

Bill No. 251030 Public Testimony Talking Points

Planning + Policy Framing

- “The historic preservation ordinance is a core planning tool, not just a preservation mechanism. Changes here affect predictability across the development process”
- “We should be cautious about introducing new procedural complexity without clear public benefit”
- “This is a cumulative issue, each change on its own may seem small, but together they weaken the preservation framework”
- “Communities rely on the Historical Commission process to have a voice in what happens around them in our historic built environment, which is a public good”

Process & Transparency

- “Several provisions appear to shift key decisions earlier in the process, and rely on information that is not publicly accessible. This creates an uneven playing field between applicants and the public”
- “We support development and investment, but it should happen within a clear, transparent, and predictable framework”
- “This is not about preservation vs. development, it’s about maintaining a fair process that does not erode public trust”

Designation Concerns

- “Additional procedural steps and waiting periods may discourage or delay designation”
- “Flexibility in reconsidering nominations is important as new information and community priorities evolve”

Design Review / Context

- “The ability to evaluate projects in context is fundamental to good planning. Removing or limiting that consideration risks inconsistent outcomes”

Closing

- “We urge you to oppose the bill as written or pursue amendments that address these concerns”