Proposed 2010 Council Study Issue

CDD 09-05 New Heritage Preservation Designation for Existing Structures as "Buildings of Character"

Lead Department Community Development

Element or Sub-element Heritage Preservation

New or Previous Previous

Status Pending **History** **1 year ago** Below the line **2 years ago** None

1. **What are the key elements of the issue? What precipitated it?**

   The Heritage Preservation Commission has identified the desire to study the possible creation of an additional designation for the City's inventory of structures that are deemed as "Buildings of Character." Such buildings may be not considered "Local Landmarks" or "Heritage Resources," but are considered noteworthy as buildings of good quality, and a design that contributes to the character and appearance of an area. They may illustrate, or be reminders of, the historic development of the area and are worthy of City recognition.

   As part of this study, staff would examine the City's inventory of structures (commercial, residential, industrial, etc.) that are not already considered "Heritage Resources" or Local Landmarks" and determine whether a new designation could be warranted. The first step would be to research what impact these designations would have on redevelopment of the subject properties. The study would also define and outline certain parameters for the new designation. The intent of the study would not be to create additional restrictive permitting or construction limitations to such structures beyond the current "Local Landmark" or "Heritage Resource" designation, but rather be a tool that could add value to the property through promoting awareness of the City's notable architecture and link to the past.

2. **How does this relate to the General Plan or existing City Policy?**

   Goal 6.3B: To enhance, preserve and protect Sunnyvale's Heritage including natural features, the built environment and significant artifacts.

   Policy 6.3B.5: Seek out, catalog and evaluate heritage resources which may be significant.

   Goal 6.3B.5d: Where it has been determined that a structure, streetscape or other heritage resource should be considered for designation as a cultural resource or as a landmark, institute the process to designate them accordingly.

3. **Origin of issue**

   Council Member(s)
   General Plan
   City Staff
   Public
   Board or Commission Heritage Preservation Commission

4. **Multiple Year Project?** No **Planned Completion Year** 2010

5. **Expected participation involved in the study issue process?**

Does Council need to approve a work plan?	No
Does this issue require review by a Board/Commission?	Yes

If so, which?
Heritage Preservation Commission

Is a Council Study Session anticipated?	No

What is the public participation process?
City staff would solicit input from property owners, business owners and those with knowledge of historic architecture. Outreach would be conducted to interested parties through community meetings and public hearings.

6. **Cost of Study**

Operating Budget Program covering costs
242 Land Use Planning

Project Budget covering costs

Budget modification $ amount needed for study

Explain below what the additional funding will be used for

7. **Potential fiscal impact to implement recommendations in the Study approved by Council**

Capital expenditure range	None
Operating expenditure range	None
New revenues/savings range	None

Explain impact briefly

8. **Staff Recommendation**

Staff Recommendation None

If 'For Study' or 'Against Study', explain

9. **Estimated consultant hours for completion of the study issue**

Managers

Role	Manager				Hours
Lead	Ryan, Trudi	Mgr CY1:	20	Mgr CY2:	0
		Staff CY1:	150	Staff CY2:	0
Support	Ise, Suzanne	Mgr CY1:	10	Mgr CY2:	0
		Staff CY1:	0	Staff CY2:	0
Interdep	Berry, Kathryn	Mgr CY1:	20	Mgr CY2:	0
		Staff CY1:	0	Staff CY2:	0

Total Hours CY1: 200

Total Hours CY2: 0

Note: If staff's recommendation is 'For Study' or 'Against Study', the Director should note the relative importance of this Study to other major projects that the Department is currently working on or that are soon to begin, and the impact on existing services/priorities.

Reviewed by

Department Director **Date** 10/13/09

Approved by

City Manager **Date** 10-13-09

Addendum

A. Board / Commission Recommendation

☐ **Issue Created Too Late for B/C Ranking**

Board or Commission	Rank	Rank 1 year ago	Rank 2 years ago
Arts Commission			
Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee			
Board of Building Code Appeals			
Board of Library Trustees			
Child Care Advisory Board			
Heritage Preservation Commission	1 of 2	2 of 3	
Housing and Human Services Commission			
Parks and Recreation Commission			
Personnel Board			
Planning Commission			

Board or Commission ranking comments
During their ranking, the Heritage Preservation Commission requested that historic signs be included in this study.

B. Council

Council Rank	(no rank yet)
Start Date	(blank)
Work Plan Review Date	(blank)
Study Session Date	(blank)
RTC Date	(blank)
Actual Complete Date	(blank)
Staff Contact	