

James Hagler

From: James Hagler
Sent: Monday, March 20, 2017 1:34 PM
To: Jeff Shrum
Cc: John Veneziano; 'Edward Lavallee'
Subject: FW: HRG comments to Draft Comp Plan
Attachments: 3.8.17 HPB Comp Plan response -3-17v2.docx

Importance: High



City of Venice Department of Historical Resources

STAFF REPORT

To: Jeff Shrum, Development Services Director
From: James Hagler, Director of Historical Resources
Date: March 20, 2017
Re: City Comp. Plan

Jeff,

On March 3, 2017 9:00am a special meeting was called by the Historical Preservation Board to discuss the New Comp Plan and if it was decided to form a committee to review the new comp plan with additions by the Historical Preservation Board. A board member was appointed (Curtis Whittaker) at that time to address the comp. plan as it related the Historical Resources for the city. To help and research two other members were also included (Jon Barrick, ARB, and Larry Humes VHI) The results are included and to be presented at the next comp plan on March 22, 2017.

From: M. Curtis Whittaker [mailto:mcw@Rathlaw.com]
Sent: Friday, March 17, 2017 6:12 PM
To: Jon Barrick <jondbarrick@gmail.com>; Larry Humes <lhumes240@gmail.com>; James Hagler <JHagler@Venicegov.com>
Subject: HRG comments to Draft Comp Plan

All: thanks for the input and support for fare on this thing. Attached is a revised set of comments that does three things:

1. Includes the sentence I mentioned on asking for Staff help to draft Plan A.
2. Conforms the cites to the more recent CP draft of 1/30 (I was working with a hard draft from 1-12)
3. Removes some very specific inserts that Jon had made regarding Historic Register criteria.

When I went into the 1/30 DCP, I found that Staff had already moved up into Land Use, and made City-Wide, some of the Historic Resource provisions from the Neighborhood – Island section. So we've already made some progress. In

order to reflect that change, I had to tweak some up front text, and reorganize some of our comments to track their new formatting.

In doing that, and re-reading some of what Jon inserted, it became clear to me that we should drop it from these comments, and pick them up in the context of the follow-on historic preservation ordinance(s) that we will need to push once we get the Comprehensive Plan done. Thus, I dropped the following from these comments, as they are specific standards that must be debated within the context of specific laws that spawn out of the CP:

- a. National Register of Historic Places shall be utilized to establish criteria to evaluate the significance of sites and structures. Potential districts, sites, buildings, structures, or objects should have at least two of the seven kinds of integrity: location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling and association, and; are associated with the events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history; or are associated with the lives of persons significant in our past; or embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, or that represent the work of a master, or that possess high artistic values, or that represent a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction; or have yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history. Significance can be determined relative to a local, state or national context. A property does not have to be important regionally or on a state-wide basis to be significant. Its value may derive from its role in the prehistory or history of the local area. The U.S. Department of the Interior has published guidelines that explain in detail the application of each of the four criteria above to particular types of Historic Resources.
- b. Prominence and importance related to the City.
- c. Prominence and importance related to a neighborhood within the City.
- d. Degree of threat to the historical resource.
- e. Condition of the historical resource.
- f. Degree of support for the historical resource.

Also, since we already say that the City will take all steps to achieve CLG designation, I removed the separate section about a mandated Historic Preservation Ordinance, as repetitive. Appendix additions that tracked this text was also removed.

Again, Jon's additions were strong, and we will use them down the road in actual ordinance drafts. Right now, re-reading them, I think they would create undue resistance at the CP level.

If you agree, then the attached is the draft that I'd like to present to the Planning Board next week. I'd ask James to get it to Jeff, and Jon to circulate it to whomever he deems appropriate within the ARB.