



City of Jacksonville

Historic Preservation Commission

Annual Report

June 27, 2018

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 2017 to June 2018, 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 Chapters 307, 320 & 780 *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.”

Additionally, The Commission hears appeals of staff determinations related to applications for local Historic Rehabilitation Tax Exemptions, as defined and codified in Chapter 780, Part 3.

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, with one vacant position.

The members are as follows:

Position	Commissioner	Term end date
Chair:	Jack C. Demetree III	2018
Vice Chair:	Ryan P. Davis	2018
Secretary:	Erik Kasper	2020
Commissioner:	Tim J. Bramwell	2020
Commissioner:	Andres Lopera	2019
Commissioner:	Maiju Stansel	2019
Commissioner:	<i>Vacant</i>	

June 27, 2018



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.

Historic Rehabilitation Tax Exemption: Qualifying property that has completed a qualifying improvement project shall be exempt from that portion of ad valorem taxation levied by the City on 100 percent of the increase in assessed value resulting from the substantial improvement project during the exemption period. The exemption does not apply however, to taxes levied for the payment of bonds or to taxes authorized by a vote of the electors pursuant to Section 9(b) or Section 12 of Article VII of the State Constitution. The amount of the exemption shall be determined by the Property Appraiser based upon his usual process for post-construction inspection and appraisal of property following rehabilitation or renovation.



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	Landmark designations/ changes to staff approvals/ other non-COA applications.
Jul-17	13				1		Commission Expanded the scope for staff approval of siding replacement.
Aug-17	17	2					
Sep-17	9	1		1			
Oct-17	9						
Nov-17	5			1			
Dec-17	7	1					
Jan-18	10	1					
Feb-18	12		1		Approval of Demo for: 2841 Doric Avenue, 220 East Bay Street, 300 East Bay Street		
Mar-18	6		1	1			Road Renaming Approval for New World Ave. & Inman Place.
Apr-18	5				Approval of Demo for 2906 Harvard Ave.	3	
May-18	17					2	Road Renaming Approval for Everbank Field Drive.
June-18	8						Appeal of Denial of Tax Exemption for 101 E. Bay Street



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 with noted limitations. In the table on page three, you will note one occasion that the Commission made changes to expand the ability of staff to approve changes in siding. The Commission periodically examines these specific limitations and has expanded the scope for staff, and thereby reduced the amount of applications that must go before the Commission. This was done in an effort to alleviate the time delay and additional costs placed upon applicants for projects that the Commission felt staff could review and make a determination on.

Staff has worked with the Commission to resolve violations through the normal Special Magistrate process, as opposed to Commission review, which is an option outlined in Chapter 307. This has led to a reduction in the number of violations that go before the Commission, and are now sent to the Magistrate first, and only to the Commission in rare cases. This action has resulted in Commission COA's related to violations beginning in February of 2018.

The Commission has migrated from paper applications and mailed Commission meeting books to electronic formats, though the use of City provided tablets. This has made the use of staff time more effective, and has given the Commission access to better quality application information, in the form of scalable pictures and plans, and color images.

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. As compared to 2016-2017, the Commission only had one appeal go before the LUZ Committee. The Staff has worked with the Commission to attempt to settle appeals related to violations as an alternative to the costly process of appealing to the LUZ Committee. Generally, the Commission offers guidance on what would be acceptable outcomes to resolve violations, and staff works to achieve those goals through negotiation.

With all of these combined efforts, Historic Preservation Commission meeting times have been reduced by an average of two hours. The average meeting time for the 2016-2017 reporting period was 5 hours. This was based on a range of the shortest being two hours, and the longest being 9 hours. For the 2017-2018, that average has been reduced to 3 hours, with a range of half an hour for the shortest, to five hours for the longest.

June 27, 2018

