

Public Comments Summary

Notice of proposed changes sent on GovDelivery (4000+ subscribers) and Social Media

Press release sent in May 2018

25 comments received/23 through Wufoo

6 comments unrelated to LM Ordinance changes

3 comments supporting draft changes

Definitions

Comments on Definition clarifications-

- Use National Register Standards

- Use LDC definitions

- Parking area definition

- Landscaping

- Structure

- Property vs. Site

- Accessory Structure/Carriage House

- Integrity

- Design Guidelines

- Certificate of Appropriateness

- Support of definition of local landmark as a “higher bar”

- New Construction – add public right of way

- District – add public right of way

- Historic Landmark (LDC)

- Building

- Historic District

ARCs/COAs/Design Guidelines

2 comments on Design Guideline process—make sure there are public meetings included on revising DGs

Applicant should have ability to ask for ARC review, even if a staff reviewable item

Need to develop a way to deal with after-the-fact COAs

Allow for modern window replacements

Add review of street furniture as an exterior alteration

Limit application of Design Guidelines to the front of buildings only

Tenants/renters should not be able to serve on ARCs since they have no financial interest in the outcome

Cultural landscapes should not be exempt from review for exterior changes

Designation Process

Language should be added to allow LMC to be empowered to charge fees

Allow for public notice with alternative media for notice

Clarify what is on the “petition application form” that is proposed

Concern about increased “burden of proof” on petitioners

Allowing Commission to designate is good, but citizen process should still be accessible

Concern about including integrity considerations for designation (should only be used in extreme cases).

Along with National Register information being proposed to support a designation, SHPO 106 determinations of eligibility should be used

District designations have no clear deadlines for the process

Clarify language concerning the form provided by staff for designation requests, petitioner is to complete form, not staff

Signature requirements for petitions should be expanded to 500- have a higher threshold (1)

One year comment/correction period for technical review process is too long and burdensome on property owner (1)

Support new criteria language (1)

Support LMG finding ways to incentivize/fund historically significant properties (1)

Support property owner consent (1)

Doesn't support property owner consent (1)

Designation Criteria Considerations – add engineering/archaeology (2)

Economics/economic hardship should be considered in designation process (2)

Economic factors should not be considered in designation (1)

Eliminate fees for designation (4)

Properties that are 50 years old will be eligible for designation creating issues for future development

Survey documentation will be used by Commission and Public to designate properties

Notice related to Landmarks and Demolition should include property owners across the street as well as adjacent properties

Designation reports should be authored or certified by MHPO

What is sufficient integrity?

How many criteria must be met?

Remove National Register cutoff date of 1990

Remove property owner consent requirement- creates hardship on petitioners

Website post reports on PDS/HP

Rewrite subsection (O), remove designation of an area

Metro Council Involvement in Designation

Transmittal of designation report to MC should be 7-days, not 3-days

Clarify grounds that MC can use to overturn designations

Time limit to review cases

Concern for proposal to allow MC to initiate designation process

Limit ability for MC to overturn designations

Does not support MC authority to veto designation decisions

Remove ability of MC to overturn a LM decision shall be overturned if the Commission was clearly erroneous