



ONE CITY. ONE JACKSONVILLE.

City of Jacksonville, Florida

Lenny Curry, Mayor

City Hall at St. James
117 W. Duval St.
Jacksonville, FL 32202
(904) 630-CITY
www.coj.net

June 29, 2017

Council Secretary Dr. Cheryl L. Brown
117 W. Duval Street
City Hall, Suite 425
Jacksonville, FL 32202

RE: Jacksonville Historic Preservation Commission Required Annual Report

Dear Dr. Brown:

On behalf of the Jacksonville Historic Preservation Commission, The Chair and the Planning and Development Department are pleased to provide this Annual Report, which details the Commission's activities, members, and an assessment of the Commission's effectiveness, as prescribed by Ordinance 2016-521 and codified in Ch. 50, Section 110, Part B. The Commission adopted this report at their June 28th meeting.

Kind Regards,

Christian Popoli
City Planner Supervisor
Planning and Development Department
214 North Hogan Street, Suite 300
Jacksonville, Florida 32202
(904) 255-7852
cpopoli@coj.net

CP/DC/SF/KR

David B. Case
Chairman
Jacksonville Historic Preservation Commission



City of Jacksonville

Historic Preservation Commission

Annual Report

June 29, 2017

Prepared by the Planning and Development Department
In Compliance Chapter 50, Section 110 Part B

Introduction

This report contains a breakdown of all the activities of the Jacksonville Historic Preservation Commission (“Commission”) from July 2016 to June 2017, as well as the current makeup of the Commission. Additionally, there is a brief narrative assessing the Commission’s effectiveness over this period.

There is a table beginning on page three that details all of the different activities of the Commission. There are a number of application types addressed in the table. There are definitions provided for reference, which are taken from Chapter 307, *Code of Ordinances*.

Chapter 307 is the governing legislation for most of the Commission’s actions. Additionally, Chapter 320 is a section of the Code dedicated to building permits. Part of Chapter 320 enables the Commission to review requests for demolition of certain qualified historic structures. These are noted in the table below as “320s.”

The Commission holds regular meetings once a month, on the 4th Wednesday beginning at 3:00 p.m.

Commission Members

The Commission is currently comprised of seven members, and does not currently have any vacancies.

The members are as follows:

Position	Commissioner	Term end date
Chair:	David B. Case	2014
Vice Chair:	Cora Jones Hackley	2014
Secretary:	Jack C. Demetree, III	2018
Commissioner:	Searcy Carr Dennheim	2017
Commissioner:	Andres Lopera	2019
Commissioner:	Ryan P. Davis	2018
Commissioner:	Maiju Stansel	2019

June 29, 2017



Definitions

Administrative Review: Planning and Development Department staff level review for approval, approval with conditions, and/or denial of COA applications for routine alterations and minor repairs or other work as set forth in Section 307.107, *Code of Ordinances*. Staff shall have the discretion to refer an application to the Commission for consideration for any reason.

Certificate of appropriateness (COA): an Order voted on by the Jacksonville Historic Preservation Commission at a public hearing or an application administratively approved by the Planning and Development Department pursuant to Section 307.107 allowing an applicant to proceed with approved alteration, demolition, relocation or new construction of a designated landmark, landmark site or property in an historic district, following a determination of the proposal's suitability to applicable criteria.

Landmark: a building or structure which is at least 50 years old and meets at least two of the criteria contained in Section 307.104(j), Ordinance Code, and which has been so designated by the City Council, and has significant archaeological or architectural features or the location of an historical event.

Minor Modification of Appropriateness (MMA): an application to modify a previously approved COA.

Opinion of Appropriateness (OOA): An OOA is an application for a non-binding opinion from the Commission. These are typically used by applicants to get a feel of the Commission's reaction to a project before it is ready for a full COA review. The Commission does not take any action and no decision is made. They simply provide feedback on an applicant's design and request. Each Commissioner expresses his or her individual opinion.



Table of Commission Actions

All applications heard by the Preservation Commission, as well as other items they addressed though the reporting period.

	COAs	Violations	OOAs	MMAs	320 Reviews	Letters of Support	Landmarks
Jul-16	12		1	1	1		Landmark Recommendation for Hemming Park
Aug-16	8						
Sep-16	15	1	1				
Oct-16	5						
Nov-16	5	1					
Dec-16	3						
Jan-17	18			1			
Feb-17	7		1				Landmark Recommendation for Rebecca Turner Residence
Mar-17	6	1					
Apr-17	12			1	1	3	
May-17	12	2	1		Approved partial demo and staff was directed to write a landmark nomination		
June-17	8	1		1		2	Landmarks of Norwood Elementary and YWCA recommended to Commission



Commission Effectiveness

In the case of the Commission, as a quasi-judicial body, the review of applications is an easy benchmark to demonstrate effectiveness, as shown in the table and graphs contained herein. But the true goal of the Commission is to preserve history, through the preservation of historic structures and places. The most obvious cases are requests to demolish historic structures, particularly those that are contributing to a local historic district. Though the best outcome is preservation, this is not always possible. The Commission has done a great job of preserving structures that truly are salvageable, and not allowing these structures to be demolished. By the same token, the Commission has been amenable to requests for demolition of structures that are non-contributing to the district, or that have been damaged by the elements, insects, or general deterioration to the point of structural failure.

The Commission has worked over the last year to improve the process for Certificates of Appropriateness (COA) review, by encouraging staff to review certain applications through expanded administrative approval. You will note in the table on page three, several references to the Administrative Matrix, this is the document that outlines staff's scope of approvals. You may also note several times the Commission has amended this document, expanding the scope for staff, and thereby reducing the amount of applications that must go before the Commission. This was done in an effort to alleviate the time delay placed upon applicants for projects that the Commission felt staff could review and make a determination on.

Additionally, there is the element of Appeals which may be considered an additional benchmark. Appeals are not a common outcome for most of this Commission's actions. When they do happen, it is the goal of the Commission that their decisions be upheld. While this isn't always the case, the Commission has prevailed on the majority of these appeals in the reporting period. Out of three appeals between July 1st and June 30th, the LUZ Committee has only overturned one. This demonstrates that the Commission has effectively been enforcing the requirements of Chapter 307, and the adopted design guidelines.

June 29, 2017

