



ONE CITY. ONE
JACKSONVILLE.

City of Jacksonville, Florida

Lenny Curry, Mayor

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

June 30, 2022

Peggy Sidman, Director/Council Secretary
Jacksonville City Council
117 West Duval Street, 4th Floor – Suite 425
City Hall – St James Building
Jacksonville, FL 32202

RE: Jacksonville Historic Preservation Commission Required Annual Report

Ms. Sidman:

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

Kind Regards,

Kristen D. Reed, AICP
Chief of Community Planning
Planning and Development Department
214 North Hogan Street, Suite 300
Jacksonville, Florida 32202
(904) 255-7837
KReed@coj.net

Jack C. Demetree III
Chairman
Jacksonville Historic Preservation Commission

SK/BK/KR/JD



City of Jacksonville

Historic Preservation Commission

Annual Report

June 30, 2022

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

Introduction

This report contains a breakdown of all the activities of the Jacksonville Historic Preservation Commission (“Commission”) from July 2021 to June 2022, as well as the current makeup of the Commission. Additionally, there is a brief narrative assessing the Commission’s effectiveness over this period.

There is a table beginning on page three that details all of the different activities of the Commission. There are a number of application types addressed in the table. Definitions from Chapters 307, 320 and 780 *Code of Ordinances* are provided for reference.

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

The Commission hears appeals of staff determinations related to applications for local Historic Rehabilitation Tax Exemptions, as defined and codified in Chapter 780, Part 3. The Commission reviews all Certificates of Appropriateness that have not been delegated to staff. They review all landmark designation requests and make recommendations to City Council on those applications for designation. The Commission reviews requests for the naming and renaming of public streets, public parks, and the designation of scenic corridors. The Commission reviews applications for Certificates of Appropriateness for approval of work after-the-fact as violations. The Commission also reviews nomination applications for National Register of Historic Places listing, and they nominate sites for listing on the Register. Occasionally, they also give awards of recognition for preservation work in the City.

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

Commission Members

The Commission is currently comprised of seven members. One position is currently vacant.

The current members are as follows:

Position	Commissioner	Term end date
Chair:	Jack C. Demetree III	March 4, 2024
Vice Chair:	Andres Lopera	March 4, 2022
Secretary:	Erik Kasper	March 4, 2020
Commissioner:	Julia Epstein	March 4, 2024
Commissioner:	Maximilian Globber	March 4, 2023
Commissioner:	Michael Montoya	March 4, 2022
Commissioner:	Vacant	



Definitions

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

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

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

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

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

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

Downtown Preservation and Rehabilitation Program / Downtown Historic Rehabilitation Trust Fund: Chapter 111.910 created a process for the Downtown Investment Authority, in conjunction with the Historic Preservation Section of the Planning and Development Department, to administer Trust Fund monies to eligible historic structures that go through a preservation rehabilitation process for returning the structure to active use. The structures must be designated a Local Landmark, per Chapter 307. Additionally, Chapter 55 created the Downtown Preservation and Revitalization Program (DPRP), to foster the preservation and revitalization of unoccupied, underutilized, and/or deteriorating historic, and qualified non-historic, buildings located in Downtown. The projects are reviewed by Staff, and the Commission as necessary with regards to the designation of these buildings as local landmarks, or with regards to COA approvals.



Table of Commission Actions

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

	COAs	Violations	OOAs	MMAs	320 Reviews	Letters of Support	Landmark designations/ changes to staff approvals/ other non-COA applications, ETC.
Jul-21	14	1					
Aug-21	13	1					Designation Recommendation for Landmark of 128 West Adams Street; Road Re-naming from Racetrack Road to Race Track Road
Sep-21	12	1					Road Re-naming from Tampa Avenue to Droad Street; Remand of Appeal for 1043 Walnut Street
Oct-21	25	2					
Nov-21	6				1		
Dec-21	8	1			1	Letter of Support for Grant for St. Philip's Episcopal Church	National Register Nomination for Clifton Cemetery
Jan-22	13	1		1			Designation Recommendation for Landmarks of 604 North Hogan Street and 211 West Ashley Street
Feb-22	Meeting not held – no quorum						
Mar-22	14	3			2		Designation Recommendation for Landmark of 327-345 East Bay Street
Apr-22	Meeting not held – no quorum						



							Letter of Support for Grant for Historic Preservation Section	Designation Recommendation for Landmarks of 318 North Broad Street and 525 West Beaver Street; Park Naming for Seiden Park
May-22	20	3		2	1			
June-22	10	1			1			Edgewood Circle Drainage Improvement Project – COJ Notification

Commission Effectiveness

As a quasi-judicial body, the review of applications is an easy benchmark to demonstrate the Commission's effectiveness, as shown in the table contained herein. The primary goal of the Commission is to preserve the City's history, through the preservation of historic structures and sites. The most obvious cases are requests to demolish historic structures, particularly those that are contributing to a local historic district. Though the best outcome is preservation, this is not always possible. The Commission continues to preserve structures that are truly salvageable by not allowing these structures to be demolished. They are also amenable to requests for demolition of structures that have been damaged by the elements, insects, or general deterioration to the point of structural failure.

The Commission has worked over the last year to improve the process for Certificates of Appropriateness (COA) review, by encouraging staff to review certain applications through expanded administrative approval with limitations. The Commission periodically examines these specific limitations and has expanded the scope for staff; thereby reducing the amount of applications that must go before the Commission. This was done in an effort to alleviate the time delay and additional costs placed upon applicants.

Staff has worked with the Commission to resolve violations through the Special Magistrate process, as opposed to Commission review, which is an option outlined in Chapter 307. Staff has been working with the Office of General Council to explore enforcement alternatives to prevent large numbers of violations going before the Commission. Violations tend to be the most time consuming applications, and typically result in other enforcement actions, either through the Special Magistrate, or in some cases, City Council. Staff has worked with the Commission to attempt to settle cases related to violations as an alternative to the costly process of appealing to the LUZ Committee. Generally, the Commission offers guidance on what would be acceptable outcomes to resolve violations, and staff works to achieve those outcomes through negotiation.

The Commission has migrated from paper applications to using the Land Use and Zoning Application Portal and from mailed Commission meeting books to an electronic format, with City provided tablets. This has made staff more effective and has improved the quality of the applications given to the Commission, in the form of scalable pictures and plans, and color images. Additionally, it has led to more transparency with the public, who can now log into a website and see all applications going to the Commission.



Appeals may be considered an additional benchmark. Appeals are not a common outcome for most of this Commission's actions. It is the goal of the Commission that their decisions be upheld when appeals occur. Four (4) appeals have been filed over the past year. Of these, City Council upheld the decision of the JHPC in two (2) of the appeals, and one (1) was upheld with conditions added. In the remaining appeal, the appellant was found to not have standing. One (1) appeal is currently anticipated to be filed and will be heard by the Land Use and Zoning (LUZ) Committee in July or August 2022.

