

**Mayor's Advisory Work Group: Historic Preservation Ordinance  
Minutes of the December 3, 2015 Meeting**

**Stephen P. Clark Center  
111 NW 1<sup>st</sup> Street  
29<sup>th</sup> Floor, Room 29A  
Miami, FL 33128**

**I. INTRODUCTION – Arva Moore Parks, Chair – the meeting started at 9:15 a.m.**

**Arva Moore Parks, Chair:** Stated that in Dr. Dorothy Field's place, R. Jollivette Frazier will be taking her place.

**Kathleen Kauffman:** Stated that Rodolphe el-Khoury won't be available until after December to attend these meetings.

**Advisory Work Group Members – Roll Call:**

Morris Broad, Vice Chair	Present
Rodolphe el-Khoury	Absent
Neisen Kasdin	Absent for Roll Call (arrived at 9:20 a.m.)
Becky Roper Matkov	Present
Dolly McIntyre	Absent
Arva Moore Parks	Present
Stan Price	Absent
Lyle Stern	Present
Ramon Trias	Present
R. Jollivette Frazier	Absent for Roll Call (arrived at 9:17 a.m.)

**Audience Present:**

Kathleen Kauffman, Chief, and Sarah Cody, Historic Preservation Planner, Miami-Dade County Historic Preservation Office; Mitch Novick, Chair of the Miami-Dade County Historic Preservation Board; Tere Florin, Communications Officer for Regulatory & Economic Resources; J. Bruce Ehrenhaft, Dade Heritage Trust; Jack Osterholt, Deputy Mayor/RER Director; Lourdes Gomez, RER Deputy Director; Jeff Ransom, Archaeologist for Historic Preservation Office; Eddie Kirtley, County Attorney's Office; Michael S. Weiss, Office of the Mayor; Sonia Grice, Mayor's Office; Mario Marlotte, RER Department; and Danielle Mejia, Commissioner Heyman's Office

**II. Approval of the Minutes – November 5, 2015**

**Arva Moore Parks, Chair:** Asked members if there were any corrections to the minutes of November 5, 2015.

**Morris Broad, Vice Chair:** Made a comment that Neisen was not absent.

**Kathleen Kauffman:** Responded indicating that Neisen was absent from roll call, but that he appears later in the minutes.

**Ramon Trias** moved the Motion to approve the Minutes of November 5, 2015. **Lyle Stern** seconded the Motion. Motion was approved by group vote.

Morris Broad, Vice Chair	Yes
Rodolphe el-Khoury	Absent
Neisen Kasdin	Absent for Roll Call
Becky Roper Matkov	Yes
Dolly McIntyre	Absent
Arva Moore Parks	Yes
Stan Price	Absent
Lyle Stern	Yes
Ramon Trias	Yes
R. Jollivette Frazier	Yes

### **III. REVIEW OF INFORMATION REQUESTED FROM STAFF**

#### **A. Review of Comprehensive Development Master Plan (CDMP)**

**Kimberly Brown, Principal Planner with the Planning Division for RER Department:**

Gave her PowerPoint presentation on the historic preservation policies of the Comprehensive Development Master Plan. Briefly, the CDMP is a growth policy that balances a myriad of issues, and among those is an accommodating development in a manner that is commensurate with projected population and economic growth. It is centered on high intensity urban centers connected by multi-modal transportation, and also optimizes efficiency, and the kinds of service deliveries, and a conservation of valuable resources, and these are issues that we look at when we amend the CDMP applications; whether an application would enhance or degrade the environmental or historical resources. In the land use element, this is the primary objective related to historic preservation, and this outlines the broad policy which is to protect, preserve, ensure the proper management, and promote public awareness for the historic resources, and the addition of new listings for those locally designated and for the National Register. So under the objective LU6 are a series of policies that advance the goals of that objective, and within that, the policies are to identify and seek designation and protection of the resources, to emphasize districts and multiple resource listings, to seek financial resources - particularly for those resources on county property - and to seek public acquisition for those that would have a major public benefit. It also indicates that historic structures should be used to accommodate historic functions where it is financially and logistically advantageous, and

that the county should seek to develop incentives to encourage the private sector to preserve the historic resources, and that the county will provide technical assistance for municipalities that have their own historic preservation programs, and to provide a historic preservation board for those municipalities that do not have their own, and to communicate with other state and municipal agencies including the Miccosukee and other private non-profits, and pursuing other local and state agencies to work with them to develop programs and policies jointly; seeking public awareness for the value of these resources; exploring the plats and maps program to allow for interpretive education, and to formulate procedures for allowing resource districts and historic districts. There are also a series of other policies in our CDMP plan, which encourage the identification and protection of historically significant housing from intrusion, and promoting compatible land uses. We also have policies in our Parks & Recreation and Open Space Development, and that talks about the management of the historic resources in Parks property for its long term viability and integrity, and also looking at the establishment of local zones where you have historic structures that are clustered together to provide historical education. Within the Coastal Management Element, we deal with performance standards for those coastal areas and also working with municipalities, together, to make sure that historical structures are not destroyed during hurricanes which are rendered beyond reasonable repair and also during pre-and post-term hazard mitigation measures to ensure that we are prepared.

**Ramon Trias:** Do the policies of Miami-Dade County seek appropriate designation in an active way? Does that happen with the County, wherein they initiate and pursue the designations as a matter of practice?

**Kathleen Kauffman:** Right now we haven't been very actively pursuing because we have so many ongoing projects, but a couple of years ago, we were actively pursuing.

**Arva Moore Parks, Chair:** Thanked the County staff for responding to all of our questions and coming back with such thorough information. Feels that it is important for this board to learn, we are in a massive learning project here.

**B. Other ordinances, and the multiple property owner issue:**

**Kathleen Kauffman:** You asked us to look up Chicago and New York specifically, but we also looked up other major cities that do large preservation programs. We reviewed all of their ordinances, and we also called their staff if it wasn't clear to us, and we found out things like: do they require owner consent for any designation (whether it was single family or multi-family,) and we asked them if they treat condo or co-op properties differently, and we asked who can request a designation. Chicago interestingly does provide definitions in their definitions section for what is considered "an owner," and they spell out cooperative and they spell out condominium - and so for those two kinds of properties, the owner is considered the board or the association.

**Arva Moore Parks, Chair:** That is only in Chicago not the other places, correct?

**Kathleen Kauffman:** Correct, the other ones don't differentiate.

**Neisen Kasdin:** This is something that I've had experience with in Chicago, and it makes sense. If we are going to allow owners to be applicants, which I think is appropriate, then I think we need to do what Chicago did. If it is a co-op or a condo, the "owner" would only be the cooperative association or the condominium association. What I have seen, frankly, is that a minority of owners of units who are often times against either 80 or 90% of the wishes or the other owners or co-op shareholders, and will use it as a negotiating tactic to get more money from the prospective buyer of a building. If you have a co-op or condominium, the building is owned by the association and that should be considered as the "owner" for the purposes of an applicant.

**Ramon Trias:** Feels that is fine, but in terms of the best practices, he feels that owner/consent is something that is not a best practice, in general. Asked if Staff agreed.

**Kathleen Kauffman:** In our dealings with the State, and the Bureau of Historic Preservation, they have always made it very clear that requiring owner/consent produced programs that are not very effective.

**Neisen Kasdin:** That would amount to having no ordinance.

**Ramon Trias:** That's right.

**Kathleen Kauffman:** I believe the Chair brought a letter for you as it relates to the issue of "owner consent."

**Arva Moore Parks, Chair:** Yes, it is from the National Trust. It was written to the City of Milwaukee, who was considering adopting an owner consent clause, and it stated how detrimental it was to...

**Neisen Kasdin:** I don't think that the owner/consent is appropriate, and it makes a sham of an ordinance.

**Arva Moore Parks, Chair:** What's interesting is that when the Dade County Ordinance was passed, the municipalities that were taking control of their own jurisdiction, some of them had owner consent and they had to go back and remove it. I remember specifically being involved with the City of Coral Gables and the City of Miami.

**Neisen Kasdin:** And Miami Beach too.

**Arva Moore Parks, Chair:** Asked how the City of New York deals with condominiums.

**Kathleen Kauffman:** We spoke to Staff in New York City and they indicated that they designate a lot of condominiums and co-op buildings, that is a large part of what they designate, and they don't differentiate.

**Arva Moore Parks, Chair:** Noted that Staff picked out Philadelphia and San Francisco also, which are both great cities and have great preservation programs.

**Morris Broad, Vice Chair:** Wondered if we were comparing apples to oranges, because these are all cities with multi-million residents. What happens in a smaller city where there are only 100,000 to 200,000, what is their approach to it? I find all of this interesting, but I am not sure that it is necessarily applicable to every situation that comes down the pike.

**Kathleen Kauffman:** I think that you would find similar situations regardless of the city size. Most preservation ordinances, most effective ordinances, have similar provisions, regardless of the size of the city.

**Becky Roper Matkov:** I think Charleston is a smaller city and they have an extremely stringent preservation ordinance.

**Neisen Kasdin:** If I may, the point that Morris makes has validity. If you look at the preservation scene 40 years ago, there was much more to preserve, but now there is very little to preserve. Now fast-forward 40 years, preservation is established and strong, and there is a lot that is covered by preservation laws. So I think that we are at a point where there should be discussion at the National Trust level - where does preservation go now? The world is different in regards to preservation. If you look at cities like New York and San Francisco, because they are older cities, a lot of the buildings that are preserved are much larger, major buildings, and it is a little bit different in Miami where the building stock isn't that old and a lot of the designation and preservation that is contributing are relatively minor structures; and it is not quite the same in some respects like in the major northern cities.

**Arva Moore Parks, Chair:** It's the only history that we've got, Neisen, and it's the only stock that we have. Something that is 50 years old in Miami is like something from the 18<sup>th</sup> century in some of the other cities. Mentioned how Neisen and Barbara Capitman were involved in saving Miami Beach, even though at the time, people were saying the same thing about that (what they are now saying about MiMo.) So you can't freeze preservation in time, and if we did, that we wouldn't have the Art Deco district. Just think what that would mean to economic development in Miami. You have to keep thinking about what's next to preserve.

**Neisen Kasdin:** Well you're absolutely right.

**Ramon Trias:** Some of this is not a preservation problem, but a problem with the vision of a community in terms of the comp plan, in terms of zoning. Once an area is developed then what is allowed can feel so different; these incompatibilities need to be eliminated because that can really be an issue.

**Morris Broad, Vice Chair:** But Ramon, can't you contain scale when you have an ordinance that limits height limitation?

**Ramon Trias:** Yes.

**Morris Broad, Vice Chair:** And that is the answer is most of these municipalities. One that I am very familiar with that has a 75-foot height limitation. You are never going to have a high rise in that community so that addresses your comment.

**Ramon Trias:** Those regulations may be effective, but to create the vision of a community that is also compatible with its history... you still need to figure out a way that allows for new buildings to fit in – character-wise. If that is not the case, then we need to do better at the regulations.

**Arva Moore Parks, Chair:** Well I think that the two examples where preservation makes the communities are in Miami Beach and Coral Gables.

**Neisen Kasdin:** It can be the cornerstone of our civilization. But, for example, I look at the new building that was built on 76<sup>th</sup> Street and Indian Creek Drive, and there was a only a shard of an undistinguished MiMo building that was made to be preserved, and attached to a new design, which was a very handsome new design. The creation of the MiMo district, the creation of the Art Deco district, the recognition of the great Lapidus structures, are all critical to the image of the city. But you take a mediocre example of mid-century modern architecture, or perhaps art deco buildings that are isolated and not part of a larger neighborhood and forcing people to preserve them, versus giving way to allowing people to do good new architecture... there is a balance. Provided some examples in Miami Beach where they reinterpreted the interiors to allow an evolution of how the building is used better now. All I am saying is that now that preservation has matured, it has to be nuanced in order for what is important to be preserved in terms of what is allowed for new design.

**Kathleen Kauffman:** This information on what Chicago and New York has done, this is information that you have asked us to provide. Since some of you have indicated that you want to be moving forward with recommendations soon, if this is something that you all agree on regarding the ownership definitions, perhaps you can go ahead and determine that this would be one of your recommendations.

**Neisen Kasdin:** I submitted a marked-up ordinance to the county attorney and staff with a number of suggestions - one of them dealing with who is an owner.

**Arva Moore Parks, Chair:** I think that who is an owner should be put on our list to discuss. Let's start a list with all the types of questions and/or recommendations, but thinks who is an owner is a "key" question. She wanted to go back to the letter that they received from the Mayor as to what our job is. She read into the record the following statement from the Mayor's letter:

*Our job is not to rewrite the ordinance, our job is to review the ordinance and to recommend changes.*

### **C. List of proposed revisions by Staff**

**Kathleen Kauffman:** The list before you is what Staff has already proposed as changes to the ordinance. You received this list at the last meeting. Some of the things are very broad and cover the whole ordinance. For example, we cleaned up spelling errors, the outdated names of departments were updated, official titles were corrected, and the numbering system has been updated throughout. A general cleanup of the ordinance. We added more definitions in the definitions section of terms that were used throughout the ordinance, including contributing structure, demolition by neglect, ground disturbing activity, historic preservation chief, integrity, non-contributing structures, and Staff. We did provide a recurring opportunity for municipalities to create their own historic preservation board and remove themselves from County jurisdiction; however, in conjunction with the ability for cities to opt out, we turned the current encouraged guidelines for running local preservation programs into the required minimum standards that all programs need to comply with. We provided a procedure for notifying the Board of County Commissioners when municipalities are not in compliance with our ordinance, because we have these minimum standards in our ordinance, but we have no mechanism to deal with a municipality that is not in compliance. We added archaeologists and engineers to the list of people that could be appointed to the historic preservation board, but this panel has also talked about economists and contractors, and we are happy to add that in.

**Neisen Kasdin:** And developers.

**Morris Broad, Vice Chair:** And architects.

**Neisen Kasdin:** There should be preservation architects and regular architects.

**Arva Moore Parks, Chair:** The commission can already appoint those.

**Neisen Kasdin:** Not the way the language is now, it has to be an architect who is a preservation architect, but given consideration as to the role of new architecture, you may want to broaden the pool of architects to consider an architect whom may not be a preservation architect.

**Morris Broad, Vice Chair:** Is there an architect on the board now?

**Kathleen Kauffman:** The ordinance currently states that the historic preservation board cannot contain *less than* one architect. And, it does *not* specify that it has to be a preservation architect. We also added in proposed language that this board must elect a chair annually, and it adds a term limit of two consecutive terms for the chair.

**Arva Moore Parks, Chair:** With terms of 4 years each.

**Kathleen Kauffman:** Appointment terms, but we also added in term limits for how long they can serve as chair. We also added the following items in our version of the proposed revision:

- It adds notification requirements to the appropriate County Commissioners and local municipal officials in case the county is performing an official survey within their district, this is in response to Commissioner Heyman's concerns that we weren't doing enough communication with the local municipal officials
- Requires that appropriate County Commissioners be added to the list of officials that are already being notified when designation reports are filed with the board
- Further clarifies what "filed with the board" really means for submittal of designation reports because we are trying to make it very clear as to what the designation process is.
- Clarifies that the historic preservation board has the authority to initiate designations
- Clarifies that it is within the preservation board's authority to direct staff to perform research and to provide recommendations to the board
- Provides a requirement that a condominium or cooperative board's official position on a proposed designation must be submitted to the historic preservation board with any request by an owner to designate
- We added additional ways to get information out to the citizens by adding websites as a way to provide more information (as it relates to designation reports.)
- Clarifies that the designation of a property does not preclude an owner from requesting approvals on alterations, demolitions, or additions to historic properties. We've always felt this was implicit because there is a COA process already provided for in the ordinance, but we just added additional language to let people understand that if you were designated, this does not preclude you from asking for one of those things.
- We did a lot more with the archaeological language and we included "ground disturbing activities" to include as a prohibited activity in the moratorium phase. This is very important because when you impose a moratorium, right now that really only covers buildings. So if you are considering an archaeological site, obviously you wouldn't want them to disturb the ground either before you can hear the designation case.
- Clarifies when an economic hardship case can be made. Hardship materials are already listed in the ordinance as to when they are supposed to be submitted to

staff, and so this new language just clarifies all of that. It makes the economic hardship section consistent with the hardship definition as already provided in the ordinance. The new language requires the hardship case to include statements as to whether a property is the primary homesteaded or not for the individual claiming the hardship. Most importantly, it provides a simpler process for claiming economic hardship as it relates to only restoration or repair work. This is really important because right now because if you read our economic hardship section in the current ordinance, there is a lot of information that is supposed to be provided to the board and to staff previous to making the claim – but that is really what should be required when you are requesting to demolish a building. What we have found in previous years is that sometimes hardship cases are made based solely on repair or restoration work that needs to be done. For example, after we had a series of hurricanes come through, a lot of people needed to replace their roofs, and maybe they couldn't afford the barrel tile roof that preservation would require, and they needed to make a hardship claim to be able to use the type of material that was covered by insurance. So this is providing a simpler process for those types of economic hardship claims.

- Provides criteria for the historic preservation board to use when considering economic hardship claims, which there are none at this time, even though there is currently criteria provided for the board to use when considering demolition requests
- Provides dates of validity for certificates to dig
- Provides a more detailed appeals process, including providing a stay on any demolition or alteration to a property that is going through the appeals process, because we have had that issue come up this year in which a building was demolished before the appeals process finished. Also extends the period of time in which to file an appeal to 30 days, and it will increase the current appeal fee which is \$100 to be more consistent with the zoning appeal fee. It allows the preservation chief to include a recommendation on any appeals being considered by the board of County Commissioners, and requires that the Staff's recommendation to the preservation board be part of the appeal package; clarifies who is responsible for notifying interested parties of upcoming appeals; again we are trying to make it very clear regarding the appeals process and who is responsible for notifying
- Adds the review of the National Register nomination applications to the list of duties that are in the ordinance, and this is something that is already required by the State (they are required to go before the local CLG before being submitted to the State)
- Adds descriptive language for what is considered demolition by neglect
- Clarifies that the County shall be responsible for filing ad valorem tax exemptions covenants and then we would be responsible for making sure that the owners got copies of that covenant.

So those are the things that we have covered in our proposed revision.

#### IV. OPEN DISCUSSION BY PANEL

**Arva Moore Parks, Chair:** Is there any discussion on any of that?

**Mitch Novick:** Serves as the current chair of the Historic Preservation Office. I have been chair I believe for 4 years. Regarding the issue of term limits - and just to preface my comments I have agreed to withdraw to be chair starting in January, which I believe there is an election by our Board. In Miami Beach, the term limit to be chair is a 4 year term limit, and feels that is reasonable. I would ask that the term limit of 4 years be considered. And I think that Kathleen and staff, you may want to reach out to City of Miami Beach to get their language that they might want to provide for you next meeting.

**Morris Broad, Vice Chair:** This is one of my issues.

**Kathleen Kauffman:** There is already a term limit in the ordinance, it is a 4 year appointment, but the commissioner has the right to keep extending that board members appointment if they so choose to.

**Eddie Kirtley:** It has to be by 2/3rds of the commission vote.

**R. Jollivette Frazier:** What was the rationale for staff's recommendation?

**Kathleen Kauffman:** The rationale for what part?

**R. Jollivette Frazier:** The annual election of the chair.

**Kathleen Kauffman:** Well we do that anyway as part of the Board's policies. They elect a new board chair every year, but now we are just now making this part of the policies a part of the code.

**Arva Moore Parks, Chair:** So they are not elected to a four year term, they are only elected to a one year term, is that what you are saying?

**Kathleen Kauffman:** No, no, we are talking about two different things. A commissioner can appoint a board member to the historic preservation board, and that is a four year term. But every year the preservation board members themselves elect a person who will serve as a chair every year. Technically, they could change every year.

**Ramon Trias:** That is typical of most boards.

**R. Jollivette Frazier:** Of most boards where?

**Ramon Trias:** Well most boards that I have known in my career, generally they elect a chairman every year.

**R. Jollivette Frazier:** None of the boards that I know, in my career, do that.

**Morris Broad, Vice Chair:** I thought it might be helpful to look at the existing board members and see how long they have served because, for instance, if you have a board member that has been on for 12 or 15 years, I don't consider reappointing that person for another two years is appropriate. I think they should be termed out immediately because it is terribly important to have diversity and to have new ideas and new thinking.

**Mitch Novick:** Ours is a one year term, and is the election is done annually.

**Morris Broad, Vice Chair:** Mitch that's fine, you have been chairman how long now?

**Mitch Novick:** I think about 4 years now. I don't ask for it, I keep getting nominated for it...

**Morris Broad, Vice Chair:** And now you are stepping down in January?

**Neisen Kasdin:** Miami Beach has a 6 year term limit and you can't serve on a board for more than 6 years. You might want to consider an 8 year term limit for being on the board because there is some advantage to having board members with the knowledge of what has happened on the board. On the chairman issue, it is a double edged sword. I know that Mitch has his fans and foes, and we shouldn't be talking about who is the current chair. Some people may love him and some people may not, and you might have a really good chair that you would want to stay as Chair. There are a lot of people, quite frankly, that don't have the ability to serve as chair well, and you don't want that person in the chair position because then the board will not function properly. Four years to serve as chairman be appropriate, sometimes it may work well and sometimes it may not work well.

**Arva Moore Parks, Chair:** She is a believer in term limits and thinks that 6 years sounds very reasonable, and that is what Miami Beach does.

**Neisen Kasdin:** But the appointment here in the County, is it for 4 years?

**Kathleen Kauffman:** Yes, the term appointment is 4 years.

**Neisen Kasdin:** So to synchronize with that, maybe the max term total should 8 years.

**Lyle Stern:** I think 8 years is a really long time, and the technology changes, and people with new ideas and philosophies; turnover is important. 8 years sounds like a long term, even 6 years sounds like a long time, but 4 years should be the right one.

**Arva Moore Parks, Chair:** Having served on many of these, I think there is a learning curve for people in the beginning.

**Neisen Kasdin:** This is true.

**Arva Moore Parks, Chair:** If you are new, it takes a couple of years to figure out what is going on.

**Neisen Kasdin:** Agreed.

**Morris Broad, Vice Chair:** How long have the current members served, without naming any names?

**Arva Moore Parks, Chair:** I don't think that that is really relevant because it gets personal with the current Board, and I don't want to get personal at all.

**Morris Broad, Vice Chair:** I'm not looking for the names, but looking for the concept of how long an individual has served.

**Kathleen Kauffman:** We have had some board members that have been reappointed by their commissioners, but their original appointment dates were since 2003-2004.

**Mitch Novick:** I'm still considered new on that board.

**Eddie Kirtley:** Madam Chair if I may, in the County Code now, all board members for all Boards have a 4 year term, and any request to extend an appointment has to be approved by 2/3rds of the vote from the commission. The question that we would have to answer is could these term limits be limited to only two terms of four years for this one Board, when all of our Boards have the ability to have appointments extended with 2/3rds vote of the commission.

**Arva Moore Parks, Chair:** It is hard to tell the commission that they can't do something.

**Lourdes Gomez:** And I can tell you that for all the other county boards where professional expertise is required, we find we do sometimes have "lifers" on the board because we simply cannot find volunteers to dedicate their time. Look at what you yourselves are having to do now... these boards are very time consuming, to do a good job, and it is a volunteer effort. So that would be another thing to consider.

**Ramon Trias:** That is the point that I wanted to raise also, because sometimes it is hard to find people that are qualified and are interested, that have the time, and that are motivated. Unless there is some major issue going on, I would try to be flexible here.

**Kathleen Kauffman:** So let me just be clear, there is already a term limit, right now, for historic preservation board member appointees, for 4 years.

**Ramon Trias:** Which could be extended by the commissioner if they choose to. Which is fine.

**Kathleen Kauffman:** It could be extended if 2/3rds of the entire commission agree to that.

**Neisen Kasdin:** You are saying it is only a 4-year term to serve on the board?

**Mitch Novick:** I understood it be two terms of 4 years to be on the board.

**Kathleen Kauffman:** (Referring to the ordinance) "The term of office of membership shall be a 4-year term for each member" and the county commissioner can extend that.

**Neisen Kasdin:** But you can put a limit on how many times they can serve.

**Arva Moore Parks, Chair:** But telling the County Commission they can't extend it with their vote, does that make sense?

**Neisen Kasdin:** Well the current board members have been there for more 4 years, so clearly it is a term of 4 years with no limit on the number of reappointments right, today?

**Eddie Kirtley:** Yes as far as I know.

**Neisen Kasdin:** So what we are saying is the term is going to stay 4 years, but now we are discussing the limit if any regarding reappointments. I have evolved over the years with my thinking regarding term limits, and sometimes you have very good members that you force off and that's not good. On the other hand I don't want someone to be on the boards for too many years. I think 8 years is a good term.

**Ramon Trias:** But why would we provide special rules for this Board if the other County Boards are all under the same rules?

**Morris Broad, Vice Chair:** These are just recommendations.

**Arva Moore Parks, Chair:** The recommendation could be that we keep the term to 4 years, but we can extend (with a 2/3rds vote from the commission) one more term for a max of 8 years. One of the reason why term limits are important is because you have to recruit new, younger people if you are going to keep this ethic going, and that is key.

**Lyle Stern:** Construction technology is always aging too, and we are a community that gets so much new talent, and so much more international movement of residents, and feels that a breadth of new experience is good.

**Neisen Kasdin:** So true.

**R. Jollivette Frazier:** Are we then suggesting that the ordinance will preclude the right of a Commissioner to appoint whomever they wish to appoint?

**Lyle Stern:** I personally am very comfortable with one term of four years and the 2/3rds vote gets another four years, 8 years is a substantial period of time to serve as a board member, and I think this is imperative. Change and turnover are important and feels with a community this large there are competent people available.

**Arva Moore Parks, Chair:** There are a certain number of people on the board that have to be in a certain profession, you have to have an architect, you have to have a preservationist, etc.

**Kathleen Kauffman:** (Reads from ordinance) “The preservation board shall contain *not less than* one architect, one real estate agent, or attorney at law, one historian or one architectural historian.” Those are the slots that are absolutely required.

**Becky Roper Matkov:** It does not mention a preservationist at all, which I think it should.

**Kathleen Kauffman:** It does include “preservationist,” just not as a required position. Read for the panel the language in the ordinance:

*“The Board of County Commissioners shall appoint architects, realtors, historians, art historians, lawyers or other individuals from the business, financial or other segments of the community who by virtue of their profession that have a demonstrated knowledge or concern for historic preservation.”*

Then it goes in to specify that it contains not less than an architect or real estate agent or attorney and one historian or architectural historian.

**Neisen Kasdin:** I think that is too limiting. I would like for you to see what I proposed.

**R. Jollivette Frazier:** I think those that have knowledge and/or interest is important, because you can learn always learn.

**Neisen Kasdin:** We don’t want to limit it to finding only those with knowledge or an interest in preservation. I think that at the end of the day, the big picture here is that historic preservation is part of a great tool kit to making a great community and I think that we need to make room on the board for people with exceptional ability in economics, urban

planning, architecture, construction, development, as well as preservation. We need all of these perspectives brought to the table.

**Becky Roper Matkov:** But this is a preservation board for a reason. You want people that are interested in it, and are encouraging preservation. It's not a zoning or planning board.

**Neisen Kasdin:** You are actually deciding the fate of people's individual properties. You are changing zoning that affects these properties and there are other goals in the community, for example, sea level rise, that are critically important and interacts with preservation, and do we have people on these boards that have the capability of addressing that? You have transportation needs, housing, and economic needs. You cannot have someone on the board, and I have heard it before, to have someone who is there just to preserve homes and designate buildings. In my opinion, that is not the proper frame of mind. It is critically important to have people with knowledge and backgrounds and interest in preservation, but the participation shouldn't stop there, that is what I am saying.

**R. Jollivette Frazier:** But my point is at the point I joined that board, I did not have the knowledge, but I learned. And stayed on the County's zoning appeal board for many years, and did an outstanding job at it.

**Ramon Trias:** Kathleen, if a Commissioner wants to appoint somebody, let's say, that is interested in sea level rise, they can do that, right?

**Kathleen Kauffman:** The ordinance states "or other individuals." So, yes.

**Ramon Trias:** From my perspective, I think that is great that it is already open-ended, and I think that it will become more difficult if we make it too restrictive, or if we require certain types of expertise beyond what we have. IT may be more difficult to find people.

**Neisen Kasdin:** But if we call out certain kinds of expertise, then we should call out other types of expertise which I think is relevant at this time.

**Arva Moore Parks, Chair:** Neisen, go back and read the beginning of the preservation ordinance, and its purpose, and I think that is what we continually need to relate back to.

**Neisen Kasdin:** I also think we need to have a discussion about that. That t was my first point, when we first gathered here, we need to have a discussion about the purpose clause to see if it is adequate. In building and planning a great community, preservation is one of a number of tools for doing that. The way the preamble of the ordinance is set, and the way this regulatory scheme is structured, it is heavily weighted, as the only thing to be considered in preservation is preservation itself and no other things like community planning, jobs, economics, transportation, and other important community needs. The root of the problem lies in the narrow focus of the purpose clause.

**Arva Moore Parks, Chair:** Neisen let me ask you this, doesn't the planning board have to deal with the planning, and the zoning board has to deal with zoning? Of all of these other boards that we have, why should this one be different? It is a specific board for a specific purpose, just like the zoning and planning board and all the other boards, why should this one be comprehensive in its purpose?

**Ramon Trias:** Let's say that the board realizes that the current land use for this neighborhood isn't appropriate, because it is too big; they should be able to give an opinion on that. In one way I agree with you, and think that it goes both ways, in a sense, to calibrate the CDMP to preservation. We should have discussion at one point on how preservation should relate to and effect scale, building type, and compatibility.

**Neisen Kasdin:** That is actually a strong point, because part of the plan should be able to comment on the individual city's comprehensive plans and zoning to make sure that its purpose is for a legitimate preservation goal.

**Arva Moore Parks, Chair:** I would like to see if Staff can look at some of the other boards as to how they are set up within the County. To find out the purpose of the zoning, planning, and some of these other boards.

**Neisen Kasdin:** to the purpose of the zoning board is basically to decide on variances and objections in the city or the County, and uses particular specific criteria. Planning is a broad function and they are supposed to look at everything.

**Morris Broad, Vice Chair:** Wanted to make the point that the decisions that have been made lately by the Preservation Board have been getting reversed by the Board of County Commissioners, and that is not a good sign, for a preservation board to have their decisions reversed one after another.

**Arva Moore Parks, Chair** asked **Neisen** if he was going to be able to present his discussion.

**Neisen Kasdin** It has not been distributed yet.

**Arva Moore Parks, Chair:** No I don't want you to distribute it, I want you to talk about it.

**Neisen Kasdin:** I have just been called for a meeting with the Mayor and don't know how long I will be. (Mr. Kasdin left the meeting)

**Arva Moore Parks, Chair:** Feels that the current appeals process, that's is a whole new ballgame.

**Morris Broad, Vice Chair:** If reversing the Board's decisions become the rule, then you have a real problem.

**Arva Moore Parks, Chair:** Do we know how many have been appealed successfully?

**Morris Broad, Vice Chair:** There are two that I know of very recently.

**Kathleen Kauffman:** There are two recent ones.

**Mitch Novick:** There are two that I am familiar with, that are in the courts.

**Lyle Stern:** Relying on an appeals process is the wrong approach since this can further delay economic conditions. It is better to balance the Board so that there is a fairer decision, and, though it may achieve the same result, it will look like a more balanced thought process was given to it.

**Becky Roper Matkov:** But Staff already works with developers and the other various people working on these buildings to begin with... It's not always a situation where you just draw a line in the sand and say, we won't cooperate with developers.

**Morris Broad, Vice Chair:** I would like to remind you that Staff's recommendations have recently been refused by the Board. You have a group of highly professional Staff, one sitting right over here, whom I have a lot of respect for, making a recommendation to the board after working with a developer, like you said, Becky, and tried to come to a great compromise, and the Board turned it down.

**R. Jollivette Frazier:** Well who makes recommendations to that Board, is it only one department, or more than one?

**Kathleen Kauffman:** To the Historic Preservation Board? It's the historic preservation staff. But I would like to point out, that just because an item is overturned by the County Commission, it doesn't necessarily mean that the Preservation Board made the wrong decision. There are a lot of factors that determine how a County Commission reacts or doesn't react to a certain appeal, and it is not necessarily the same issues or criteria that the Preservation Board was looking at.

**Lyle Stern:** I agree that's true, but I think that the broadened base creates a better template for effective historic preservation. We all want effective historic preservation, and we want every important building to be preserved, and we want meaningful preservation.

**Kathleen Kauffman:** I don't see any harm in adding any engineers and developers to the list of potential people that Commissioners could appoint to the preservation board.

**R. Jollivette Frazier:** Indicated she would like to see more discussion on that point because I really don't see the need to have some of those fields as required positions on the Board.

**Kathleen Kauffman:** I didn't mean to list them as part of the required members of the Board.

**Arva Moore Parks, Chair:** There still would be so much left open, even if you added in developers and contractors, and you know there are a lot of preservation contractors and developers out there too.

**Ramon Trias:** There is a distinction between saying you have to have at least a lawyer or an architect, and saying that the pool of people Commissioners should pick from are from these fields. That pool is not the same thing as the minimum standards for the Board membership.

**Arva Moore Parks, Chair:** Ok, well add that to your list to come back with our final discussion, but that would definitely be on our list. The other key issue here is your economic hardship clause. Can we get the ordinance where you are proposing those changes?

**Lourdes Gomez:** You want the staff's actual language ordinance?

**Arva Moore Parks, Chair:** Yes, can we have it?

**Kathleen Kauffman:** Passed out Staff's version of the ordinance revision to the panel members.

**Arva Moore Parks, Chair:** This is your homework for the next meeting.

**Lyle Stern:** If I may, I have one other question, why the distinction between primary homestead properties or not? What is the relevance in that distinction?

**Kathleen Kauffman:** It was part of the economic hardship changes that were added to the list of some information you are supposed to provide when you are claiming economic hardship

**Lyle Stern:** I would just like to understand from an ownership point of view, whether a home is an investment property or primary residence, is it treated differently?

**Kathleen Kauffman:** I don't think that it is treated differently, but I think it was just a matter of when you are claiming an economic hardship, it is some of the key information to provide, along with all the other information that is already asked for in the current ordinance.

**Becky Roper Matkov:** So you think in that case, they might be more sympathetic for them to fight for?

**Kathleen Kauffman:** Well I think if it is your primary residence, and this is a real hardship for you, then yes, I think you have a stronger case.

**Morris Broad, Vice Chair:** On this issue about reverting the county preservation authority, do the rest of you think that is appropriate to do?

**Kathleen Kauffman:** Do you mean to allow cities to have their own jurisdiction?

**Morris Broad, Vice Chair:** Yes, along the lines that you had indicated as part of your revisions.

**Kathleen Kauffman:** Yes, the Staff revision has a proposal to allow cities to go through a process to create their own historic preservation program. Our current suggestion is that this would be allowed to happen every four years. So in another four years there would be another opportunity to opt out, but now there is no recurring opportunity.

**Morris Broad, Vice Chair:** Asked when was the last time cities had the ability to opt-out?

**Kathleen Kauffman:** In 2003 was the last opportunity, but when they did that one in the 2003 ordinance revision, they did not provide it as a recurring opportunity. So this one would supply a recurring opportunity every four years.

**Eddie Kirtley:** I would add that under the current ordinance, if there is a new municipality that comes into effect, it does allow a one year period after incorporation for that municipality to make that decision, but if you are an existing municipality you had a year after 2003. If you didn't take advantage of it then, now there is no opportunity to do so.

**Morris Broad, Vice Chair:** But would that apply now or would a municipality have to wait another four years from now to be able to request to opt out?

**Kathleen Kauffman:** Under the current proposed version you would have a period of time to opt-out now (if the ordinance revision was passed,) but then, the next opportunity would be four years from now.

**R. Jollivette Frazier:** How many have opted out since 2003?

**Kathleen Kauffman:** We have 10 that have opted out.

**Becky Roper Matkov:** And they are?

**Kathleen Kauffman:** Miami, Miami Beach, South Miami, Homestead, Sunny Isles Beach, Coral Gables, Opa-Locka, Hialeah, Miami Springs and Miami Shores.

**Mitch Novick:** You may want to discuss problems that have occurred in some of these cities which opted out, like Miami Beach for example, I believe that the county had to initiate legal action against them. Sunny Isles Beach should also be considered as a stellar example as to what might happen today if a municipality should opt-out without appropriate criteria and regulations to make sure they run a decent program.

**Kathleen Kauffman:** So this is why, in our list of revisions, we added in language regarding how to deal with cities that in fact, are not in compliance. For example, the City of Opa-Locka supposedly runs their own program, but they haven't had a Board for years, and are in violation of our ordinance, but we have no way to deal with that because there are no consequences in our current ordinance.

**Eddie Kirtley:** Madam Chair I know that you appreciate history, so just to give you the background as to how the opt-out provisions came to be where they are today. When the ordinance was first written in 1981, there were a number of existing cities that wanted to create their own preservation program, and they were given a year period from the date of the new County ordinance to start their own program. But there were a number of new incorporations that happened from 1981 through 2003, and the ordinance didn't really contemplate on how those cities had their own chance to do their own program. So in 2003, this is why there was offered another chance to accommodate those municipalities that were incorporated over the last number of years.

**Lyle Stern:** Asked Mitch why he said Sunny Isles Beach was a stellar example.

**Mitch Novick:** I recall all of those great little mid-century two and three story hotels, they are almost all virtually gone.

**Kathleen Kauffman:** Since this has come up I would very much like to clarify something. Sunny Isles Beach was the only city to choose to opt-out in 2003. It was after they opted out from under County jurisdiction that all of those mid-century motels were demolished. Not before. Those demolitions did not happen under "County watch," as some people have claimed, and blamed it on us. When Sunny Isles Beach was under County jurisdiction, those buildings weren't even old enough to consider for designation because they hadn't quite hit the 50-year mark yet. I think the point Mitch was trying to make is that a city might have its own preservation program, but it might not really be doing much preserving.

**Arva Moore Parks, Chair:** Did they have a board, and go through the process to review those demolitions?

**Kathleen Kauffman:** They have a board.

**Ramon Trias:** Kathleen in Sunny Isles, they had two and three story motels, and so what was built instead when they were demolished?

**Kathleen Kauffman:** All those high-rise condo towers.

**Ramon Trias:** Right. And they are 20 or 30 stories, and even up to 50 stories. That is the problem, and that is not only a historic preservation issue. The issue is simply a total disconnect with the vision of what things should be, and the kind of legislative documents that we have to explain that vision. When you have a vision that allows 50 stories, and you have a three-story building sitting there, frankly it is almost impossible to have any kind of historic preservation, and that may or may not be a good thing, but we should have this discussion in a way that leads to some action. It is not enough to have some land use map, or some other document that simply says, well, we don't really mean it when we say in the CDMP that historic preservation is important, because our land use is totally inconsistent with that statement. I would encourage more thought in that discussion, how can we encourage historic preservation when the land use may be at total odds?

**Lyle Stern:** On the flipside, isn't Sunny Isles incorporated, and they did their own vision? It was that municipality's decision to have high rise buildings?

**Ramon Trias:** And that may be fine, and it may be ok, but let's not confuse it with having a solid historic preservation program. If indeed their vision is different, and there is consensus in that, then it's ok, but I think we need to have that discussion because otherwise we are going to be confusing the issue.

**Lyle Stern:** The consensus by the community, or by the county, or by the Historic Preservation Board?

**Ramon Trias:** The community and city should definitely be one of those stakeholders, yes, but the County obviously has an opinion, and the residents and property owners should be part of the discussion as well.

**Lyle Stern:** Maybe that is the part that I do not understand and need some clarification. I may be wrong in asking, but you are saying that the County should have an over-arching right to determine what individual municipalities should or will do in historic preservation?

**Ramon Trias:** What I am saying is that we talk about historic preservation, and how preservation is a good thing, but as long as there are other types of regulations that are

completely incompatible with historic preservation, we are not going to make any progress with historic preservation. I don't want to point fingers to any particular municipality, but that is a common problem. Let's say we have a fantastic row house in Georgetown, but if we all of a sudden rezone it to 20 stories, something is going to happen, and it is not going to be preservation.

**Lyle Stern:** Understood.

**Morris Broad, Vice Chair:** Mitch to address your point to the situation in Sunny Isles. Bay Harbor Islands has a 75 foot height limitation, that's it. You can't built any higher than 75 feet, and frankly the cry in Bay Harbor Islands is they don't want to be a Sunny Isles, but Sunny Isles made that determination they permitted this to happen. I frankly think it's horrible, but that is what they did. I think because of that example, you have a greater sensitivity in some of these other municipalities to this business of unbridled development.

**Mitch Novick:** Just to respond briefly, I owned property in Bay Harbor, which has long since sold, but when the first two thirteen-story buildings were built, there was a major outcry amongst the citizens in Bay Harbor Islands, and that is what brought about the 75 foot height limitation.

**Morris Broad, Vice Chair:** Yes, the pendulum swung all the way to the other side.

**Mitch Novick:** I don't know what transpired in Sunny Isles, but I know that in the mid 80's Oceania was built, and then it started spreading out, and the development replaced the unbelievably historic Castaways. The point that I am trying to make is that I don't know if the zoning was increased or the height limit was increased at some point, or was it always that high to begin with. I believe the Porsche tower is 60 stories.

**Arva Moore Parks, Chair:** One of the other things that we haven't brought up today is the TDRs. Feels this is critical because of all of the economic incentives.

**Kathleen Kauffman:** So in that ordinance revision version that we have given you, that was all done before this committee started, and so the economic incentives are not yet a part of that, but Staff believes this has been a valuable contribution as a result of this panel.

**Arva Moore Parks, Chair:** If we could come up with a list of economic benefits for preservation to recommend, we should. And we need to figure out ways to do educational sessions for people, to teach them about the economic benefits for historic preservation. It is pretty clear in this community, there is not an area or district in the City of Miami that hasn't been economically boosted after being declared a district. I mean when you look at the numbers in the City of Miami, it would astound you. You could have bought a house in Morningside for \$50,000 before the district, and now if you can get one under a \$1M your lucky, and it happened because of the historic district. I had even looked into Buena Vista and those property values are going up like crazy. The district do make a difference

and there is not one district, to my knowledge, in Miami-Dade County that has gone down in values since it was made a historic district.

**Ramon Trias:** There's also a difference between single-family neighborhoods and more commercial districts; however, we do have Miami Beach as an example of something that is not single-family.

**Kathleen Kauffman:** And the MiMo district on Biscayne Boulevard.

**Ramon Trias:** Exactly. We can make that argument also, in the sense that it would be interesting to research that, what is the effect when we are talking about housing, or the effect when talking about new businesses, or all the other types of buildings.

**Kathleen Kauffman:** Yes, it would be fascinating to see the actual numbers, and that is a really in depth study The MiMo district has only been designated since 2006 and the changes that have happened there are amazing, so it would be fascinating for someone to do a study on the number of new businesses in that district since 2006 and how long they have been there.

**Arva Moore Parks, Chair:** One thing that Coral Gables did, that may be relevant to the 75-foot height limit in Bay Harbor Islands, is that they passed a rule some time ago that with doing some type of historic preservation, you could add a couple of floors to your project. For example, Coral Gables had a 13-story limit for a long time, and it was the Colonnade building that made it possible for the first time to add an additional floor after the 13<sup>th</sup> story. This is why Avra Jain is using the TDRs, to add additional height so her other developments make economic sense. But other than TDRs, which transfer to another property, you could simply add a floor, through a historic variance, to your own project, and that has effectively helped preservation in Coral Gables.

**Lyle Stern:** I agree, but let's see how rezoning is going to play out in Wynwood. Although I remain optimistic, the reality is that there is a major amount of TDRs available, so the value of the TDRs has dropped compared to what TDRs were valued at before. For example, in Wynwood, it is a TDR program specific for that district. You can't bring TDRs in or take them out. So that is my issue in trying to solve preservation issues with TDRs when it is a commodity whose value changes.

**Becky Roper Matkov:** Pointed out the October 21<sup>st</sup> Miami Herald article that talks about the multi-million dollar project on the Miami River, and the developer is buying lots of air rights from the City of Miami, but instead of writing a check to the city of Miami, the developer is spending the money on public assets including the River Walk the highway underpass, and the Jose Marti park. There are lots of different ways to get developers to think broadly about providing benefits to the public, including historic preservation.

**Arva Moore Parks, Chair:** So the economic incentives, the TDRs and also the tax abatements are all good issues for discussion for the next meeting.

**Becky Roper Matkov:** Not only the tax abatement we currently have for improvements to properties, but we were talking about if there would be a reduction for property tax for historically designated buildings, period. That would be a real benefit.

**Kathleen Kauffman:** That would be huge benefit but that kind of recommendation would need to come from this panel to encourage the County to push for it at the legislative level.

**Arva Moore Parks, Chair:** Is there anything else? I'm sorry Neisen is not back because he had made a list of things that he wanted.

**Morris Broad, Vice Chair:** Well this way you will be able to adjourn by 10:30.

**Arva Moore Parks, Chair:** Yes, but it's already 10:45.

**Lyle Stern:** Requested if staff could distribute Neisen's recommendations to the panel.

**Lourdes Gomez:** Just wanted to make sure that before you adjourn the meeting, we have the housekeeping discussion because we are getting requests from individual board members outside of these meetings, so we were advised to treat that now.

**Arva Moore Parks, Chair:** Ok let's talk about the housekeeping, and maybe Neisen will walk in.

## V. HOUSEKEEPING

**Lourdes Gomez:** We were going to ask you as a board to see how you want to handle those requests that come in to Staff from panel members outside of the meeting. Eddie had given us advice as to the Sunshine Law in that we shouldn't be distributing those.

**Eddie Kirtley:** When we start getting requests from individuals on the panel, Staff can't really just relay that to the panel members outside of this meeting, so you have a couple of options. Either you can have Staff just bring to you all those items at the next meeting, or you can ask that something be added to an agenda and if that is the case, then Staff can distribute it to everyone as an agenda item ahead of the meeting so that you can have a chance to look at it and then come and discuss it here. You can also vote on it also at the next meeting, but it's because of the Sunshine Law that we are a little constrained if any individual makes a request to Staff as to their ability to share with everyone.

**R. Jollivette Frazier:** Can you add to the website a list of the items requested by this panel as to the name of item and who requested it?

**Lourdes Gomez:** We could do that ourselves but don't know if that would be per the Sunshine Law.

**Eddie Kirtley:** He can check on that if this is the request of the panel.

**Arva Moore Parks, Chair:** It seems to me that the members should be able to bring the information to the panel, and that is what we are here for. The Sunshine Law really does get in the way of lots of things. So I as Chair would like to suggest instead of sending it to Staff that if anybody has a specific suggestion, have Staff check with the Chair before doing it as an agenda item

**R. Jollivette Frazier:** I thought you were talking about requesting background information.

**Eddie Kirtley:** No this has been more about people wanting the panel to discuss something at the next meeting, or they want to share a document with the board.

**Ramon Trias:** Feels that agenda items should be done through the Chair.

**Arva Moore Parks, Chair:** I think that Agenda items should be done with the Chair. Neisen had sent something in that the county attorney indicated should not be sent out, and I was hoping that he was going to be here to present it, but I guess we will have to wait till next time.

**Eddie Kirtley:** If you all want to take it with you then it is fine if we distribute it here while your meeting is in session. You can discuss it next time.

**Kathleen Kauffman:** Indicated she had copies of Neisen's version and distributed it to the panel members.

**Arva Moore Parks, Chair:** I believe that he worked on the ordinance specifically, didn't he? Our role is not to rewrite the ordinance, but to make recommendations and so we may want to take his recommendations and pull them out and not have to deal with them specifically with the ordinance, but we can pass it out, that's fine.

**Sarah Cody:** And just so the members know, Neisen didn't make any changes after page 10 of the ordinance, and that is why you are being handed only pages 1 through 10.

**Kathleen Kauffman:** Advised panel members to write on the top of the handouts which one was the Staff version and which one was provided by Mr. Kasdin.

**Lourdes Gomez:** Asked if the Chair was ready for any specific agenda item for the next discussion, in light of their homework.

**Arva Moore Parks, Chair:** Well I think we have already said some today, right?

**Lourdes Gomez:** Well you certainly made a list, so we can add that to the next agenda.

**Becky Roper Matkov:** Made a comment that the Town of Winter Park was in the middle of revising their ordinance as well. They are using our ordinance as an example. The Miami-Dade County ordinance has been considered a model for the State for years, and we need to keep in mind that what we do have is pretty darn good, but it certainly can be improved or strengthened, or even simplified in some ways, but would like for us to remember that throughout the State, we are a considered by them to be a good example.

**Arva Moore Parks, Chair:** Did we discuss impact fees?

**Kathleen Kauffman:** We did, at the last meeting.

**Arva Moore Parks, Chair:** I know, but I feel it should be added to the list of our recommendations as an agenda item. We should look at them, because even though they don't exist now, it is another thing that we can ask the County to do. In my neighborhood, which is near Brickell, we found out that those impact fees were being used in Aventura, and we went to battle over that, and we ended up getting our street fixed. So there was something that was impacting our neighborhood, and we benefited from the fees. I think some kind of preservation impact fee is a wonderful new area of money that might be possible to change in the law also.

**Kathleen Kauffman:** When our County attorney Dennis Kerbel gave you that presentation on the impact fees at the last session, s I think that he was pretty clear that it was not really the best way to go, as far as historic preservation purposes, because it is difficult to prove there was a nexus that showed the impact was actually impacting houses as opposed to street traffic or something like that.

**Arva Moore Parks, Chair:** But let's look into it. I am curious about other places and maybe they have something like an impact fee bank.

**Lourdes Gomez:** Maybe it's not called an impact fee bank, but we will look into it.

**Arva Moore Parks, Chair:** I know it can be very effective, especially when you have a lot of building going on.

**Sarah Cody:** Madam Chair just to clarify the items for next meeting, on how all county boards are set up and how they define their intent and purpose. Is that something you would like to discuss at the next meeting?

**Arva Moore Parks, Chair:** Yes. Would like to come to some sort of consensus before we do a formal vote on any recommendations. The Mayor is interested in the recommendations that will come out of this panel, and that is what we need to work toward.

**Lourdes Gomez:** So we are going to bring you that list of future discussion topics for next time, and we will have Dennis here again in case you want to have the discussion on impact fees, and Mark Woerner will be here in case you want to have the TDR discussion, and we will do the research on all the other county boards. Anything else?

**Arva Moore Parks, Chair:** Thanked Staff for doing a particularly great job.

**VI. NEXT MEETING: January 7, 2016, 9:00 a.m.**

**VII. ADJOURNMENT**

**Arva Moore Parks, Chair adjourned the meeting at 10:54 a.m.**

