

Sayers, Margery

From: grace kubofcik <gracek8@verizon.net>
Sent: Friday, June 15, 2018 11:31 AM
To: CouncilMail
Cc: james kubofcik
Subject: Council Bill 46-2018
Attachments: Single Site Hist Districts CB46.docx

Council members attached is my testimony I will be out of town June 18.
Grace Kubofcik

June 15,2018
Re: Council Bill 46-18
Single Site Historic Districts

Chairperson Sigaty and members of the County Council

I am writing in support, with some amendments Council Bill46, which establishes the process to establish Single Site Historic Districts. I appreciate the introduction of this legislation by Councilmember Jon Weinstein. Howard County has many historic resources including at least 700 viable historic buildings. The Department of Planning and Zoning maintains an active list of these resources.

Owners of Historic buildings would be the ones to initiate the process to become a Single Site Historic District. The decision to grant such a designation would include a Department of Planning and Zoning technical report, a public meeting and decision by the Historic Preservation Commission followed by a public hearing and decision by the Howard County Zoning Board.

Amendments Needed:

Section 16.202(2). New language. “and demolition of structures of” this goes to the issue of “neglect” and currently the issue of a nature event such as sever flooding.

Section 16.602(c) line 18 adds the word “the” in front of Zoning Map.

Section 16.602(d)(1)(a) lines 24 -29. Notice to the public. How long before the public meeting of the Preservation Commission will the public have access to the technical staff report? Will adjacent property owners be informed of the proposal and how?

Section 16.602(d) (1)(c)(ii) Rules of procedure notice lines 19 and 20. I do not support the provision that states at least 10days notice posted on the web site. I support 30 days notice.

Section 16.602(d)(2) lines 22-30. Criteria for establishing Single Site Historic Districts.

I strongly support (a) lines 25 and 26.

(b) Lines 27 and 28 protect the integrity of a historic property from “ adverse changes and/or demolition”. What does this mean and through whose eyes is something “adverse”? Demolition, are we avoiding the issue of neglect or just demolition so the property owner can develop something else on the site?

Suggest additional criteria be inserted including the use and preservation of the property, and the setting of the structure.

Thank you for your attention to my comments.

Grace Kubofcik
Ellicott City, MD

Sayers, Margery

From: Mr. Drew <mrdrew@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, June 18, 2018 6:25 AM
To: CouncilMail
Subject: CB46-2018

To the council,

Single site historic districts are a great idea.

However, when I read the language of this bill, I see words about adjusting the boundaries of existing historic districts. It would be very bad if this bill enabled the removal of parcels from existing historic districts.

Part of the value of a historic district is the integrity of the overall context. I think it would be worthwhile to modify the language of this bill to make it clear that the only boundary adjustments allowed for existing districts are ones that increase the area of the district.

Drew Roth
Elkridge