



**SMART GROWTH FOCUS AREA:  
Historic Preservation Working Group Meeting  
September 9, 2011**

**Exercise Responses and Meeting Notes**

*\*Policies in red where identified as the top 3 priorities during subgroup discussions.*

**GOAL 1: Leverage Tucson's heritage assets for economic development**

Our community's heritage resources distinguish it from other places, which is a major driver of Tucson's tourism economy. Preservation and promotion of local heritage assets can grow the local economy through *heritage-based* economic development, creating more jobs, increasing tax revenue, raising property values, and encouraging community reinvestment.

**1.a) Preserve Tucson's historic fabric and other heritage resources to distinguish our community from other places, increase quality of life for residents, and attract visitors and a highly skilled workforce.**

Generally Agree

- Must identify what our heritage resources are in order to preserve them.
- It's already under way, through NPZ process.
- New residents need to be educated on Tucson and Southern Arizona Rich heritage.
- All are interconnected
- What does "preserve" mean? City property or not? Requires funding or not? What if preservation is at odds with other goals?
- This is key to the attraction of "creative class" & people between 24-35 years old.
- But how are you going to measure this?
- Ambassador Program like MTCVB Tourism Ambassador. Need more advocates to promote this logical progression, this relationship between preservation and community well-being and prosperity. Go beyond the "choir", the usual suspects who care about historic preservation. Educate other sectors of the community that 1a is true and important.
- This is an umbrella goal – All these come under other headings.
- Over-all statement
- This seems very general – An overall philosophy
- A means to improve economy in a non-destructive manner
- Increase revenue
- Without an identity, we will just be urban sprawl and lousy building that turn bad soon.
- Stronger building code enforcement

Disagree

- Do not agree w/attract visitors. Historic preservation is for local residents. If visitors also appreciate – that's good

**1.b) Pursue heritage designations to boost heritage tourism in the region.**

Generally Agree

- Promote also local community experiences and education
- Local community
- Can be done. Not sure it's a priority.
- Take advantage of Old Tucson and Tucson's rich Movie history.
- Specifically, the National Heritage Area designation. Not just related to tourism. Also, supports quality of life and everything in 1(c)
- Preserve (?) Heritage Area + world Heritage (?) for the region.
- Santa Cruz/Frontage area should be established immediately -Congress-Broadway Historic District
- Santa Cruz River Valley – example
- Increase Revenue
- Would have an immediate impact on our local economy
- But we need sustainable, productive business too.

No Opinion

- Not sure whether this has any effect
- Hard to do- time consuming. Expensive

**1.c) Support heritage businesses, heritage destinations, and annual heritage events, which reflect the multi-cultural history and distinctive living traditions of our community, and provide authentic experiences for heritage travelers.**

Generally Agree

- Feasible & important for the attracting tourism.
- Tucson is made up of different cultures, take advantage of that and celebrate all the contributions different ethnic groups have made to our city.
- And connect residents with the community
- Provide a budget for managing Presidio Heritage Park and keep it open. Encourage MTCVB to market it better.
- Historic commercial buildings 2<sup>nd</sup> RE loc 21 businesses in them need to be protected
- Increase revenue
  - supports local businesses, & local economy
  - tourism
  - preserves cultural
  - community building
  - building an identity a cultural identity
- Include 50yr old buildings etc.

**1.d) Provide incentives for rehabilitation and adaptive reuse of historic buildings, in order to stimulate private investment, create high-wage jobs, raise property values, increase City revenues, support tourism, spur revitalization of economically depressed areas, and stabilize the local economy during downturns.**

Generally Agree

- Use incentives to create win, win for City, Developer & neighborhoods

- Strong incentives for this in and around the UofA to promote residential living environment around the UofA. We are losing- not only historic structures, but R-1 and R-2 life styles
- This may not be feasible, due to lack of public funding.
- Incentives from what funds? How & what? Legal? Again, what if at odds with other stated goals?
- Yes-although there already are a number of incentives available
- Advocate to Rio Nuevo that they may legally and should invest TIFF funds in façade projects in downtown.
- This is a lot to ask of a building!!
- Text overly descriptive policy works w/out (?)
- This policy is too much of a laundry list

#### No Opinion

- Like the money to put up new facades in down-town – relatively cheap way for big impact
- Too grand a statement

### **1.e) Develop clear design guidelines and streamlined permitting processes for rehabilitations of historic buildings and compatible new developments in historic districts.**

#### Generally Agree

- Concern about the supremacy of the “Overlay zone” that trumps 4P efforts Include planting, lighting and vistas
- Have a public design guidelines w/professions
- Doing this one neighborhood at a time (through the NPZ) is moving too slowly.
- We want to encourage a business friendly atmosphere for our city
- This can have a huge impact. 1e and 1f and 1d are almost the same/ related
- A short guide book might be useful. (?) recent policy changes
- Developing NPZ, one neighborhood at a time- very time consuming not protective of any place but our little area
- Concern on input vs. partnership
- Needs to be handled carefully to preclude unforeseen consequences
- Incompatible infill destroys the architecture usage
  - close the loopholes
  - clear guidelines help developers & revenues

#### Disagree

- Already exist- how would Tucson doing this not confuse the guidelines of the (?)

### **1.f) Prepare guidelines and incentives for preservation and enhancement of historic streetscapes.**

#### Generally Agree

- Same as a 1. E. Also, it should be possible to build on the existing Feldman’s and Jefferson Park Design Manuals to create a single, unified manual.
- Essential!
- This can have a huge impact. This is something the city can and should be doing
- Guidelines and incentives could be good for all preservation projects.
- Historic streetscape needs to be defined. Requires buy-in, involvement from private property owners at a level that may not be feasible in 10 years
- Not unless economy improves

- Our historic streetscapes are (?) by road widening/RTA projects

#### No Opinion

- Incentives from what funds? How & what? Legal? Again, what if at odds with other stated goals?

#### **Other comments for Goal 1:**

- Historic term should be broadened to include Heritage resources, too. “Historic Heritage resources”
  - These resources should be(?) on local public awareness for community use, experience and education
- Clarify that this is mainly for tourism. Other than that I’ve read nothing else indicating how this helps other economic development for these incentives may be at odds with other economic development. Or clarify how rehab & restoration creates jobs which support City of Tucson goals for job creation
- Form public private partnerships with the goals of preserving historic structures and creating an income stream for preservation of other structures.
  - Look at possible revenue flows from rehabbing historic structures.
  - Reach out to (?) to prioritize historic perseveration (SA dom. Foundation).
- It would be helpful to indicate which of these policies or strategies come at a significant cost- both direct cost to City/taxpayers and to private parties/economic costs.
- Set broad, workable precedents, like the NP2, Also apply to other neighborhoods that need their historic elements preserved.
- These policies are not (?) but mutually reinforcing

**GOAL 2: Use historic preservation as a strategy in planning and decisions for Smart Growth and sustainability.** Preservation and “green” retrofitting of historic buildings can be a driver for sustainable development and smart growth because they inherently reduce waste, save energy, conserve materials, utilize existing infrastructure, and compliment density. Historic neighborhoods are often more walkable, are in close proximity to transit and bike routes, and use space efficiently.

#### **2.a) Identify and reduce any impediments in the Land Use Code, Building Code, and permitting processes that discourage adaptive reuse of historic buildings.**

##### Generally Agree

- Need to develop levels of enforcement
- Lack of enforcement tools
- This should be done ASAP
- This should be relatively simple
- Provide definition of “adoptive reuse” in General Plan
- BUT must be handled very carefully to preclude unforeseen consequences
- Sign code may prevent signs on converted/adaptively reused properties

##### Disagree

- We blame LUC for everything
  - Not sure it is a big problem

- Must make it safe
- Concern with loop-holes

**2.b) Develop tools in the Land Use Code, code-compliance options, and permit fee reductions to encourage investments in rehabilitation and compatible infill in historic districts, and to retrofit and adaptive reuse of historic buildings.**

Generally Agree

- (Need to develop levels of enforcement
- How do you incentivize the preservation + enhancement of historic areas
- Especially for adaptive re-use. Bringing a historic home up to commercial code is prohibitively expensive.
- Always has to be balanced with budget- are there (?) reductions more valuable than other incentives?
- “Adaptive reuse of historic buildings” as long as they are compatible with the neighborhood.
- To preserve historic fabric of the city and (?) demolition (?) (?)

Disagree

- Concern with loop-holes

**2.c) Develop a demolition fee structure that increases fee according to the age and embodied energies of building to encourage retrofitting and reuse of existing building stock, reduce waste, and reinvest in existing neighborhoods and infrastructure.**

Generally Agree

- Needs to develop levels of enforcement
- Probably not feasible, due to Prop 207. Would have to be very carefully worded.
- This is great! Both commercial + residential
- With the (?) (?) (?) fee structure for historic or contributing properties be high enough
- Yes- Can be used almost immediately
- What a great revenue source! (Just kidding!)
- To preserve our historic
  - Easy way to slow the comm. value old buildings.
  - Revenue

Disagree

- Health & safety most important
  - Not all historic building are worth saving badly designed building (internally)
- Because any entity with money can demo any building
- Does this mean that builders pay a few extra bucks to knock down a building?
- Develop a place to STOP demolition of historically significant structures Deep pockets will pay large fees to (?) and re-build!

**2.d) Treat urban parks and community gardens as heritage resources and preserve them within and near historic districts.**

Generally Agree

- (1) Partner with existing non-profits and organizations included with community [?]
- (8) Preserve all? Does this require \$ to buy them if not city owned?
- (9) Must (?) parks & gardens so that they are used.

- Catalina Park improvements were not viewed through this lens.
- Question of costs of water and up keep
- We need all the green space we can get! Food (?) Poor neighborhoods
- -provides open space
- -positive benefits
- -neighborhood resources
- -natural wildlife
- -fights heat island effect
- -food security
- -preserves open space
- This isn't trivial. Trees, urban parks, green areas critical.

Disagree

- You would have to go through the historic office to (?) crop's?

No Opinion

- Can be done inexpensively- unless property owner involves Prop 207
- This goal could apply to any urban part of Tucson
- Need more information
- Not sure I understand this

**2.e) Preserve and develop infrastructure for a variety of transportation modes within and near historic districts.**

Generally Agree

- Are easements included in public access in historic – cultural properties
- Urban Core! Is this a HP (?)
- Modern Streetcar
- We need all the green space we can get! Food (?) (?) poor neighborhoods
- 

Disagree

- Concern with (?) will be destroyed

No Opinion

- We can continue creating bicycle boulevards at reasonably low cost. No on blanket rezoning.
- Preserve all? Some? Sidewalks too?
- This goal could apply to any urban part of Tucson
- Should not impact historic neighborhoods. Modern streetcar will negatively impact 4<sup>th</sup> Ave
- This issue is true citywide, particularly around major activity centers and the downtown area.
- Bike routes, sidewalks may be possible. If this means light rail, it is where it is- not going any place else
- Too vague

**2.f) Prioritize retrofitting and adaptive reuse of existing City-owned buildings over new construction to preserve historic buildings and increase sustainability of City facilities.**

Generally Agree

- Sustainability
- What is “sustainability” be careful w/ clichés
- Good setting an example for property owners.

- Sets precedent and leadership
- Depends on architecture of structure
- Where is the funding from?
- It surely should SAVE money. City can lead by example
- -City can be a leader
- -Adaptive reuse is cost effective
- -Preserves historic aspect of downtown
- -Preserves our unique architectural & visual identity

Disagree

- It depends on the cost

No Opinion

- Prioritize where? In real estate RFP's? To only FRP for preservation?
- Use city owned buildings model of preservation.
- Be cost effective
- May not be financially feasible, very dependent on conditions of existing business

**Other Policy Comments for Goal 2:**

- Need to form water management plan for historic built environment for water reuse and structural preservation
- Develop preservation specific in overly that allows the conservation of residential zones property into (?)/ retail on (?) and (?)
- All except “e” can be done w/o a great out lay of \$ and should be done. Just the will rather than capital costs.
- Many of these changes should not be costly and impact should save money and other resources
- Regarding Demolition; Tucson would benefit from a regulatory “demolition” policy– similar to that with City Historical Prop. – Perhaps slightly less stringent

**GOAL 3: Use historic preservation as a strategy for neighborhood stabilization.**

Preservation can create and maintain affordable housing, generate jobs, retain existing businesses and attract new ones. Historic designations can increase civic participation, lengthen duration of residence by owners and renters, stabilize property values, and strengthen a unique sense of place and identity.

**3.a) Assist low- to moderate-income neighborhoods and depressed commercial districts in their efforts to obtain historic designation from the National Register of Historic Places.**

Generally Agree

- Establish a funded resource for this effort
- @ a cost of 122k for (?)PNA to do theirs, we definitely need to lower the cost of creating new districts.
- Yes...if funding can be found. CLC pass- through grant [?] needed for my neighborhood to expand its Historic District.
- What does “assist” mean?
- COT staff should actively assist with this.

- (Partial disagreement) Architectural (?) should be the standard we shouldn't be (?) Neighborhoods that don't truly have historic
- (?) (?) Demonstrate economic impact before handing out \$\$ to document historic (?)
- Because many people living in older "contributing" property are low income
- Won't happen in this economy
- Our historic business districts are threatened by road widening projects
- These are areas that are the easiest to prey on. Need all 4 types of assistance

Disagree

- Should we be using COT. Should be this (?)?

No Opinion

- Do we contribute to Frad
- This Policy is more appropriately located in the part of the General Plan addressing affordable housing- Should be considered as part of the discussions

**3.b) Create incentives for owner-occupants to invest in maintenance and retrofitting of historic dwellings.**

Generally Agree

- Strong incentives for this in and around the UofA to promote residential living environment around the UofA.
- Yes... most importantly, do not let historic property tax break lapse
- West University years ago had block grant \$ to loan out. When these properties eventually turn over the \$ will return for other grants.
- Problem on funding
- won't happen in this economy
- budget issues
- These are areas that are the easiest to prey on. Need all 4 types of assistance

No Opinion

- What incentives? Financials where would the \$ come from? Pima County better positioned for property tax
- Already there
- Nice but I don't expect the city to fund everyone's dream.

**3.c) Explore voluntary options to address adverse effects of gentrification in Tucson's low- to moderate-income historic neighborhoods, such as displacement of long-time residents due to rising property values. Examples of existing options include reductions in mortgage costs through the Pima County Community Land Trust Program, and reductions in annual property taxes through the State Historic Property Tax Reclassification Program.**

Generally Agree

- Should City Of Tucson have a parallel Land Trust program for low/moderate income
- Need to educate the public and those living in historic neighborhoods
- Very important, but hard to see this happening – maybe through purchase of foreclosed homes.
- A very important subject a lot of the public is not aware that were there is major develops property values and taxes go up and they might be able to afford to live in their neighborhoods or barrios. (Gentrification)
- To gather public support for preservation (?) of gentrification must be (?) The TCC left 2 terrible taste in the mouths of displaced people

- These are areas that are the easiest to prey on. Need all 4 types of assistance

Disagree

- Is length of time in an area the whole justification for remaining? I can see in areas with strong support systems but not in all sometimes youth or younger residents more active. Also under this policy benefits come to owners not residents.
- Don't think we've had "adverse effects of gentrification."

No Opinion

- Where is this happening, is this a problem?
- I don't know if this is a good policy- I defer to other experts for this.
- This Policy is more appropriately located in the part of the General Plan addressing affordable housing- Should be considered as part of the discussions
- Do these options have the potential to do this? How do we know if they do.
- Complicated, hard to do- could only be for small area

**3.d) Increase awareness of historic property tax credits for owners of residential and commercial properties.**

Generally Agree

- Could be done cheaply through HCDD listserv.
- Can be done w/o big \$ out lay. Can be accomplished through neighborhood associations
- Easy to get work out
- Preservation is more important than tax breaks
- It's cheap: it's easy
  - can be done
  - preserves housing stock
- These are areas that are the easiest to prey on. Need all 4 types of assistance

**3. e) Include historic properties in the City's programs and partnerships to develop affordable housing stock.**

Generally Agree

- City owned historic property need management plan to stabilize or convey to owner who ? to do so
- City can work to trade for non-historic property if it is not feasible to sustain the properties it owns (?)
- The best way to preserve an historic building is to ensure that it is occupied.
- This discussion been on the table for over 10 years
- Once again, this would (?) concerns about gentrification

No Opinion

- What does including them mean?
- What does this mean?
- How?
- Needs clarification
- (?) what this means; how this could be implemented
- very broad
- Don't really understand this

### Other Policy Comments for Goal 3:

- Does city (?) of properties include heritage attributes?
- Support (?) Histories where is not just residential that connects with walkable neighborhoods. Identify areas for (?) Identity development (?) Development (?)
- Tucson needs an overall Policy (and attitude) which protects historic properties – That policy should not be up for interpretation by varying Council members.

**GOAL 4: Proactively plan for preserving Tucson’s historic and cultural resources.** A proactive approach to preservation planning can: increase the effectiveness of preservation activities; achieve fiscal efficiencies by ensuring compliance with regulations and improved management and maintenance of City-owned historic properties; and, ensure preservation is an integral element to smart growth and efforts to increase sustainability.

#### **4.a) Maintain City of Tucson’s Certified Local Government (CLG) status to ensure continued eligibility for federal and state historic preservation funding, and local authority to make determinations of eligibility for listing on the National Register of Historic Places.**

##### Generally Agree

- This is critical. Don’t know if there’s a cost, but we need this.
- Has to happen. How can these items be paid for?
- -historic conservation  
-preservation officer  
-preservation office  
You have to have this
- Necessary for the City to accomplish most of the (?) of these goals!
- Critical to maintain this foundation
- Not sure what this involves
- Just need to keep doing what we’re doing

##### No Opinion

- This needs exposure or explanation

#### **4.b) Prepare a city-wide preservation plan for both privately- and publicly-owned historic and cultural resources, and update the plan on a regular basis.**

##### Generally Agree

- How can these items be paid for?
- This seems a basic goal underlying many of the other goals
- Enormous project that cannot reasonably be done in 10 years.
- This is what we really need – a comprehensive view

#### **4.c) Inventory publicly-owned historic, archaeological, and traditional cultural resources, develop maintenance schedules and protocols for them, and allocate funding for their preservation.**

##### Generally Agree

- Historic inventory create value for the city.
- Allocation from where?
- How can these items be paid for?

- We have a task force for this that has not met since May. Momentum was lost. Let's restart this process
- Doesn't seem feasible – need more (?) staff to do this
- They keep being replaced by Circle K's

**4.d) Develop resources, integrate new technologies and conduct public outreach to increase awareness of Tucson's heritage resources and their value to the community.**

Generally Agree

- Need to partner with extent non-profit and proprietary entities to fund
- Historic inventory create value for the city.
- How can these items be paid for?
- COT can develop a culture of preservation within the staff and partnerships – it starts from within.
- We need to keep up to date on technology to survive.
- Economy properly has to be better before this gets into COT budget

**4.e) Identify revenue streams to support the City's historic preservation program and funding matches for private-sector historic preservation activities.**

Generally Agree

- Form a foundation for this purpose
- Key to all of this
- We have a task force for this that has not met since May. Momentum was lost. Let's restart this process
- Preservation has to become "economic"
- Worth trying- not sure of success

**4.f) Simplify the process for owners of historic properties to voluntarily obtain City historic landmark designations.**

Generally Agree

- Need to enhance incentives such as tax breaks, zoning, etc.
- Yes...could this be part of LUC revision?
- This is so crucial. Overlay?
- Again- something that doesn't cost a lot but helps other goals
- What is city landmark and what restrictions apply
- Define "Landmark"
- sounds appealing

**4.g) Identify general areas of archaeological sensitivity to streamline required mitigation of impacts to archaeological resources.**

Generally Agree

- More information is better to reduce uncertainty for developers.
- This could be done quickly

Disagree

- Not so certain that "streamlining" is a good thing

No Opinion

- This sounds like a huge project...maybe an inventory of entire city.

**4.h) Require other parties to mitigate impacts on historic, cultural, and archaeological resources in City Right-of-Ways.**

Generally Agree

- This is confusing as to who is really responsible and who [?]
- Concern(s) of cost effecting taxpayers, as utilities, etc.
- Needs to be strengthened- and paid for by company wanting to dig
- But need to recognize that this may impede improvement
- Concerned about this. Could be a reason (?) companies not to do a repair and/or add (?) cost to taxpayer
- Needs clarification who are “other parties”- Is this “business friendly” ☹
- Define

Disagree

- Who could this be?

No Opinion

- Who are other parties
- Too vague. Who are the “other parties?”
- It depends we hear a lot of grief about whether “historic” choices automatically make sense
- Who are other parties?
- What is meant by “other parties”
- hard to understand

**4 i) Require owners to maintain their historic properties.**

Generally Agree

- Need enhanced [?]
- Yes we can forbid demolition by neglect using the ordinance of other cities as a model. It could be positioned as a health and safety issue, to avoid Prop. 207 challenges.
- Ok but to what extent
- Is this really a preservation issue?
- But don't know how this could be a requirement. How would low income people be helped with this?
- Draft guidelines
- Good Luck! This would be great
- Enforcement possibilities
- But this is dicey-what are the consequences of allowing property to degrade?

Disagree

- How?
- Not comfortable with this. We don't have the resources to enforce this.
- How are standards developed
- (16) To what standards? Maintaining historical integrity in improvements is expensive vs. income of residents.
- Encourage (?) “require” is too (?) Gov. enforcement

No Opinion

- (8) Depends on health, safety & cost.
- (18) How
- (20) Much as I'd love to do this this is (?) with problems

**4.j) Allow use of the International Existing Building Code to allow rehabilitation of older buildings without losing character-defining historic features. [NOTE: To be consulted with the Planning and Development Services Department].**

Generally Agree

- What happens when IEBC would destroy or degrade historic features?
- Make it easier for owners to restore their buildings
- We need rehabilitative codes that allow for the economic preservation of historic or culturally significant structures that don't break the bank w/ excess code application. Is it not allowed, now?
- New Jersey Rehab. Cod, adopted around 2002 and then abandoned.
- Don't know the code, but it appears to be a good idea

Disagree

- We are throwing out the historic value

No Opinion

- Need Examples
- I'm not familiar with the IEBC
- Don't know what this is
- Don't know the code

**Other Policy Comments for Goal 4:**

- Focus on Mid-century cultural house!
- Tucson needs some regulatory policies which will help to protect neighborhoods with Nat'l Historic Status.

**GOAL 5: Establish partnerships for preservation in the region.** Partnerships with other jurisdictions and community stakeholders with help identify common goals and develop balanced approaches for preservation.

**5.a) Work with other local jurisdictions to better align preservation policies within the region.**

Generally Agree

- focus on productivity
- much of this really belongs with the county
- Also how to connect Tucson to historic communities (?) naturally
- don't know whether this can be done or can happen
- Pima County/Linda Mayro
- Need to articulate a vision applicable to our entire region
- How do you enforce it?
- Although may be problematic
- Do other jurisdictions have historical resources? We do not want a repeat of the RTA in which the suburbs trump the city

- Which jurisdictions?

No Opinion

- Is there a national or State standards of practice//policies
- How many old bldg. are there in out-lying areas?

**5.b) Work with non-government organizations, neighborhoods, developers, businesses, and other stakeholder groups to develop shared understandings and goals for historic preservation.**

Generally Agree

- AG- Metro Governance put in place  
Form taskforce [?]
- Important, but very difficult. Need a strong facilitator to enforce civility.
- What is the measurement?
- COT can develop a culture of preservation within the staff and partnerships – it starts from within.
- Can't do 1a without 5b
- basic to other goals
- educating
- Policy should protect historic resources and only allow new development of non-historic properties
- Sounds good- Don't know if you can ever get consensus from these "players"

**5.c) Find a balance between development and preservation in zoning changes and other decisions, to allow urban development and economic growth without losing the City's historic character and the community's visible connections with its past.**

Generally Agree

- How is balanced reached? What is the contract and enforcement?
- Educate City, Developers & Neighborhoods to work together in Historic Neighborhoods to develop a win- win
- Comical in the areas surrounding the UofA and downtown
- The model exists: rezoning with conditions and or rezoning hearing continuance until developer and neighborhood and city reach agreement.
- What is historical and what is an eyesore?
- Finding the right balance is very important as we move forward especially in the streetcar corridor.
- "without losing the City's historic character and the community's visible connections with its past." Critical.
- How
- Really abstract on what this means.
- Input us partnership
- Policy should protect historic resources and only allow new development of non-historic properties
- But vague- Developers should not have too much leverage- short term goals
- Talk about a Dream! – a balance?

No Opinion

- This should be under Goal #2

**5.d) Identify areas in the city where the historic built environment should be preserved, as well as areas where redevelopment should be encouraged.**

Generally Agree

- We need a planning commission specifically dedicated to this focus.
- Important to do this on a fine scale. Blanket incentivization of development along arterials will ensure demolition of historic properties. It's absolutely critical to understand that many of the most historic and architecturally interesting buildings are on arterials. Therefore, the incentivization of development, even on arterials, should be done carefully, both with respect to the demolitions permitted and with respect to the adaptive re-use facilitated.
- especially the areas that have been razed west of the Santa Cruz River
- Should this be under Goal 4?
- Historic properties are not all limited to (?) areas. Properties that are geographically isolated should not be sacrificed Preservation and redevelopment can be accomplished in the same geographic areas
- Basic to the preservation plan
- However – this can be a sticky wicket with some low income housing this can be subjective and therefore controversial
- As Above no historic area should become a “sacrifice zone”: all must be preserved, and developers told where they may develop currently we are constantly putting our (?) after development/demolition is process and it's too late

**Other Policy Comments for Goal 5:**

- Teach historic preservation in schools – catch them early
- This word “balance” – makes me nervous – Will developers change (?) is (?) “Imbalance” – (?) (?) ?
- This whole section seem s like good ideas but too vague. Also –developers have SHORT TERM interests that affect the LONG TERM interests of our city and neighborhoods