

Anya Grahn

From: Bob/Chris Berndt [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, July 16, 2021 10:32 AM
To: Anya Grahn
Subject: Proposal to Add Time Periods to the Rules of Procedure

External email: Don't click links or attachments from unknown senders. To check or report forward to reportspam@townofchapelhill.org

Hi Anya,

This follows up on my previous email regarding adding time periods to the Rules of Procedure, to make specific proposals. I would also like to suggest adding a provision setting time limits for HDC meetings. I have consulted the Town Council's Rules of Procedure for guidance in making these proposals.

1. **Add a provision setting general time periods for presentations by applicants and witnesses/speakers:** Under Section V., Meetings, add wording that the HDC encourages applicants to complete their presentations in 10-15 minutes. Add wording that testimony by witnesses and comments by citizens adhere to a three-minute time period; if a large number of speakers, the Chair may request adherence to a two-minute time period.
2. **Add a provision setting time limits for meetings:** Under Section V., Meetings, add a provision that the HDC will not begin discussion of an agenda item after 10:00 p.m. without affirmative vote of 2/3 of members present.

Please distribute this proposal to the Commission for the 7/20/21 meeting. If our attorney has specific wording or placement suggestions for the Commission, that may be helpful also.

Sincerely,
Chris S. Berndt

Anya Grahn

From: Bob/Chris Berndt [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, July 16, 2021 10:55 AM
To: Anya Grahn
Subject: More Comments on the Rules of Procedure Revisions

External email: Don't click links or attachments from unknown senders. To check or report forward to reportspam@townofchapelhill.org

Hi Anya,

Other than the proposals to add time limits, I have two other comments on the proposed revisions to the Rules of Procedure.

1. **Regular Meetings.** Section V.A. deletes a reference to having a second monthly meeting for overflow items. I am wondering if the Commission's recent experience with workload might be a reason to keep this provision in the Rules. It would be helpful to have a set time for additional meetings. Also, personally, I would rather attend two shorter meetings rather than one really long one.
2. **Review Criteria.** This is a general comment which may need more discussion in the future. I noticed that the strike-out language refers to maps of historic and architectural significance, as called for in the LUMO. In looking at the LUMO, I don't see this map language anymore. When I had my orientation with staff, I asked about the maps, and apparently they no longer exist nor are available to the Commission. My recollection is that such maps did exist in the early days of the HDC, and were used as information in presentations. Today, what the Commission has available is the National Register information as to whether a structure is Contributing or Non-Contributing (but I understand not all local district structures are covered). Instead, our review criteria consist of the Principles and Standards. Yet, a review of the table of contents indicates that the document does not contain any information relating to historic or architectural significance of specific structures.

I don't think this comment should hold up adopting the revisions to the Rules of Procedure. But I am interested in learning the evolution of thinking over time regarding using historic and architectural significance as review criteria.

Please forward these comments to the Commission for the 7/20/21 meeting.

Sincerely,
Chris S. Berndt