

## Molinar, Tess

---

**From:** Phyllis Mueller <phyllismueller@sbcglobal.net>  
**Sent:** Monday, September 21, 2020 8:17 PM  
**To:** Molinar, Tess  
**Cc:** Sue Mossman; White, Leon; Johnson, Kevin  
**Subject:** Comment on the Historic Preservation Ordinance for consideration by the Planning Commission

CAUTION: This email was delivered from the Internet. Do not click links or open attachments unless you know the content is safe.

-----

>> This is to recommend a revision to the proposed HP Ordinance. Please let this email be part of public comment.

>> As currently proposed in the ordinance, the surveys (Primary Record) of historic properties must be updated every five years. That it an unnecessary and costly burden on both applicants and city staff. Properties don't change much in five years; a simple inspection of the property would reveal if the property has been altered significantly, in which case, an update might then be requested. That could be provided for in the Ordinance.

>> I propose that surveys be required to be updated every 20 years, not 5, in conjunction with any programs the city has to offer.

>> Here are two examples:

>> 1. The property at 305-339 S. Orange Grove was approved landmark designation in 2017; the Primary Record had been conducted in 2002, 15 years earlier. The property was in the same or better condition at application than 2002. If the city required the survey be updated since has been done more than 5 years prior, it would have served as a disincentive for the applicant to make application since the services of a professional would have been needed, incurring a costly expense, not to mention staff review time.

>> 2. The same goes for 171 S. Orange Grove. It was approved landmark status in 2018; the survey was done in 1996, 22 years prior, a structure completely intact. "Old" surveys in most cases are perfectly adequate.

>> I am a member of the Historic Preservation Commission. When the ordinance came to us for review, I was unable to attend the meeting, but asked a fellow commissioner to convey my thoughts about this matter. Unfortunately the 20 year Instead of 5 year requirement did not prevail as I couldn't press my point of view.

>> That is why I now make my comment to you.

>> I ask the Planning Commission the take reality into hand and approve a 20 year survey update instead of the onerous 5 years.

>> Phyllis Mueller