We are truly pleased to have this opportunity to discuss the importance of historic ordinances and related elements with the HPB of the City of Winter Park. We hope you will see this as an opportunity to provide comments in order to enhance our recommendations. The key to preserving historic resources is to include these resources in the planning process.

This PowerPoint (PPT) presentation is a 30 slide, 7,000+ word technical presentation, so I will keep this presentation moving along. This is a presentation of technical data and best management practice (BMP) recommendations only. We do not speak for the City or the HPB, and no decisions or policy will be made this evening.
Historic Resources include a wide variety of parts of the natural and built environment, both historic and prehistoric. Historic structures are the largest single group of cultural resources. If a house is over 50 years old it is historic, not significant, just historic. In order for a resource to be considered a significant resource, it must meet one or more of four specific criteria established in 36 CFR Part 60.4, National Register of Historic Places, nominations by state and federal agencies, and 36 CFR Part 800, Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, Protection of Historic Properties. The National Register criteria for evaluation of significance are stated as follows:

The quality of significance in American history, architecture, archaeology, engineering, and culture is present in districts, sites, buildings, structures, and objects that possess integrity of location, design setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association, and;

**Criterion A:** Properties that are associated with events that have made a significant contribution to broad patterns of our history; **Criterion B:** Properties that are associated with lives of persons significant in our past; **Criterion C:** Properties that 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; **Criterion D:** Properties that have yielded, or may be likely to yield, important information in prehistory or history.

These criteria must be applied to each component of all cultural resources which fall within the project tract, and archaeological sites typically qualify under Criterion D. In accordance with National Register Bulletin 15 (National Register Branch 1982, as revised 1995:39-50), the “seven aspects of integrity” of the historic resource must be assessed. These “aspects of integrity” are location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association; to “retain historic integrity, a historic property will always possess several, and usually most, of the aspects” (National Register Branch 1982, as revised 1995:44). Significant cultural resources are those meeting the criteria of eligibility for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places, based upon interpretations of site integrity, preservation, uniqueness, and future research potential. According to the National Historic Preservation Act, any district, site, building, structure or object qualifies as a historic property for consideration in accordance with Section 106 of the NHPA.
The National Main Street Center, a program that uses historic preservation to revitalize town centers and neighborhood commercial districts, has actually tracked economic results in 1,700 Main Street communities nationally. These preservation-based programs have created over 231,000 new jobs and resulted in over $17 billion in reinvestment to date, with every dollar spent on a Main Street program yielding $40 in economic return. This data is a few years old, so these numbers are presumably higher, just from the standpoint of inflation.
HP Makes Legal, Local, & Economic Sense

HP is NOT an un-American violation of property rights.

Finding of "historic" is a finding of fact, not a term of art, & means 50 years old.

A "historic" finding is not a taking. Penn Central holds that owners must be notified, have an opportunity to comment and retain a reasonable use.

Residents and visitors identify Winter Park as the city's historic downtown and neighborhoods.

Residents seek this value and history; WP's median household income in 2011 was $57,432, while FL's mean was $47,821. That's more than one STD, so WP is in 95% percentile!

Historic preservation laws no more infringe on property rights than do other laws and even private rules that we have long accepted. Though everyone likes to believe "my home is my castle and I can do whatever I want," this statement simply doesn't reflect reality. Zoning laws, street speed limits, structural building codes, fire codes, electrical codes, and local ordinances all prevent your neighbor from replacing their single-family home with an metal scrap-yard, a landfill, or a skyscraper behind your own back fence. **Zoning is a compromise between individual wants and community needs and concerns.**

If you live in gated community, your property rights are limited by Covenants and Restrictions, documents that can legally prevent you from owning a pet, washing a car in your driveway, or having a basketball hoop over the garage. **CC&R's restrictions are far more onerous than historic preservation laws, and are commonly accepted.** In an economic sense, if a historic area includes commercial buildings and residences like WP, then a home's value rises because home buyers pay a premium for homes where they can walk to shops, restaurants, and work.
Intent of Congress as Stated in the NHPA is that:

"the historical and cultural foundations of the Nation should be preserved as a living part of our community life and development in order to give a sense of orientation to the American people."

Further, it is public policy: "to foster conditions under which our modern society and our prehistoric and historic resources can exist in productive harmony."

The National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) is the guiding law, but there are more than a dozen other federal historic preservation laws which effect everything from highway to dam to cell tower construction. Importantly, each law protects cultural resources from elements of modern development, BUT, they are not designed to prevent modern development. Historic preservation is stated public policy. As part of this undertaking, an extensive bibliography which lists various laws, codes, and guidelines (federal, state, city, and county) has been provided for referential use.
Preservation & Growth are friends, NOT rivals

1) Growth does not necessarily equate to economic development or "bad" change.

1) Historic buildings have value and need protection, and in WP represent a very small percentage of all buildings to begin with.

3) Good urban design is much better for our communities and the environment than bad.

4) HP grows the local tax base and promotes community character and livability.

To rather grossly stereotype, growth advocates sometimes see preservationists as a bunch of NIMBYs (Not In My Back Yard), and preservationists can see growth advocates as people who want to tear down neighborhoods wholesale and put up giant high rises. The truth is in between: Historic buildings have value and need protection, and good urban design is much better for our communities and the environment than bad.

However, altering mindsets about these notions is difficult, and dialogue and education about the balance between growth and historic preservation is the course of action at this time. So, quickly, let us approach a few known minds-sets which can pose barriers to useful dialogue between parties on either side of the table.
Mindset #1:

"If a property gets designated as a historic landmark, it's protected forever and can never be demolished."

Not true...........

While designation ensures a more thorough review of demolition proposals, it does not prohibit demolition outright. Even listing in the NRHP, which is more elevated than a "mere" local listing, does not provide for more iron-clad protection. Although demolition of a designated landmark additionally requires preparation of an report to assess the feasibility of alternatives to demolition, and to mitigate the demolition, a property owner may be able to obtain approval to destroy landmark if it is unsafe, unsalvageable, etc. A well-designed demolition permit system is reasonable.
Mindset #2:

"Historic preservation only benefits affluent communities, and is only for high-style buildings."

Not true.............

The purpose of historic preservation is to accurately reflect and celebrate the unique story of a community and its people through its built environment. Historic preservation is guided by the American principle of diversity, and the full range of the American experience is reflected in our historic landmarks. The preservation movement is diverse.
Mindset #3:

"Historic designation will reduce my property values."

Not true......almost universally the opposite is true.

Study after study has conclusively demonstrated that historic designation and historic districts actually increase property values. Designation gives a neighborhood or an individual historic site a cache' that sets it apart from ordinary properties. Buyers seek out the unique qualities and ambiance of a historic property. Historic district designation gives potential homebuyers two rare and economically valuable assurances: that the very qualities that attracted them to their neighborhood will actually endure over time, and that they can safely reinvest in sensitive improvements to their home without fear that their neighbor will undermine this investment with inappropriate new development.
Mindset #4:

"If my property is designated as "historic," I won't be able to change it in any way, and I don't want my property to become like a museum."

Not true......

 Owners of designated historic structures can make very significant changes to their structures, especially so to the interiors. Historic preservation laws are not meant to prevent change, but, only to manage change. This management is almost exclusively focused on the exterior, and provisions are made for things such as handicapped access. The tool to manage change is the Secretary of Interior’s (SOI) Standards for Rehabilitation, the nationally accepted benchmark for evaluating changes to historic structures, and/or your local ARB guidelines. Such standards don't require that every element of a historic site remain intact, only the most significant, or “character-defining,” historic elements of a property should be retained. New additions to the historic property can be allowed, but should be compatible with the site’s historic architecture; these standards are listed below.

1. A property will be used as it was historically or be given a new use that requires minimal change to its distinctive materials, features, spaces, and spatial relationships. 2. The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alteration of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided. 3. Each property will be recognized as a physical record of its time, place, and use. Changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural features or elements from other historic properties, will not be undertaken. 4. Changes to a property that have acquired historic significance in their own right will be retained and preserved. 5. Distinctive materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property will be preserved. 6. Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture, and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence. 7. Chemical or physical treatments, if appropriate, will be undertaken using the gentlest means possible. Treatments that cause damage to historic materials will not be used. 8. Archeological resources will be protected and preserved in place. If such resources must be disturbed, mitigation measures will be undertaken. 9. New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment. 10. New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in a such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.

(http://www.nps.gov/hps/tps/standguide/rehab/rehab_standards.htm)
SLIDE 11 (Con’t)  What Makes a Property Historic vis-à-vis Significant

HISTORIC
Age: A structure must be "old enough" to be considered historic. This means that a property must generally be at least 50 years old. Another way of looking at it is that a property must be old enough to have been studied by architectural historians so that its place in history is clear; this way of looking a building allows some types of properties that are less than 50 years old to be considered "historic."

SIGNIFICANT
Integrity: In addition to having sufficient age, a property must retain its historic physical integrity. For a building, structure, landscape feature, historic site, or historic district, this means that the property must be relatively unchanged. Its essential character-defining features relative to its significance must still be present.

Significance: Finally, a historic property can be found significant. Significance is typically defined in three ways: (1) through direct association with individuals, events, activities, or developments that shaped our history or that reflect important aspects of our history; (2) by embodying the distinctive physical and spatial characteristics of an architectural style or type of building, structure, landscape, or planned environment, or a method of construction, or by embodying high artistic values or fine craftsmanship; or (3) by having the potential to yield information important to our understanding of the past through archaeological, architectural, or other physical investigation and analysis.
Mindset #5:

"Historic preservation is bad for business."

Not true......

Historic preservation is at the very heart of our nation’s most vibrant economic development and business attraction programs. From Miami to traditional historic southern cities such as Charleston or Savannah, to the recent boom in "heritage tourism," today’s economic development strategies no longer see preservation and business development as competing values. There is no denying the power of historic preservation; Charleston has been ranked the No. 1 tourist destination in the world for the last three consecutive years. Retail expert Robert Gibbs writes that while people love big box stores, they also seek out authentic and historic places like downtown WP to shop and dine.
Mindset #6:

“Preservation is more expensive than new construction.”

Can be true at times, but in many cases historic preservation is typically more cost effective than new construction.

This can be true at times, but in many cases historic preservation is typically more cost effective than new construction. Why? Historic buildings certainly do sometimes need upgrades, but these are usually less expensive than the costs of building all-new foundations, structural systems, roofs and building finishes.

In one study, the NTHP reports that in Chicago, where the public school system is now spending $2.5 billion to upgrade facilities, bare-bones new construction costs $155 per sf, while renovation is costs just $130 per sf. Currently, it is cheaper to build new construction locally due to the recent downturn, but construction costs are rising as the economy recovers, and the “greenest” building is the one you already have given the embodied energy of the existing materials and construction. WP has local architects, contractors and tradesman with expertise in rehabilitation historic buildings for contemporary use.
Mindset #7:

“If I buy a historic property, there’s lots of government money available to help me fix it up.”

Not true.....

While it doesn’t necessarily cost more to renovate a historic structure than to build anew, few large government or foundation grants are available to owners of historic properties, and even those few typically limit eligibility to government agencies or non-profits. There is no vast pool of government money for HP, but there is also no vast pool of government money for new construction either.

What is available for historic properties versus new construction tends to be tax incentives for private owners of historic buildings. Owners of sites listed in or eligible for the NRHP may take advantage of a Federal Rehabilitation Tax Credit that provides a 20% tax offset for the cost of rehabilitation. National Register properties are also eligible to benefit from “conservation easements” – binding legal agreements with preservation that can allow owners to claim a charitable deduction on their Federal income taxes. This can be a substantial tax deduction, especially so if the property is an income producing property.
Mindset #8:

"Old buildings are less safe."

Not true.....

Although historic structures do sometimes require structural retrofits or the addition of fire sprinklers to enhance their safety, historic buildings typically perform better than newer construction in earthquakes and other natural disasters, especially hurricane force winds. What determines the safety of buildings is the quality of construction, not age, and, in many ways, "they just don’t build them like they used to." Historic preservation regulations also accommodate Americans With Disabilities Act (ADA) mandated changes such as access ramps.
Mindset #9:

“Preservationists are always fighting new development and only care about the past.”

Not true.......... 

Historic preservationists do care deeply about the past, primarily as a way of anchoring themselves and their community as it move forward confidently into the future. Historic preservation is not about stopping change and is certainly not about preventing exciting new architecture and development. Preservation allows us to retain the best of shared heritage to preserve sites of unique quality and beauty, revitalize neighborhoods, spur economic revitalization.

Transition: Only through putting aside these mindsets, can Historic Preservation in WP really move forward. Moving forward....
Recommendation No. 1

Revise, Refine, & Update Current Code – In regard to Demolition

(Slide Image Deleted From This Page For Space for Text In This “Notes” Version of PPT)

The current code, specifically Chapter 58 of the Land Development Code, Article VIII Historic preservation, need to be fully revised.

There is a full laundry list of “housekeeping” amendments needed. For example, by federal law, the technical definition of “historic” is not “listed on the FMSF” or “locally designated,” but rather “50 years old.”

There must be a process under Code Section 58-446 (1) for the demolition review of all “historic” (50 years older) properties, not just locally designated buildings or FMSF listed structures.

A demolition review form is recommended. This form would be required by the Historic Preservation Board before a demolition permit would be issued for any structure that is over 50 years old. Permit issuance would be guided by the Planning Department of the City of Winter Park, who would conduct a file review and make a guidance recommendation to the Board.

In regard to demolition permits, an economic hardship provision with specific evidence requirements should be added under Code Section 59-479, Guidelines For Issuance. This is needed for balance and to prevent hardship and takings claims.

In regard to demolition permits, an imminent danger to the public safety provision should be added under Code Section 59-479, Guidelines For Issuance. This provision should require that a structural report prepared by a professional engineer (PE), which is reviewed by both the Planning and Engineering Departments of the City, demonstrate that the building in question is a clear and present danger to public safety, is not restorable, and should address issues of architectural salvage. Permits for the demolition of historic structures which have suffered the willful neglect of ordinary, necessary repair and maintenance (abandonment) may not be granted.

We also recommend that WP maintain the use of a Certificate of Review form (COR) for additions/alterations to historic buildings, and consider a signage/mural for downtown if it becomes a local district.

Currently, the COR goes through a fully administrative system of steps, with no elected official involved, only City staff and board, unless there is an appeal; this division should be maintained.

Permits for the demolition of historic structures which have suffered the willful neglect of ordinary, necessary repair and maintenance (abandonment) may not be granted.

Demolition must be addressed first, because if there is nothing left to preserve, then questions of historic designation are meaningless.
Recommendation No. 2
Revise, Refine, & Update Current Code – Designation

- As the in-depth analysis conducted by the City has indicated, there are many cities in FL that require no public voting element in an HP designation. While Sarasota has an NRHP-type request to opt out, this is a factor of the notification NRHP process in regard to the factor of total resources surveyed within a structure survey / district, not owner volition.

- In Winter Park, the ordinance requires 20% of the residents of a proposed district sign a petition in favor of district formation. Then, a threshold of at least two-thirds of the property owners in the proposed district must submit a ballot in favor of its formation. In WP, this public voting element requiring a 2/3's vote for the historic designation process [Code Sec. 58-456 (c)] turns the historic designation process into a social affair which pits neighbor against neighbor, and historic boundaries end up defined on the basis of pro- and anti-designation factions; the historic districts are, in essence defined by modern social structure.

- In WP, individual historic landmarks also require property owner authorization, with the result that many landmarks are unprotected.

As the in-depth analysis of Florida’s HP ordinances has indicated, there are many cities in Florida that require no public voting element in an HP designation. While Sarasota has an NRHP-type request to opt out, this is a factor of the notification NRHP process in regard to the factor of total resources surveyed within a structure survey / district, not owner volition.

In Winter Park, the ordinance requires 20% of the residents of a proposed district sign a petition in favor of district formation. Then, a threshold of at least two-thirds of the property owners in the proposed district must submit a ballot in favor of its formation. In WP, this public voting element requiring a 2/3's vote for the historic designation process [Code Sec. 58-456 (c)] turns the historic designation process into a social affair which pits neighbor against neighbor, and historic boundaries end up defined on the basis of pro- and anti-designation factions; the historic districts are, in essence defined by modern social structure.

In WP, individual historic landmarks also require property owner authorization, with the result that many landmarks are unprotected.
Given the essentially voluntary nature of historic designation in WP, the board is then forced into a reactive rather than proactive position. Given a clearer mandate from the code about their role, we feel the HPB would be willing to be more active.

Many cities have no public voting element, and none have a 66% voting requirement. Voting is not the norm, is quite odd, and certainly counterproductive to historic preservation; it is analogous to allowing public determination of residential speed limits, fire codes, zoning, building codes, etc.

This voting element of the code is the crux of WP’s historic preservation problem. Unless a property has been designated with owner permission or is in a district created with the two-thirds vote, any historic property can, has been, and will continue to be torn down.

Data and public hearings should be used establish districts, not public voting. Most people love historic preservation, until it is their history they are being told they must preserve.
Recommendation No. 3
HPB Qualifications Returned to Current Version of the Code

- Qualified elector and full-time resident of the city at the time of appointment and during entire incumbency; there should be an application process;
- Possess graduate qualifications from qualified institutions evidencing expertise in architecture (licensed architect), history (Master’s level or Ph.D.) archaeology (Registered Professional Archaeologist, Master’s level or Ph.D.), law (Juris Doctor), planning (AICP), construction or building rehabilitation (Florida licensed, bonded, general contractor), civil or structural engineering (PE), landscape architecture (RLA), environmental preservation or conservation (Master’s level in life sciences), accountant (CPA), or business/finance person (MBA);
- As to composition, one member must be a licensed architect, there must be an avoidance of overlapping specialized categories, and members from a geographically diverse cross section would be ideal (all neighborhoods represented);

The professional standards for the Historic Preservation Board (HPB) were inadvertently removed during the adoption of the city-wide board ordinance. These qualifications should be re-established within the current code, specifically Section 58-445, and further fully revised. Examples of qualifications include:

Qualified elector and full-time resident of the city at the time of appointment and during entire incumbency; there should be an application process;

Possess graduate qualifications from qualified institutions evidencing expertise in architecture (licensed architect), history (Master’s level or Ph.D.) archaeology (Registered Prof. Archaeologist, Master’s level or Ph.D.), law (Juris Doctor), planning (AICP), construction or building rehabilitation (Florida licensed, bonded, general contractor), civil or structural engineering (PE), landscape architecture (RLA), environmental preservation or conservation (Master’s level in life sciences), accountant (CPA), or business/finance person (MBA);

As to composition, one member must be a licensed architect, there must be an avoidance of overlapping specialized categories, and members from a geographically diverse cross section would be desired (ideally all neighborhoods should be represented);
Recommendation No. 3 (cont’d)
HPB Qualifications Returned to Current Version of the Code

- There needs to be an iron-clad conflict of interest (COI) provision, recusal of HPB members from any review of property they own, and no HPB member or their firm can receive City funds, bid on historic preservation-related contracts in the City, etc. for a two years prior to, or subsequent to, their 3 year terms of incumbency, which are also term-limited;
- In the event that a vacancy occurs in a seat, and for which there is no application from a qualified resident, the City Commission should appoint said vacating member. This appointment shall be temporary; and,
- Must have these strict qualifications if WP is going to apply for CLG status.

There needs to be an iron-clad conflict of interest (COI) provision, covering recusal of HPB members from any review of property they own, and no HPB member or their firm can receive City funds, bid on historic preservation-related contracts in the City, etc. for a two years prior to, or subsequent to, their 3 year terms of incumbency, which are also term-limited;

Actual expenses reimbursable to HPB members are reported on first in first out (FIFO) basis accounting with a ledger which is subject to an annual financial report open to public; and,

In the event that a vacancy occurs in a seat, and for which there is no application from a qualified resident, the City Council should appoint said vacating member. This appointment shall be temporary. Upon appointment of a qualified resident to the vacancy, the temporary appointment shall terminate.

Must have fairly strict qualifications if WP is going to apply for CLG status. And it is important for WP to obtain CLG status, because CLG status will provide access to HP funding.
Recommendation No. 4

Winter Park Needs to Become a Certified Local Government (CLG), As Soon As Possible, Because CLG Status Will Help Pay For Needed HP Items

- State level HP funding largely absent since 2009 - is unlikely to return; projects and grants are applied for, and awarded, but the projects are never actually funded.
- Winter Park needs to obtain Certified Local Governments (CLG) status as written into the existing code. Many of Central Florida areas are already CLGs, including Daytona Beach, Deland, Eatonville, Eustis, Kissimmee, Orlando, New Smyrna Beach, and Windermere.
- Grant funding is available on a matching basis, typically up to a level of about $25,000, which makes up to $50,000 a year available for HP.
- This is real money: The City of Fernandina Beach has taken 40-50 K a year in CLG funding every year of the current recession.
- Must prepare grant applications to get funding; without proper applications, there is no chance of HP funding.

State level HP funding has been largely absent since 2009 and is unlikely to return; projects and grants are applied for, and awarded, but the projects are never actually funded. Winter Park needs to obtain Certified Local Governments (CLG) status as written into the currently existing code. Many of Central Florida areas are already CLGs, including Daytona Beach, Deland, Eatonville, Eustis, Kissimmee, Orlando, New Smyrna Beach, and Windermere. Grant funding is available on a matching basis, typically up to a level of about $25,000, which makes up to $50,000 a year available for HP. This is real money: The City of Fernandina Beach has taken at least 25 K a year in CLG funding every year of the current recession. Without funding, there is no HP.

These grants can be used for a variety of historic preservation projects, including historic structure surveys, the development of guidelines and ordinances, the preparation of individual NRHP nominations, the preparation of NRHP district nominations, and community history projects.

However, even if CLG status is obtained, WP must allocate time and resources (adequate staffing support) for its local planning department/historic preservation officer to complete the grant applications, or sub the grant application process out; improper or incomplete grant applications will not win awards. Rest assured that other cities are more than happy to seriously compete for these funds with WP.
Recommendation No. 5
Revise, Refine, & Update Technicalities of Various Sections of the Current Code

- Some old text needs to be deleted. For example, the "Inordinate Burden" text of Section 58-449 is non-standard for HP codes, and somewhat dated – could be stricken.
- The HPB and City attorney has proposed some excellent modifications, which should be largely adopted. The clarifications between standard and special certificates of review are a good example.
- The code must be updated regularly; some boards update their guidelines every 2-3 years, and most do so every 5-10 years. WP's current HP code was promulgated in 2001.

There are some other revisions and points we shall also touch on in the code, as this presentation proceeds.

Some old text needs to be deleted. For example, the Inordinate Burden text of Section 58-449 is non-standard for HP codes, and somewhat dated – could be stricken.

The HPB and City attorney has proposed some excellent modifications, which should be largely adopted. The clarifications between standard and special certificates of review are a good example.

The code must be updated regularly; some boards update their guidelines every 2-3 years, and most do so every 5-10 years. WP's current HP code was promulgated in 2001.
Recommendation No. 6

Use Whatever State - Level Programs That Are Still Funded

- The Florida Historical Marker Program.
- Florida Heritage Site or a Florida Heritage Landmark Program.
- FDOT projects.

1) The Florida Historical Marker Program makes available highway and street markers to identify historical events and historic places. These markers are another tool that contributes to historic preservation education programs. Typically, markers appear in the form of bronze or composite signs with a standardized, but distinctive shape employed by the Florida Department of State. Likewise, the exact, detailed requirements a resource to can be considered either a Florida Heritage Site or a Florida Heritage Landmark, with appropriate signage (www.flheritage.com/preservation/markers). The BHP will match fund these projects, which run about $3-4 K in toto.

(Side-note: The WP local plaque design program needs to be expanded to more than $2-3K per annum, standardized, and codified to make it official).

2) FDOT projects. Although they can take a long time to come to fruition, road improvement projects, specifically downtown streetscaping projects, are another way to back into historic preservation funding. The City of Mount Dora has been highly successful with this program.
Recommendation No. 7
Archaeological Ordinance and GIS Predictive Model

Many cities in Florida (Sarasota, Jacksonville, St. Augustine, Indian Beach, Fernandina Beach, etc.) have both an archaeological ordinance and an archaeological predictive model. Archaeological ordinances and GIS predictive models are vital for underground utilities work which happens every few decades, construction zones adjacent to cemeteries, and Native American issues.

Formalizes the City’s commitment to identify and protect, and recover when necessary, significant archaeological resources on public and private projects in the City;

Add a new article to the City Code dealing with Archaeological Resources, with standards tied to a specific probability zones;

Specific zones of archaeological probability (ZAPs) are classified in a Geographical Information Systems (GIS) overlay as high, medium, low, and known archaeological site probabilities;

Sets up procedures for identifying and preserving significant archaeological resources City-wide;

Defines criteria to determine which sites are significant and focuses on protecting significant sites in place and/or mitigating development impacts on significant sites

provides for staff approvals with a letter of concurrence if development will not impact any identified significant archaeological sites (this can be tied to DHR with an MOA and thus reduce review time and save builders money);

set up procedures for the preparation and implementation of a mitigation plan by the applicant when the development will impact a significant archaeological site; and,

this could be a CLG grant project, based on established DHR funding cycles.
For over thirty-five years, various property owners, organizations, and municipal officials have expressed an interest in documenting, recognizing, and preserving the heritage of Winter Park. Since 1978, various spot surveys have been conducted in the downtown, each of those recording a sampling of historic architecture in the downtown. In at least five previous instances between 1978 and 2005, agencies, organizations, and consultants have surveyed only select buildings and sites in Winter Park's downtown.

The next Comprehensive Plan update is due in 2016, so the City should update as fully as possible before then.

There must be more survey on the ground, since it is not possible to manage what you do not know is there. There are large voids in survey coverage areas – whole neighborhoods are omitted, and areas need to be tied up.

Of note, some updating has been done by the City to remove demolished (too many) properties and added a few previously overlooked buildings.

The databases of what has been recorded previously must be geo-rectified and corrected. This is a serious problem (i.e., the USGS map so many people used pre-GIS has the WP city street names wrong, so addresses are often wonky).

This is a lot of work, but could be a CLG grant project, based on established DHR funding cycles.

From a techno-functional standpoint, a complete coverage survey must be done first, because it is not possible to manage resources which are unknown.
Recommendation No. 9
Architectural Review (AR)/Design Guidelines Need to be Developed for Each Historic Zone in the City

- Design Guidelines define standards of architectural design and site development relative to the development, construction, and modifications to structures within a defined zone;
- Different historic areas of WP would have standards appropriate for the uses therein;
- Adherence to these Guidelines would result in orderly, aesthetically pleasing development that preserves and enhances property values for all owners, and upholds the values of traditional neighborhood development;
- Guidelines need to be well illustrated in terms of graphics and thorough in terms of recognized architectural styles - the goal is consistency;
- To codify / link to these guidelines, at a minimum the addition of a standardized list of ten, local, non-fanciful, standards under Section 58-469 (1) of the WP Code is recommended;
- HPB in concert with Planning Department would act as the architectural review body; and, this could be a CLG grant project, based on established DHR funding cycles.

While acknowledging the current WP downtown façade regulations guidelines, for the most part, the current code just weakly refers to the Secretary of the Interior (SOI) standards. Community support has not been present in the past, however the city must consider comprehensive architectural designs which cover the whole City.

The purpose of Design Guidelines is to define certain standards of architectural design and site development relative to the development, construction, and life cycle modifications to structures within a defined zone;

Different historic zones of the city would have standards appropriate for the uses therein.

Adherence to these Guidelines will result in orderly, aesthetically pleasing development that preserves and enhances property values for all owners, and upholds the values of traditional neighborhood development;

The guidelines need to be well illustrated in terms of graphics and thorough in terms of recognized architectural styles - the goal is consistency; architectural features and styles must be depicted in black and white line art;

To codify / link to these guidelines, at a minimum the addition of a standardized list of ten, local, non-fanciful, standards under Section 58-469 (1) of the WP Code is recommended.

The HPB in concert with Planning Department would act as the architectural review body; this could be a CLG grant project, based on established DHR funding cycles.
The current comprehensive plan was adopted in 2009 (Ordinance No. 2762-09), while Amendments to the Future Land Use and Intergovernmental Coordination Elements were adopted in October 2010, and the Capital Improvements Element was amended in September 2011. While there is an HP section in the Future Land Use section, when the city considers a full plan update in 2016 in compliance with the amended requirements of Chapter 163, F.S., the city should incorporate a new historic preservation element in the comprehensive plan.
Recommendation No. 11
Continue to Encourage Historic Preservation Activities

Respectfully leverage local groups such as the Winter Park Chamber of Commerce, the Winter Park Historical Society, Friends of Casa Feliz, and many others, etc.;

- Public education through a historic preservation day, week, or month;
- Public speaking events and conferences at the local library;
- Use state resources like DHR, BHP, FDOT, and non-profit resources like FTHP;
- Recognition awards for home restoration of year, historic garden of the month, publications, fundraising, and individual contributions;
- Public relations material such as low frequency AM broadcasts, maps and brochures, websites, and signage;
- However, recognize that these activities are secondary to the serious and fundamental, primary HP problems which WP faces; and,
- Acknowledge that this technical HP work can not all be done by volunteers, no matter how well intentioned or civic-minded they might be.

Respectfully leverage local groups such as the Winter Park Chamber of Commerce, the Winter Park Historical Society, Friends of Casa Feliz, and many others, etc.;

Public education through a historic preservation day, week, or month;

Public speaking events and conferences at the local library;

Use state resources like DHR, BHP, FDOT, and non-profit resources like the Florida Trust;

Recognition awards for home restoration of year, historic garden of the month, publications, fundraising, and individual contributions;

Public relations material such as low frequency AM broadcasts, maps and brochures, websites, and signage;

However, recognize that these activities are secondary to the serious and fundamental, primary HP problems which WP faces.

Acknowledge that this technical HP work can not all be done by volunteers, no matter how well intentioned or civic-minded they might be.
Winter Park is among the most historic cities in Florida. And Winter Park's elected officials, property owners, merchants are at an important crossroads in the City's preservation history.

Only two historic districts have been established to date, and relatively few NRHP individual nominations.

Historic structures were sparse to begin with in WP, and are being lost at a staggering rate; about 1.2% of the NET, known historic structures are leveled each year, and this rate is accelerating. (Based upon rough data from previous WP HP surveys). If the historic structure density drops too low, then historic districts can never be formed due to loss of spatial contiguity. And if there is too much destruction in an existing district, it can be de-listed by the Keeper.

WP needs to fund, very substantially, HP every year, and soon; many cities have a full-time HP department or at least a staff member and they are competing successfully for limited HP funds. Although the planning department does a huge amount with a little bit, WP's HP program lags behind its neighboring municipalities.

Use it or lose it – management of historic resources needs to become preservation of historic structures. Historic resources are non-renewable and once they are gone they can not be replaced.

Tear down all the historic structures, and your tax base, both property and income, will most assuredly follow. This is a grim trend which must be reversed.
Thank you.
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