Location:	Citywide
Proposal:	Amend the Planning Code to establish findings and requirements for the demolition of historic resources.
Applicant:	City Planning Commission
General Plan:	All General Plan designations
Existing Zoning:	All zoning designations
Environmental Determination:	The proposal relies on the previously certified Final Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the Land Use and Transportation Element of the General Plan (1998); the Final Environmental Report for the 1998 Amendment to the Historic Preservation Element of the General Plan; and the Housing Element Update Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration (2004). As a separate and independent basis, the proposal is also exempt from CEQA pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15183 "Projects Consistent with a Community Plan, General Plan or Zoning" and/or 15061(b)(3)(General Rule—no possibility of significant environmental impact.
Case File Number:	ZT09251
Action to be taken:	Discuss and make recommendation to the City Council.
For further information:	Contact: **Neil Gray** at 238-3878 or email ngray@oaklandnet.com

SUMMARY

On July 7, 2009, the City Council voted to adopt new zoning designations for the Central Business District. At the meeting, the City Council also directed staff to develop findings required to be met for the City to approve the demolition of a historic building. The current proposal reflects this direction.

Staff recommends that the Planning Commission review staff's proposal and make recommendations to the City Council.

BACKGROUND

On July 7, 2009, the City Council voted to adopt new zoning designations for the Central Business District and directed staff to develop required findings necessary for the City to approve the demolition of a historic building. The Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board (LPAB) met six times to develop citywide requirements for the demolition of Designated or Potentially Designated Historic Properties[1]. Historic Preservation and Strategic Planning Staff used these recommendations as a basis for new recommendations to the Zoning Update Committee on January 20, 2010. Attachment A contains a summary of the current recommendations for amendments to the Planning Code and required material to be submitted with an application for demolition. Attachment B contains the recommended additions and deletions from the Planning Code. These attachments reflect changes proposed by the Zoning Update Committee (see Zoning Update Committee Recommendations section, below, for a description of these changes). The staff report for Zoning Update Committee is contained in Attachment C.

REGULATORY FRAMEWORK

The Historic Preservation Element (HPE) of the General Plan, adopted in 1994 (amended in 1998), provides a strategy to preserve the City's historic resources and establishes a rating system for historic neighborhoods and individual buildings. The HPE establishes a rating system for individual historic buildings of "A" (highest importance) to "E" (no particular interest)[2]. The element also establishes the criteria and process to establish a landmark property. The HPE separates historic neighborhoods into two categories: Areas of Primary Importance (API's) and Areas of Secondary Importance (ASIs). APIs are historically or visually cohesive areas that appear eligible for the National Register of Historic Places. These areas contain a high proportion of individual properties rated "C" or greater; at least two-thirds of the properties in an API must contribute to its principal historical or architectural theme. Examples of APIs include Old Oakland, Mills College, Preservation Park, Oak Center, and Haddon Hill. ASIs are similar to APIs except they do not appear eligible to be on the National Register and they require two-thirds of the properties to be either *potential* contributors or contributors to the historic district. Examples of ASIs include the Rockridge and Fruitvale commercial districts, Jingletown, and the Clinton residential neighborhood.

The HPE also contains goals, policies and actions that govern how the City will treat historic and neighborhoods and properties, including their demolition. The demolition policies in the HPE provide the foundation for developing demolition findings in the Planning Code. The following lists these demolition related policies:

---

[1] Designated Historic properties include Landmarks, potential or potential contributors to Preservation Districts (S-7 and S-20 zones and Areas of Primary Importance). Potentially Designated Historic Properties include "A", "B" and "C" rated buildings and buildings that contribute to an Area of Secondary Importance (ASI).

[2] A = Highest Importance, B = Major Importance, C = Secondary Importance, D = Minor Importance, E = No particular interest.

Policy 2.4 Landmark and Preservation District Regulations.

Demolitions and removals involving Landmarks or Preservation Districts will generally not be permitted or be subject to postponement unless certain findings are made. Demolition or removal of more important Landmarks and of most Preservation District properties will normally not be permitted without the required findings, while demolition or removal of less important Landmarks will be subject only to postponement.

a) Demolitions and removals involving Landmarks or Preservation Districts will generally not be permitted or be subject to postponement unless certain findings are made. Demolition or removal of more important Landmarks and of most Preservation District properties will normally not be permitted without the required findings, while demolition or removal of less important Landmarks will be subject only to postponement.

c) Findings for approval of demolitions, removals, alterations, or new construction involving Landmarks or Preservation Districts will seek to balance preservation of these properties with other concerns.

d) Specific regulatory provisions are set forth in the tables entitled "Demolition and Removal Regulations for Landmarks and Preservation Districts" (see Attachment B) and "Alteration and New Construction Regulations for Landmarks and Preservation Districts."

Policy 3.5: Historic Preservation and Discretionary Permit Approvals.

(First paragraph of Policy omitted because it is not related to the demolition of historic resources)

For any project involving complete demolition of Heritage Properties or Potential Designated Historic Properties requiring discretionary City permits, the City will make a finding that: (1) the design quality of the proposed project is at least equal to that of the original structure and is compatible with the character of the neighborhood; <u>or</u> (2) the public benefits of the proposed project outweigh the benefit of retaining the original structure; <u>or</u> (3) the existing design is undistinguished and does not warrant retention and the proposed design is compatible with the character of the neighborhood.

3.7: Property Relocation Rather than Demolition as Part of Discretionary Projects

As a condition of approval for all discretionary projects involving demolition of existing or Potential Designated Historic Properties, the City will normally require that reasonable efforts be made to relocate the properties to an acceptable site.

Action 3.7.1: Property Relocation Procedures and Design Guidelines for All Discretionary Projects.

Prepare property relocation procedures and design guidelines to be adopted by the LPAB and City Planning Commission for existing or Potential Designated Historic Properties required to be relocated pursuant to discretionary City Approvals.

EXISTING DEMOLITION REGULATIONS

The Planning Code contains two Preservation District zoning designations: the S-7 Preservation Combining Zone and the S-20 Historic Preservation District Combining Zone. Both these zones contain provisions that allow for the postponement of – and require special criteria for – the demolition of historic structures. The S-7 district is designated in various areas, including the 7th Street Commercial District, the Belleview-Staten Apartment District, Old Oakland, and Preservation Park in Downtown. Sheffield Village in the North Hills and Oak Center in West Oakland have an S-20 designation.

Subsections 17.136.070(C-D) of the Planning Code (see Attachment C) require a design review process and contain required criteria to demolish Landmarks. Section 17.136.075 contains regulations allowing the Planning Director to postpone the demolition of a Local Register property[1].

PROPOSAL

Proposed Findings

The proposed findings are grouped into two basic categories of historic resources: 1) Local Register Properties[1] and 2) contributors to ASIs and "C" rated properties that do not contribute to a historic district. These categories were chosen because the demolition of a Local Register Property will generally require the preparation of an Environmental Impact Report under the California Environmental Quality Act, while the demolition of ASI contributors or noncontributing "C" rated properties generally do not. Local Register properties also have two subcategories of findings under the proposal: properties that are within a major historic district (an S-7 Combining Zone, S-20 Combining Zone, or an API) and those that are outside a major historic district. These subcategories were chosen so that the impacts of demolitions on historic districts could be specifically addressed with new findings.

Each category of historic structures contains two requirements: findings in the Planning Code that need to be met in order to demolish the historic resource and corresponding submittals required to be included with the demolition application. The submittals specifically describe the type and content of studies required to determine whether a demolition finding can be met. The Planning Director could make adjustments to these submittal requirements if they are consistent with the intent of those contained in this proposal. This is similar to current administrative procedures that allow the Planning Director to determine what submittals are required with a development application.

The following summarizes staff's recommendations. The complete proposal is contained in Attachment A and the actual Planning Code amendments are contained in Attachment B.

[1] Local Register properties include: Landmarks, contributors to S-7 and S-20 preservation districts, contributors to APIs, Heritage Properties (properties that appear potentially eligible for landmark or Preservation District designation), properties on the Study List, and properties with an "A" or "B" historic rating.

Findings for Individual Local Register Properties

The following are recommendations for required findings and submittals to demolish individual properties on the local register (Landmarks, "A" and "B" rated buildings, and Heritage Properties) that are outside an S-7 zone, S-20 zone, or an API. Either Findings 1 or 2 and each of the remaining findings would need to be met to demolish one of these structures.

Findings 1-2: 1) The applicant demonstrates that the existing property has no reasonable use or cannot generate a reasonable economic return and that the development replacing it will provide such use or generate such return; or 2) The applicant demonstrates that the property constitutes a hazard and is economically infeasible to rehabilitate on its present site [see 17.136.075(B)(1) of Attachment B].

These findings directly implement HPE Policy 2.4 and are contained in Table 4-1, "Demolition and Removal Regulations for Landmarks and Preservation Districts" of the HPE (see Attachment C). The submittal findings for Finding 1 would include studies regarding the economic viability of keeping the current building; the soundness of the building; the building maintenance history; the appraised value of the existing building; and public benefits. Finding 2 can be met if the City determines that the building is an imminent hazard to public safety.

Finding 3: The design quality of the replacement facility is equal/superior to that of the existing facility [see 17.136.075(B)(2) of Attachment B].

Like Findings 1 and 2, this finding directly implements HPE Policy 2.4 and is contained in Table 4-1 of the HPE (see Attachment C). The submittal requirements include an analysis, prepared by a historic architect or professional with equivalent experience, of the replacement facility in terms of design value, materials, visual interest, composition, detailing, and other items.

Finding 4: It is infeasible to incorporate the building into the proposed development [see 17.136.075(B)(3) of Attachment B].

This finding is not directly from the HPE, but staff believes that incorporating a historic building into a new development can provide opportunities for saving the historic resource as well as create interesting new architecture. Combining new and old buildings has been successfully done for developments such as the Altenheim, the Fox Theater, and Whole Foods in Oakland and the Jewish Contemporary Museum in San Francisco.

Findings for Local Register Properties that Contribute to a Historic District

The following summarizes the findings and submittals required to demolish individual properties on the Local Register (Landmarks, "A" and "B" rated buildings, Preservation Study List Properties, and Heritage Properties) that are within an S-7 zone, S-20 zone, or an API. Either Findings 1 or 2 and each of the remaining applicable findings would need to be met to demolish one of these structures.

Findings 1 - 2: 1) The applicant demonstrates that the existing property has no reasonable use or cannot generate a reasonable economic return and that the development replacing it will provide such use or generate such return; <u>or</u> 2) the applicant demonstrates that the property constitutes a hazard and is economically infeasible to rehabilitate on its present site [see 17.136.075(C)(1) of Attachment B].

These are the same as Findings 1 and 2, above, for the demolition of an individual Local Register Property. The submittal requirements are also the same as those findings.

Finding 3: For noncontributing properties, the existing facility is either:

a. **Seriously deteriorated or a hazard, <u>or</u>**
b. **The existing design is undistinguished and does not warrant retention [see 17.136.075(C)(2) of Attachment B].**

This finding also directly implements HPE Policy 2.4 and is contained in Table 4.1 of the HPE (see Attachment C). For (a), the submittal requirement includes a determination of an imminent hazard by the City. For (b), an application for submittal would require an analysis of whether a noncontributing property could feasibly become a contributor after damages to the building were reversed.

Finding 4: For all properties in a district: The design quality of the replacement facility is superior to that of the existing facility [see 17.136.075(C)(3) of Attachment B].

This finding directly implements HPE Policy 2.4 and is contained in Table 4.1 of the HPE (see Attachment B). The submittal requirements include an analysis prepared by a historic architect or professional with equivalent experience of of the replacement facility in terms of design value, materials, visual interest, composition, detailing, and other items.

Finding 5: For all properties in a district: the design of the replacement project is compatible with the character of the preservation district, and there is no erosion of design quality at the project site and in the surrounding area. This includes, but is not necessarily limited to, the following additional criteria:

a. **The replacement project is compatible with the district in terms of massing, siting, rhythm, composition, patterns of openings, quality of material, and intensity of detailing;**
b. **New street frontage with forms that reflect the widths and rhythm of the facades on the street and entrances that reflect the patterns on the street;**
c. **The replacement project provides high visual interest that either reflects the level and quality of visual interest of the district contributors or otherwise enhances the visual interest of the district;**
d. **If the design contrasts the new to the historic character, the replacement project enriches the historic character of the district;**
e. **Is consistent with the visual cohesiveness of the district. For the purpose of this item, visual cohesiveness is the architectural character, the sum of all visual aspects,**

features, and materials that defines the district. A new structure contributes to the visual cohesiveness of a district if it relates to the design characteristics of a historic district while also conveying its own time. New construction may do so by drawing upon some basic building features, such as the way in which a building is located on its site, the manner in which it relates to the street, its basic mass, form, direction or orientation (horizontal vs. vertical), recesses and projections, quality of materials, patterns of openings and level of detailing. When a combination of some these design variables are arranged in a new building to relate to those seen traditionally in the area, but integral to the design and character of the proposed new construction, visual cohesiveness results; and

f. The project will not cause the district to lose its current historic status [see 17.136.075(C)(3) of Attachment B].

The first paragraph of this finding directly implements HPE Policy 2.4 and is contained in Table 4.1 of the HPE (see Attachment C). Criteria a) through f) refine the HPE policy by providing specific compatibility requirements. These criteria are consistent with the recently adopted requirements for new construction in an historic district in the Central Business District. The submittal requirements include an analysis of several discussion points regarding compatibility, including:

- The replacement project's architectural compatibility with the district without being subservient. If it is subservient to the district character, is it a watered down version of a period revival style or a generic building or a visually cohesive design with a strong concept?
- The new building's contemporary interpretation of the demolished building's elements in terms of the cultural, historic, economic, or technological trends of its time.
- The preservation of the authenticity of the existing historic district with a replacement building that has an authenticity of its own time.
- The compatibility of the design of the replacement proposal with the district without being merely a compilation of façade features that are common to district or a caricature of the buildings in the district.

The findings and the submittals emphasize that a replacement project should not imitate the façade of existing historic buildings, but rather relate to the district in more contemporary fashion. In other words, a new building should have elements that relate to the district, but should not be imitative or a caricature of its historic buildings.

Finding #6: It is infeasible to incorporate the building into the proposed development [see 17.136.075(C)(3) of Attachment B].

This is the same as Finding 4 for the demolition of an individual Local Register property. The submittal requirements are also the same as that finding.

<u>Findings for "C" rated buildings and ASI contributors</u>

The following summarizes the findings and submittals required to demolish a PDHP that are not on the Local Register. These include "C" rated buildings and buildings that contribute to an ASI. There are four findings listed for these historic resources, but an applicant would have a choice of three combinations findings to meet: Findings 1 and 3; or Findings 2 and 3; or just 4. The following lists the findings:

Finding 1: The design quality of the proposed replacement project is at least equal to that of the original structure and the proposed replacement project is compatible with the character of the neighborhood [see 17.136.075(D)(1) of Attachment B].

Finding 2: The public benefits of the proposed project outweigh the benefit of retaining the original structure [see 17.136.075(D)(2) of Attachment B].

Finding 3: It is economically, architecturally, or structurally infeasible to incorporate the historic building into the proposed development [see 17.136.075(D)(3) of Attachment B].

Finding 4: The existing design is undistinguished and does not warrant retention and the proposed design is compatible with the character of the neighborhood [see 17.136.075(D)(4) of Attachment B].

Findings 1, 2, and 4 are directly from the HPE. According to the HPE, only one of these findings needs to be met to demolish a "C" rated building or a contributor to an ASI. Staff recommends that Finding 2 also be required with Finding 1 or 2 because of the many opportunities to make additions to existing historic buildings. An application to demolish a building can be approved if only Finding 4 is met because demolition is no longer an issue if the building proposed for demolition is undistinguished and the new building is compatible with the district.

The submittal requirements for Findings 1 and 2 include an analysis of equal quality and compatibility by a historic architect. The submittal requirements emphasize that replacement projects should be compatible with the district without being a caricature of its historic buildings. The submittal requirements for 3 and 4 include analyses by qualified experts.

Other Proposed Code Amendments

Staff proposes the following other significant changes to the Planning or Municipal Code to accommodate the proposed findings:

- The required design review process for several zones was modified to require a design review process for alterations to Designated Historic Properties and Potentially Designated Historic Properties. These sections currently only require a design review process for Local Register Properties. This change assures that the proposed demolition findings will be required for both Designated and Potentially Designated Historic Properties.
- Section 17.136.025(B)(1)(c) of the Planning Code and Section 15.36.080(B) of the Municipal Code are proposed to be amended to no longer exempt the demolition of

"nuisance" structures which are historic resources without first gaining design review approval. This change assures that a historic property can only be demolished without design review approval if its structural integrity is so compromised that it poses an immediate threat to health and safety. Demolition of historic nuisance structures would require design review, whereas non-historic structures could be abated without design review.The change also allows the planning department to review the design of replacement buildings. The modification change to the Building Code requires further review from the Building Department prior to a hearing in front of the City Council.

- Staff proposes to delete Section 15.36.080(A) of the Municipal Code to remove a significant loophole in the regulations that allows the demolition of any building if it results in a surface parking lot or a vacant lot without first obtaining a building permit for a replacement structure. This modification requires further review from the Building Department prior to a hearing in front of the City Council.
- Various section of the Planning Code (17.136.070(E), 17.84.060 and 17.100B.070) currently allow the demolition of a Landmark or a contributor or potential contributor to the S-7 or S-20 historic preservation districts after a postponement period even after a Design Review application to demolish the building is denied by the City. Staff proposes to delete these sections so that denial of a Design Review application can prevent such demolitions, not merely postpone them.

ZONING UPDATE COMMITTEE (ZUC) RECOMMENDATIONS

The ZUC proposed the following changes to Staff's recommendation at their January 20, 2010 meeting:

1. Include in the submittal requirements text that require a comparison of the proposed replacement project to the existing project when a finding requires that a replacement project has equal or superior design quality to the demolished structure;
2. Amend the discussion point regarding the public benefits of a project to include areas that exhibit change and growth "evidenced by the scale, use and building type;" and
3. Add the building soundness report and building maintenance history to the required documentation for the demolition of hazardous historic buildings.

The first two changes are recommended by staff and included in Attachment A. Staff discussed the third recommendation with the Oakland Heritage Alliance (OHA), the group that proposed the change, due to a concern that the time taken to perform a building maintenance history of a building that is an imminent hazard would endanger the health and safety of the public. The OHA agreed that only a building soundness should be required. This change is also included in Attachment A.

MINOR MODIFICATIONS

Staff requests that the Planning Commission authorize staff to make minor changes, clarifications and refinements to the proposal prior to submittal to the City Council. This may be required to clean up language, correct typing errors, or make other minor changes consistent with the Commission's recommendations. Although not anticipated, Staff proposes to bring any staff

initiated significant or controversial changes back to the Planning Commission for further recommendation prior to submittal to the City Council.

ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATION

The proposal relies on the previously certified Final Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the Land Use and Transportation Element of the General Plan (1998); the Final Environmental Report for the 1998 Amendment to the Historic Preservation Element of the General Plan; and the Housing Element Update Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration (2004). As a separate and independent basis, the proposal is also exempt from CEQA pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15183 "Projects Consistent with a Community Plan, General Plan or Zoning" and/or 15061(b)(3)(General Rule—no possibility of significant environmental impact.

Reliance on Existing Environmental Documents

Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the LUTE

The EIR for the LUTE evaluated the environmental impacts of the proposal and anticipated future reliance on it for actions that were consistent with it and intended to implement it. Reliance on the LUTE EIR is appropriate as stated on page I-4 of that document:

> The EIR may also be used at a future date by the Planning Commission and City Council to evaluate the environmental impacts of subsequent actions that are consistent with the Land use and Transportation Element or are intended to implement the Land Use and Transportation Element.

Further, the changes to the ordinance being proposed were evaluated by the LUTE EIR. The LUTE EIR specifically states that the document may be used to evaluate the environmental impacts of "amendments of the Zoning Ordinance and Zoning Map for General Plan consistency". Page III.G-13 of the LUTE EIR states that LUTE policies regarding high density construction could result in the demolition of historic structures. The LUTE incorporates the 24 policies and 66 actions contained in the HPE designed to project historic buildings.

The EIR identifies the following mitigation measures:

1. Mitigation Measure G.3a: Amend the Zoning Regulations text to incorporate the new preservation regulations and Districts (page III.G.16); and
2. Mitigation Measure G3b: Develop and adopt design guidelines for Landmarks and Preservation Districts (page III.G.16).

The proposal implements the first mitigation measure through new findings in the Planning Code and submittal requirements relating to the demolition of historic resources.

EIR for Amendments to the Historic Preservation Element of the General Plan

In 1998, the City certified an EIR to evaluate the impacts of four new policies proposed for the Historic Preservation Element. The proposed amendments affected Policy 3.2, which delineates the process that city-owned and controlled properties are considered for historic designation; Policy 3.3, which delineates a process that requires property owners to apply for historic designation as a condition of receiving City financial assistance; Policy 3.5, which addresses design review requirement for Potentially Designated Historic Properties; and Policy 3.8, which addresses the City's thresholds for environmental significance for historic properties. This EIR contains several mitigation measures regarding demolition impacts on historic properties to less than significant and identifies others as unavoidable or irreversible. Staff has incorporated the following mitigation into the proposal: Mitigation Measure B.1 Adoption and implementation of the proposed language of Policy 3.5 of the Historic Preservation Element.

Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration for the 2004 Housing Element Update

In 2004, The City certified an Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration for an update to the Housing Element. The element was based on eight goals that provide direction and guidance for meeting the City's housing needs through 2006:

1. Provide adequate sites suitable for all income groups;
2. Promote the development of adequate housing for low- and moderate-income households;
3. Remove constraints to the availability and affordability of housing for all income groups;
4. Conserve and improve older housing and neighborhoods;
5. Preserve affordable rental housing;
6. Promote equal housing opportunity;
7. Promote sustainable development and smart growth; and
8. Increase public access to information through technology.

The Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS/MND) for the element contains several mitigation measures that reduce the impacts of the actions directed by the Housing Element to less than significant. Staff has considered and incorporated the mitigations into the proposal. The IS/MND largely depends on the analysis contained in the LUTE EIR regarding the preservation of historic structures (see above).

Based upon the foregoing, further environmental review is not required as none of the requirements of CEQA Guidelines section 15162 and/or 15163 have been met.

CEQA Guidelines Section 15183

As a separate and independent basis, the proposal is exempt from CEQA under CEQA Guidelines section 15183, which provides that projects that are consistent with the development density established by existing general plan policies for which an EIR was certified shall not require additional environmental review, except to examine project-specific significant effects that are peculiar to the project. This allowed exemption streamlines the review of projects.

1. As discussed in the "General Plan Analysis" section of this document, the project is consistent with the LUTE, for which an EIR was certified in March 1998, and the Historic Preservation Element (HPE) of the General Plan, for which an EIR was certified in 1998.

2. Feasible mitigation measures identified in the LUTE and HPE EIRs were adopted and have been, or will be, undertaken;

3. The LUTE and HPE EIRs and this environmental review evaluated impacts peculiar to the project and/or project site, as well as off-site and cumulative impacts, and found them to be adequately addressed. The project is an implementation of the LUTE and the HPE and, therefore, no new impact should result from the project not anticipated by the EIRs for those plans.

4. Uniformly applied development policies and/or standards (imposed as Standard Conditions of Approval) have previously been adopted by the City Council on November 8, 2008. These conditions will substantially mitigate the impacts of future projects.

5. Substantial new information does not exist to show that these Standard Conditions of Approval and mitigations identified above will not substantially mitigate the project and cumulative impacts.

CEQA Guidelines Section 15061(b)(3)

As a further separate and independent basis, the proposal is also exempt from CEQA under CEQA Guidelines section 15061(b)(3), which provides that where it can be seen with certainty that a project will not have significant impacts, no environmental review is required. Here, the proposed demolition findings and submittal requirements are more restrictive than the current regulations regarding historic resources.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the Planning Commission recommend approval of: a) the submittal requirements contained in Attachment A; (b) the Planning Code amendments contained in Attachment B; and (c) Municipal Code requirements contained in Attachment B to the City Council.

Prepared by:

_____
NEIL GRAY, Planner III

Approved for forwarding to the
Zoning Update Committee of the
City Planning Commission

_____
ERIC ANGSTADT
Deputy Director
Community and Economic Development Agency

ATTACHMENTS:

A. Summary of proposed findings and submittal requirement for the demolition of historic resources.
B. Proposed Planning and Municipal Code Amendments.
C. Staff report for the January 20, 2010 meeting of the Zoning Update Committee.