Hi Mike,

At our meeting last night, the **landmarks commission** made the following decisions (motions) about the issues we’ve discussed on the final draft of the land use code.

1. **Review process** – we would like you to take to council, as you suggested, the issue of whether we can exempt COA decisions from the permit process requirements. We can live with holding public hearings, but the public meeting process would be simpler if the exemption can be done easily enough.

   As for the details of how the code is written, the commission leaves to your discretion how to revise the language of sections 15.210 and 15.280 that we discussed by email.

2. **Design standards** – we agree that standards for rehabilitation of existing buildings and regional retail commercial design should be in the landmarks chapter, but otherwise we would like to rely on the standards in the rest of the code rather than include them in our chapter.

We are not asking for changes on any of the other subjects we discussed by email, but your input on these topics was very useful.

Separately, by means of the minutes of our meeting, we are informing council that we have reached agreement with the arts commission on language for murals.* The proposed language is attached. It leaves open one issue that we would like to put in the hands of council, namely, whether the arts commission’s endorsement can be required for all murals when the landmarks commission’s jurisdiction is landmarks register only. We will be able to provide an example of the proposed easement. We hope the mural language can be included in the adopted code.

Thank you for the opportunity to review the final draft of the code.

Meg

---

*Christina, could you please close the loop with Alex on this, telling him that we’ve accepted all his changes (except the two ?s) and added our own about restoration of historic murals, and that we’re asking the council to decide on “should” vs. “will”?*