

As We See It, the project launched by the Historic Preservation Officer in July to replace the city's historic preservation ordinance, <u>Chapter 50</u> in the Code of Ordinances, and move it to Land Development Regulations is unnecessarily ambitious.

At the quarterly meeting of the NSB Residents' Coalition in August the Leadership Group of the Coalition voted to request the HPC to **amend** the current Historic Preservation Ordinance rather than **rewrite** it and to leave it in the city's Code of Ordinances as Chapter 50 for the following reasons.

- Our current HPO has been certified by the National Park Service and that ranking
 has enabled New Smyrna Beach to be a <u>Certified Local Government city (CLG)</u>.
 The program provides many <u>benefits</u> to our city including small grant money. There
 is no guarantee that a totally rewritten HPO will be approved by the State Bureau of
 Historic Preservation as is required for CLG cities. Amendments, too, must be approved as well but changes to single entries are more transparent and efficient.
- As a CLG city the wording in our Historic Preservation Ordinance must be consistent
 with both state and federal historic preservation guidelines. Our historic preservation
 program was found to be in full compliance after a review from the State in 2018.
 There are no content issues that would require rewriting the entire ordinance.
- Chapter 50, the city's Historic Preservation Ordinance is unlike other ordinances with which citizens are familiar. Although our City Commission can follow certain procedures and change a Land Development Regulation, they cannot change our HPO without first having the State Bureau of Historic Preservation review it. This layer of protection originated in Federal Law with the passage of our National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 (amended in 1980). The 89th Congress passed this law so that ordinary citizens could protect their historic places independent of local politics. Moving Chapter 50 serves no obvious purpose.

It should be noted that the current HPO has rarely been fully implemented. <u>Section 50-6</u> is an example. Although our Historic Preservation Commission members are talented and energized, their desire to fulfill these obligations has not been facilitated. Let's use the tools we have in our current HPO before replacing them.