by eliminating over the counter demolition for properties that are over 45 years old.	<i>Pro: Language may result in increased protection of historical resources. Con: Language is too broad as it includes all properties that are over 45 years old. The Land Development Code addresses the demolition review process for these properties. The regulations and process for demolition review are being addressed separately.</i>

15	HP17	HP.j.	Amend laws, regulations and policies so that zoning and community plans are consistent with the existing or established historic character of older neighborhoods to maintain historic streetscapes and reduce the development pressure to demolish historic buildings in these areas.	<i>Pro: Language may result in increased protection of historical resources. Con: Language predisposes an outcome that may not be appropriate in all cases. It is too broad as includes non-defined and vague language. These issues will be addressed at the community plan level through historic resource surveys and urban design principles.</i>
----	------	-------	---	---