

SALT LAKE CITY CORPORATION

FRANK B. GRAY
DIRECTOR

DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY & ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT
OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR

RALPH BECKER
MAYOR

MARY DE LA MARE-SCHAEFER
DEPUTY DIRECTOR

ROBERT FARRINGTON, JR.
DEPUTY DIRECTOR

CITY COUNCIL TRANSMITTAL



David Everitt, Chief of Staff


all
Date Received: 10/09/2009

Date Sent to City Council: 01/08/2010

TO: Salt Lake City Council
Carlton Christensen, Chair

DATE: August 25, 2009

FROM: Frank Gray, Community & Economic
Development Department Director



RE: Petition PLNPCM2009-00171: Master Plan Adoption initiated by City Council.

STAFF CONTACTS: Joel Paterson, Planning Manager, at (801) 535-6141 or
joel.paterson@slcgov.com

RECOMMENDATION: That the City Council hold a briefing and schedule a Public
Hearing

DOCUMENT TYPE: Ordinance

BUDGET IMPACT: Some of the actions in the plan will require funding. Grants may
be acquired for some projects; however, others may require City
Council allocation of funding.

DISCUSSION:

On April 1, 2009 the Historic Landmark Commission passed a motion to recommend the City Council adopt the Historic Preservation Plan. On September 23, 2009, The Planning Commission passed a motion to recommend the City Council adopt the Historic Preservation Plan with the further recommendation that sustainability goals be revised, updated and expanded and that Economic Hardship be clarified. The vote was unanimous in favor.

Issue Origin: The need for a comprehensive preservation plan began with a 2003 Legislative Action from City Council. In response, the Planning Division presented "A Review of Salt Lake City's Approach to Historic Preservation: Administration Response to the City Council's

SCANNED TO: David
SCANNED BY: [Signature]
DATE: 11/10/09

451 SOUTH STATE STREET, ROOM 404
P.O. BOX 145486, SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH 84114-5486
TELEPHONE: 801-535-6230 FAX: 801-535-6005

WWW.SLCGOV.COM/CEDE



RECEIVED
NOV 09

Legislative Action” to the City Council in 2004. The City Council allocated funding for the project as part of the adoption of the 2006-2007 budget from CDBG funds and General Funds. The City hired Clarion Associates, Inc. as consultants for the project in April of 2007.

Analysis: The Salt Lake City Historic Preservation Plan is a comprehensive plan that provides historic preservation guidance for all departments of Salt Lake City. This plan will be the key strategic document that will guide preservation activity into the future and inform decisions such as amendments to master plans, budget priorities, development of incentives for rehabilitation, zoning text and map amendments, and site-specific development decisions.

The only department comments received were from the Redevelopment Agency (RDA). All issues raised by the RDA were resolved in the current draft.

The Planning Commission, in its motion, requested that the sustainability goals should be revised, updated and expanded and that Economic Hardship process and regulations be clarified. The sustainability chapter is the largest chapter of the plan and covers issues of environmental, social, cultural and economic sustainability. Clarion Associates, developed the proposed Preservation Plan and is the company also working with the Sustainability Division on revising existing codes that hamper the City’s ability to reach its sustainability goals. The two projects were closely intertwined. Attached is a memo from Clarion Associates describing how the two projects work together.

The Economic Hardship issue is a zoning text amendment that the Historic Landmark Commission has begun working on. A draft amendment will likely be reviewed by the Planning Commission and forwarded to City Council this year.

Master Plan Considerations: The proposed Historic Preservation Plan is consistent with the vision and goals of the City’s community master plans and supports the preservation of neighborhood character and local history.

PUBLIC PROCESS:

The Historic Preservation Plan process kicked-off in August of 2007 with the following activities:

- Discussion with the Historic Landmark Commission
- Discussion with Planning Commission. Commissioners received a list of Community Advisory Committee members and stakeholder groups.
- An Open House at the Central City Community Center. Advertised through listserv and an advertisement in the *Salt Lake Tribune*
- Community Council Chair Meeting
- Stakeholder Interviews

(Please see Chronology for dates.)

Community Advisory Committee (CAC) meetings

The Community Advisory Committee representatives were “appointed” by each City Councilmember for each City Council district. Additional members included representatives from the City’s preservation partners such as the Utah Heritage Foundation and the State Historic Preservation Office. Three Historic Landmark Commissioners served as liaisons between the Community Advisory Committee and the Historic Landmark Commission.

The Community Advisory Committee helped to coordinate the development of the Preservation Plan. The Committee was charged with the responsibility of providing input, identifying issues and recommending policies and actions to address the issues relating to historic preservation in Salt Lake City. In addition, the committee members reviewed drafts of the plan and suggested changes.

The Community Advisory Committee included:

| Name | Representation |
|--------------------|---|
| Nelson Knight | CC District 1 |
| Brett Crane | CC District 2 (was not able to participate) |
| Rob Pett | CC District 3 |
| Noreen Heid | Former HLC member from District 4 (replaced de Freitas) |
| Bee Lufkin | CC District 5 |
| Lisette Gibson | CC District 6 |
| Elizabeth Giraud | CC District 7 |
| Bob Farrington | Downtown |
| Esther Hunter | HLC |
| Anne Oliver | HLC |
| Warren Lloyd | LEED architect |
| Kirk Huffaker | UHF |
| Barbara Murphy | SHPO |
| David Richardson | AIA |
| Ben Logue | Developer |
| Polly Hart | HLC (replaced Hunter) |
| Carla Wiese | Downtown (replaced Farrington) |
| Patrick de Freitas | CC District 4 (was not able to participate) |

Stakeholder Interviews

A Stakeholder group was a group of no more than five individuals with specific perspectives relating to historic preservation. They met with the consultants for “round table” discussions relating to their perspectives on the overall goals of the project and received input on relevant issues. These groups discussed their impressions of the strengths and weaknesses of the current ordinances, existing policies and their general expectations of the planning effort. The stakeholder groups included the following:

- City Council members/ Planning Commissioners
- Architects
- Past Economic Review Panel Members
- Realtors
- City Staff (outside of the Planning Division)
- Citizens
- Developers

Public Outreach

In addition to the guidance of the CAC, the public was encouraged to participate in the development of the Plan. Outreach activities included fliers, presentations at various organizations, a PSA on SLC-17, letters and newsletters, listserves and the website.

City Council/ Planning Commission Meetings

4 Public Workshops/Presentations (not including public hearings and meetings)

| Date | Location | No. in attendance |
|---------------|-------------------------------|-------------------|
| 8/23/07 | Central City Community Center | 21 |
| 9/17/08, noon | City & County Building | 5 |
| 9/17/08, 6pm | City & County Building | 1 |
| 2/18/09 | Cathedral of the Madeleine | 18 |

For a complete list of outreach, please see Exhibit 7C (Planning Staff Report).

Planning Commission Review

The Planning Commission held four Public Hearings on May 13, May 27, July 8, and September 23, 2009. Issues raised at the Public Hearing included the role of the Historic Landmark Commission’s architectural review committee; concern that preservation of the built environment equates to preserving density; accountability and the ability to accomplish all that the plan recommends; the economic hardship ordinance and implementation of sustainability goals.

On July 8, 2009, The Planning Commission passed a motion to recommend the City Council adopt the Historic Preservation Plan with the further recommendation that sustainability goals be revised, updated and expanded and that the Economic Hardship process be clarified. The vote was unanimous in favor of the motion. The Planning Staff later determined that notice of this public hearing was not published in a newspaper of general circulation as required by State law. A newspaper notice was published prior to the May 27, 2009 meeting when the Planning Commission held an issues only public hearing but did not take action.

To rectify this procedural error, the Planning Commission noticed and held a public hearing on September 23, 2009. The public notice included publishing notification of the public hearing in the Salt Lake Tribune and the Deseret Morning News. No additional public comments were received during the public hearing and the Planning Commission passed a motion to recommend the City Council adopt the Historic Preservation Plan with the further recommendation that sustainability goals be revised, updated and expanded and that the Economic Hardship process be clarified. The vote was unanimous in favor of the motion.

RELEVANT ORDINANCES:

State Code section 10-9a-403 authorizes municipalities to prepare a comprehensive plan. The code allows the municipality to determine the extent of the plan. Salt Lake City accomplishes a comprehensive plan through a series of master plans.

State Code section 10-9a-204 sets the public notice requirements for consideration of public hearings and public meetings to consider general plan or modifications. The noticing requirements have been met.

Table of Contents

1. Chronology
2. Ordinance
 - A. Historic Preservation Plan
3. City Council Hearing Notice
 - A. Labels
4. Historic Preservation Plan Project Summary
5. Clarion Memo on Historic Preservation Plan and Sustainable Code Revisions
6. Original Petition
7. Planning Commission Hearing September 23, 2009
 - A. Original Notice and Postmark/Agenda
 - B. Newspaper Advertisement
 - C. Staff Report
 - D. Minutes
8. Planning Commission Hearing July 8, 2009
 - A. Original Notice and Postmark/Agenda
 - B. Staff Report
 - C. Minutes
9. Planning Commission Hearing May 27, 2009
 - A. Original Notice and Postmark/Agenda
 - B. Staff Report
 - C. Minutes
10. Planning Commission Hearing May 13, 2009
 - A. Original Notice and Postmark/Agenda
 - B. Newspaper Advertisement
 - C. Staff Memo
 - D. Minutes
11. Historic Landmark Commission Hearing April 1, 2009
 - A. Original Notice and Postmark/Agenda
 - B. Staff Report
 - C. Minutes

Exhibit 1

Chronology

CHRONOLOGY

Petition PLNPCM2009-00171, SLC Historic Preservation Plan

| | |
|-------------------|---|
| April 26, 2007 | Initial contract with Clarion Associates activated |
| August 2007 | Initial discussions with Historic Landmark Commission and Planning Commission |
| August 23, 2007 | Stakeholder Interviews |
| August 23, 2007 | Public Workshop held at the Central City Community Center. |
| October 23, 2007 | Initial meeting with Community Council Chairs |
| November 2007 | Petition assigned to Robin Zeigler, Senior Planner. |
| December 4, 2007 | Citizen Advisory Committee meeting |
| February 9, 2008 | Fisher Mansion Open House, promotion about Plan |
| February 9, 2008 | Information about plan development presented to the Liberty Wells Community Council |
| February 12, 2008 | Information about plan development presented to the Utah Heritage Foundation Board. |
| February 12, 2008 | Citizen Advisory Committee meeting |
| June 18, 2008 | Citizen Advisory Committee meeting |
| June 23, 2008 | New Contract with Clarion activated. Time extended and number of consultant trips expanded. |
| June 24, 2008 | Citizen Advisory Committee meeting |
| July 14, 2008 | Citizen Advisory Committee meeting |
| August 18, 2008 | Information about plan development presented to the Downtown Alliance. |
| September 6, 2008 | Greater Avenues Street Fair—presentation of Plan |

| | |
|--------------------|--|
| September 13, 2008 | Capitol Discover Day—presentation of Plan |
| September 13, 2008 | 9 th & 9 th Street Festival—presentation of Plan |
| September 17, 2008 | Two public workshops were held at the City and County Building |
| November 18, 2008 | Citizen Advisory Committee meeting and meetings with City Council members |
| February 18, 2009 | Final public workshop held at the Cathedral of the Madeleine |
| March 17, 2009 | Historic Landmark Commission agenda published |
| April 1, 2009 | Public Hearing: Historic Landmark Commission recommendation of Plan |
| April 28, 2009 | Planning Commission agenda published |
| May 6, 2009 | Draft plan presented to Central City Community Council |
| May 12, 2009 | Public Notice appears in the Salt Lake Tribune and the Deseret News |
| May 12, 2009 | Planning Commission agenda published |
| May 13, 2009 | Public Hearing: Clarion presents draft plan to Planning Commission |
| May 27, 2009 | Public Hearing: Planning Commission provides planning staff with comments on Historic Preservation Plan. |
| July 2, 2009 | Planning Commission agenda published |
| July 8, 2009 | Public Hearing: Planning Commission unanimously votes to recommend plan to City Council. |
| July 9, 2009 | Request ordinance from Attorney's Office |
| July 31, 2009 | Receive ordinance from Attorney's Office |
| September 15, 2009 | Planning Commission agenda published |
| September 15, 2009 | Public Notice appears in the Salt Lake Tribune and the Deseret News |
| November 4, 2009 | Request for a revised ordinance from Attorney's Office |

November 4, 209

Received revised ordinance from Attorney's Office

Exhibit 2
Ordinance

SALT LAKE CITY ORDINANCE
No. _____ of 2009
(Adopting the Salt Lake City Historic Preservation Plan)

An ordinance adopting the Salt Lake City Historic Preservation Plan.

WHEREAS, the Salt Lake City Planning Commission ("Planning Commission") held public hearings on May 13, 2009, May 27, 2009, July 8, 2009, and September 23, 2009 on an application initiated by the Planning Commission and recommended by the City's Historic Landmarks Commission (Petition No. PLNPCM2009-00171) to adopt a proposed Salt Lake City Historic Preservation Plan; and

WHEREAS, at its September 23, 2009 meeting, the Planning Commission voted in favor of recommending to the Salt Lake City Council ("City Council") that the City Council adopt the proposed Salt Lake City Historic Preservation Plan pursuant to said application; and

WHEREAS, after holding a public hearing on this matter, the City Council has determined that the following ordinance adopting the Salt Lake City Historic Preservation Plan is in the best interest of the City.

NOW, THEREFORE, be it ordained by the City Council of Salt Lake City, Utah:

SECTION 1. Adopting the Salt Lake City Historic Preservation Plan. The Salt Lake City Historic Preservation Plan is hereby adopted to apply within the City's municipal boundaries, as identified in the Salt Lake City Historic Preservation Plan attached hereto as Exhibit "A",

SECTION 2. Effective Date. This ordinance shall become effective on the date of its first publication.

Passed by the City Council of Salt Lake City, Utah, this _____ day of _____,
2009.

CHAIRPERSON

ATTEST AND COUNTERSIGN:

CITY RECORDER

Transmitted to Mayor on _____.

Mayor's Action: _____ Approved. _____ Vetoed.

MAYOR


CITY RECORDER

(SEAL)

Bill No. _____ of 2009.

Published: _____.

HB_ATT#9317-v1-Ordinance_adopting_SLC_Historic_Preservation_Plan

| |
|--|
| <p>APPROVED AS TO FORM Salt Lake City Attorney's Office</p> <p>Date: <u>NOVEMBER 4, 2009</u></p> <p>By: <u></u> Paul C. Nielson, Senior City Attorney</p> |
|--|

Planning Department
11/4/09

Exhibit A
Historic Preservation Plan

Table of Contents

| | |
|--|----|
| Introduction | 4 |
| Historic Preservation in Salt Lake City: A Background | 5 |
| Preservation Program Highlights 1976 - 2009 | 6 |
| Objectives of this Plan | 7 |
| Planning and Outreach | 7 |
| Historic Resource Inventories and Surveys | 8 |
| Regulations and Incentives | 8 |
| The Planning Process | 9 |
| Plan Overview | 10 |
| A Vision for Historic Preservation in Salt Lake City | 12 |
| Theme 1: Foster a Unified City Commitment to Preservation. | 12 |
| Theme 2: Develop a Comprehensive Preservation Toolbox. | 13 |
| Theme 3: Administer a Convenient and Consistent Historic Preservation Program. | 13 |
| Theme 4: Improve Education and Outreach. | 14 |
| Theme 5: Support a Sustainable City. | 14 |
| Turning a Vision into Actions | 15 |
| Foster a Unified City Commitment to Preservation | 16 |
| Citywide Planning | 17 |
| Overview | 17 |
| Goals, Policies, and Actions | 19 |
| Interdepartmental Coordination | 20 |
| Overview | 20 |
| Goals, Policies, and Actions | 25 |
| Transit and Historic Preservation: An Opportunity for Partnership | 27 |
| A Shared Understanding of Preservation's Benefits | 29 |
| Overview | 29 |
| Goals, Policies, and Actions | 29 |
| Develop a Comprehensive Preservation Toolbox | 31 |
| Historic Resource Surveys | 32 |
| Overview | 32 |
| Goals, Policies, and Actions | 35 |
| Historic Designation (Districts and Landmark Sites) | 37 |
| Overview | 37 |
| Protecting Historic Properties OF the Recent Past | 45 |
| Land Use and Design Regulations | 46 |
| Overview | 46 |
| Goals, Policies, and Actions | 47 |
| Conservation Districts | 49 |
| Transfer of Development Rights | 51 |
| Administer a Convenient and Consistent Historic Preservation Program | 56 |
| Historic Landmark Commission | 56 |

| | |
|--|-----------|
| Overview | 56 |
| Goals, Policies, and Actions..... | 58 |
| Program Administration..... | 59 |
| Overview | 59 |
| Goals, Policies, and Actions..... | 63 |
| Improve Education and Outreach | 66 |
| Overview | 66 |
| Goals, Policies, and Actions..... | 69 |
| Support a Sustainable City | 74 |
| Energy..... | 75 |
| Overview | 75 |
| Goals, Policies, and Actions..... | 76 |
| Economic Development..... | 79 |
| Overview | 79 |
| Goals, Policies, And Actions..... | 81 |
| Urban Nature..... | 82 |
| Overview | 82 |
| Goals, Policies, and Action | 83 |
| Transportation..... | 85 |
| Overview | 85 |
| Goals, Policies, and Actions..... | 85 |
| Housing..... | 86 |
| Overview | 86 |
| Goals, Policies, and Actions..... | 87 |
| Implementation Action Plan..... | 90 |
| How Will The Plan Be Implemented?..... | 90 |
| Policy Decisions | 90 |
| Regulatory Improvements | 90 |
| Coordination and Partnerships | 90 |
| Pursuing Funding Mechanisms | 91 |
| Education and Outreach..... | 91 |
| Implementation Action Plan | 91 |
| Appendix A: Historic Districts and Sites Field Analysis | 97 |
| Overview | 97 |
| Project Background..... | 99 |
| Local Districts | 99 |
| South Temple | 99 |
| The Avenues..... | 100 |
| Exchange Place..... | 101 |
| Capitol Hill | 102 |
| Central City | 103 |
| University | 104 |
| National Districts..... | 104 |
| The Avenues Extension | 104 |
| City Creek Canyon..... | 105 |
| Westside Warehouse..... | 105 |

| | |
|--|------------|
| Gilmer Park | 106 |
| Bennion-Douglas..... | 106 |
| Bryant | 107 |
| Highland Park | 108 |
| Northwest..... | 109 |
| Capitol Hill Extension..... | 109 |
| Yalecrest..... | 110 |
| Additional Areas of Historic Interest | 111 |
| Desoto-Cortez Neighborhood | 111 |
| Federal Heights Neighborhood..... | 111 |
| City Cemetery | 112 |
| Neighborhood North of the Avenues Historic District Extension | 113 |
| Gentile Core | 113 |
| West Liberty Neighborhood..... | 114 |
| West Temple Neighborhood..... | 114 |
| Westmoreland Neighborhood | 115 |
| Westminster Avenue Neighborhood..... | 115 |
| Forest Dale (Nibley Park) Neighborhood | 115 |
| Sugarhouse Neighborhood | 116 |
| Liberty Wells Neighborhood | 116 |
| 900 West Neighborhood..... | 117 |
| Euclid Neighborhood | 117 |
| Rose Park Neighborhood..... | 117 |
| Lower Ensign Downs Neighborhood..... | 118 |
| Industrial-Warehouse Area | 118 |
| Salt Lake City's Individually Listed Sites | 118 |
| Comments Regarding Survey & Designation | 119 |
| Appendix B: City Plans and Policies for Historic Preservation | 122 |
| City Plans | 122 |
| Planning Area Master Plans..... | 123 |
| Appendix C: Potential Funding Sources for Historic Preservation | 126 |
| Appendix D: Definitions | 130 |

Introduction

Though a relatively young city, Salt Lake City has been identifying and protecting its historic resources much longer than most communities in the West. Salt Lake City adopted its first local historic overlay ordinance in 1976. Since then, the City has established and continually improved an array of tools and programs aimed at protecting the buildings and landscapes from its past – from multiple surveys of historic resources in Salt Lake City’s neighborhoods, to the establishment of six local historic districts and dozens of Landmark Sites, to design guidelines that direct the character of building projects in the historic districts, to the historic overlay ordinance itself, which has gone through revisions and updates since its original adoption.

The residents and officials of Salt Lake City also have cultivated a strong network of public and private partners focused on preserving reminders of the City’s heritage, including the community councils, Utah Heritage Foundation, and the State Historic Preservation Office, plus an established base of City support for preservation located in the planning division.

Today, as Salt Lake City continues to grow in density and in geographic area, the City’s older neighborhoods face increasing pressures for redevelopment and infill, presenting both challenges and opportunities. Many stakeholders have questioned the role historic preservation plan should play in a modern, growing city, which faces challenges like an expanding transit system that runs through older neighborhoods, and a new emphasis on green development and sustainability.

This preservation plan represents the City’s first effort to think comprehensively about the role historic preservation plays throughout all of Salt Lake City. This plan is intended to be used to inform an array of future decisions, from amendments to master plans, to budget priorities, to site-specific development decisions. This plan will be the key strategic document that will guide preservation activity into the future and strengthen the already successful preservation efforts in Salt Lake City.

This chapter presents the following background and introduction to the rest of the plan document:

- Historic Preservation in Salt Lake City: A Background;
- An overview of the planning process behind the development of this plan; and
- An overview of this plan’s contents.



The State Capitol Building is a major landmark in the city. The successful preservation of the city’s historic resources will require the joint and ongoing commitment of preservation and planning staff, as well as other City departments, the State Historic Preservation Office, Utah Heritage Foundation, and other preservation partners.

HISTORIC PRESERVATION IN SALT LAKE CITY: A BACKGROUND


In 1953, the Utah State Legislature passed the Historic District Act acknowledging the importance of the state's historic heritage. The Act declares that the counties, cities, and towns of the state possess the power to identify, preserve, protect, and enhance historic and prehistoric areas and sites lying within their jurisdictions (Section 11-18-1, Utah Code Annotated, 1953, as amended). In addition, these governmental entities are empowered to expend public funds for the purpose of identifying, preserving, protecting, and enhancing historic areas and sites.

Salt Lake City adopted a historic overlay ordinance in 1976 in response to grass-roots concerns about the loss of the City's historic buildings and heritage. These concerns were triggered by a number of demolitions of historic structures that occurred in the late 1950s-1960s, including the Salt Lake Theater and several mansions along South Temple Street, although some neighborhoods such as the Avenues and Capitol Hill had already begun to enjoy quiet reinvestment. The ordinance established the Historic Landmark Committee (Commission), and provided procedures for designating resources and reviewing development applications that affect historic properties. Three years later, in 1979, the first citywide preservation guidelines were adopted. The American Institute of Architects interdisciplinary Regional/Urban Design Assistance Teams (R/UDAT) report conducted for the City in 1988 led to significant revisions to the zoning ordinance in 1995. Most notably, the revised ordinance contained stricter anti-demolition provisions and established the Historic Landmark Commission as an independent commission (it had previously been a committee of the Planning Commission). Four years later, the City Council adopted revised design guidelines – *Design Guidelines for Residential Historic Districts in Salt Lake City*. The revised ordinance and design guidelines both helped to strengthen the City's preservation efforts. Together, these elements constitute what this report refers to as the City's "historic preservation program," which is described in detail in the following section.



FIGURE 1: PRESERVATION POLICY TIMELINE

Preservation Policy Timeline



PRESERVATION PROGRAM HIGHLIGHTS 1976 - 2009

PROPERTIES CURRENTLY PROTECTED BY THE HISTORIC PRESERVATION PROGRAM

Since the adoption of the preservation ordinance in 1976, the city has established six local historic districts and designated over 160 sites as local Landmark Sites. The size of the preservation program and number of designated properties means that city planning staff review a high volume of applications for certificate of appropriateness (COA) applications each year. Over the past five years, staff has reviewed an average of 240 COAs each year, totaling over 1,200 applications.

A NATIONALLY RECOGNIZED PRESERVATION PROGRAM

Salt Lake has a nationally recognized preservation program. In 2007, the American Planning Association named South Temple one of America's "10 Great Streets" and the White House recognized Salt Lake City as a "Preserve America" community in 2006.

A SAMPLING OF SIGNATURE PROJECTS

City and County Building (1891)

Significance: Richardsonian Romanesque architecture. Intricately linked to numerous events in state history – for more information visit: www.slcgov.com/info/ccbuilding/ccbuilding.htm#making_arch_land

Restored: 1986-1989. Over \$31 million in total construction costs and furnishings to restore the building including exterior cleaning, seismic retrofitting, and restoration work to the tiling, marble, painting and other interior details.

Trolley Square (1908)

Significance: 1900s electric trolley garage.

Restored: Early 1970s. Remains a nationally noted example of adaptive reuse of historic structures. Trolley Square is in the midst of another renovation aimed at enhancing the relationship of the historic structures to the surrounding Central City Historic District through expanded retail space and parking.

First Security Bank (1955)

Significance: Utah's first modern building, one of the finest examples of internationally-influenced architecture in the state.

Restored: 2004. Restoration generated \$2.3 million in historic rehabilitation credits and \$1.23 million in new market tax credits. Received a preservation award from Utah Heritage Foundation and the National Preservation Honor Award from the National Trust for Historic Preservation in 2006.



OBJECTIVES OF THIS PLAN

In 2004, the City completed a review of the historic preservation program and decided to prepare a preservation plan to set a unified citywide strategy for preservation activity. The preservation plan, in addition to charting the course for the future, is also intended to address a variety of issues raised by stakeholders during interviews conducted at the start of this project. These issues are summarized below in the following three general topic areas:

- Planning and Outreach;
- Historic Resource Inventories and Surveys; and
- Regulations and Incentives.

PLANNING AND OUTREACH

ESTABLISH LONG-TERM VISION AND STRATEGY FOR PRESERVATION PLANNING

Many stakeholders noted the lack of formally established goals and priorities for historic preservation in Salt Lake City, which they felt has resulted in a preservation program that, to some observers, focuses heavily on already-designated properties and districts and does not adequately articulate a "big picture" vision for historic preservation in Salt Lake City. This plan addresses this concern by presenting a clearly defined vision and goals for how preservation interacts with and supports other City goals and activities, including those related to neighborhoods, economic development, transit, and growth.

IMPROVE COORDINATION BETWEEN HISTORIC PRESERVATION AND OTHER CITY PLANS, POLICIES, AND REGULATIONS

The City's planning structure, which emphasizes master planning at the subarea level, has resulted in individual plans that are strongly tailored to neighborhood interests. A concern, however, is that the City's patchwork quilt of master plans does not necessarily allow for easy coordination between competing City policy goals, or for the development of uniform policies across all areas of the City. To some observers, there have been missed opportunities for collaboration between preservation and other City interests, and sometimes preservation interests have been pitted unnecessarily against other worthwhile City goals like economic development and affordable housing.

This preservation plan identifies these planning and policy overlaps and establishes a strategy for resolving inconsistencies and incompatibilities and improving interdepartmental coordination. It also sets priorities for the historic preservation program so that they can be weighed and balanced against other goals and objectives of the City (e.g., increased transit ridership, affordable housing, and redevelopment). The citywide plan will ensure that historic preservation goals can be consistently applied throughout the City, resulting in better protection and a higher level of consistency and predictability.

EXPAND EDUCATION AND OUTREACH

The City currently conducts only limited education and outreach as part of its historic preservation program. This plan identifies additional education and outreach programs that should be offered by the City over time to improve understanding and user-friendliness of historic preservation.

HISTORIC RESOURCE INVENTORIES AND SURVEYS

DEVELOP A STRATEGY FOR FUTURE HISTORIC RESOURCE SURVEYS

Historic resource surveys are a vital tool for informing the community about the types of historic properties that exist and the extent to which such properties maintain their historic integrity. City officials have acknowledged that most survey work has occurred sporadically and been completed in a reactionary, rather than proactive and strategic, manner. In response to the 2004 City Council-led review of the historic preservation program, the City is undertaking new re-surveys to update the information for existing districts. This historic preservation plan builds on this work by providing additional direction about survey and resurvey priorities for the future.



A resurvey of the Avenues was completed in 2008.

IMPROVE THE UNDERSTANDING OF SALT LAKE CITY'S HISTORIC CONTEXT

The significance of a historic resource today is influenced by the period in which it was established and the role the resource has played in the community over time. Understanding the context in which a particular neighborhood, building, structure, or object was established helps to define the significance of that resource today. In Salt Lake City, past surveys and historic nomination documents have only provided an introductory level of information on the historic contexts of the resources being preserved.

BROADEN THE FOCUS OF HISTORIC PRESERVATION

Historic preservation in Salt Lake City traditionally has focused on historic districts developed prior to WWII, as well as various architecturally significant individual Landmark Sites. This plan calls for the City to broaden this focus to include thematically related historic resources, as well as those from the recent past.

REGULATIONS AND INCENTIVES

ADOPT A WIDER RANGE OF PRESERVATION TOOLS

The City's preservation regulations consist primarily of the historic overlay ordinance and the residential district design guidelines, which apply only to locally designated Landmark Sites and locally designated historic districts. While these are working generally well, there is a need for a broader range of tools to complement the existing ordinance and guidelines. This plan proposes that the City expand the regulatory tools available for preserving history and

character in the City. Specific tools suggested are conservation districts and transfer of development rights programs, among others.

ADDRESS CONCERNS WITH THE DEMOLITION PROVISIONS OF THE ORDINANCE

Current demolition provisions of the historic overlay ordinance, including the economic hardship process, are seen as not providing applicants with clear and understandable direction. This plan calls for the further evaluation and improvement of the demolition provisions in addition to the work currently underway by staff. It also addresses numerous conditions that contribute to demolitions, such as incompatible underlying zoning.

EVALUATE PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION AND STAFFING NEEDS

The procedures for review and approval of development applications involving historic properties are not clear to the general public, and perceived problems with development review have led some individuals and companies to avoid projects that would involve a local Landmark Site or property within a historic district. This plan suggests strategies to ensure that program administration offers a level playing field and high degree of transparency to property owners and residents through additional resources to make navigating the process easier, while at the same time allowing an appropriate level of flexibility and creativity.

CONSIDER A WIDER RANGE OF INCENTIVES TO ACHIEVE PRESERVATION OBJECTIVES

Incentives, such as the state and federal tax incentives for the qualifying rehabilitation of historic properties and Utah Heritage Foundation's revolving loan fund, are valuable tools for preservation. This plan calls for additional incentives – both financial and other – to encourage the preservation of historic properties.



The Historic Landmark Commission is the key decision-making body for the historic preservation program of the city.

THE PLANNING PROCESS

This plan was developed through an interactive process that involved and incorporated feedback from a variety of groups. In addition to constant and close communication with planning staff of the Planning Division, public participation in the planning process included the following:

HISTORIC LANDMARK COMMISSION

Regular meetings were held with the Historic Landmark Commission charged with oversight of the planning process to receive their feedback and direction.

CITIZEN ADVISORY COMMITTEE

A 17-member Citizen Advisory Committee included citizens representing a range of backgrounds, interests, and geographic areas of the City, including preservation architects, historians, and property owners. This volunteer group

met regularly during the process to provide feedback on the content of this plan as it was developed.

PUBLIC WORKSHOPS

Three public workshops and one open house were held throughout the plan's development. These were held at the beginning, middle, and end of the process to offer opportunities for the community to define what they would like to see the plan address, help shape the goals and policies for the plan, and then to provide feedback on the draft plan prior to adoption.

CITY WEBSITE

A dedicated page on the City's website, with a presence on the main page, served as a primary method of making plan work products and announcements available to the public for their review. The website also provided a means to submit questions and comments to staff.

ADDITIONAL OUTREACH ACTIVITIES

The planning process also employed a number of additional outreach methods at various times throughout the planning process, including interviews with key preservation stakeholders and City elected officials, surveys widely distributed through the community councils, an ongoing online survey, presentations by staff to various groups, a public service announcement (PSA) on SLCTV, and posters at various locations to advertise the effort was underway and how to find additional information.



Final workshop.

PLAN OVERVIEW

Following this introduction, this plan contains the following chapters and appendices:

2: A VISION FOR HISTORIC PRESERVATION IN SALT LAKE CITY

This chapter contains the five-theme vision statement for historic preservation activity in the City. These themes serve as the basis for the rest of the content and recommendations of the plan.

3: FOSTER A UNIFIED CITY COMMITMENT TO PRESERVATION

This chapter presents an overview of the conditions and dynamics of preservation planning, including a review of the geographic and programmatic overlaps that exist between preservation and other departments and planning activities of the City. The chapter establishes goals and policies for how the City can practice a unified City approach to preservation.

4: ADOPT A COMPREHENSIVE PRESERVATION TOOLBOX

This chapter discusses the tools and incentives currently used in the City and presents numerous recommendations for improvements and additions to



Three workshop and open house events were held during the course of the planning process to garner public input.

broaden the regulatory tools and incentives available to support historic preservation.

5: ADMINISTER A CLEAR, CONVENIENT, AND CONSISTENT HISTORIC PRESERVATION PROGRAM

This chapter provides an overview of how the preservation program is administered and recommends ways to improve information sharing, staffing levels, and outreach methods to improve overall user-friendliness and efficiency of the program.

6: IMPROVE EDUCATION AND OUTREACH

This chapter reviews current outreach approaches used to support preservation by the City and its preservation partners, and identifies additional recommendations to further appreciation and understanding of historic resources.

7: SUPPORT A SUSTAINABLE CITY

This chapter highlights ways in which preservation can help further community sustainability in the areas of environment, economy, parks and landscape, transportation, and housing.

8: IMPLEMENTATION ACTION PLAN

This chapter summarizes the actions identified in each of the preceding chapters of the historic preservation plan, and identifies priorities, responsible parties, and potential funding sources for their implementation.

APPENDIX A: HISTORIC DISTRICTS AND SITES FIELD ANALYSIS

This appendix summarizes the consulting team's field analysis of existing historic districts and potential historic areas where new historic resources surveys are recommended.

APPENDIX B: CITY PLANS AND POLICIES FOR HISTORIC PRESERVATION

This appendix summarizes various adopted City plans and policies that relate to historic preservation.

A Vision for Historic Preservation in Salt Lake City

While the City has administered a historic preservation program for more than 30 years, this preservation plan presents the first opportunity to formally define a vision for the program and set long-term, citywide goals and objectives to guide specific actions and decisions.

This chapter summarizes the overall vision for historic preservation in Salt Lake City. This vision statement was developed through an ongoing, collaborative process in which the Historic Landmark Commission, the Citizen Advisory Committee, and City residents all discussed the role they want historic preservation to play in the future life of the City. The vision provides strategic guidance regarding how the City should maintain, strengthen, and expand its preservation activities in a manner that is consistent with other City objectives, in order to identify and maximize mutual benefits.

This vision is expressed through five themes:

1. Foster a Unified City Commitment to Preservation.
2. Develop a Complete Preservation Toolbox..
3. Administer a Convenient and Consistent Historic Preservation Program.
4. Improve Education and Outreach.
5. Support a Sustainable City.

Each of these themes are described below. Following this brief overview, chapters 3 through 7 provide additional background and detail for each theme, and include goals, policies, and actions designed to achieve the vision.

THEME I: FOSTER A UNIFIED CITY COMMITMENT TO PRESERVATION.

Salt Lake City builds upon its past historic preservation achievements by continuing to make historic preservation an important City priority. Historic preservation is recognized as a key component of the future growth, economy, character, and appeal of the City and its neighborhoods. Historic preservation goals are consistent and compatible with larger City land use and economic development goals. Historic preservation is integrated into the City's governance culture. All City departments, agencies, boards, and commissions collaborate with historic preservation program staff, communicating their plans and objectives with the aim of seeking potential mutual benefits from each project and investment. City officials lead the charge, fostering a team atmosphere in which each department actively supports preservation and all staff, administrators, and board members and commissioners receive the



The City and County Building.

necessary training. Goals, plans, and policies of the City are aligned, eliminating potential conflicts and forging a unified direction. Collaboration extends to community organizations and business and special interest groups, with which the historic preservation program will enjoy a high degree of trust and communication.

THEME 2: DEVELOP A COMPREHENSIVE PRESERVATION TOOLBOX.

Salt Lake City has an impressive depth and range of historic resources. The historic preservation program develops and pursues a clear strategy for identifying and protecting a wide range of important resources, including not only older historic districts and Landmark Sites, but also signature resources from the recent past. Also, because preservation has as much to do with preserving the unique character of a place as it does with preserving sites and buildings themselves, the City develops a range of new tools to safeguard the predominant character of established neighborhoods as development and infill take place.

THEME 3: ADMINISTER A CONVENIENT AND CONSISTENT HISTORIC PRESERVATION PROGRAM.

Clear and efficient administrative procedures, convenient resources and access to staff, and consistent information on and application of the rules are crucial components to a successful historic preservation program. With the continuous support of the City, and working with other departments where appropriate, the Planning Division develops the written information resources, streamlined processes, and staffing to administer the program in a clear and timely fashion. The policies of the Historic Preservation Plan establish the short-term and long-term goals and priorities for the program to assist both staff and decision-makers with their respective roles in achieving this component of the vision. In addition, the City will consistently enforce requirements in historic districts to reinforce necessary property owner's participation with the historic preservation program.

6.0 ARCHITECTURAL DETAILS

Purpose:
Architectural details help establish a historic building's distinct visual character. Thus, they should be preserved whenever feasible. If architectural details are damaged beyond repair, their replacement, matching the original detailing, is recommended.

Background

Architectural details play a vital role in defining the character of a historic structure; they add visual interest, define historic building styles and types, and often characterize its craftsmanship and historical heritage. Features such as window heads, brackets and columns, sills, cornices and finials often associated with particular styles, and their form and preservation are important.

Treatment of Architectural Features

Preserving original architectural details is essential to the integrity of the building and its context. Where replacement is required, one should consult with the preservation staff to insure authenticity. Avoid an architectural detail in place if it is an exact replica of the original detail, the integrity of the building as a historic resource is diminished and the preservation of the original material is precluded.



Preserving original architectural details is essential to the integrity of a building and its context.



Architectural details help establish a historic building's distinct visual character. Thus, they should be preserved whenever feasible. If architectural details are damaged beyond repair, their replacement, matching the original detailing, is recommended.

Expanding the range of preservation tools, including new design guidelines, is a key priority of this plan.



The Historic Landmark Commission website is currently the primary non-staff method of distributing information and applications for historic preservation.

THEME 4: IMPROVE EDUCATION AND OUTREACH.

The City clearly and consistently conveys the message that historic preservation is valued in Salt Lake City. Planning staff works with other City department staff, the Historic Landmark Commission, and other preservation partners to communicate that message. The City and its preservation partners take up the important charge of promoting preservation, creating a wide range of educational materials to increase community pride and awareness of the City's history and how that history relates to the built environment. Residents and visitors are able to easily access information on the rich history of Salt Lake City through a variety of interactive means including the internet, printed materials, interpretive signage, walking tours, videos and other media as appropriate.

THEME 5: SUPPORT A SUSTAINABLE CITY.


The City practices historic preservation with an eye towards the future. Preservation is a key tool for achieving the City's goals for economic, environmental, and community sustainability. Historic preservation involves the use and reuse of existing structures, which translates into lower environmental impacts. The City recognizes these environmental benefits of historic preservation and commits to educate about how preservation is green as well as investigate the possibilities of using green building materials, environmentally-responsible landscaping, energy efficiency, and renewable energy generation within historic neighborhoods. The incorporation of green building practices is encouraged whenever they are compatible with best historic preservation practices.



The National Trust for Historic Preservation's sustainability initiative is an excellent resource for emerging research and practices in the area of historic preservation and community sustainability.

TURNING A VISION INTO ACTIONS

The five themes of the vision serve as the foundation upon which this plan is built. Each theme contains goals, policies, and actions that spell out in greater detail how the City will achieve the theme and ultimately the broader vision for historic preservation.



VISION THEMES

The vision is a general statement that describes the desired future for preservation in the City. In this plan, the vision is divided into five themes that collectively convey the vision for the preservation program by describing how different aspects of preservation will function in the future.

GOALS

Goals provide general direction to help guide the City's decisions about public and private investment and development, partnership and coordination arrangements, activities, and education and outreach to achieve this vision. Goals are supported by more specific policy statements.

POLICIES

Policies are the course of action to achieve the goals. The policies provide guidance for daily decisions to support the implementation of the plan, its vision and goals. It is ultimately the decision-makers' responsibility to weigh and balance seemingly divergent aims of the City (such as redevelopment and preservation) to set an appropriate direction for the City.

ACTIONS

Actions are the specific steps that the City and others must take to implement the goals and policies of the preservation plan.

Foster a Unified City Commitment to Preservation

Historic preservation issues arise every day in the actions and decisions of a variety of Salt Lake City officials and agencies. From land use plans for older neighborhoods, to street and sidewalk improvements in historic districts, to redevelopment projects involving up-and-coming historic commercial centers, to planning and maintenance of historic parks, to transit planning along historic commercial corridors – a wide variety of official activities involve preservation-related issues in some way. Yet, the plans, policies, and regulations that direct official City activity in each of these areas often are silent regarding preservation, leading to scores of instances every year where preservation interests must be balanced with other important City goals without the benefit of careful advanced planning. All too often, inconsistencies within City plans and policies set up unnecessary conflicts between preservation and other worthwhile City objectives. To some observers, it is unclear how preservation of the past can assist in building a stronger future.

A unified and supportive City commitment to historic preservation is necessary to successfully achieve the objectives of this plan now and in the future. Implementation of this plan will be achieved through many types of changes, including planning, regulations, funding decisions, and day-to-day policy and other decisions across the whole City government. A citywide preservation ethic can be achieved by conveying a clear and consistent message of historic preservation's objectives, opportunities, and benefits to all City officials, departments and agencies. A shared understanding and treatment of preservation across City departments and agencies will be needed to pursue the vision expressed in Theme 1.

The topics covered in this chapter include:

- Citywide Planning
- Interdepartmental Coordination; and
- A Shared Understanding of Preservation's Benefits.

Theme 1: Foster a Unified City Commitment to Preservation

Salt Lake City builds upon its past historic preservation achievements by continuing to make historic preservation an important city priority. Historic preservation is recognized as a key component of the future growth, economy, character, and appeal of the city and its neighborhoods. Historic preservation goals are consistent and compatible with larger city land use and economic development goals. Historic preservation is integrated into the city's governance culture. All city departments, agencies, boards, and commissions collaborate with historic preservation program staff, communicating their plans and objectives with the aim of seeking potential mutual benefits from each project and investment. City officials lead the charge, fostering a team atmosphere in which each department actively supports preservation and all staff, administrators, and board members and commissioners receive the necessary training. Goals, plans, and policies of the city are aligned, eliminating potential conflicts and forging a unified direction. Collaboration extends to community organizations and business and special interest groups, with which the historic preservation program will enjoy a high degree of trust and communication.

CITYWIDE PLANNING

OVERVIEW

While the bulk of Salt Lake's day-to-day preservation activity occurs within the local historic districts, preservation planning has a citywide perspective, owing to the wide distribution of Landmark Sites and also the perpetual, citywide cycle of survey and designation of additional historic properties. The recognition of this citywide scope was a fundamental motivator behind the City's decision to create a citywide preservation plan. An important function of this plan is to illustrate the best means for citywide coordination between the actions and planning activities of the City's various departments, agencies, and partners as they relate to preservation.


The fact that land use planning in Salt Lake City is performed by numerous entities and for several geographies (e.g., by neighborhood, or by functional areas such as transit corridors) has resulted in some plans and policies that are inconsistent with and unsupportive of preservation. For example, existing zoning designations in some cases allow theoretical maximum densities for an historic site that could only be achieved by replacing the designated historic resource. This is somewhat attributable to the fact that, prior to this plan, the City did not have a clear statement of the goals and objectives for preservation with which other plans and policies could align. With a preservation plan now in place, the City will be able to pursue plan updates to identify and rectify problems, such as inappropriate future land use designations for contributing historic structures. It will also be necessary to simply update plans where overlaps with historic preservation exist to integrate the ideas of this plan.

TABLE I: EXAMPLES OF PLANNING GEOGRAPHIES COVERED IN CITY PLANS

| Citywide | Planning Communities | Specialized Geographies |
|---|--|--|
| Housing Plan Urban Design Element Transportation Plan Open Space Plan Parks and Recreation Plan | Master Plans (including land use plans) | Downtown Plan TOD corridor planning |

In particular, master plans provide perhaps the greatest opportunity to ensure that future Salt Lake planning addresses preservation-related issues on a consistent basis. Master planning in the City is conducted in each of eight planning communities, rather than citywide. There is little relationship between master plan boundaries and local historic district boundaries.

FIGURE 2: LOCATION OF HISTORIC DISTRICTS BY CITY PLANNING COMMUNITIES



Source: Salt Lake City Planning Division GIS, 2009

There are at least two key areas in each master plan in which the City has an opportunity to define more precisely its overall preservation objectives: (1) the setting of goals and priorities for the planning community, which includes a section on historic preservation, and (2) the future land use map.

- Preservation Goals:** Prior to this planning effort, preservation goals were defined within individual master plans for the eight planning communities. There is a high degree of variability in how each of these plans has addressed historic resources within its boundaries, and preservation issues generally. (See Table I in Appendix B.) While this plan now establishes a citywide vision and goals, how these are

integrated and interpreted through the individual master plans remains an extremely important function for the successful implementation of this plan.

- ***Future Land Use Maps:*** The master plans each include a future land use plan map, which is intended to direct changes in use and intensity over time. These maps therefore have a huge influence on the City's ability to preserve historic structures and sites. These maps are a blueprint to property owners and development entities as to what development potential to expect for their property in the future. Future land use maps that accurately reflect and convey the presence of historic resources in the land use patterns they establish are critical to the long-term viability of historic resources.

GOALS, POLICIES, AND ACTIONS

Goal 1.1: Ensure consistency between the Historic Preservation Plan and all other adopted City plans.

Policy 1.1a: Update Community Master Plans to reflect the goals and policies in the Historic Preservation Plan, as they relate to the specific community.

ACTION 1: MASTER PLAN ASSESSMENT

Review all Community Master Plans for consistency with the Historic Preservation Plan. Establish and update priorities based on degree of compliance with the goals and policies of the Historic Preservation Plan. First priority should be given to updating those plans that have already been identified as having elements that conflict with the Historic Preservation Plan, including the Central City Historic District. Plan updates should identify and address inconsistencies in both the future land use map and also the text. Text changes alone will not be sufficient.

ACTION 2: DEVELOP PRESERVATION ISSUES LIST FOR COMMUNITY MASTER PLANS

Establish a list of preservation-related issues that all Community Master Plans should address, if applicable to their area, to provide guidance and consistency as the plans are updated. This list should not only address existing and proposed historic resources, but also how such resources relate to the surrounding physical context, such as nearby landscapes, parks, commercial areas, and transit lines and station areas.

ACTION 3: ESTABLISH ANNUAL PRIORITIES AND PURSUE FUNDING

Pursue budget funding to update master plans. While budgeting priorities will reflect many factors, emphasis should be placed on updating those plans that are least consistent with the preservation plan. The Planning Division should coordinate regularly with community councils in determining budgeting priorities, especially regarding council-initiated projects that may impact plan updates.

Policy 1.1b: Update other adopted City plans to ensure compatibility with the goals and policies of the Historic Preservation Plan.

ACTION I: CITYWIDE PLAN ASSESSMENT

Review all adopted citywide plans for consistency with the Historic Preservation Plan. Such plans should include, at a minimum: survey and nomination priorities, identification of and objectives for planning overlaps such as transit stations, redevelopment projects, or sites for adaptive reuse and economic development.

INTERDEPARTMENTAL COORDINATION

OVERVIEW

There are numerous overlaps between preservation activities and the actions and interests of other City departments and agencies. These exist most notably between preservation and Economic Development, Housing and Neighborhood Development (HAND), Public Services, the Salt Lake City Redevelopment Agency (RDA), and the planning and implementation activities for Trax light rail service. In some cases these overlaps are confined to a specific geography or project, while in others the overlaps are both dispersed and perpetual.

Despite these overlaps, the level of coordination has not always been as strong as it could be. Sometimes, a lack of coordination has resulted in project delays, loss of good will, and negative public sentiment. The City has much to gain in aligning its policies and actions to express a unified mission to its residents and avoid unnecessary financial costs. The sections below describe the degree of overlap with each and highlight some of the potential benefits of collaboration.

TABLE I: DEPARTMENT ACTIVITY OVERLAPS WITH HISTORIC DISTRICTS


| Historic District | Planning Communities | Other Geographies |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------|
| Local Historic Districts | | DT, TOD, RDA |
| South Temple | Central and Avenues | |
| The Avenues | Avenues | |
| Exchange Place | Central | Downtown |
| Capitol Hill | Capitol Hill | RDA |
| Central City | Central | TOD line and station |
| University | Central | TOD |
| National Register Districts | | |
| The Avenues Extension | Avenues | |
| City Creek Canyon | Avenues and Capitol Hill | |
| Westside Warehouse | Central | Downtown, RDA |
| Gilmer Park | Central | |
| Eastside (Bryant & Bennion-Douglas) | Central | TOD line and station |
| Highland Park | Sugarhouse | |

| Historic District | Planning Communities | Other Geographies |
|------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------|
| Northwest | Northwest and Capitol Hill | TOD line and station |
| Capitol Hill Extension | Capitol Hill | |
| Yalecrest | East Bench | |

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

Economic development and preservation are more often than not mutually supportive interests. Economic development in Salt Lake City can be supported by preservation through additional housing and commercial activity in historic structures, the integration of neighborhood commercial in historic neighborhoods, offering a downtown that highlights the past as well as the future to create a unique destination, and through increased tourism to the City. This overlap is most pronounced in the downtown. Rich in historic resources -- including the local historic district Exchange Place, numerous Landmark Sites (and many not yet designated), and historic landscapes -- the City's downtown is a wonderful opportunity to highlight the City's rich history as the City builds its own unique downtown fabric.

FIGURE 3: LOCATION OF LOCAL HISTORIC DISTRICTS AND CENTRAL BUSINESS DISTRICT



Source: Salt Lake City Planning Division GIS, 2009

HOUSING AND NEIGHBORHOOD DEVELOPMENT

The majority of historic districts in the City, both local and national, are residential neighborhoods. Those in local historic districts or listed as Landmark Sites are subject to additional regulations and review through the Historic Landmark Commission for various projects and improvements. Since historic preservation typically increases property values, the long-term viability of these neighborhoods will depend on their ability to achieve a range of size and price in the housing stock to meet a variety of needs, including those of families, the elderly, and single people. The Housing and Neighborhood Development Division works in CDBG-eligible areas to address housing needs of the workforce and seniors. Its various programs offer opportunities to partner with the historic preservation program to address home maintenance and multi-family housing needs in local historic districts and in Landmark Sites.

PUBLIC SERVICES

Landscapes, streetscapes, and parks all contribute greatly to the aesthetics and human appeal of the City. Man-made elements such as historic park plazas, as well as natural features like street trees, can contribute greatly to the character of the surrounding area. In historic parks, major focal points often include old trees, as well as historic accessory buildings and features, all of which make these older parks stand apart from newer parks and public spaces. Maintaining and repairing these historic landscapes requires a more tailored approach to materials and design than typically is appropriate in more modern areas. While some historic landscapes already are protected as Landmark Sites (like Liberty Park or Washington Square associated with the City and County building), clearer guidance is needed on how to treat all historic landscapes. An expanded view of which landscapes should be treated as historic will help streamline the management of these landscapes.


REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY

Preservation, by definition, occurs in the oldest portions of the City. These areas are also often viewed as sites for redevelopment. The ability to retain structures is largely related to both the preservation ethic of the City and the degree of difficulty associated with developing projects oriented to a modern business and lifestyle setting in an older structure. Modern adaptive reuse demands can include the reuse of upper floors of an old building in the downtown for residences or the division of a large old home into apartments. Facilitating adaptive reuse of structures and providing guidance as to how best to integrate newer (often higher-density) development with older buildings regardless of use will help promote more adaptive reuse.



The Daughters of the American Revolution fountain is a protected feature of Liberty Park.

FIGURE 4: LOCATION OF LOCAL HISTORIC DISTRICTS RELATIVE TO RDA PROJECT AREAS




Source: Salt Lake City Planning Division GIS, 2009

LIGHT RAIL TRANSIT SERVICE

Light rail service in the City is a great asset and a large step forward to achieving a sustainable transportation system. The rail line connects major destinations in the City including the University, the Downtown, and municipal buildings. In so doing, the rail line and station areas move through historic districts and past Landmark Sites. Transit-oriented development (TOD) calls for higher levels of density along transit corridors, and especially adjacent to transit stops, to ensure ridership achieves the intended traffic reductions to make the project worthwhile. Where additional density is required in historic districts or near historic structures, new tools and practices can be employed to facilitate achieving net density goals while minimizing impacts to historic resources. While the City will have to make some tough choices in the ½ -mile areas around stations, careful planning for preservation and transit can employ new tools and practices to find a balance and retain more of the historic fabric. (Development proposals in transit corridors typically are reviewed for impacts on cultural resources pursuant to federal law. This review provides an opportunity to evaluate and mitigate the impacts of transit projects on historic properties.)

FIGURE 5: LOCATION OF LOCAL HISTORIC DISTRICTS RELATIVE TO TRAX STATION AREAS



Source: Salt Lake City Planning Division GIS, 2009

GOALS, POLICIES, AND ACTIONS

Goal 1.2: Ensure consistency between the Historic Preservation Plan and all City policies.

Policy 1.2a: At all levels of City government, make decisions relating to historic resources and preservation activities that are in accordance with the Historic Preservation Plan.

ACTION 1: DECISION-MAKING PRIORITY

The City will use the Historic Preservation Plan to guide decision-making regarding the expansion and maintenance of the historic preservation program and all historic resources. When conflicts arise between the Historic Preservation Plan and other adopted City plans, decision-makers should attempt to balance conflicting goals, giving due consideration to the historic preservation goals and policies expressed in this plan, in addition to other City objectives. While all decisions will continue to be made by City officials on a case-by-case basis, factors affecting historic resources (e.g., the potential loss of irreplaceable resources) will be considered.

Policy 1.2b: Coordinate regularly with other City departments to ensure compatibility of strategic goals and objectives and to pursue implementation of the Historic Preservation Plan.

ACTION 1: CITY COORDINATION COMMITTEE

Create a City Coordination Committee comprised of representatives from various City departments engaged in activities that may affect the implementation of this Historic Preservation Plan. Such agencies should include, at a minimum: Housing and Neighborhood Development, the Redevelopment Agency, Public Services, Property Management, and the Office of Sustainability and the Environment. The committee should meet regularly (e.g., monthly or quarterly) to ensure that each is aware of the actions of the other and to identify any areas where joint efforts could be pursued by two or more departments.

ACTION 2: COORDINATE WITH ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

Assign a preservation planning staff representative to closely coordinate with the Economic Development division to ensure ongoing communication between the two divisions. Areas of ongoing dialogue should include, at a minimum, opportunities to develop an increased understanding of the economic benefits of historic preservation, methods for increasing heritage tourism to the City, and opportunities for partnerships between Economic Development and Historic Preservation.

ACTION 3: COORDINATE WITH TRANSPORTATION PLANNING

Assign a planning staff representative to coordinate with City and state transportation planning efforts, in particular the light rail system expansion and station area planning. The intent should be to ensure compatible



Utah Heritage Foundation provides several guided and self-guided tours. Guided tours are geared to school groups and include the Kearns Mansion History Mystery Tour (above) and the City and County Building.

development patterns for all transportation facilities, including transit-oriented development (TOD), without eroding the integrity or supply of historic resources in historic districts.

ACTION 4: COORDINATE WITH CITY SUSTAINABILITY EFFORTS

Assign a planning staff representative to pursue ongoing coordination with the new Office of Community Sustainability and the Environment, in order to strengthen the understanding of the role preservation has in helping the City achieve its sustainability objectives

Policy 1.2c: Establish and maintain an ongoing strategy for implementing the Historic Preservation Plan.

ACTION 1: ANNUAL ACTION PLAN FOR IMPLEMENTATION

Develop an annual action plan for implementing the Historic Preservation Plan that identifies the actions to be pursued in the coming year. The priorities expressed in the Action Plan Matrix (Chapter 8) should serve as a basis for this priority-setting, with additional items added over time that are consistent with the vision of the plan. The annual plan should include, at a minimum, a funding program to be submitted to City Council for consideration during the annual budgeting process. While this annual action plan will serve as the overarching guide for budgeting decisions, it will not preclude the City's ability to respond to changing circumstances and unforeseen issues or opportunities that may arise during the year.

ACTION 2: PERIODIC IMPLEMENTATION PROGRESS REPORTS

On an ongoing basis, City staff should track the progress of implementing the annual action plan and periodically present status reports to City Council, Planning Commission and the Historic Landmark Commission.

TRANSIT AND HISTORIC PRESERVATION: AN OPPORTUNITY FOR PARTNERSHIP

Three of the current transit stations in the City are within or along the boundary of local historic districts. The planned extensions to the system generally do not lie within or abut existing historic districts, with the possible exception of the South Davis line (running on either 400 W or 300 W).

A station area is the ½ -mile area around a transit station. While ideal density numbers vary by community, higher density is generally encouraged within transit areas, particularly the first ¼ mile from the station to encourage use of the transit system.

There are several important considerations applicable when applying transit-oriented development (TOD) principles in an historic context.

1. Offer Attractive and Distinct Station Areas

Station area plans should ideally develop unique identities for each station. These identities are largely shaped by the surrounding development context of the station. For example, a station in the central business district may have a different design and development pattern than one next to the University. By appropriately building on the existing context, the station area can serve as a draw and facilitate transit use. The station areas in Salt Lake are designed to be the same general design, with the only defining feature being art. The city made a deliberate decision to make them consistent; however, the art could certainly be used to help to identify the individual history of each site.

Historic districts offer an advantage in planning a station in that the historic district already defines a unique identity. TOD planning in these areas should work to build upon this identity by placing a strong emphasis on adaptive reuse and appropriate additions to existing structures. Communities such as Dallas, Denver, San Diego, and Arlington County, Virginia, have found that preserving and integrating historic buildings in station area plans helps maintain community identity. New development should be compatible with the overall identity of the district and use appropriate scale and step-downs in height to transition to the remainder of the district.



The historic Sears building at the Cedar light rail station in Dallas.

2. Create Mixed-Use Activity Centers

The goal of TOD planning is to develop station areas that maximize ridership both day and night. A mix of residential, restaurant and entertainment, office, and retail uses are necessary to achieve this.

The adaptive reuse of historic buildings at station areas can help ensure that interesting, unique architecture is retained and helps form a distinctive draw for each of these activity centers. In some locations, adaptive reuse might be partnered with the transfer of development rights (TDRs) to achieve additional density and to accommodate a broader mix of uses than may have traditionally existed. See the discussion on TDRs in Chapter Four.

3. Promote a People-Friendly Design

Regardless of the architecture or development intensity of a given station area, the overall design and circulation pattern should be pedestrian-friendly. Walkability is a key focus as transit riders are pedestrians before and after departing the light rail car. Station areas should offer multiple routes of safe pedestrian ways with enhancements that promote use of outdoor spaces through outdoor dining and plaza areas for art, gathering, or garden spaces.

Traditional development patterns in older portions of cities and towns tend to already be more pedestrian-oriented than more recent developed areas, which tend to be more auto-oriented. Intact and connected sidewalks, large shade trees and detached sidewalks are some of the amenities already in place in historic districts.

4. Manage Parking

Parking to serve the transit station and the development within the transit station area should be well planned for in advance. Parking should be placed on the side or rear of a building rather than in front of the building, and development should maximize the use of on-street and flexible or shared parking arrangements.

Salt Lake City has an advantage for offering on-street parking given the wide street widths of the original street grid. These spaces should be maximized to reduce the need for additional parking lots as development in station areas intensifies.

A SHARED UNDERSTANDING OF PRESERVATION'S BENEFITS

OVERVIEW

Historic preservation offers communities numerous economic, social, and environmental benefits. An important component of building citywide support for preservation will be the ability of planning staff and other preservation advocates to be able to clearly communicate these benefits. In implementing this plan, the City's Planning Division will work to document and maximize the understanding of the various benefits of historic preservation to the City. This will involve, in part, increased outreach from planning staff, the Historic Landmark Commission, and other preservation partners to help convey and illustrate these benefits. Ideally, preservation will be integrated with and help support other City efforts including the development of transit station areas, meeting housing needs, and strengthening the City's downtown and tourism activity.

GOALS, POLICIES, AND ACTIONS

Goal 1.3: Foster a shared understanding of preservation within the City.

Policy 1.3a: Educate City leaders and other departments on the economic, environmental, cultural, and social benefits of historic preservation.

ACTION 1: OUTREACH TO CITY LEADERS AND OTHER DEPARTMENTS

Create a variety of educational materials to educate elected and appointed officials and all City staff about the benefits of historic preservation, with the objective of increasing awareness and understanding of the role historic preservation plays in the well-being and prosperity of the City over the long-term. Tools might include, for example, PowerPoint or other types of visual presentations, or a series of online or hard-copy brochures. Where possible, such materials should quantify specific benefits and offer examples of how investments in historic preservation have helped catalyze additional change and investment. The materials should also highlight some examples of win-win relationships between preservation and other departments and agencies. As part of this outreach effort, the Planning Division staff should make at least two presentations per year to the City Council to provide updates on the historic preservation program and progress made in implementing this plan.

ACTION 2: WEAVE EDUCATION INTO ALL PRESERVATION PLANNING FUNCTIONS

Integrate education about preservation's benefits into all Planning Division functions. For example, weave an educational component into the department's annual budget requests.



The Planning Division is developing an informational video to educate about the importance of preservation.

Policy 1.3b: Increase City department coordination and communication on area-specific projects and objectives.

ACTION 1: ASSIGN STAFF PLANNING TEAMS TO THE COMMUNITY

Assign a team of preservation planning staff members to represent geographic planning areas, in order to allow closer coordination with residents and other agencies on projects planned for the area on an ongoing basis. Ensure coordination between the teams and the land use planners assigned to each district, to ensure consistency if questions or needs arise with residents and business owners of a particular district.

ACTION 2: DEVELOP PROPERTY ACQUISITION PROCESS

Develop a thorough process for the acquisition of historic properties by the City, including up-front planning for future use, resale, renovation, and designating (if appropriate), in addition to the actual purchase of the property. In cases where the City will retain ownership, the purchase process should include the development of a plan for the long-term management of the site, coordinated with the Property Management Division and other City departments and divisions.

ACTION 3: PLANNING FOR CITY-OWNED PROPERTIES

Engage neighborhoods in discussions about the use of City-owned historic properties (structures, sites, and landscapes) through community group meetings or neighborhood charrettes, as appropriate. Where redevelopment is a potential or desired option, or if one of the RDA or Housing programs could be of assistance to the productive and desired future use of the site, RDA and others should be integrated into the planning discussions to encourage their involvement in the project.



The city recently acquired the 29th Ward Meeting House, an historic LDS Ward house in the city's 29th Ward.

Policy 1.3c: Secure funding to conduct a detailed study of the economic benefits of historic preservation to the City.

ACTION 1: STUDY ECONOMIC BENEFITS OF HISTORIC PRESERVATION

Identify and apply for funding for an economic benefits study to quantify the value of historic preservation in the City and identify opportunities to increase benefits in the future. Base the study on popular models already developed for states and cities with longstanding preservation programs, such as Colorado, Florida, and Michigan, and Dallas, Texas. This may require more than one study to assess commercial and residential benefits separately. Investigate the potential of University of Utah's involvement via the Economic Research Center or the Family and Urban Studies Department, as well as the Economic Development Corporation of Utah to assist in supporting the effort through donations of time, data, or funding.

ACTION 2: UNDERSTAND MUTUAL INTERESTS

Coordinate the scope of the study with the City's other efforts in economic development to benefit and inform plans and actions of both interests as much as possible.

Develop a Comprehensive Preservation Toolbox

In addition to establishing a unified, citywide vision for historic preservation in Salt Lake City, it will be equally important to ensure that a broader and more robust range of policy and regulatory tools is available to effectuate that vision.

Since the beginning of the City's preservation efforts over three decades ago, the community has developed an impressive array of programs and policies for the identification and protection of historic resources. The most important of these tools include an ongoing program of historic resources surveys; a tested set of preservation regulations (consisting primarily of the historic overlay ordinance and the residential district design guidelines); and a dedicated planning staff within the planning division charged with administering and enforcing all aspects of the preservation program.

The comments received as part of this planning process agreed that the City's preservation "toolbox" is useful but incomplete. There are opportunities to fine-tune existing programs -- for example, to address concerns related to demolition, economic hardship, and other issues. There also is room for new, complementary initiatives, such as a new strategy to guide future historic resource surveys. A wider range of preservation regulations also is necessary, such as a transfer of development rights program, conservation districts, and a wider range of incentives. New design guidelines are necessary for nonresidential development and multiple family housing.

This chapter discusses opportunities to fine-tune and broaden the City's preservation toolbox in three important categories:

- Historic Resource Surveys,
- Designated Properties (Historic Districts and Landmark Sites), and
- Land Use Regulations and Design Guidelines.

Theme 2: Adopt a Complete Range of Preservation Tools to Recognize and Protect a Diversity of Resources

Salt Lake City has an impressive depth and range of historic resources. The historic preservation program develops and pursues a clear strategy for identifying and protecting a wide range of important resources, including not only older historic districts and landmarks, but also signature resources from the recent past. Also, because preservation has as much to do with preserving the unique character of a place as it does with preserving sites and buildings themselves, the City develops a range of new tools to safeguard the predominant character of established neighborhoods as development and infill take place.

HISTORIC RESOURCE SURVEYS

OVERVIEW

Historic resource surveys are a vital tool for informing the community about the types of historic properties that exist within Salt Lake City and the extent to which such properties maintain their historic integrity. They provide baseline information for evaluating applications for modifications to historic properties. They provide valuable information on the history, architecture, and condition of specific neighborhoods, buildings, sites, and landscapes, and they set the stage for historic designation.

A survey involves the visual examination of a select area or group of properties to determine their historic integrity and significance. In addition to inventorying historic properties, surveys typically rank the resources based on their relative historic significance. Surveys may look for resources from either a geographic or thematic perspective, depending on their objectives (see box, right).

Accurate surveys are vital to a well-functioning historic preservation program in a number of ways. For example, surveys help inform development decisions. At the local level, major land use decisions should be informed by the best available information about the presence or condition of historic resources. This applies not only to decisions specifically affecting historic properties, such as certificates of appropriateness; it also includes rezonings, subdivisions, conditional uses, and any other type of land use activity that might affect a historic building or site. In such situations, it is vital to have up-to-date survey information to ensure that historic resources are protected as development activity moves forward. At the national level, Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act requires all federally funded projects to assess their impacts on historic resources. On the state level, Section 9-8-404 requires all state-funded projects to assess their impacts on historic resources.


Survey work can be performed at two levels that differ in the level of detail, expertise, time, and resources needed to complete the work. These two survey methods are described below.

Reconnaissance Survey

The reconnaissance survey, commonly known as a "windshield survey," is an effective way of evaluating large areas to identify potentially eligible properties for local and/or national designation. This survey is conducted by the surveyor briefly looking at each property or resource within a predefined area or related to a historic theme. An experienced surveyor can determine from this level of survey which resources appear to meet the necessary age and integrity standards and which do not. In Utah, the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) requires survey documentation to include a brief context description of the survey area from secondary sources to help frame the history of use and development as well as provide a justification of the survey area boundary. In the field, the surveyor documents potential resources on a map of the survey area and then photographs



While geographic surveys may focus on specific areas such as neighborhoods (top), thematic surveys highlight resources by type such as historic churches (bottom), parks, or apartment buildings.



and makes basic notes on the architecture and apparent integrity of a property. Because no research or more detailed fieldwork is completed on individual resources, the reconnaissance survey offers the benefit of being relatively inexpensive and an effective way of identifying areas where intensive-level survey may be warranted.

Intensive Survey

The intensive-level survey builds upon the results of a reconnaissance survey by involving detailed documentation of each site, building, or structure included in a project. Because of the detailed work and documentation, these are both more expensive and time-consuming. The intensive-level survey typically includes additional photography, enhanced field notes, and archival research to document some history and significance of each resource. This level of survey results in a substantial document (a site form) for each property, where the results of the fieldwork and research are recorded together with a determination of significance.

Surveys are only as useful as they are current. As time passes, surveys become less and less accurate representations of conditions on the ground. The boundaries of historic areas may expand or shrink, and individual properties may lose or gain their historic integrity. Current survey information is needed to capture these changes and allow for the continuing evaluation (and modification if necessary) of district boundaries and lists of contributing structures over time. Accurate information on properties and districts helps ensure that the time and resources of the historic preservation program are efficiently and appropriately directed to the correct locations.

Once a survey is completed, it should be updated periodically to address the ongoing impacts of two dynamic forces: time and maintenance.

Time: One standard for determining eligibility for historic designation is age, so surveys must be updated periodically to address new properties that meet the 50-year guideline. Further, surveys should be updated periodically to acknowledge that the resources that historians and the public perceive as "historic" and worth preserving may evolve and change over time. Current survey practice tends to recognize a broad range of socio-economic, cultural, and architectural influences that may lead to historic significance, whereas older surveys tended to have a narrower definition of historic significance. Broadly speaking, the older the survey, the less likely it presents an accurate and complete picture of an area's current historic significance.


Maintenance: Over time, property maintenance can impact the status of a historic property.

- A property owner may defer maintenance of their property so that its condition deteriorates and it no longer qualifies as a historically significant or contributing structure.
- A property owner may make an inappropriate alteration to a structure that renders it no longer historically significant or contributing.
- A property owner may make an alteration that rectifies a past modification and enables the structure to now qualify as a historically significant or contributing structure.

- A structure listed in an older survey may have been demolished.

Salt Lake City has completed 24 historic resource surveys to date, with all but the most recent resulting in the designation of either a national or local historic district. A map of the survey areas is shown below.

FIGURE 6: SALT LAKE CITY HISTORIC DISTRICT SURVEYS



Source: Salt Lake City Planning Division GIS, 2007.

The nature of historic resource surveys in Salt Lake City has changed significantly over time. The earliest surveys, from over 30 years ago, were relatively simple and focused on the historic resources with the highest visibility at that time. Since then, surveying has evolved into more of a sophisticated, City-led process that, while sporadic, has focused on a broader range of resources -- from outstanding, high-style individual buildings to large, predominantly vernacular residential neighborhoods.

City officials have acknowledged that most survey work has occurred sporadically and been completed in a reactionary, rather than proactive and strategic, manner. In response to the 2004 City Council-led review of the historic preservation program, the City is undertaking new re-surveys to update the information for existing districts. This planning process builds on this work by providing additional direction about which existing surveys should be updated and areas of the City where new surveys should be undertaken.

The goals, policies, and actions below establish a long-term strategy for identifying, prioritizing, and pursuing additional historic resource surveys,

based on the essential role that surveys play in identifying and protecting the City's historic resources.

GOALS, POLICIES, AND ACTIONS

Goal 2.1: Strategically pursue the identification of historic resources through surveys.

Policy 2.1a: Identify and prioritize areas where new surveys are needed.

ACTION 1: ESTABLISH SURVEY CRITERIA

Develop criteria that may be applied on an ongoing basis to determine where new survey work is necessary. Criteria should include, but not be limited to:

- Concentration of potential resources;
- New types of resources not yet protected;
- Possible endangerment of the resource/area (including encroachment from new development);
- Need of survey to precede and inform potential planning or development (including activities by other departments); and
- Presence of public support (for surveys of unlisted resources).

ACTION 2: IDENTIFY AREAS WHERE NEW SURVEYS ARE NEEDED

Based on the survey criteria called for in Action 1, and using the recommendations in Appendix A as a starting list, develop a list of areas where new historic resource surveys are needed. Update the list on at least an annual basis. Use GIS technology as one tool to help identify resources that may have historic value but have not yet been surveyed.

Create a simple and easy-to-maintain system of tracking suggestions for areas where surveys are needed. Tracking individual sites may facilitate the identification of possible thematic collections to be surveyed or sites to be nominated individually. These priorities will serve as a framework against which planning staff can weigh and balance survey suggestions to ensure strategic aims of the preservation program are represented.

Follow a collaborative process to review and update the list of areas where surveys are needed. Include in the discussions a variety of preservation stakeholders, including City staff, the Historic Landmark Commission, community councils, preservation partners (like Utah Heritage Foundation), and general public input.

Policy 2.1b: Identify and prioritize areas where survey updates or resurveys are needed.

ACTION 1: ESTABLISH AGE THRESHOLD FOR EXISTING SURVEYS

To ensure that survey information is up-to-date, establish a general threshold age for surveys to reach before they should be updated. There are few hard precedents on this issue around the country, and update timeframes generally vary. Many surveys are updated after roughly 25-30 years. The need for a

re-survey depends on the amount and pace of new development – for example, if not much development occurred in an area in the past 20 years, there might not be as great of a need to update the survey. The resources available for surveys also impacts the frequency of updates.

Up-to-date surveys are an essential tool for informing City decision-makers about the context and relative importance of resources in the community. The City will work to ensure that surveys are well-maintained and accurately portray the location and integrity of the City's historic resources. Incorporate updated survey work into the annual survey priority list as necessary (Action 2.1a).

ACTION 2: IDENTIFY AREAS WHERE RESURVEYS ARE NEEDED

Based on the survey criteria called for in Policy 2.1a, and using the recommendations in Appendix A as a starting list, develop a list of areas where updates or complete revisions to existing surveys are needed, because of the age of the survey and/or changed conditions.

Policy 2.1c: Prioritize surveys for funding consideration on an annual basis or semi-annual basis.

ACTION 1: IDENTIFY SHORT- AND LONG-TERM SURVEY FUNDING PRIORITIES

Work with preservation partners and the Commission to develop a list of short- and long-term funding priorities for surveys, based on the list of needed surveys that is called for in Policy 2.1a. Reevaluate funding priorities on an annual or semi-annual basis.

Goal 2.2: Ensure that up-to-date and complete surveys are used to inform preservation decision-making.

Policy 2.2a: Ensure that all future surveys provide adequate information upon which to make informed decisions.

ACTION 1: ESTABLISH A CONSISTENT FORMAT FOR NEW SURVEYS

Ensure that all future surveys share a generally consistent format and structure, and contain the same elements, which should comply with the State Historic Preservation Office's survey guidelines and should include at a minimum:

- Survey forms and processes approved by the State Historic Preservation Office;
- Digital photographs of all surveyed properties;
- Ratings of significance for each surveyed property; and
- A survey report that includes, among other items, a statement of the historic context of the survey area and recommendations.

Policy 2.2b: Work with the State Historic Preservation Office to establish electronic archives and provide results of surveys and National Register applications on the website.

ACTION 1: SUPPORT ARCHIVE DEVELOPMENT

Coordinate with SHPO on the development of their electronic archives and assist as necessary to facilitate the development of that resource. Also develop capabilities to place City preservation archives online (e.g., photographs, applications).

ACTION 2: PROMOTE ELECTRONIC ARCHIVE USE

Assist with raising awareness of the system and promoting its use once it is up and running. Use tools such as community council newsletters (if available) to announce the archive system, as well as brochures and presentations that can be developed in collaboration with the SHPO.

HISTORIC DESIGNATION (DISTRICTS AND LANDMARK SITES)

OVERVIEW

Once identified, historic resources may be nominated for national and/or local historic designation. Local nominations typically occur following completion of a survey and a National Register nomination, though individual property nominations may occur independent of a survey.

NOMINATIONS

Property owners, non-profit organizations, or local officials may pursue individual listing of a property at either the national and/or local levels. These nominations are typically driven by pride in and awareness of the historical or architectural significance of a property, and also so the owner can access the associated financial benefits such as tax credits for rehabilitation projects.

Organizations and local officials may also prepare thematic or multiple-property nominations of properties that are connected through a common history, a consistent architectural style, or a similar historic context (a historical theme, geographical area, and chronological period). Nominating a set of related properties can streamline the documentation process, since most resources share a common background that can be described once for the whole group.

Salt Lake City has pursued a number of thematic and multiple-property National Register nominations. These encompass a wide array of historic resources, including commercial and public buildings, transportation facilities, and religious institutions. Past National Register nominations include:

- Sugar House Business District MPS (Multiple-Property Survey)
- SLC Business District MRA (Multiple Resource Area)
- Wilford Woodruff Family Historic Residences TR (Thematic Resources)
- U.S. Post Offices in Utah MPS
- Electric Power Plants of Utah MPS
- Perkins Addition Streetcar Suburb TR
- Jewish Synagogues TR



The Yalecrest neighborhood was added to the National Register in 2007.

- Public Works Buildings TR
- Historic Resources of SLC MPS (The context name is "Urban Expansion to the Early 20th Century, 1890s to 1930s"; the property type is Urban Apartment Buildings.)
- Mormon Church Buildings in Utah MPS

LISTING ON THE NATIONAL REGISTER OF HISTORIC PLACES

A property owner, organization, or government may nominate a property or district for listing on the National Register of Historic Places by completing the appropriate nomination form and supplying the required documentation. This nomination is submitted to the City's Historic Landmark Commission for recommendation before being forwarded on to the State Historic Preservation Office, which reviews the nomination and notifies the property owner and local jurisdiction of the nomination to allow for public comment. If there is no objection from the owner, or majority of owners in the case of a district, and the property meets the appropriate criteria (see box, right) the SHPO will forward the nomination to the National Park Service for consideration.

Listing on the National Register is honorific. It does not impose any regulations or restrictions on the owner regarding the maintenance of their property, but does qualify the owner to take advantage of federal and state tax incentives as well as Utah Heritage Foundation's Revolving Loan Fund, if qualified.

The City has 185 individual properties listed on the National Register of Historic Places, including the Utah State Capitol Building, Utah State Fairgrounds, and Temple Square.

The City has 16 National Register districts, including six also listed as local historic districts. Those ten only listed as national historic districts are purely honorific and are not protected under the City's historic preservation zoning and design guidelines like the locally-listed districts (but they do qualify the owners for tax benefits and also trigger Section 106 review for federal projects). The ten districts only listed on the National Register include:

- The Avenues Extension (1980)
- City Creek Canyon (1980)

Criteria for Listing on the National Register

"The quality of significance in American history, architecture, archeology, engineering, and culture is present in districts, sites, buildings, structures, and objects that possess integrity of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association, and:

- That are associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history; or
- That are associated with the lives of persons significant in our past; or
- That embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, or that represent the work of a master, or that possess high artistic values, or that represent a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction; or
- That have yielded or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history."

Source: <http://www.nps.gov/history/nr/listing.htm>

- Westside Warehouse (1982)
- Gilmer Park (1996)
- Eastside (Bryant & Bennion-Douglas) (1996-2003)
- Highland Park (1998)
- Northwest (2001)
- Capitol Hill Extension (2002)
- Yalecrest (2007)

In addition, two more national districts are expected soon: Forest Dale (expected in 2009) and Liberty Wells (expected in 2010).

LISTING ON THE SALT LAKE CITY REGISTER OF CULTURAL RESOURCES

Because local historic designation is technically a zoning map amendment, applications for local designation must meet the general rezoning standards in the Salt Lake City Zoning Code. In addition, the application must meet the specific criteria for historic designation of the ordinance (see box below), which are based on National Register criteria. The same process is used for the local listing of either a Landmark Site or district, and includes:

- The property owner or City submits a completed application with all the required information and fees to the Planning Division.
- The Planning Division researches the feasibility of the proposed site for designation.
- A professional architectural and historic survey of the proposed site will be conducted.
- Planning Division staff develops a report analyzing whether the proposed site meets the City's criteria and makes a recommendation to the Historic Landmark Commission.
- The Historic Landmark Commission holds a public hearing on the request to review the proposal and make a recommendation to the Planning Commission.
- The Planning Commission holds a public hearing to review the proposal and makes a recommendation to the City Council.
- The City Council holds a public hearing and makes a final decision on the proposal. (Source: Planning info sheet: "Inclusion of Property on the Salt Lake City Register of Cultural Resources" available on-line at <http://www.slcgov.com/CED/HLC/content/Inclusion.asp>.)

Designation of a Landmark Site or district is accomplished by the City Council adopting an ordinance to amend the zoning map for the affected property. This amendment applies the (H) Historic Preservation Overlay District to the property or district. The zoning map amendment process is intended to allow changes in public policy, through a public process involving input from



The Fisher Mansion and Carriage House is a Landmark Site. In 2008 students of University of Utah documented the city-owned structure as a class project.

community councils, residents, business and property owners, and historic preservation organizations.

The majority of sites listed individually on the Salt Lake City local register were pursued for listing by the City's first preservation planner (added in 1980). Buildings listed on the National Register before April 16, 1976, were automatically listed on the local register in most cases. This planner proactively approached property owners about listing their properties based on the results of survey work. Recent City policy has tended to favor listing resources on the National Register before pursuing local designation (in part to build support for preservation by demonstrating the benefits of designation before subjecting the property to local design standards).

Following local designation, all new construction and all exterior changes to designated properties must be reviewed and approved by the Historic Landmark Commission. The Commission may deny demolition of a locally listed structure or a property within a locally designated district. Local designation also makes a property eligible for the Utah Heritage Foundation revolving loan program.

The City has 164 individual properties listed on the local Register of Cultural Resources, including the Rocky Mountain Bell Telephone building, the original Salt Lake City library, and the Fisher Mansion and Carriage House. Eighty four of these properties are listed on both the City Register of Cultural Resources and the National Register. Properties that are listed on both include the Salt Lake City & County Building, Trolley Square, and Pioneer Park.

Criteria for Local Historic Designation
in Salt Lake City (as of May 2009)

1. Significance in local, regional, state or national history, architecture, engineering or culture, associated with at least one of the following:

Events that have made significant contribution to the broad patterns of history, or
Lives of persons significant to the history of the City, region, state, or nation, or
The distinctive characteristics of a type, period or method of construction; or the work of a notable architect or master craftsman, or
Information important in the understanding of the prehistory or history of Salt Lake City;
2. Physical integrity in terms of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling and association as defined by the national park service for the National Register of Historic Places; and
3. The age of the site. Sites must be at least fifty (50) years old, or have achieved significance within the past fifty (50) years if the properties are of exceptional importance.


Source: Salt Lake Zoning Code, Section 21A.34.020(C)2

The City has six locally designated historic districts:

- South Temple (designated in 1977)
- The Avenues (1978)
- Exchange Place (1978)
- Capitol Hill (1982)
- Central City (1991)
- University (1991)

The following goals, policies, and actions establish a strategy for how the City can update, maintain, and expand its list of designated historic resources.

FIGURE 7: HISTORIC DISTRICTS IN SALT LAKE CITY



Source: Salt Lake City Planning Division GIS, 2009 Goals, Policies, and Actions

Goal 2.3: Ensure the long-term health and viability of existing historic districts.

The City is committed to safeguarding its historic districts to ensure these vibrant neighborhoods remain an asset for the City in years to come.

Policy 2.3a: Evaluate the appropriateness of all historic district boundaries on an ongoing basis, with priority given to existing locally designated districts.

ACTION 1: TRACK DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITY NEAR LOCAL DISTRICT BOUNDARIES

Use the City's GIS resources to track demolition and other development activity within and near established local historic districts to determine when and where areas of conflict are emerging. Possible impacts to the integrity of historic districts may reasonably be expected to arise in areas with pressures for more intense development, such as major roadway corridors, redevelopment areas, and transit station areas.

Policy 2.3b: Refine local historic district boundaries as necessary to reflect current conditions.

ACTION 1: EVALUATE POSSIBLE LOCAL DISTRICT BOUNDARY CHANGES

On an ongoing basis, work with an inter-departmental coalition and preservation partners to identify and evaluate areas where expansions or changes to the boundaries of existing districts may be necessary to reflect changed conditions, or where historic preservation interests must be balanced with other forces or interests that serve the long-term health and function of the City. Use the recommendations in Appendix A (see box at right) to define priorities for resurvey work.

ACTION 2: REFINE LOCAL DISTRICT BOUNDARIES

In consultation with the State Historic Preservation Office, pursue changes to existing district boundaries, based on the evaluation in Action 1 above. Pursue boundary changes only where political and property owner support exists for such changes, and where boundary changes would be consistent with adopted local plans. Pursue boundary changes only following new surveys or resurveys of the applicable properties.

Priority Local Districts for Resurvey

Field research as part of this planning effort identifies the following local districts as priority sites for resurvey and boundary evaluation work.

- Central City
- Exchange Place
- Bryant
- Westside Warehouse
- University

Goal 2.4: Protect exemplary groupings of historic properties as local historic districts.

Policy 2.4a: Pursue local historic district listing for significant concentrations of historic properties to ensure their continued protection through the historic preservation program.

ACTION 1: IDENTIFY NATIONAL DISTRICTS APPROPRIATE FOR LOCAL LISTING

Determine which national districts would make good candidates for listing as local districts and if there is local support by property owners for such a listing. The City has several districts that are designated at the national, but not the local, level. Additional surveys, as well as staff and stakeholder knowledge, will be used to identify national districts to be nominated as local districts.

ACTION 2: IDENTIFY OTHER CANDIDATE AREAS FOR LOCAL DESIGNATION

Work with preservation partners and local residents to identify significant concentrations of historic properties that may qualify for local historic designation.

ACTION 3: PREPARE LOCAL DISTRICT AND MULTIPLE-PROPERTY NOMINATIONS

Prepare historic district or multiple-property nominations to the Salt Lake City Register of Cultural Resources where significant political and property owner support exists for such listings, and where historic designation would be consistent with locally adopted plans.

Goal 2.5: Protect significant individual properties as designated local Landmark Sites.

Policy 2.5a: Pursue local listing of significant individual properties to ensure their continued protection.

ACTION 1: IDENTIFY LANDMARK SITE CANDIDATES

Work with preservation partners and local residents to identify significant individual historic properties that may qualify for historic designation. The City has many architectural treasures not yet listed as Landmark Sites on the Salt Lake City Register of Cultural Resources. In particular, consider alternatives to the 50-year mark for determining eligibility for historic designation; see "Protecting Historic Properties from the Recent Past" box for more information.

ACTION 2: NOMINATE ADDITIONAL LANDMARK SITES

Prepare and submit nominations for new Landmark Sites to the Salt Lake City Register of Cultural Resources.

ACTION 3: EVALUATE DESIGNATION STATUS OF EXISTING LANDMARK SITES

Survey all current individual Landmark Sites to ensure that they still meet the applicable designation criteria. Submit findings and staff recommendations for updating the list of Landmark Sites in the City. This may be done concurrently with the submission of nominations for new Landmark Sites that were not on the original list.

Policy 2.5b: Designate all eligible City-owned historic properties as Landmark Sites.

ACTION 1: PURSUE LOCAL LISTING OF CITY PROPERTIES

Prepare and submit nominations to the Salt Lake City Register of Cultural Resources for current City-owned eligible sites.

ACTION 2: UPDATE CITY PROPERTY ACQUISITION PROCESS

Designate future eligible City-owned historic properties as Landmark Sites, as the City takes ownership. Integrate a determination of eligibility into the property acquisition process of the City so that the two are done simultaneously.

Goal 2.6: Encourage the listing of significant historic properties on the National Register of Historic Places to complement local designation.

Policy 2.6a: Encourage National Register listing of eligible sites, landscapes, and districts.

ACTION 1: ENCOURAGE NATIONAL REGISTER NOMINATIONS FOR PROPERTIES IDENTIFIED THROUGH SURVEY WORK

When historic properties are identified through survey work, work with property owners to nominate such properties to the National Register of Historic Places, where they are eligible, and where there is property owner support -- particularly where local designation is unlikely. Nominate eligible thematic collections for listing on the National Register through a multiple-property listing.

PROTECTING HISTORIC PROPERTIES OF THE RECENT PAST

A recurring theme in the comments received during this planning process is that Salt Lake should be more assertive in identifying and protecting historic resources from the recent past. Historic preservation traditionally has focused on a fairly strict threshold of 50 years in determining whether or not a property is historically significant. A simple reason for this threshold is because, typically, timeframes of less than 50 years do not allow sufficient insight into whether a property is sufficiently important in the big-picture history of the community. In the words of the National Park Service: "The passage of time allows our perceptions to be influenced by education, the judgment of previous decades, and the dispassion of distance." Often, because they are not considered technically eligible for designation, historic resources that are less than 50 years old receive less attention and protection than older landmarks, and are more susceptible to demolition or inappropriate alterations.

There is growing precedent for recognizing historic significance in properties that have not hit the 50-year mark. Some nationally famous examples have included the architecturally significant terminal building at Dulles Airport in Washington, D.C., and Elvis Presley's historically significant Graceland mansion, both of which were placed on the National Register when they were less than 50 years old. The Park Service guide on the topic explains:

"Fifty years is obviously not the only length of time that defines "historic" or makes an informed, dispassionate judgment possible. It was chosen as a reasonable, perhaps popularly understood span that makes professional evaluation of historical value feasible. The National Register Criteria for Evaluation encourage nomination of recently significant properties if they are of exceptional importance to a community, a State, a region, or the Nation. The criteria do not describe "exceptional," nor should they. Exceptional, by its own definition, cannot be fully catalogued or anticipated. It may reflect the extraordinary impact of a political or social event. It may apply to an entire category of resources so fragile that survivors of any age are unusual. It may be the function of the relative age of a community and its perceptions of old and new. It may be represented by a building or structure whose developmental or design value is quickly recognized as historically significant by the architectural or engineering profession. It may be reflected in a range of resources for which a community has an unusually strong associative attachment. Thus a complete list of exceptionally significant resources cannot be prepared or precise indicators of exceptional value prescribed."



Salt Lake City Public Safety Building (Historic Northwest Pipeline Company Headquarters), 1958, is an example of a significant modern resource that has just recently reached the 50-year milestone.

Other Resources:

- Recent Past Resource Network: www.recentpast.org
- US Dept Interior: NPS: *Guidelines for Evaluating and Nominating Properties that Have Achieved Significance Within the Past Fifty Years* (proper cite)
- *Twentieth Century Building Materials: History and Conservation*, Thomas C. Jester, ed., 1995.
- Modernism and the Recent Past: www.preservationnation.org/issues/modernism-recent-past/

LAND USE AND DESIGN REGULATIONS

OVERVIEW

The City's preservation regulations consist primarily of the historic overlay ordinance and the residential district design guidelines, which apply only to locally designated Landmark Sites and locally designated historic districts. The comments received during this planning process indicated that these regulations are working relatively well (except as discussed below), but there is strong interest in developing new, additional tools like design guidelines for non-residential uses (e.g., multi-family, open space, commercial, and institutional uses) as well as neighborhood conservation districts for areas that may not want or qualify for local designation, yet still have character worthy of protection.

This section first provides an overview of the regulatory tools already in place. Following the background summary, the plan provides goals, policies, and actions aimed at making targeted improvements and expansions to the regulatory system.

(H) HISTORIC PRESERVATION OVERLAY DISTRICT

The purpose of the (H) Historic Preservation Overlay District is to protect locally listed Landmark Sites and historic districts by regulating alterations to and demolitions of Landmark Sites and properties within historic districts, and new construction in historic districts. The district establishes the following:

- Eligibility criteria for the selection of a local Landmark Site or historic district;
- Procedures for the establishment of districts and Landmark Sites, review of alterations to historic properties, district boundaries, revoking local designation status, and issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness for construction and alterations.
- Standards for issuing a Certificate of Appropriateness for demolition of a Landmark Site, including a definition of economic hardship and procedures for determining when economic hardship exists.

DESIGN GUIDELINES FOR RESIDENTIAL HISTORIC DISTRICTS

In addition to the regulatory controls established through the overlay district, local historic districts and Landmark Sites are subject to the *Design Guidelines for Residential Historic Districts in Salt Lake City* (the "design guidelines"). Like the Zoning Ordinance standards, the design guidelines incorporate the nationally recognized *Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation*, but include an expanded explanation, illustrations and photographs, and policy statements pertaining to individual building elements. The design guidelines provide a basis for making decisions about the appropriate treatment of historic properties and compatible new construction. In addition to design guidance, the design guidelines present a catalog of architectural styles present in the City

6.0 ARCHITECTURAL DETAILS

Why:

Architectural details help establish a historic building's character and distinguish it from other buildings. They should be preserved whenever feasible. If architectural details are damaged beyond repair, their replacement, matching the original detailing, is recommended.

Background:

Architectural details play a vital role in defining the character of a historic structure; they add visual interest, define ornamental styles and types, and show the range of a craftsman's skill and architectural design. Features such as window heads, brackets and eaves, cast-iron porches, and fountains often mark an architectural style and therefore their preservation is important.

Treatment of Architectural Features:

Preserving original architectural details is central to the integrity of the building, and its context. Where replacement is required, one should restore only those portions that are damaged or missing. Even if an architectural detail is replaced with an exact replica of the original detail, the integrity of the building as a historic resource is diminished and therefore preservation of the original material is preferred.



Preserving original architectural details is central to the integrity of the building and its context.



Preserving original architectural details is central to the integrity of the building and its context.

The design guidelines address renovations, additions, and new construction affecting local landmarks and historic districts.

that highlights the date range and key characteristics of each. They also provide a brief overview and key objectives for each local district in which they apply.

The guidelines focus on key preservation principles:

- Respect the historic design character of the building;
- Seek uses that are compatible with the historic character of the building;
- Protect and maintain significant features and stylish elements;
- Preserve any existing original site features or original building materials and features; and
- Repair deteriorated historic features and replace only those elements that cannot be repaired.

The rehabilitation standards of the design guidelines address site design and landscaping; exterior alterations including materials, windows, doors, porches, architectural detail, and roofs; additions; accessory structures; and seismic design. Property owners must receive a "Certificate of Appropriateness" for any exterior alteration prior to obtaining a building permit.

GOALS, POLICIES, AND ACTIONS

Goal 2.7: Align preservation-related City regulations with the goals and policies of this plan.

The City will work to identify and resolve conflicts between current regulations and the implementation of this plan and protection of historic resources in the City.

Policy 2.7a: Ensure that underlying zoning in historic districts is supportive of historic preservation objectives for that area.

ACTION I: ASSESS UNDERLYING ZONING

Assess underlying zoning in historic districts and identify areas where zoning is inconsistent with preservation objectives. Coordinate the zoning review with any boundary adjustments resulting from the actions related to Goal 2.3 of this plan.

This issue is closely related to concerns raised with the demolition and hardship provisions of the ordinance, discussed below under Goal 2.9. Comments received during this planning process indicated that the current demolition and economic hardship provisions of the ordinance do not state clear processes and provide an applicant with understandable direction. In some cases, economic hardship arguments have been successfully used to allow demolition. In many cases, this is the result of underlying zoning that allows uses or densities that greatly exceed the value of the existing structure. A preliminary assessment of this issue indicates that the Central City and University Districts are two priority areas to be examined in this regard.



*New house under construction.
(Photo courtesy of Utah State
Historic Preservation Office.)*

ACTION 2: PURSUE ZONING MAP AMENDMENTS

Pursue zoning map amendments to underlying zoning in historic districts where the underlying zoning is determined to be at odds with the long-term preservation objectives for the district.

Policy 2.7b: Refine the building development code to clearly enable historic remodels and adaptive reuse of commercial structures.

ACTION 1: ASSESS BUILDING CODE BARRIERS AND CONFLICTS

Work with an interdisciplinary team including builders, architects, preservationists, and others to identify barriers to non-residential and multi-family adaptive reuse projects under current zoning, fire, and building codes, and develop solutions to those barriers through code amendments.

ACTION 2: DEVELOP SMART CODE FOR ADAPTIVE REUSE

Encourage the building department to work with planning staff in developing an Alternative Rehabilitation Code or "Smart Code" to apply to historic commercial and office buildings to facilitate their adaptive reuse. This should specifically address the barriers and conflicts as identified through action 2.7.b1. Models could include the California State Historical Building Code and the Boulder, Colorado, historic building code.

Goal 2.8: Broaden the range of tools available to encourage the preservation of historic properties.

Policy 2.8a: Develop new regulatory tools to help encourage and require the preservation of historic properties.

ACTION 1: EXPLORE POSSIBILITY OF A CONSERVATION OVERLAY DISTRICT

Amend the zoning code by establishing a conservation district overlay tool to provide additional flexibility in how communities protect local character. The overlay district will allow review (typically administrative) of development proposals that affect key, character-defining features in designated areas. See the text box below for additional information.

ACTION 2: DEVELOP TRANSFER OF DEVELOPMENT RIGHTS (TDR) PROGRAMS

Develop one or more programs to allow and support the transfer of development rights to support historic preservation. See the text box for additional information.

ACTION 3: EXPLORE OTHER TOOLS AND INCENTIVES

Explore other tools and incentives as the need arises, to continue to diversify the tools and incentives at the City's disposal to achieve its preservation aims.

CONSERVATION DISTRICTS

What is a Conservation District?

New "conservation districts" might be an appropriate tool for protecting some of the communities in Salt Lake that have special attributes that citizens want to protect. Conservation districts are being considered or have been adopted in a growing number of jurisdictions across the country as one alternative to more stringent historic district regulations. Communities as diverse as Dallas, Texas (illustrated on this and the following page); Cambridge, Massachusetts; and Portland, Oregon, all have adopted conservation districts, though each district is unique. (Portland also has "conservation landmark" designation for individual properties.) Most conservation districts are directed at preserving the residential character of a neighborhood, maintaining a unique community center, or emphasizing an important cultural element of a community. Some are intended as step-down, buffer, or transition areas immediately surrounding a protected historic district. +Sometimes, they are used for areas that fall short of meeting the criteria for a local, state, or national historic designation, but which nevertheless have important cultural, visual, or other significance.



Example of conservation district in Dallas, Texas

Key Elements of Conservation Districts

- Design flexibility is an important attribute of conservation districts. Whereas the primary purpose of a preservation district is to protect the historic integrity of an area (usually by preventing demolition and requiring appropriate renovation or highly compatible new construction), conservation districts can, depending on how they are drafted, be much more flexible and can allow design elements that might accent or complement a particular neighborhood feature so long as the general character of the area remains intact. Design guidelines in conservation districts generally are not overly detailed and are developed on the basis of specific neighborhood concerns and features, such as building height, lot size, setbacks, and landscaping. (Historic districts go further to also address more specific elements of the buildings themselves such as windows, decorative elements, materials, and colors.) A conservation district could be an appropriate tool to address concerns such as encroachment of commercial uses into residential areas, by imposing some limited design and development standards designed to preserve the existing character of the area. The conservation district could be a good tool for allowing infill development that is consistent with established neighborhood design (contextual setbacks, shape of building, pitch of roof, etc.).
- The sponsoring group typically develops a plan or study that details the proposed conservation district with a map, neighborhood history, defining characteristics, issues the district is intended to address, and design guidelines to be instituted through the district.
- The process for creating conservation districts can be voluntary. The voluntary nature of the district means that it would be applied in areas where residents care strongly about their neighborhoods, and thus much of the district's provisions would be self-enforced.
- Administration of conservation districts is typically kept as simple as possible – using existing procedures of underlying zoning and allowing staff review of most proposals in conservation districts. This keeps the mechanics streamlined and does not place a review volume burden on official boards and commissions which, over time, could result in an unwillingness or inability to support additional conservation districts.

In Salt Lake, the Sugarhouse and Gilmer Park neighborhoods have been suggested as possible areas to consider conservation districts.



Examples of conservation districts in Dallas, Texas.

TRANSFER OF DEVELOPMENT RIGHTS

What is a Transfer of Development Rights Program?

Transfer of development right (TDR) programs treat development potential as a commodity that can be transferred (often for a price) between designated sending and receiving areas. In the case of preservation, such programs can be used to transfer density from historic buildings to other properties in the city. The purchase of the development rights associated with a historic property preserves the property and compensates the property owner for the foregone development potential. The purchaser of the rights is then able to develop their property at a higher density or intensity than would otherwise have been allowed. The system is designed to reduce redevelopment pressure on historic landmarks by allowing unused development potential to be transferred. The landmark owner may generate additional income by selling development rights to the owner or developer of the receiving site.

This win-win relationship and use of the market system make TDRs popular in concept. While a valuable tool, much care must be taken in crafting the programs to achieve their intended purpose and to be as administratively simple as possible. Many communities nationwide have used TDR programs to support historic preservation, including San Francisco and New York City. In Salt Lake, the City in the past has supported transfers of development rights in a preservation context – for example, with the Hotel Monaco downtown. In another example, Portland, Oregon, allows the transfer of unused density or floor area ratio (FAR) from a historic landmark to another location in certain multi-family and nonresidential zoning districts. Density or FAR may be transferred within the neighborhood where the landmark is located or to any site within two miles of the landmark.

TDR Sending and Receiving Areas

A TDR program, which deals with shifting density around to different locations in the city, should be developed to achieve a desired result in overall built form. It is therefore critical to have a big-picture idea of the goals for preservation as well as how transfers could help facilitate other efforts in the city. The following are some potential TDR sending-receiving relationships:

Economic Development

Sending: Local historic districts or landmark sites (citywide)

Receiving: Predefined target area or areas in the Downtown where additional density may be desired.

Housing

Sending: Local historic districts or landmark sites (citywide)

Receiving: Predefined historic or eligible buildings suitable for adaptive reuse or expansion to accommodate affordable housing.

Redevelopment

Sending: Local historic districts or landmark sites.

Receiving: RDA project areas outside historic districts

Light Rail Transit

Sending: Historic properties within a prescribed distance of the receiving transit station area.

Receiving: Predefined transit station areas.

DEFINE BOUNDARIES WITH MARKET REALITIES IN MIND

As a market-based tool, it is essential to the success of any TDR program to define sending and receiving area boundaries with a number of factors in mind:

- **Demand:** Market demand of the development in the receiving areas.
- **Incentive:** Level of additional density allowed in the receiving area.
- **Supply:** Credits available from sending areas should be scaled correctly so that the market is not flooded and benefits can be directed in a meaningful manner.

REASSESS AND REFINE

Any TDR program should build in a review period to assess its function and make any necessary "tune ups." If any unintended outcomes have occurred, or if the system becomes too complex, the City should seek to diagnose the program structure and components to better direct the use of the system. Likewise, if market assumptions were incorrect and the market is either under- or over-performing, adjustments in the supply and demand side of the credits should be made.

Policy 2.8b: Develop a wide range of incentives to encourage the protection of historic properties.

ACTION 1: EDUCATE ABOUT EXISTING INCENTIVES

Educate property owners about existing incentives to increase participation in these programs. Work with SHPO as necessary to clarify the procedures for tax incentives to make this process more user-friendly. For more information on tax incentives and low-interest loans for rehabilitation, see the table in Appendix C.

ACTION 2: IMPROVE PRESERVATION PROGRAM INCENTIVES TO PROPERTY OWNERS

Identify potential new incentives to make the preservation of historic properties more appealing and less burdensome to a wider variety of property owners. Incentives the City may wish to consider include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Offer incentives within the City Housing programs to encourage their projects to follow preservation standards when dealing with historic properties or areas.
- Work with RDA to create incentives for preservation-oriented projects in redevelopment districts.
- Expedite application processing for projects that adhere to preservation standards.

Goal 2.9: Offer economic hardship and demolition provisions that achieve their intended purpose.

Comments received during this planning process indicated that the current demolition provisions of the ordinance, including economic hardship process, are seen as convoluted and ineffectual. In some cases, economic hardship arguments have been successfully used to allow demolition. In many cases, this is the result of underlying zoning that allows uses or densities that greatly exceed the value of the existing structure. Other conditions contributing to demolition include the practice of "demolition by neglect" whereby the owner allows the structure to deteriorate until the cost to repair it is high enough to qualify for demolition, or complications and costs associated with securing a structure against seismic activity. The following policies and actions identify how these regulations should be altered in the future to address these concerns.

Policy 2.9a: Pursue targeted modifications to historic overlay ordinance to address concerns with demolition and economic hardship.

ACTION 1: MAKE TARGETED ORDINANCE REVISIONS

Make immediate modifications to the economic hardship provisions of the ordinance to address those issues already identified by staff:

- Replace the Economic Review Panel with a specialist hired by the City and kept on retainer.
- Establish a completeness requirement, and prohibit the processing of incomplete applications.
- Assess valuation prior to land assembly to avoid inflated values.

ACTION 2: EXAMINE BEST PRACTICES AND LESSONS LEARNED

Explore best practices for how comparable communities address the issue of demolition and neglect and the economic hardship process. Develop recommendations for how the City could maintain a strong economic hardship process, while revising its process to best fit the City's needs.

Policy 2.9b: Adopt stronger standards to prevent demolition of historic resources by neglect.

ACTION 1: DRAFT AND ADOPT DEMOLITION-BY-NEGLECT STANDARDS

Amend the ordinance by drafting new standards to prohibit demolition of historic resources by neglect. Ensure this process considers and identifies alternate or carrot-and-stick approaches to those situations where physical or economic constraints are preventing maintenance. These cases should be documented and presented to relevant departments or agencies of the City with the intent of developing collaborative programs to address service gaps for populations in need (see 5.7e.2) Ensure that sufficient staff administration and enforcement resources are available to implement any adopted new regulations.

Goal 2.10: Refine existing design guidelines and create new guidelines to address multi-family and non-residential development in local historic districts and local Landmark Sites.

The City will work to refine the current residential design guidelines as needed to ensure they are clear, complete and guide infill and alterations in local historic districts and to local Landmark Sites. The City will work to develop design guidelines to address multi-family and non-residential structures in historic districts and sites that can be used in conjunction with the residential design guidelines to ensure appropriate preservation and infill of all types of development and renovation in historic districts.

Policy 2.10a: Refine portions of design guidelines addressing new construction in order to offer a greater degree of guidance and clarity for how to achieve compatibility while retaining a degree of flexibility for the property owner.

ACTION 1: UPDATE AND CLARIFY NEW CONSTRUCTION REQUIREMENTS

Identify problematic areas in the current residential design guidelines for new construction and make necessary revisions to resolve them. This includes the addition of any related definitions or graphics to help clarify the intent of the guidelines so they can be more consistently applied. Items to be addressed in these revisions include, at a minimum, the measurement of height, particularly in cases of sloped properties, and clearer guidance on allowable materials.

ACTION 2: ALIGN DESIGN GUIDELINES

As the City develops new sets of design guidelines as called for in this plan, close attention should be paid to ensure that all requirements are compatible. This is especially important where new construction is not of the same use as the other surrounding uses such as the addition of a neighborhood commercial area in a historic neighborhood.

Policy 2.10b: Refine the design guidelines to better address the protection of historic signs, such as historic business signage, within local districts or on local Landmark Sites.

ACTION 1: ENCOURAGE THE RETENTION OF HISTORIC SIGNS

Refine the rules for signage to ensure that a business can both advertise its own presence through the use of a sign while still retaining the historic sign in place on the building. The design guidelines will need to address sign placement and design to ensure that both signs can be kept without the building looking cluttered or inhibiting the current business from appropriately denoting its presence. Amend the zoning ordinance to allow for broader use of signs if historically appropriate and consistent with adopted plans and community input.



Policy 2.10c: Add provisions to the design guidelines to address appropriate new business signage in local historic districts and on local Landmark Sites.

ACTION 1: DEVELOP DESIGN GUIDELINES FOR NEW SIGNS

Develop design guidelines for new signs in local historic districts and on local Landmark Sites to ensure they are compatible with the character of and do not diminish the integrity of the historic area or structure.

Policy 2.10d: Develop multi-family design guidelines to address apartment renovations and conversions within historic districts or Landmark Sites and appropriate infill development of new multi-family buildings within local historic districts.

ACTION 1: CREATE MULTI-FAMILY DESIGN GUIDELINES

Create design guidelines for multi-family development in historic areas to help the City its long-term needs for housing.

Policy 2.10e: Develop non-residential design guidelines to apply to commercial, institutional, industrial, and parks and open space areas within local historic districts and Landmark Sites.

ACTION 1: DEVELOP NON-RESIDENTIAL DESIGN GUIDELINES

Develop design guidelines for non-residential development to apply to both updates to existing structures in historic districts or non-residential Landmark Sites as well as the addition of new non-residential structures or parks in local historic districts. This will enable local districts and Landmark Sites to better manage alterations and improvements to non-single family residential structures.

Administer a Convenient and Consistent Historic Preservation Program

Administration of the City's historic preservation program owes much to the daily efforts of the Historic Landmark Commission and the planning staff. These two groups assist property owners with the application process and the design guidelines, as well as ultimately conducting application review for properties subject to the Historic Overlay District regulations and design guidelines described in the previous chapter.

Together, these two groups manage the majority of the program's responsibilities. The first half of this chapter discusses the Historic Landmark Commission. The following section, program administration, discusses planning.

HISTORIC LANDMARK COMMISSION

OVERVIEW

The Historic Landmark Commission (Commission) is the official City entity charged with reviewing and deciding upon all applications for Certificates of Appropriateness that are not delegated to staff. Apart from the City Council, they are the body most heavily involved in setting preservation policy for Salt Lake City.

COMMISSION APPOINTMENT AND MEMBERSHIP

The Mayor, with the consent of the City Council, appoints members to the Historic Landmark Commission. The Commission is comprised of City residents (between 9 and 15 members at the time of this plan) with an expressed interest in preservation and are knowledgeable about the heritage of the City. Commission members serve on a volunteer basis. Since its inception in 1976, the Commission has included professionals, such as architects, contractors and realtors, as well as concerned citizens and residents of the historic districts.

COMMISSION MEETINGS AND RESPONSIBILITIES

The Commission meets at least once a month to review applications for Certificates of Appropriateness. (See Figure 9 for a summary of review responsibilities and process.) In these meetings, the Commissioners consider the formal applications themselves, along with oral presentations by staff and the public, written staff reports that include the staff's analysis and recommendations for each project (including findings of fact and recommended conditions of approval). Between 2005 and 2008, the Commission and staff

Theme 3: Administer a Clear, Convenient, and Consistent Program

Clear and efficient administrative procedures, convenient resources and access to staff, and consistent information on and application of the rules are crucial components to a successful historic preservation program. With the continuous support of the City, and working with other departments where appropriate, the Planning Division develops the written information resources, streamlined processes, and staffing to administer the program in a clear and timely fashion. The policies of the Historic Preservation Plan establish the short-term and long-term goals and priorities for the program to assist both staff and decision-makers with their respective roles in achieving this component of the vision. In addition, the City will consistently enforce requirements in historic districts to reinforce applicable property owner's participation with the historic preservation program.

have reviewed an average of 250 applications each year. This relatively heavy caseload should be a factor in future decisions about how existing and any new components of the preservation program are administered. Today, a relatively large percentage of applications for Certificates of Appropriateness (generally, those dealing with minor projects) are handled at the staff level in Salt Lake. There will need to continue be a strong role for administrative review, if the Commission case load is to remain manageable.

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW COMMITTEE

In the past, the Historic Landmark Commission supported a subcommittee, the Architectural Review Committee, which met as necessary to assist applicants with revising their applications to better meet the ordinance and design guidelines. The subcommittee was comprised of commission members who provide general advice to property owners regarding proposed projects. This service proved to be a valuable tool in assisting applicants with design issues, particularly individual property owners. In recent years, the subcommittee only met on a case-by-case basis.

COMMENTS ON THE COMMISSION

Comments received during this planning process indicated that a key goal for the City should be to maximize the effectiveness of the Commission by ensuring its members receive proper training and support. The volunteer members of the Commission devote a significant amount of time and effort to learning the nuts and bolts of the City's preservation regulations. The City should work to make citizen involvement in this important administrative function as easy and effective as possible. Additional training of the Commission members, coupled with support of new members to ease transitions, would help make the overall preservation program leadership more unified, consistent, and effective. In particular, ongoing education of preservation best practices (e.g., historically-appropriate green building materials) would greatly advance the preservation program and enable the Commission members to stay current in their knowledge.

Currently, new Commissioners participate in a brief training session regarding the City's preservation program, in which they learn about the regulations, design guidelines, and Commission roles and responsibilities. Aside from this initial training and packet of technical and procedural information, there is little formal training of Commissioners. Consequently, both Commissioners and the experienced preservation professionals who typically represent clients before the Commission report a lag time of several months where new members are learning on-the-job. Both sides of the table would like Commission members to receive more training to enable them to quickly get up to speed, and to also foster some level of consistency in the application of regulations.



In 2008, the HLC and Planning staff attended a training session provided by the National Alliance of Preservation Commissions and funded by the SHPO and National Trust.

GOALS, POLICIES, AND ACTIONS

Goal 3.1: Provide knowledgeable, consistent, and fair program administration.

Policy 3.1a: Improve knowledge and expertise of the Historic Landmark Commission through training – both for new Commissioners and for the entire group on at least an annual basis to ensure they have the information to continuously lead and improve the program.

ACTION 1: ANNUAL COMMISSIONER RETREATS

The Commissioners should meet at least once per year for a meeting and workshop to review decisions made and challenges met in the past year, set strategic objectives for the future, and receive training and updates regarding preservation best practices from around the country. Possible topics could include, for example, new trends and materials in green remodels to historic structures.

ACTION 2: FACILITATE ADDITIONAL TRAINING

Ensure funding is available for conference attendance or other educational or training opportunities that arise throughout the year. Establish consistent parameters for how available funding should be spent and distributed within the Commission. For example, a portion of available funding should be devoted to training for new Commission members.

ACTION 3: NEW COMMISSION MEMBER TRAINING MATERIALS

Augment new Commission member training information with this plan, plus any best practice information or other materials developed as called for in this plan, that help explain the City's preservation goals and the various tools available for meeting those goals.

ACTION 4: COMMISSION MENTORING PROGRAM

Create a program whereby outgoing Commission members mentor new members prior to their formal appointment by the mayor to ease the transition and ensure prompt orientation of new members. This could include participation in Commission trainings and attending Commission meetings before being formally seated in order to observe the process.

Policy 3.1b: Clearly define appropriate advocacy activities for Historic Landmark Commission.

ACTION 1: REVISE ORDINANCE DESCRIPTION OF COMMISSION ROLE

Refine the "Historic Landmark Commission Membership" section of the (H) Historic Overlay ordinance language to remove reference to public advocacy, since that function is already performed by other preservation stakeholders. Instead, emphasize the responsibility of the Commission to educate and, under the supervision of the Mayor, forge working partnerships with other City leaders, departments, agencies, and residents to further preservation objectives in the City.

Existing preservation conferences, networks, and trainings offer several opportunities for Historic Landmark Commission, including:

- National Trust for Historic Preservation conference (annual)
- Commission Assistance Mentoring Program (CAMP) training (multiple dates and locations each year)
- National Alliance of Preservation Commissions (bi-annual national conference, newsletter, and other resources)
- Preservation Leadership Training (typically once a year, locations vary)
- Utah Heritage Foundation Annual Preservation Conference

Policy 3.1c: Revise the zoning ordinance to formally establish an architectural review committee as a body responsible directly to the Historic Landmark Commission to provide guidance to applicants and staff.

ACTION I: ESTABLISH ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW COMMITTEE

Revise the historic overlay ordinance to establish an Architectural Review Committee of the Historic Landmark Commission to provide an optional venue for project-specific design feedback. This will assist property owners in interpreting and applying the historic regulations and design guidelines to their project proposal. The roles of this committee should include: to provide proactive advice to property owners on how to meet the requirements of the City's preservation regulations and guidelines; and to offer targeted recommendations to property owners who have had project applications rejected by the Commission, by providing general guidance as to how a proposal might be modified to address the stated objections. This will allow the program to take advantage of the expertise of Commission members and to improve feedback and guidance provided to staff and participants in the process. The proactive use of the committee should be encouraged by staff through awareness-raising efforts (brochures, the website, etc.). The committee would meet on an as-needed basis, and applicants would be notified that the opinions of the committee are advisory only and do not necessarily reflect those of the entire Commission, or that they will ensure issuance of a permit.

PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION

OVERVIEW

In addition to the Historic Landmark Commission, the success of the Salt Lake City historic preservation program depends on the contributions of a variety of individuals and groups, including City officials, residents, and the strong preservation partners of the City, such as the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) and Utah Heritage Foundation (UHF). This section discusses the groups involved in the administration of the preservation program, besides the Commission, along with various other aspects of program administration.

GROUPS WITH ADMINISTRATIVE RESPONSIBILITIES

Salt Lake City Planning Division

The Salt Lake City Planning Division has been committed to preserving and protecting the City's historic buildings for over thirty years as part of an overall strategy of maintaining community identity and livability. The Planning Division oversees development in Historic Preservation Overlay Districts and provides professional staff to support the Historic Landmark Commission, the decision-making body that administers the historic overlay ordinance.

Certified Local Government Program

The Certified Local Government (CLG) program was established as an amendment in 1980 to the National Historic Preservation Act as a way of integrating local governments as "historic preservation partners" with the national historic preservation program. The 1980 amendments specify requirements for the participation of local communities in the program. Certification includes enacting an approved preservation ordinance and appointing a historic preservation commission of at least five people. Salt Lake City has been a Certified Local Government since August 19, 1985 and an active participant in the program since 1993. This program is run by the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO).




FIGURE 8: PLANNING DIVISION ORGANIZATIONAL CHART (FEBRUARY 2009)

In 1980, the Planning Division hired its first planner to address preservation issues in the City. Since that time, preservation has become a staff-wide project. (See Figure 8.) Planning staff is responsible for regular planning tasks as part of the Planning Division as well as the numerous specialized functions of the preservation program including:

- Administrative review of applications for a Certificate of Appropriateness for properties to which the Historic Overlay District applies;
- Attendance and preparation related to Historic Landmark Commission meetings;
- First point of contact for public questions on historic preservation, including property status, interpretation of the Historic Overlay District and Residential Design Guideline requirements;
- Long-range and strategic planning for the continued development of the program;
- Coordination with other preservation partners and departments on preservation matters (e.g., compatible activities, overlapping responsibilities, etc.); and
- General education and outreach to the community on preservation and the preservation program.

Planning Commission

Because all proposed historic designations must go through the public hearing process required for zoning map amendments, the Planning Commission reviews applications for the designation of a local Landmark Site or historic district and makes a recommendation to City Council. The Commission also

makes decisions on conditional uses in historic structures, an incentive for preservation that allows adaptive reuse in zoning districts where the use may not otherwise be allowed. The Planning Commission also makes recommendations on text amendments and preservation regulations before they are forwarded to the City Council.

City Council

The City Council reviews applications for the establishment of local Landmark Sites and historic districts and makes the final designation decisions, based upon recommendations from the Historic Landmark Commission and Planning Commission. The City Council members, along with the Mayor, also appoint Commission members. The City Council is also responsible for setting preservation policy; allocating funding for preservation projects such as surveys, funding, or staffing; and adopting tools to implement the program such as regulations and design guidelines.

PROJECT REVIEW AND DECISION

A property owner of a local Landmark Site or of a property within a local district who wishes to obtain a certificate of appropriateness (COA) does so in one of two ways: administrative review and decision, or review and decision by the Historic Landmark Commission. The procedural route of the project is principally determined by the status of the property and the action the property owner would like to take with the property however, appeal and referral of administrative decisions can shift decision-making over to the Commission. The key steps in each review and decision process are illustrated in the figure below.

BUILDING CAPACITY MOVING FORWARD

During the process of developing this plan, several themes emerged regarding how administration of the preservation program could be improved.

First, the procedures for review and approval of development applications involving historic properties are not clear to the general public. People working to bring a project through the process have met with delays and confusion. This is in part due to a historic planning staffing shortage. Some interviewees also expressed frustration with the planner-of-the-day arrangement (which has now been discontinued), which was cited as leading to inconsistent and incomplete information from staff. Generally, perceived problems with development review have led some individuals and companies to avoid projects that would involve a local Landmark Site or property within a historic district.

Project approval was also cited as inconsistent from project to project, though there is variation in whether this is perceived as a negative or positive of the program. Some see the inconsistency as frustrating, while others welcome it as an unofficial loophole through which to inject projects with a greater level of creativity than would be allowed with a stricter administration of the regulations. (This tends to be a frequent user perspective of preservation

professionals. Individual property owners and residents find the inconsistencies inefficient and frustrating.)


A number of comments were received regarding the City's staffing levels for the Planning Division, with many comments suggesting that current levels are too low. To some observers, low staffing levels mean that staff members must devote the majority of their time to day-to-day review of applications and assistance to property owners, leaving little time for addressing more long-range planning (like overseeing new surveys and nominations or clarifying regulations and procedures) and developing resources to improve user-friendliness.

In addition to ensuring appropriate staffing levels, the City should focus on offering tools and resources that can improve user-friendliness while also freeing up staff time from dealing with basic program procedural questions. New tools and resources are needed to enable people to understand and navigate the requirements, steps, and timing of the City's procedures as they relate to their project

Finally, a major function that has not been provided by the City is code enforcement for historic projects. City code enforcement officers lack the appropriate staffing and preservation-specific training to enable effective and proactive enforcement of historic regulations. This has resulted in a perception that projects can be done illegally outside of the system with less cost and time commitment, and with no repercussions.

The following goals, policies, and actions address these issues.

Figure 9: Review Procedures as of 2009



GOALS, POLICIES, AND ACTIONS

Goal 3.2: Ensure the preservation program has full and knowledgeable staff.

Ensure appropriate staffing levels to meet the needs of the case load, education and outreach, and other plan implementation tasks.

Policy 3.2a: Create a metric and workload tracking system to plan for additional staff.

ACTION 1: DEVELOP A STAFF WORKLOAD TRACKING SYSTEM

Create a system to track the workload of the planning staff, including not only day-to-day project review responsibilities, but also estimated time commitments necessary to pursue the longer-range actions called for in this plan, including education and outreach. Update this tracking system on at least an annual basis.

Policy 3.2b: Increase number of trained historic planning staff to meet expected work volume.

ACTION 1: TRACK TARGET STAFFING LEVELS

Use the workload tracking system to track committed hours of work for planning staff and identify a target staffing level on an annual or semi-annual basis, as appropriate.

ACTION 2: MAINTAIN ADEQUATE STAFFING LEVELS

Pursue additional staff positions through the City and department budgeting process to meet the current shortfall once it is tabulated. Once the optimal staffing level is reached, continue to track staffing needs to ensure efficient and adequate staffing.

ACTION 3: PROVIDE EDUCATION FOR STAFF

Ensure that staff members are provided with educational resources and training to effectively administer the City's historic overlay ordinance and related programs.

ACTION 4: CONDUCT TRAINING ON DESIGN GUIDELINES

Conduct training on the design guidelines to ensure that they are consistently applied. This training should include Public Services Department, Redevelopment Agency, Commission, planning staff, and others as appropriate.

Goal 3.3: Improve user-friendliness of the historic process.

The City will work to make participation in the historic preservation program as clear, predictable, and easy as possible. This will be achieved through developing informational resources and making necessary procedural changes.

Policy 3.3a: Develop materials to assist those interested in undertaking projects to know exactly the steps, requirements, and timeframes for each step to help them successfully navigate the process.

ACTION 1: CREATE USER HANDBOOK FOR HISTORIC PRESERVATION PROJECTS

Develop a short handbook describing the requirements and review process for historic projects while also communicating the big-picture objectives of what preservation, and its additional requirements, are intended to achieve.

Goal 3.4: Ensure preservation regulations are enforced.

Program regulations need to be enforced to ensure the City is sending a clear and consistent message in support of historic preservation and adherence to applicable regulations and review processes.

Policy 3.4a: Create dedicated staff positions to provide building inspection and code enforcement for local historic districts and Landmark Sites to ensure renovations and construction are being conducted in accordance with the permit.

ACTION 1: CONSIDER CREATION OF NEW PRESERVATION ENFORCEMENT POSITION

As part of the annual budgeting process, and if resources are available, consider the creation of one or more staff positions dedicated to building inspection and code enforcement for historic properties and districts to ensure approved renovations and new construction are conducted in accordance with agreed upon specifications and to identify unpermitted activities. These may be specially trained housing and zoning officers or additional planning staff hired to address enforcement for the program.

ACTION 2: DEVELOP SYSTEM FOR NEW CONSTRUCTION PROJECT REVIEW

Modify the review procedures for new construction in historic districts to require review and comment by planning staff on building permits, and also during key phases of the development, to ensure conformance with the approved permit.

Goal 3.5: Build the City's technological capacity to facilitate program administration.

Several opportunities exist for the City to streamline and facilitate information sharing and analysis to support preservation program activities. Geographic Information Systems (GIS) could assist with analyzing spatial considerations within districts, such as how current and future transit station areas overlap with historic districts. It could also facilitate understanding and sharing information on a specific property with applicants and other departments, such as how it is zoned, including any overlay zones, or what future land use is designated for the property. Ideally, any database capacity the City develops will be easily integrated with the database of the State Historic Preservation Office.

Policy 3.5a: Build GIS capacity within the historic preservation department to assist and inform program activities.

ACTION I: ADD GIS CAPACITY

Add GIS capacity to the historic preservation program through purchase of necessary equipment and additional staff or training.

Policy 3.5b: Closely coordinate with other departments and preservation stakeholders to ensure maximum utility of the data.

ACTION I: GIS EDUCATION AND OUTREACH

Educate planning and other City department staff as well as non-City preservation partners on the potential uses of GIS for preservation planning and tracking to promote use and to streamline and support preservation functions.

Policy 3.5c: As capacity is developed, the City will integrate available technology and information into its daily procedures to ensure the technology is used to make the process more transparent, well-informed, and user-friendly.

ACTION I: TRACK PROPERTIES BY PARCEL

Track historic properties in GIS by populating the parcel attribute information with relevant fields and data that can assist in day-to-day decision making. Possible attribute information that can be maintained include: survey and survey date, age of structure, condition information, permits granted and permit dates, enforcement history, owner name and address, current land use, zoning and any applicable overlays, and planned land use. Where possible, data should be coordinated with the SHPO's data management programs to allow for the sharing of data where appropriate (such as by coordinating parcel identification numbers).

Improve Education and Outreach

There are numerous resources available to help citizens learn about, support, enjoy, and preserve the historic resources of Salt Lake City. The City offers some of these resources, most notably the City's website, which provides useful technical materials describing the City's preservation regulations and guidelines. Further, the City's preservation partners – particularly the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) and Utah Heritage Foundation (UHF) -- offer numerous additional resources for education and outreach. These include materials to assist property owners with researching and documenting their own homes; information describing tools and incentives that are available to facilitate preservation, like tax credits and preservation easements; and educational resources, tours, and award programs to help children, residents, and visitors learn about and appreciate the great historic resources of the City.

This chapter reviews the key education and outreach activities already in place, and then provides goals, policies, and actions intended to strengthen and expand these offerings.

OVERVIEW

The City currently does not perform extensive education and outreach as part of its historic preservation program. Available information on historic preservation is limited to functional descriptions of program components and procedures and is conveyed largely through the Historic Landmark Commission website. While this information is useful, it is often seen only by those already aware of historic preservation. Information that would inform the community about the City's history, what historic preservation does, and its benefits to the community would help expand awareness, support, and participation in preservation activities. Outreach efforts could be conducted online as well as through the production of printed materials and reports, public presentations, and SLCTV.

CITY OUTREACH

Community Councils

Salt Lake City recognizes neighborhood-based community organizations whose purpose is to provide community input and information to City departments, including planning preservation-related issues. The community councils are encouraged to make recommendations to the City on all matters affecting the City or each organization's particular area or neighborhoods. All City Council districts have community councils. Most of these groups hold regular meetings and issue a monthly newsletter, and maintain a listserv, are a key route to information-sharing and garnering public participation in the City. In the case of preservation, the close correlation of historic districts and planning areas represented by the community councils allow planning staff to conduct direct

Theme 4: Increase Community Pride, Awareness, and Involvement in Historic Preservation

The City clearly and consistently conveys the message that historic preservation is valued in Salt Lake City. Planning staff works with other City department staff, the Historic Landmark Commission, and other preservation partners to communicate that message. The City and its preservation partners advocate for preservation, creating a wide range of educational materials to increase community pride and awareness of the City's history and how that history relates to the built environment. Residents and visitors are able to access information easily on the rich history of Salt Lake City through a variety of interactive means including the internet, printed materials, interpretive signage, walking tours, videos and other media as appropriate.



*The HLC website
<http://www.slcgov.com/CED/HLC>
is a major asset in sharing
information about the City's
historic preservation program.*

outreach to property owners as needed through already established venues (meetings, newsletter, listserv).

City Website

The website of the Historic Landmark Commission is currently the principal source for information about the City's preservation program. The City is currently revising its online materials to further the utility of the website.

STATE HISTORIC PRESERVATION OFFICE OUTREACH PROGRAMS

In addition to its participation in the nomination process, the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) is an active preservation partner, providing technical assistance and research information to property owners and the City.

Technical Assistance: State and Federal Tax Credits

The State Historic Preservation Office oversees Section 106 reviews for projects using federal funding and administers the state and federal tax credits and various other federal grants for preservation. As such, the SHPO has proved to be the most valuable source of information on tax credits for historic property owners in the City, particularly those with properties that are only listed on the National Register and are therefore not officially part of the City's preservation program. The SHPO's commitment to assisting property owners and expertise in navigating the forms and processes of historic tax credits has resulted in several renovation and adaptive reuse projects that preserved additional resources outside of the City's preservation program.

Property Research Assistance

The SHPO assists property owners with historic research on individual properties. This ability will be greatly expanded through an online inventory of Utah historic sites, which is currently under development, and will be a great resource for City staff, the Commission, and residents to research and track properties.

Other Education and Outreach Activities

The SHPO also offers a variety of other education and outreach activities, such as:

- An online interactive Utah history game for children through its website.
- A directory of contractors to help with historic projects.
- Guidelines for photographing a historic property.
- Guidelines for measuring historic building floor plans.
- An on-line course on how to identify historic features.



The Utah SHPO website is a rich source of state history information and educational resources.

UTAH HERITAGE FOUNDATION OUTREACH PROGRAMS

Established in 1966, Utah Heritage Foundation (UHF) was the first statewide preservation organization in the western United States. As a private, membership-based, not-for-profit organization, the Foundation helps property owners, preservation professionals, organizations and government agencies to preserve, protect and promote Utah's built environment through public awareness, advocacy and active preservation. The Foundation fulfills its mission through a wide range of programs and activities, including low-interest loans from its Revolving Fund Loan Program, which reach communities throughout the state.

Educational Tours

UHF has several self-guided historic tours of the City:

- Historic Buildings of Capitol Hill,
- Historic Downtown Walking Tour, and
- Historic South Temple Street.

In addition, UHF docents offer tours for K-12 students as well as the general public of the following sites in Salt Lake City:

- Kearns Mansion,
- Salt Lake City and County Building,
- McCune Mansion,
- Keith Mansion,
- Meditation Chapel in Memory Grove Park, and
- Marmalade District on Capitol Hill.

State Preservation Conference and Heritage Awards

- In 2007 Utah Heritage Foundation began hosting the annual state Preservation Conference.
- UHF announces annual Heritage Awards to highlight exemplary preservation projects from the prior year. This positive reinforcement of preservation is a valuable tool to highlight historic sites and the value of preservation activity. While these awards are statewide, many of the recipients are in the City due to the fact that most preservation activity in the state takes place in the City.

Publications

Celebrating Compatible Design: Creating New Spaces in Historic Homes.



Utah Heritage Foundation website highlights a variety of historic preservation activities in the state, much of which is taking place in Salt Lake City – including awards, tours, and preservation methods and incentives.



As a part of their annual conference, Utah Heritage Foundation offers home tours. (Photo courtesy of Utah Heritage Foundation.)

GOALS, POLICIES, AND ACTIONS

Goal 4.1: Increase public awareness of the historic preservation program and its benefits.

The City currently conducts limited direct education and outreach related to the historic preservation program. This has largely been attributable to limited staffing, but also to the fact that the City lacked a clear and consistent message to convey to the public about the purpose and long-term objectives of preservation in the City. Now, with the completion of a city-wide historic preservation plan, the City will work to improve public awareness of the preservation program by providing materials to express program requirements and benefits clearly and making those materials readily accessible.

Policy 4.1a: Notify historic property owners of their historic status and potential assistance benefits on an annual basis to increase awareness and participation.

ACTION 1: ANNUAL PROPERTY OWNER NEWSLETTER

Create an annual newsletter to historic property owners to remind them of historic property status, maintenance requirements, and available information and assistance. This should be built into the annual budget for the program.

ACTION 2: CONVEY HISTORIC STATUS AS PART OF THE SALE PROCESS

Partner with REALTORS® to convey the historic status of a property during the showing of a property, as well as at the time of purchase (e.g., through an additional item on the disclosure form) to ensure new owners are aware of the property status. At the same time, provide potential buyers with information on what that status (e.g., local versus national listing) will mean for them as an owner.

ACTION 3: LOBBY FOR STATE REQUIREMENTS FOR HISTORIC DESIGNATION ON PROPERTY TITLES

Over the long term, lobby the state legislature to consider statewide adoption of new rules assigning greater recognition to historic designation as part of the title recordation process and the disclosure form.

Policy 4.1b: Create property maintenance information handouts to assist property owners in understanding requirements and available assistance for various projects.

ACTION 1: DEVELOP PROPERTY MAINTENANCE HANDOUTS

Develop a series of informational handouts on property maintenance topics to help property owners find the information they need in a clear, consistent, and easy-to-use format. In developing the series, make use of existing materials already developed by other entities to avoid duplication of effort. The City, UHF, and SHPO should coordinate their efforts regarding the development and distribution of new materials.

Potential topics for handout series include:

- Financing Home Improvements to Your Historic Home or Building
- Benefits of Restoring Wood Windows
- Incorporating Renewable Energy Capability (Solar and Wind)
- Home Maintenance and Additions for Historic Properties
- Energy Efficient Historic Homes
- Seismic Retrofitting of Historic Structures

Goal 4.2: Improve coordination with preservation partners.

The City will collaborate with and support the SHPO and Utah Heritage Foundation to ensure that they City offers comprehensive program of education and outreach, including information on history, formal historic tours, self-guided walking tours, property research support, tax credit and financing information and assistance, preservation best practices, and other materials on the benefits of historic preservation.

Policy 4.2a: Coordinate with preservation partners to form strategic partnerships to support educational efforts.

ACTION: PERIODIC EDUCATION AND OUTREACH MEETINGS WITH PRESERVATION PARTNERS

City officials and planning staff should meet periodically with preservation stakeholders such as Utah Heritage Foundation and the SHPO specifically to coordinate on education and outreach efforts. These meetings should be geared toward briefing the participants on individual goals and activities, identifying any strategic partnerships or complementary efforts that could be pursued, and identifying needs for additional educational outreach on preservation related topics. Increased collaboration can help ensure that a full spectrum of education and outreach is provided while avoiding overlaps.

Policy 4.2b: Create an information guide to highlight the components of the education and outreach offerings so interested parties are aware of what is offered and how to access the information they need.

ACTION I: CREATE EDUCATION AND OUTREACH GUIDE

Create an educational handout that discusses the different components of the education and outreach activities of the preservation program and its preservation partners (UHF and SHPO). This should include information on guided and self-guided historic tours in the City, presentations and outreach to community councils, available handouts and information, and other topics.

Policy 4.2c: Expand the Commission website to contain educational information on City history and on best preservation practices and benefits.

ACTION I: EXPAND WEBSITE CONTENT

The City has already begun to expand its use of the web for preservation and planning activities through restructuring of the City's website and the addition of a monthly planning division e-newsletter with a preservation highlight. The City will continue to devote the necessary resources to reorganize and expand the website to include new content and materials, including new best practice highlights and informational handouts, to further support the implementation of this plan. The City also will continue to focus on improving the site's organization and user-friendliness.

ACTION 3: GATHER RELEVANT "BEST PRACTICE" HIGHLIGHTS

Coordinate with Utah Heritage Foundation, the State Historic Preservation Office, the National Trust for Historic Preservation, the National Park Service, City departments such as Transportation and Housing, and others as appropriate to create a list of preservation-related "best practice" educational materials. Such materials should be designed to complement the educational materials on preservation benefits proposed in Action 1 above. The following list of subjects should serve as a starting point for developing best-practice highlights:

Preservation Practice in Transit-Oriented Development Corridors
Making the Preservation – Affordable Housing Connection
Incorporating Green Building Practices into Historic Structures
Best Practices in Adaptive Reuse

Where possible, highlights should illustrate existing applications of best practices in the City.

Policy 4.2d: Create case study highlights of preservation best-practice examples in the community, including those efforts that involve collaboration with other departments or preservation partners.

ACTION 1: HIGHLIGHT COMMUNITY BEST PRACTICES

Positively reinforce participation by calling attention to preservation success stories in the City. Regularly highlight institutional and renovation successes through a multi-media approach, including use of SLC-TV. Publish highlights in reports, newsletters, newspapers, and the website to draw attention to successes.

Policy 4.2e: Assist the State Historic Preservation Office with hosting periodic workshops for the public on tax incentives and project financing.

ACTION 1: PROJECT FINANCING WORKSHOPS

Co-host workshops with SHPO and/or UHF on project financing options for historic properties, targeting both residential and non-residential property owners.

Goal 4.3: Increase public visibility of historic preservation.

The City will work to highlight preservation projects locally and nationally to draw attention and awareness of preservation activity in the City.

Policy 4.3a: Hold annual preservation awards program to highlight successes.

ACTION 1: REINSTATE AWARDS PROGRAM

Work with the Mayor's office and other City departments to reinstitute a City-sponsored annual awards program to highlight project successes during the prior year and convey their importance to the entire City. Consider

sponsoring with outside organizations, such as the local chapter of the American Institute of Architects.

Policy 4.3b: Regularly nominate projects for preservation awards to draw attention to the preservation program of Salt Lake City.

ACTION I: PURSUE BROADER RECOGNITION OF SALT LAKE CITY PRESERVATION ACTIVITIES

Continuously emphasize the importance of preservation in the life of the City by seeking state and national recognition of historic resources and preservation program accomplishments in Salt Lake City (e.g., National Preservation Awards of the National Trust). Compile a list of potential awards and application submittal dates and then work with the Commission and preservation partners to identify which awards to pursue.

Policy 4.3c: Improve or increase the presence of signage denoting historic districts and sites throughout the City and identify and preserve existing historic signage.

ACTION I: INCREASE THE NUMBER OF HISTORIC SIGNS AND MARKERS

Pursue funding to add or repair historic signs to highlight the importance of specific sites and districts, including historic signs no longer associated with extant historic buildings. Where possible, link the addition of new signs into other processes including street repair, City property acquisition, and local designation decisions.

Policy 4.3d: Participate in neighborhood events and celebrations to publicize and educate about the historic preservation program.

ACTION I: ATTEND COMMUNITY EVENTS AND FAIRS

Attend community events and fairs in historic areas to publicize the program through handouts and graphic posters that simply convey the benefits of preservation and opportunities available to property owners.

Policy 4.3e: Foster connections between schools and the City's history as a means of outreach and also to provide benefit to school programs.

ACTION I: WORK WITH SCHOOL DISTRICT OFFICIALS TO INTEGRATE CITY HISTORY INTO SCHOOL CURRICULA

Work with school administrators to develop a plan for integrating local history into school programming where it is appropriate and can help augment classroom learning.



The Planning Division provided information at the Greater Avenues Street Festival in 2008.

Goal 4.4: Increase financial incentives for preservation.

Facilitate public access to existing financial incentives through education and technical assistance and work with preservation partners to increase available financial resources to meet the high demand for financial incentives and assistance.

Policy 4.4a: Continue to educate people about tax benefits available for their projects in collaboration with the State Historic Preservation Office.

ACTION 1: CREATE A FINANCING AND INCENTIVES BROCHURE

Create a brochure to highlight all financing and incentive options available to historic property owners and categorize them into residential and non-residential property types. If appropriate, create two brochures directed at residential and non-residential properties.

ACTION 2: OFFER PERIODIC TAX-CREDIT WORKSHOPS

Coordinate with SHPO to schedule and conduct periodic workshops on tax credits to improve user-friendliness and use of these valuable programs.

Policy 4.4b: Support Utah Heritage Foundation's efforts to expand the revolving loan fund that serves the City.

ACTION 1: HELP EXPAND UHF LOAN POOL

The City will work to support the expansion of the UHF revolving loan fund within the City's boundaries to expand the use of this highly used program. Support could be monetary or in the provision of in-kind goods and services such as free City-owned event space, staff support, advertising space in buildings and on the City's website, among other potential options.

Policy 4.4c: Work with Utah Heritage Foundation to increase use of preservation easements.

ACTION 1: PROMOTE PRESERVATION EASEMENTS

The City will work with Utah Heritage Foundation to develop a strategy to promote the increased use and awareness of the UHF preservation easement program. This tool is currently underutilized. The City will help determine underlying reasons for low use such as staff referral rates, misinformation or a lack of information on easements, or real or perceived barriers to use. The City will then work with UHF to address issues and increase use of the preservation easement tool.

Policy 4.4d: Coordinate with Housing and Neighborhood Development to provide project review to applications for City Housing and Small Business loans targeted to historic resources.

ACTION 1: MODIFY REVIEW PROCEDURES

Modify review procedures for City Housing and Small Business loans to include historic planning staff or Commission project review, as appropriate, when the property in question is historic but not locally designated.

Support a Sustainable City

One of the key goals of this planning effort is to establish stronger relationships between historic preservation and other City programs and policies. In particular, many participants in the development of this plan stressed the need for a strong linkage between historic preservation and sustainability.

Salt Lake City is in the midst of a ground-breaking effort to incorporate sustainability principles into a wide variety of City programs and policies. The creation of the Office of Sustainability and revisions to City zoning and subdivision ordinances are two early and significant steps towards this goal.

The City has developed the following thematic framework for aligning its programs and policies with sustainability:

1. Climate Change and Air Quality
2. Water Quality and Conservation
3. Alternative Energy Production and Energy Conservation
4. Mobility and Transportation
5. Urban Forestry
6. Housing Accessibility and Diversity
7. Community Health and Safety
8. Food Production and Nutrition
9. Recycling and Waste Reduction
10. Open Space, Parks, and Trails

This chapter of the plan illustrates how preservation can support not just environmental sustainability, but also economic, social, and cultural sustainability. Preservation can help the City achieve its goals in several of the topic areas listed above, particularly energy, economic development, urban nature, transportation, and housing, and additional topics might be added to this list in the future. In each of these areas, this chapter demonstrates how preservation can be a cornerstone of the City's efforts to promote sustainable development.

Theme 5: Support a Sustainable City

The City practices historic preservation with an eye towards the future. Preservation is a key tool for achieving the City's goals for economic, environmental, and community sustainability. Historic preservation involves the use and reuse of existing structures, which translates into lower environmental impacts. The city recognizes these environmental benefits of historic preservation and commits to investigate the possibilities of using green building materials, environmentally-responsible landscaping, energy efficiency, and renewable energy generation within historic neighborhoods. The incorporation of green building practices is encouraged whenever they are compatible with best historic preservation practices.

ENERGY

OVERVIEW

EMBODIED ENERGY

In the words of Richard Moe, the president of the National Trust for Historic Preservation at the time of this plan's adoption, "The bottom line is that the greenest building is the one that already exists." In other words, one of the most environmentally friendly development practices is the decision to repair and reuse an existing building, rather than replace it.

The key link between historic preservation and environmental sustainability lies in the concept of "embodied energy," which refers to the life-cycle energy that is represented in the existing structure. This includes the expended energy to harvest, process, fabricate, and transport the raw materials used during the original construction.

Demolition of a historic structure for redevelopment has a very high associated energy cost. Not only is the energy embodied in the structure lost, but significant energy is involved in the demolition itself, and more energy is used to construct a new building. Plus, new materials must be consumed to construct the replacement building. In today's global marketplace, these materials may come from numerous countries around the world, meaning that significant energy is involved simply in bringing the materials to the site. A new, earth-friendly, energy-efficient building may require 50 to 60 years or more to recover the energy lost in demolishing an existing building.

Seen in this light, the reuse of a historic structure can often be the most energy-efficient option and the most sustainable form of development.

ENERGY EFFICIENCY

Historic construction methods and materials incorporate more energy-saving features than are typically appreciated. For example, tests on wood windows in historic homes have shown them to be as efficient as new double-paned vinyl windows when properly maintained. Maintenance of wood windows offers short and long-term savings to the property owner. In the short term, maintenance – which includes weather-stripping, caulking, and/or the addition of storm windows – is typically less expensive than replacement. In the long term, wood windows can last over a hundred years whereas vinyl products typically need replacement after 10-15 years.

As another example, older development patterns often made good use of building and tree placement to maximize the potential of passive solar heat. The angle of the home allows for maximum sun exposure, while deciduous trees offer shade to keep the home cool in the warmer months.

Of course, the energy use of a particular building is a complex issue and requires individual assessment to determine whether the building is operating



Although windows can suffer from neglect, repair can be more environmentally sustainable and often cheaper in the long run than replacement.

as efficiently as possible. Increasingly, there are many resources available to help to improve the energy-efficiency of historic buildings.

RENEWABLE ENERGY

Salt Lake City has taken a major step to address climate change by joining the international Cities for Climate Protection (CCP) Campaign and committing to a goal of reducing its carbon footprint to 20% below the 2005 level by 2020. The City is also an active supporter of Utah's involvement in the Western Climate Initiative (WCI) which works regionally to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. Clean renewable energy sources will be a key component of an overall strategy to achieve the carbon goals of the City and region. Salt Lake City already allows the use of solar collectors on locally designated historic structures so long as they do not negatively affect the historic character of the building or district. The City is committed to ensuring that the current regulations do not present barriers to expanded use of solar collectors.

"We envision Salt Lake City as a prominent sustainable city: the international crossroads of western America, blending family life styles, vibrant artistic and cultural resources, and a strong sense of environmental stewardship with robust economic activity to create a superb place for people to live, work, grow, invest and visit."

Salt Lake City Vision and Strategic Plan, 1993

GOALS, POLICIES, AND ACTIONS

Goal 5.1: Improve public understanding of the life-cycle energy benefits of historic preservation.

Policy 5.1a: Educate the general public on the role historic preservation plays in promoting a sustainable City.

ACTION 1: PRESERVATION/SUSTAINABILITY EDUCATION SERIES

Hold a series of educational sessions led by staff and guest speakers on how preservation relates to sustainability.

Policy 5.1b: Educate the owners of historic properties about the energy benefits of preserving older buildings.

ACTION 1: CREATE EDUCATIONAL MATERIALS FOR OWNERS OF HISTORIC PROPERTIES

Create informational handouts for property owners that address the energy benefits of historic preservation, and also provide specific tips and recommendations for maintenance and renovation of older buildings. These handouts should compare and contrast the short- and long-term costs of the purchase of new materials versus the repair and maintenance of existing features. Specific topics could include, for example, a discussion of the long-term benefits of repairing historic windows versus replacing them with new windows. Handouts should direct property owners to additional resources to locate more information. Ensure that the brochures are updated over time as new information becomes available (e.g., new City policies on acceptable building materials in historic districts). See also the chapter of this plan, *Improve Education and Outreach*, for additional action items relating to public education.



This new house under construction in the Central City historic district is considered a "green build"; however, rehabs can be green, too.

BEST PRACTICE HIGHLIGHT: CHICAGO HISTORIC BUNGALOW INITIATIVE

The Historic Chicago Bungalow Initiative (HCBI) is designed to educate the public about the historic and architectural importance of Chicago's tens of thousands of bungalows, and to assist property owners in adapting their homes to meet current needs. The program also focuses on improving quality of life and property values in Chicago's older, close-in neighborhoods, thus helping to spur redevelopment and minimize the energy and environmental costs associated with urban sprawl. A major focus of the program is encouraging energy-efficient rehabilitation projects. After going through a free certification process, bungalow owners can apply for low-interest loans or grants to help "green" or restore their homes. The HCBI has restored several bungalows as model green homes, and tracks the energy usage of these models against conventional restorations.

For more information, visit www.chicagobungalow.org.



RESOURCE:

NATIONAL TRUST FOR HISTORIC PRESERVATION SUSTAINABILITY INITIATIVE

In recent years the National Trust has invested considerable resources and effort in becoming a full-service information clearinghouse for preservation and sustainability. According to the organization, "Historic preservation can – and should – be an important component of any effort to promote sustainable development. The conservation and improvement of our existing built resources, including re-use of historic and older buildings, greening the existing building stock, and reinvestment in older and historic communities, is crucial to combating climate change." The Trust's website contains a variety of resources, including speeches on sustainability, tips for homeowners, and case studies of specific rehabilitation projects.

For more information, visit <http://www.preservationnation.org/issues/sustainability>.

Goal 5.2: Encourage the use of sustainable building practices in the renovation and maintenance of historic structures.

Policy 5.2a: Regularly research and publicize appropriate green building practices as they emerge to raise awareness and keep the City informed about available technologies, materials, performance, and practices.

ACTION 1: RESEARCH NEW GREEN BUILDING MATERIALS, TECHNOLOGIES, AND PRACTICES

As technologies and products rapidly evolve to meet a wider array of design needs, the City planning staff and Commission will consider which green building practices are appropriate for renovations and additions to historic structures. Ongoing review of industry best practices will help the City's preservation program stay at the forefront of the historic preservation and sustainability.

ACTION 2: UPDATE DESIGN GUIDELINES ON A REGULAR BASIS

On a regular basis, the planning staff will compile information on promising new green building materials, technologies, and practices and prepare recommendations for any necessary updates or revisions to the City's design guidelines. Such recommendations should be presented at least annually to the Historic Landmark Commission. Allocate time and staff resources to that purpose on a regular schedule.

ACTION 3: APPOINT A STAFF GREEN BUILDING LIAISON

Appoint a staff liaison to actively participate in Salt Lake City/Utah activities relating to the integration of green building practices in historic preservation projects. This background will be particularly helpful during best practice and educational handout research and development.

ACTION 4: SUPPORT CONTRACTOR WORKSHOPS

Work with preservation partners, such as the UHF, to host workshops aimed at people who are looking for a new career or to supplement other contractor skills, to teach about particular trades and skills associated with historic buildings, such as window and wood repair. If possible and if the necessary resources are available, work with preservation partners to develop a certificate accreditation process for attendees, which over time would help establish a list of contractors who are interested in and trained to work on historic buildings.

Policy 5.2b: Modify design guidelines to address solar collectors and other types of alternative energy equipment within local historic districts and on local Landmark Sites pending design review.

ACTION 1: ENABLE BROADER USE OF SOLAR COLLECTORS

Evaluate design guidelines to determine whether modifications are necessary to allow solar collectors and other types of alternative energy equipment, as recommended by the sustainable code effort to enable broader use of renewable energy technology on historic properties. While the current



(top) Solar panels in a west side neighborhood. Additional design guidelines could help minimize the profile of such panels in historic districts.

(bottom) Solar panels on the roof of the Peter Pan apartments, a National Register site, can be seen but are low profile.

version of the design guidelines (at the time of this planning effort) appear sufficient to allow the placement of solar collectors in historic districts, the guidelines should be reevaluated on an ongoing basis to address changing technologies.

Policy 5.2c: Support architectural salvage efforts to promote the reuse of historic building materials.

ACTION I: SUPPORT ARCHITECTURAL SALVAGE PROGRAMS

Support local non-profits and businesses that establish architectural salvage programs that facilitate the retention and reuse of materials from historic properties. Such programs help prevent the loss of often-unique and irreplaceable architectural elements, while also reducing the amount of waste sent to landfills.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

OVERVIEW

In addition to environmental sustainability, historic preservation supports economic sustainability. A healthy and sustainable City needs a diverse economy and viable tax base. The ability of any City to draw and retain residents and businesses is largely based on the quality of life it can offer. In Salt Lake City, historic preservation has helped achieve the City's status as an attractive and distinct City in a number of ways:

- **Downtown/Central Business District:** Numerous historic structures, including the local historic district Exchange Place, help define a unique and attractive downtown.
- **Distinctive Neighborhoods:** Historic neighborhoods in the City's core have avoided the deterioration and disinvestment that can threaten the image and fabric of the City.
- **Architectural and Historic Attractions:** Preservation activity in the past 30 years has protected numerous sites with distinct historical and architectural significance that attract visitors as well as contributing to the visual interest of the City's built environment.
- **Affordability.** The rehabilitation of older buildings can help provide affordable spaces for both residential and commercial uses, helping to provide a range of housing and business options and contributing to the development of mixed-income areas.

While these are secondary economic benefits, preservation also offers direct benefits to the City's economy through increased employment – studies have documented that rehabilitation projects typically employ more people, and often higher-skilled labor, than new construction projects. The following sections discuss two additional types of direct economic benefits: heritage tourism activity and increased property values.

HERITAGE TOURISM

Across the country, from major urban centers to rural villages and hamlets, research has consistently shown that thriving historic areas attract visitors who provide a significant source of revenue for both local and state economies. Visiting historic places, or "heritage tourism," has grown substantially in the past few decades as more and more visitors seek to combine recreation with meaningful educational experiences. Heritage tourism is focused on the experience and preservation of a distinctive place and its stories from the past to the present. Its resources are diverse and may include historic landscapes, ethnic festivities, and living traditions such as the production of local foods and crafts.

Heritage tourists include travelers who incorporate at least one visit to a historic site or landmark among other activities, and also the smaller subset of visitors whose primary reason for traveling is to visit historic places. Heritage tourists tend to have a greater respect for the places they visit and are less likely to have a negative impact on heritage resources. Heritage tourism is an important tool to bring preservation and economic development together.

Utah enjoys an abundance of beautiful scenery and historic places that attract all types of visitors. Heritage tourism contributes to Utah's economy by generating revenue, creating new jobs, and providing opportunities for small businesses. An example of heritage tourism may include a visit to Salt Lake City's historic downtown, which attracts visitors interested in historic settings such as the unique buildings and landscapes associated with the City's LDS heritage.

According to the nationwide research by the Travel Industry Association of America (TIA), heritage and cultural travelers consistently stay longer and spend more money than other types of U.S. travelers; in one recent year, they averaged \$623 per trip versus \$475 per trip for other U.S. travelers. Heritage travelers also tend to travel longer: 5.2 nights versus 3.4 nights. Most cultural travelers want to enrich their lives with new travel experiences. They have a greater respect for the places they visit and are less likely to have a negative impact on heritage resources.

The economic impacts of heritage tourists go beyond their direct expenditures. Each dollar spent at a hotel, restaurant, or retail shop circulates in the economy as the establishment buys supplies, contracts for services, and pays wages to its employees. This re-spending of money can be calculated through economic multipliers, and can add up to a significant source of income for the City and state.

PROPERTY VALUES

Over the past decade, many communities throughout the country have investigated the impact of local historic district designation on property values. Places as diverse as Colorado, Florida, Michigan, and Texas have tracked property value trends in locally designated historic districts.

While each of these communities has recognized that measuring property value impacts is a complex issue that involves multiple variables that change widely depending on each area studied, they nevertheless have found consistent evidence to support the position that historic designation at the very least does not decrease property values, and oftentimes designation can be a contributing factor in raising values higher and faster than similar, undesignated areas. This was the case, for example, in a 2005 study for the state of Colorado that looked at property values in a range of selected locally designated historic districts (both residential and commercial) in Denver, Durango, and Fort Collins.

GOALS, POLICIES, AND ACTIONS

Goal 5.3: Support historic tourism to Salt Lake City.

Policy 5.3a: Work with preservation partners and economic development groups to develop a heritage tourism strategy.

ACTION 1: DEVELOP HERITAGE TOURISM STRATEGY

The City should actively support efforts by UHF and the Visitor's Bureau to develop a heritage tourism strategy in collaboration with preservation partners and economic development groups, including the City economic development staff, Chamber of Commerce, State Historic Preservation Office, RDA, and others. The first step should be to identify options to promote heritage tourism through existing attractions and the Downtown. The next step should be to identify measures that could be taken to expand the geographical range of the City's heritage tourism efforts towards other neighborhoods and a broader range of resources.

Key elements for the overall heritage tourism strategy to address will include:

- **Products and experiences:** The types of heritage resources that exist for visitors to Salt Lake City – the "things to see and do."
- **Infrastructure:** The physical facilities needed to support heritage tourism (such as lodging, food and beverage, transportation) and also the information resources needed to support the tourism industry (e.g., visitor information databases).
- **Marketing and communications:** The multi-media approach for creating awareness of Salt Lake City heritage tourism opportunities.
- **Funding:** The funding streams and financial resources, both public and private, which will support development and maintenance of heritage tourism resources.
- **Organizations:** The entities charged with managing heritage tourism activities in the City (and perhaps state), including the chamber of commerce, convention and visitors bureau, preservation groups, and City staff and officials.

Policy 5.3b: Pursue funding for heritage tourism in cooperation with other partners involved in developing the tourism strategy.

ACTION I: PURSUE GRANTS TO SUPPORT HERITAGE TOURISM

Capitalize on the City's status as a Preserve America community to identify and pursue grants to help finance heritage tourism growth in the City. Possible sources include Preserve America grants and Utah Cultural Heritage Tourism Grants.

Goal 5.4: Increase coordination between historic preservation and Downtown revitalization and economic development efforts.

The Central Business District contains a variety of historic buildings in addition to Washington Square, Temple Square, and Exchange Place Historic District. The Historic Landmark Commission and planning staff should be collaborators in the revitalization and enhancement of downtown.

Policy 5.4a: Work with downtown and preservation stakeholders to create a Main Street-type program for Downtown Salt Lake City.

ACTION I: DEVELOP COMMUNITY REVITALIZATION PROGRAM

Work with a variety of Downtown and preservation stakeholders, such as City officials, the Chamber of Commerce, the Redevelopment Agency (RDA), Downtown Alliance, State Historic Preservation Office, and the Salt Lake City Economic Development Division, to develop a community revitalization program for the Downtown, which relies on historic preservation as a catalyst for downtown economic development. Build on successful concepts introduced and tested by the National Trust's Main Street program.

URBAN NATURE

OVERVIEW

Salt Lake City has a number of parks that are listed as historic Landmark Sites, including Liberty Park and Pioneer Park. Other historic landscapes maintained by the City include neighborhood parks, park strips and medians, cemeteries, and the landscapes around City-owned buildings. Maintenance responsibility of these properties is the responsibility of Public Services, but planning staff and the Commission do review heritage tree removal when in a Landmark Site or local district, including historic parks. There also are a variety of privately owned green spaces in historic districts and on the grounds of Landmark Sites.

The City will work to ensure that historic features of all its historic landscapes remain present for future generations through responsible stewardship and careful maintenance practices.



Gilgal Sculpture Garden received a Utah Heritage Foundation Preservation Award in 2008.

GOALS, POLICIES, AND ACTION

Goal 5.5: Preserve historic parks and other historic landscapes in Salt Lake City.

Policy 5.5a: Create design guidelines for historic landscapes including parks, medians, open space areas, and cemeteries.

ACTION 1: SURVEY THE CITY'S HISTORIC LANDSCAPES

Conduct one or more surveys of historic landscapes in the City, including parks, cemeteries, open space, and streetscapes. Surveys are a necessary prerequisite to the development of design guidelines, and also to provide a baseline for making decisions regarding development proposals affecting historic landscapes. The existing master plans on their own (e.g., the parks master plan) are not always sufficient to provide a basis for making decisions. Further, not every park or site has a master plan.

ACTION 2: CREATE HISTORIC LANDSCAPE DESIGN GUIDELINES

Based on the survey called for in Action 1, develop design guidelines for historic landscapes to ensure the integrity of these spaces is retained and that they support the structures they surround. This set of design guidelines should be balanced against other citywide sustainability goals to ensure recommended practices have a rational relationship to the public need for safety, water conservation and management of invasive species and pests.

The City will strive for landscaping techniques that are compatible with historic landscapes, in addition to being water-efficient and environmentally responsible. If, for example, a tree species was once commonly planted but is now known to be invasive or susceptible to certain pests or diseases, current knowledge and best practice should determine the selection of replacement species. The focus should remain on the overall aesthetic, however, to ensure there is consistency in the landscape and that the replacement "reads" the same as the species it replaced. Replacement should still be conducted, as it is now, when a tree is ill or damaged and poses a safety risk (falling over or repeated large falling branches). The City preservation and public services staffs can work collaboratively to develop an appropriate plant palate for historic areas to guide future maintenance activities in these landscapes.

Policy 5.5b: Coordinate with Public Services Department to preserve City-owned parks and other historic landscapes.

ACTION 1: PRESERVE LOCALLY DESIGNATED PARKS

Coordinate with the Public Services Department on the maintenance and improvement of historic parks in line with the design guidelines for landscapes (See Policy 5.5a) and other goals and policies of this plan.



Liberty Park, a Landmark Site, includes many historic features such as this stone arbor.

ACTION 2: IDENTIFY AND PURSUE LISTING FOR ADDITIONAL HISTORIC PARKS AND HISTORIC LANDSCAPES

Identify additional historic parks in the City for survey and, if appropriate, nomination as Landmark Sites or included within historic districts.

ACTION 3: DEVELOP INFORMATIONAL PACKET FOR ALL HISTORIC PARKS IN THE CITY

Create an informational packet on the history of use and landscape design of the City's historic parks. This summary should include all older parks in the City, not just those already listed as local Landmark Sites. This packet should be provided to the Historic Landmark Commission, Public Services Department, and planning staff for their use and reference and be used to develop and refine the design guidelines for historic landscapes.

Policy 5.5c: Maintain historic landscape features such as markers in road, memorials in medians, and sidewalks

ACTION 1: INVENTORY HISTORIC DETAILS TO BE PRESERVED

Create an inventory of historic markers, memorials, and any other significant historic landscape features that should be retained and share that information with the Public Services Department to inform their project planning. As GIS capability expands, these points can be geocoded into a shapefile with a GPS device to make locating and identifying resources easy and convenient.

ACTION 2: DETERMINE APPROPRIATE PRESERVATION MEASURES FOR HISTORIC LANDSCAPE FEATURES

Eliminate or streamline negotiations on preservation of historic Landmark Site features, such as street and sidewalk details, by determining appropriate protection and mitigation measures and thresholds in advance with the Public Services department. The appropriate mitigation measures should be tiered based on the significance of the resource. Special consideration may wish to be taken with the street and sidewalks in front of Landmark Sites or that serve as view corridors from historic parks.

ACTION 3: PUBLIC SERVICES DEPARTMENT COORDINATION

Foster an ongoing arrangement with the Public Services Department, such that Public Services Department will notify the planning staff any time repairs are to be made in either a local or a national historic district that may affect historic landscape features. This should also include streets and sidewalks within historic districts that may have been updated in a manner that did not retain historically compatible characteristics. New work to streets, sidewalks, medians, etc in these areas should be viewed as an opportunity to bring the streetscapes and landscapes closer in line to the original conditions and the guidance and objectives of this plan.

Policy 5.5d: Educate the public about the preservation of privately owned historic landscapes.

ACTION I: DEVELOP EDUCATIONAL MATERIALS FOR THE OWNERS OF PRIVATE HISTORIC LANDSCAPES

Develop a series of brochures or other educational materials that may be made available to the owners of historic landscapes on private property, such as private landscaping within local districts or on the grounds of Landmark Sites. Individuals should be encouraged to use historically compatible materials where possible, while still respecting the City's sustainability goals. A basic element of a standard residential landscape is the lawn or turf area – but the choice of turf species used can greatly impact its susceptibility to drought and overall water consumption. Given that approximately half of residential water use in the US is used for landscape irrigation, eliminating thirsty species from the landscape can have a dramatic impact on overall water consumption. As the City develops landscaping standards as part of its code revisions, planning staff can modify plant lists to focus on appropriate selections in historic areas.

Policy 5.5e: Review and update the Master Plans to ensure that open space goals within historic districts or Landmark Sites are consistent with the historic preservation plan.

ACTION: SEE POLICY I.2A.

TRANSPORTATION

OVERVIEW

A sustainable transportation system is one that allows for many types of movement and access throughout the City, with an emphasis on alternatives to motor vehicle travel. The historic development pattern of the City grid lends itself to alternate modes of transportation such as pedestrian, bicycle, and transit. The City will continue to support alternate modes of travel in its historic areas through appropriate improvements to the overall transportation infrastructure, which includes highways, major and minor roads, transit (bus, light rail, street car), bicycle lanes, and sidewalks.

GOALS, POLICIES, AND ACTIONS

Goal 5.6: Support a range of transportation modes.

Policy 5.6a: Work with the Public Services Department to offer a welcoming pedestrian and bicycle environment in historic districts.



TRAX connects major destinations in the city, such as Temple Square (above) and the University. Through proactive planning, the historic character can help shape unique identities for transit stations.

ACTION I: DEVELOP HISTORIC DESIGN GUIDELINES THAT ENHANCE THE PEDESTRIAN ENVIRONMENT

Work with Public Services Department to plan for improvements within historic districts and to Landmark Sites that simultaneously enhance the pedestrian environment and the historic streetscape. Pedestrian-friendly features should include well-maintained sidewalks, clear and safe crossings, street trees, and compatible design of bicycle racks and street furniture near commercial activities. The pedestrian-friendly design features should be integrated into the historic district design guidelines.

Policy 5.6b: Coordinate with the Utah Transit Authority and City Transportation Division on light rail routes, stations, and street car system improvements planned within historic districts.

ACTION I: REPRESENT PRESERVATION PRIORITIES IN THE TRANSIT PLANNING PROCESS

Ensure consistent participation by planning staff in the transit planning and policy-setting process. In particular, ensure that planning division staff with knowledge of the City's historic resources participate in the development of new and expanded light rail lines, with the objective of minimizing actions (such as the siting of new stations) that may harm historic resources and supporting actions that will enhance historic preservation.

HOUSING

OVERVIEW

Another key attribute of a sustainable city is the availability of a wide variety of convenient, safe, and affordable housing options for residents of all income levels. The City is committed to supporting vital urban neighborhoods that accommodate a range of size, age, and income households.

Creating and maintaining a supply of affordable housing is a challenge in any city. Historic neighborhoods can provide a significant range of housing options. With the use of incentive programs, such as grants and preservation tax credits, these neighborhoods have the potential to provide even more affordable homes.

The supply of housing in the core areas of a city directly impacts the mix of age, income, and family sizes that can reside there. In Salt Lake City, current preservation limitations on home additions and maintenance requirements were criticized by some participants in this planning process as resulting in a more homogenous resident profile than is desired or sustainable for the long term. The perceived inability of the central neighborhoods to accommodate different housing needs impacts the city's overall development footprint, as core-area residents move elsewhere in search of housing options to match their needs. For example, a growing family that finds it difficult to expand its home because of preservation restrictions may look to a neighborhood in the suburbs for a



The adaptive reuse of the former ZCMI General Warehouse (above) for the Artspace City Center has added artist townhouses (below), artist live-work units, gallery space, and an interior garden. Adaptive reuse can be a critical tool in preserving historic structures and providing space for affordable and rental housing options as well as economic activity.



Photos courtesy of Utah Heritage Foundation.

new home. This results in increased land and resource consumption as new homes are constructed.

The City's challenge is to pursue its preservation objectives while at the same time ensuring that a variety of household types can find convenient and affordable housing in the City. Preservation standards and programs should support adaptive reuse, renovation of historic apartments, and appropriate expansion of single-family homes to allow historic structures to meet various lifestyle needs.

GOALS, POLICIES, AND ACTIONS

Goal 5.7: Promote a range of housing options in historic areas to meet a variety of needs.

Policy 5.7a: Ensure zoning supports the retention and reuse of existing historic apartment and non-residential buildings.

ACTION 1: ENSURE COMPATIBLE ZONING

Ensure underlying zoning for historic non-residential structures supports the reuse for multi-family or some compatible non-residential use.

Policy 5.7b: Support the renovation and use of historic apartment buildings and the adaptive reuse of historic non-residential buildings for residential units.

ACTION 1: IDENTIFY AND REMOVE OBSTACLES AND INCENTIVES FOR DEMOLITION

Work to identify obstacles to non-residential renovation and adaptive reuse projects including fire and building code requirements and find appropriate solutions that make renovation projects more viable and user-friendly.

ACTION 2: EDUCATE STAFF ON CODE CHANGES AND AVAILABLE ASSISTANCE

Ensure that current planning, code enforcement, building permit, and other relevant staff are trained in the code changes to ensure rules and information are applied and distributed in a correct and consistent manner. Inform all relevant parties of contacts for either their own questions or people to whom they can direct private citizens with questions on project requirements and available incentives.

Policy 5.7c: Work to develop appropriate policies on additions to historic homes to accommodate the needs of families.

ACTION 1: SUPPORT APPROPRIATE RESIDENTIAL ADDITIONS

Develop policies for additions to residential properties to ensure that historic structures can continue to meet the housing needs of both families and

individuals. Determine whether existing design guidelines are sufficient to implement policies, or whether revisions are necessary.

UHF also has outlined a number of suggested policies for sensitive residential additions in its publication, *Celebrating Compatible Infill Design*.

Policy 5.7d: Work to develop appropriate policies on allowing accessory dwelling units in historic homes.

ACTION 1: ALLOW ACCESSORY DWELLING UNITS IN HISTORIC DISTRICTS

Assess best practices for accessory dwelling units in historic areas and make appropriate regulatory modifications to allow accessory dwelling units in historic districts. Consider density bonuses to encourage provision of accessory dwelling units.

Policy 5.7e: Explore potential partnerships between the Housing Authority, Housing Division, RDA, and non profit housing agencies and historic preservation to leverage funds and offer affordable housing units.

ACTION 1: AFFORDABLE HOUSING BEST PRACTICE

Identify priorities and best practices for affordable housing and historic preservation to educate on how preservation and affordable housing can best support the objectives of the other.

ACTION 2: PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT

Coordinate with other departments and agencies to develop programs that support affordable housing and jointly pursue funding to support affordable housing objectives. The Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) program is one possible source of funding.

Goal 5.8: Assist homeowners in overcoming age, income, or ability challenges of home maintenance requirements.

The City will explore and support volunteer efforts and financing options to support homeowners facing challenges in meeting exterior home maintenance requirements.

Policy 5.8a: Coordinate with the Housing and Neighborhood Development Division to develop and encourage the use of community programs that assist elderly or differently-abled owners of historic properties with exterior maintenance tasks.

ACTION 1: CREATE TARGETED MAINTENANCE ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS

Identify and pursue programs to provide targeted assistance in home maintenance and weatherization where there is need and support for such programs from elderly, differently abled, or low-income residents. Programs may include public/private or public/non-profit partnerships, as well as direct collaboration with the Housing and Neighborhood Development Division. Some such programs may already exist, but perhaps could be better integrated with the city's preservation programs. Develop standards designed

to uphold the material requirements of the historic overlay ordinance. The Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) program is one possible source of funding.

ACTION 2: COORDINATE OUTREACH TO PROPERTY OWNERS

Work with other program partners to develop an outreach campaign on the new programs as they are offered to both encourage participation and help overcome any concerns or reservations property owners may have about seeking assistance. The Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) program is one possible source of funding. The community design center (ASSIST, Inc.) could be a resource for outreach and support to the elderly, handicapped, and low- and moderate-income residents.

ACTION 3: PURSUE AND CREATE FUNDING SUPPORT

Identify and pursue available funding sources to support the new housing rehabilitation program such as Community Development Block Grants and Urban Renewal Program funds. Where gaps still exist, pursue public-private and public-non-profit partnerships to offer additional funding options.

Implementation Action Plan

HOW WILL THE PLAN BE IMPLEMENTED?

Salt Lake City will implement the Historic Preservation Plan through five basic types of actions:

1. Policy Decisions,
2. Ordinance Revisions,
3. Coordination and Partnerships,
4. Pursuing Funding Mechanisms, and
5. Education and Outreach.

These are described briefly in the sections that follow.

POLICY DECISIONS

The plan identifies a number of actions that will be carried out during day-to-day policy decisions made by the planning staff, the Commission, and the City Council. The Commission and Council will continually make decisions regarding development proposals and plan amendments and will use this plan to guide such policy decisions as they occur. The City Council's annual funding to support planning and planning staff activities will directly impact the successful implementation of this plan.

REGULATORY IMPROVEMENTS

Regulatory improvements to the (H) Historic Overlay ordinance, creation of new tools like conservation districts, and improvements and additional design guidelines for historic areas will all be critical components of plan implementation. Changes will also be necessary to the building code, sign code, and other regulations to support policies of this plan and facilitate adaptive reuse projects. By bringing regulations of the City into alignment with preservation objectives, the City will help reduce internal conflicts and contradictions and support a more unified approach to preservation and development.

COORDINATION AND PARTNERSHIPS

The plan identifies two categories of partnerships central to its successful implementation:

PRESERVATION PARTNERS

The City will work closely with Utah Heritage Foundation, the Utah State Historic Preservation Office, and other non-profit preservation advocacy groups to coordinate on many preservation-related activities, including development of an on-line database, education and outreach activities, and grants and loans, among others.

CITY DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES

The planning staff of the Planning and Zoning Division of the City will coordinate with other departments, particularly the Economic Development, Housing, and Public Services, as well as the Redevelopment Agency of Salt Lake City.

PURSUING FUNDING MECHANISMS

Throughout this plan, the Action statements make reference to a number of potential funding sources to assist in implementing goals of the preservation plan. Many of these are competitive annual grants that the City will need to pursue independently or in conjunction with another agency or entity and that require cash matches. The pursuit of these funding sources, as well as keeping current on any additional opportunities that may exist over time, will need to be integrated as a practice of planning staff and other departments where mutual opportunities or overlaps exist.

EDUCATION AND OUTREACH

Education and outreach are a critical component to fostering support and understanding for the preservation program and how preservation activities relate to other City goals, such as sustainability. The City will work with other preservation partners and community council groups to increase public awareness and create additional educational opportunities and materials.

IMPLEMENTATION ACTION PLAN

The following pages contain the Implementation Action Matrix. This matrix summarizes each action identified in the plan and assigns a time frame and one or more responsible partners.

Timing: The matrix expresses the relative priority of the action within the timing section of the matrix. These columns specify the timing for each action as: ongoing, within the first year after the plan is adopted, in the one- to five-year timeframe, or five to ten years from adoption.

Responsible Parties: The matrix identifies the parties responsible for implementing the action, including joint actions and collaborations.

| Action Ref # | Implementation Action | Timing | | | | Responsible Parties |
|--|--|---------|---------|---------|----------|--------------------------------------|
| | | Ongoing | 0-12 mo | 1-5 yrs | 5-10 yrs | |
| Theme 1: Foster a Unified City Commitment to Preservation | | | | | | |
| 1.1a.1 | Master Plan Assessment (p.19) | ✓ | | | | City Staff |
| 1.1a.2 | Develop Preservation Issues List for Community Master Plans (p.19) | | ✓ | | | HLC, City Staff |
| 1.1a.3 | Establish Annual Priorities and Pursue Funding (p.19) | ✓ | | | | HLC, City Staff |
| 1.1b.1 | Citywide Plan Assessment (p.20) | ✓ | | | | City Staff |
| 1.2a.1 | Decision-Making Priority (p.22) | ✓ | | | | City Officials, City Staff |
| 1.2b.1 | City Coordination Committee (p.25) | | ✓ | | | City Staff |
| 1.2b.2 | Coordinate with Economic Development (p.25) | ✓ | | | | City Staff |
| 1.2b.3 | Coordinate with Transportation Planning (p.25) | ✓ | | | | City Staff |
| 1.2b.4 | Coordinate with City Sustainability Efforts (p.26) | ✓ | | | | City Staff |
| 1.2c.1 | Annual Action Plan for Implementation (p.26) | ✓ | | | | HLC, City Staff |
| 1.2c.2 | Periodic Implementation Progress Reports (p.26) | ✓ | | | | City Staff |
| 1.3a.1 | Outreach to City Leaders and Other Departments (p.29) | | ✓ | | | HLC, City Staff |
| 1.3a.2 | Weave Education into all Preservation Planning Functions (p.29) | | | ✓ | | City Staff |
| 1.3b.1 | Assign Staff Planning Teams to the Community (p.30) | | ✓ | | | City Staff |
| 1.3b.2 | Develop Property Acquisition Process (p.30) | | | ✓ | | City Officials, City Staff |
| 1.3b.3 | Planning for City-Owned Properties (p.30) | | | ✓ | | City Officials, City Staff |
| 1.3c.1 | Study Economic Benefits of Historic Preservation (p.30) | | | | ✓ | City Officials, City Staff |
| 1.3c.2 | Understand Mutual Interests (p.30) | ✓ | | | | City Officials, HLC, RDA, City Staff |
| Theme 2: Develop a Comprehensive Preservation Toolbox | | | | | | |
| 2.1a.1 | Establish Survey Criteria (p.35) | | ✓ | | | City Staff, HLC |
| 2.1a.2 | Identify Areas Where New Surveys Are Needed (p.35) | ✓ | | | | HLC, City Staff |
| 2.1b.1 | Establish Age Threshold for Existing Surveys (p.35) | | | ✓ | | HLC, City Staff |
| 2.1b.2 | Identify Areas Where Resurveys Are Needed (p.33) | | ✓ | | | HLC, City Staff |
| 2.1c.1 | Identify Short- and Long-Term Survey Funding Priorities (p.36) | | | ✓ | | HLC, City Staff |
| 2.2a.1 | Establish a Consistent Format for New Surveys (p.36) | | | ✓ | | HLC, City Staff, SHPO |
| 2.2b.1 | Support Archive Development (p.37) | ✓ | | | | HLC, City Staff, SHPO |
| 2.2b.2 | Promote Electronic Archive Use (p.37) | ✓ | | | | HLC, City Staff, SHPO, UHF |
| 2.3a.1 | Track Development Activity Near District Boundaries (p.42) | ✓ | | | | City Staff |
| 2.3b.1 | Evaluate Possible Local District Boundary | | | ✓ | | HLC, City Staff |

| Action Ref # | Implementation Action | Timing | | | | Responsible Parties |
|--------------|--|---------|---------|---------|----------|---------------------------------|
| | | Ongoing | 0-12 mo | 1-5 yrs | 5-10 yrs | |
| | Changes (p.42) | | | | | |
| 2.3b.2 | Refine Local District Boundaries (p.42) | | | ✓ | | City Officials, HLC, City Staff |
| 2.4a.1 | Identify National Districts Appropriate for Local Listing (p.43) | | | ✓ | | HLC, City Staff, SHPO |
| 2.4a.2 | Identify Other Candidate Areas for Local Designation (p.43) | | | ✓ | | HLC, City Staff, SHPO |
| 2.4a.3 | Prepare Local District and Multiple-Property Nominations (p.43) | | | ✓ | | HLC, City Staff, SHPO |
| 2.5a.1 | Identify Landmark Site Candidates (p.43) | ✓ | | | | HLC, City Staff, SHPO, UHF |
| 2.5a.2 | Nominate Additional Landmark Sites (p.43) | | | | ✓ | City Officials, HLC, City Staff |
| 2.5a.3 | Evaluate Designation Status of Existing Landmark Sites (p.43) | | | ✓ | | City Staff, HLC |
| 2.5b.1 | Pursue Local Listing of City Properties (p.44) | | ✓ | | | City Staff, HLC |
| 2.5b.2 | Update City Property Acquisition Process (p.44) | | ✓ | | | City Officials, HLC, City Staff |
| 2.6a.1 | Encourage National Register Nominations for Properties Identified Through Survey Work (p.44) | ✓ | | | | City Staff, SHPO, UHF |
| 2.7a.1 | Assess Underlying Zoning (p.47) | | ✓ | | | City Staff |
| 2.7a.2 | Pursue Zoning Map Amendments (p.48) | | ✓ | | | City Officials, HLC, City Staff |
| 2.7b.1 | Assess Building Code Barriers and Conflicts (p.48) | | ✓ | | | City Staff |
| 2.7b.2 | Develop Smart Code for Adaptive Reuse (p.48) | | | ✓ | | City Staff, City Officials |
| 2.8a.1 | Establish a Conservation Overlay District (p.48) | | | ✓ | | City Officials, HLC, City Staff |
| 2.8a.2 | Develop TDR Programs (p.48) | | | | ✓ | City Officials, HLC, City Staff |
| 2.8a.3 | Explore Other Tools and Incentives (p.49) | ✓ | | | | City Officials, HLC, City Staff |
| 2.8b.1 | Educate About Existing Incentives (p.52) | ✓ | | | | City Staff, SHPO, UHF |
| 2.8b.2 | Improve Preservation Program Incentives to Property Owners (p.52) | ✓ | | | | City Staff, RDA |
| 2.9a.1 | Make Targeted Ordinance Revisions (p.53) | | ✓ | | | City Officials, HLC, City Staff |
| 2.9a.2 | Examine Best Practices and Lessons Learned (p.53) | ✓ | | | | City Staff |
| 2.9b.1 | Draft and Adopt Demolition-by-Neglect Standards (p.53) | | ✓ | | | City Staff |
| 2.10a.1 | Update and Clarify New Construction Requirements (p.54) | | ✓ | | | City Officials, HLC, City Staff |
| 2.10a.2 | Align Design Guidelines (p.54) | ✓ | | | | City Officials, HLC, City Staff |
| 2.10b.1 | Encourage the Retention of Historic Signs (p.54) | ✓ | | | | City Officials, HLC, City Staff |
| 2.10c.1 | Develop Design Guidelines for New Signs (p.55) | | | ✓ | | City Officials, HLC, City Staff |
| 2.10d.1 | Create Multi-Family Design Guidelines (p.55) | | | ✓ | | City Officials, HLC, City Staff |
| 2.10e.1 | Develop Non-Residential Design Guidelines (p.55) | | | ✓ | | City Officials, HLC, City Staff |

Theme 3: Administer a Convenient and Consistent Historic Preservation Program

| Action Ref # | Implementation Action | Timing | | | | Responsible Parties |
|--|---|---------|---------|---------|----------|----------------------------------|
| | | Ongoing | 0-12 mo | 1-5 yrs | 5-10 yrs | |
| 3.1a.1 | Annual Commissioner Retreats (p.58) | ✓ | | | | City Officials, HLC, City Staff |
| 3.1a.2 | Facilitate Additional Training (p.58) | ✓ | | | | City Officials, HLC, City Staff |
| 3.1a.3 | New HLC Member Training Materials (p.58) | | ✓ | | | City Staff |
| 3.1a.4 | HLC Mentoring Program (p.58) | ✓ | | | | HLC, City Staff |
| 3.1b.1 | Revise Ordinance Description of HLC Role (p.58) | | ✓ | | | City Officials, HLC, City Staff |
| 3.1c.1 | Establish Architectural Review Committee (p.59) | | ✓ | | | City Officials, HLC |
| 3.2a.1 | Develop a Staff Workload Tracking System (p.63) | ✓ | | | | City Staff |
| 3.2b.1 | Track Target Staffing Levels (p.63) | ✓ | | | | City Staff |
| 3.2b.2 | Maintain Adequate Staffing Levels (p.63) | ✓ | | | | City Officials, City Staff |
| 3.2b.3 | Provide Education for Staff (p.63) | ✓ | | | | City Officials, City Staff |
| 3.2b.4 | Conduct Training on Design Guidelines (p.63) | | | | ✓ | City Staff |
| 3.3a.1 | Create User Handbook for Historic Preservation Projects (p.64) | | | ✓ | | City Staff |
| 3.4a.1 | Consider Creation of New Preservation Enforcement Position (p.64) | | | | ✓ | City Officials, City Staff |
| 3.4a.2 | Develop System for New Construction Project Review (p.64) | | | ✓ | | City Staff |
| 3.5a.1 | Add GIS Capacity (p.66) | | | ✓ | | City Officials, City Staff |
| 3.5b.1 | GIS Education and Outreach (p.66) | | | | ✓ | City Staff |
| 3.5c.1 | Track Properties by Parcel (p.66) | | | | ✓ | City Staff, SHPO |
| Theme 4: Improve Education and Outreach | | | | | | |
| 4.1a.1 | Annual Property Owner Newsletter (p.69) | ✓ | | | | City Staff, Community Councils |
| 4.1a.2 | Convey Historic Status as Part of the Sale Process (p.69) | | | | ✓ | City Officials, City Staff, SHPO |
| 4.1a.3 | Lobby for State Requirements for Historic Designation on Property Titles (p.69) | | | | ✓ | SHPO, UHF |
| 4.1b.1 | Develop Property Maintenance Handouts (p.69) | | | ✓ | | City Staff, SHPO, UHF |
| 4.2a.1 | Periodic Education and Outreach Materials with Preservation Partners (p.70) | ✓ | | | | City Staff, SHPO, UHF |
| 4.2b.1 | Create Education and Outreach Guide (p.70) | | | ✓ | | City Staff, SHPO, UHF |
| 4.2c.1 | Expand Website Content (p.70) | | ✓ | | | City Staff |
| 4.2c.2 | Gather Relevant "Best Practice" Highlights (p.71) | ✓ | | | | City Staff |
| 4.2d.1 | Highlight Community Best Practices (p.71) | ✓ | | | | City Staff |
| 4.2e.1 | Project Financing Workshops (p.71) | ✓ | | | | City Staff, SHPO |
| 4.3a.1 | Reinstate Awards Program (p.71) | | ✓ | | | City Officials, HLC, City Staff |
| 4.3b.1 | Pursue Broader Recognition of Salt Lake City Preservation Activities (p.72) | ✓ | | | | City Officials, HLC, City Staff |
| 4.3c.1 | Increase the Number of Historic Signs and Markers (p.72) | | | ✓ | | City Staff |

| Action Ref # | Implementation Action | Timing | | | | Responsible Parties |
|--|--|---------|---------|---------|----------|---|
| | | Ongoing | 0-12 mo | 1-5 yrs | 5-10 yrs | |
| 4.3e.1 | Attend Community Events and Fairs (p.72) | ✓ | | | | City Staff |
| 4.3e.1 | Work with School District Officials to Integrate City History into School Curricula (p.72) | | | ✓ | | City Staff, School District Administrators |
| 4.4a.1 | Create a Financing and Incentives Brochure (p.73) | | | ✓ | | City Staff, SHPO |
| 4.4a.2 | Offer Periodic Tax-Credit Workshops (p.73) | ✓ | | | | City Staff, SHPO |
| 4.4b.1 | Help Expand UHF Loan Pool (p.73) | ✓ | | | | City Officials, HLC, City Staff, UHF |
| 4.4c.1 | Promote Preservation Easements (p.73) | ✓ | | | | City Staff, SHPO, UHF |
| 4.4d.1 | Modify Review Procedures (p.73) | | ✓ | | | City Officials, HLC, City Staff |
| Theme 5: Support a Sustainable City | | | | | | |
| 5.1a.1 | Preservation/Sustainability Education Series (p.76) | | | ✓ | | City Staff |
| 5.1b.1 | Create Educational Materials for Owners of Historic Properties (p.76) | | | | ✓ | City Staff |
| 5.2a.1 | Research New Green Building Materials, Technologies, and Practices (p.78) | ✓ | | | | City Staff |
| 5.2a.2 | Update Design Guideline on a Regular Basis (p.78) | ✓ | | | | HLC, City Staff |
| 5.2a.3 | Appoint A Staff Green Building Liaison (p.78) | | ✓ | | | City Staff |
| 5.2a.4 | Support Contractor Workshops (p.78) | | | | ✓ | City Staff, SHPO, UHF |
| 5.2b.1 | Enable Broader Use of Solar Collectors (p.78) | | ✓ | | | City Officials, City Staff |
| 5.2c.1 | Support Architectural Salvage Programs (p.79) | | | | ✓ | City Officials, Chamber of Commerce, RDA |
| 5.3a.1 | Develop Heritage Tourism Strategy (p.81) | | | | ✓ | Chamber of Commerce, Salt Lake City Visitor Bureau, Utah Tourism Council, City Staff, UHF, SHPO |
| 5.3b.1 | Pursue Grants to Support Heritage Tourism (p.82) | | | ✓ | | City Staff |
| 5.4a.1 | Develop Community Revitalization Program (p.82) | | | | ✓ | Chamber of Commerce, City Staff, UHF, SHPO |
| 5.5a.1 | Survey the City's Historic Landscapes (p.83) | | | ✓ | | City Staff, SHPO |
| 5.5a.2 | Create Historic Landscape Design Guidelines (p.83) | | | | ✓ | City Officials, HLC, City Staff |
| 5.5b.1 | Preserve Locally Designated Parks (p.83) | | ✓ | | | City Staff |
| 5.5b.2 | Identify and Pursue Listing For Additional Historic Parks and Historic Landscapes (p.84) | | | | ✓ | City Staff, SHPO |
| 5.5b.3 | Develop Informational Packet for All Historic Parks in the City (p.84) | | | ✓ | | City Staff, UHF |
| 5.5c.1 | Inventory Historic Details to Be Preserved (p.84) | | | ✓ | | City Staff |
| 5.5c.2 | Determine Appropriate Preservation Measures for Historic Landscape Features (p.84) | | | | ✓ | HLC, City Staff |
| 5.5c.3 | Public Services Department Coordination (p.84) | ✓ | | | | HLC, City Staff |
| 5.5d.1 | Develop Educational Materials for the Owners | | | | ✓ | City Staff |

| Action Ref # | Implementation Action | Timing | | | | Responsible Parties |
|--------------|---|---------|---------|---------|----------|--------------------------------------|
| | | Ongoing | 0-12 mo | 1-5 yrs | 5-10 yrs | |
| | of Private Historic Landscapes (p.85) | | | | | |
| 5.6a.1 | Develop Historic Design Guidelines that Enhance the Pedestrian Environment (p.86) | | | | ✓ | City Officials, HLC, City Staff |
| 5.6a.2 | Represent Preservation Priorities in the Transit Planning Process (p.86) | ✓ | | | | City Officials, City Staff |
| 5.7a.1 | Ensure Compatible Zoning (p.87) | | ✓ | | | City Officials, City Staff |
| 5.7b.1 | Identify and Remove Obstacles and Incentives for Demolition (p.87) | | ✓ | | | City Officials, HLC, RDA, City Staff |
| 5.7b.2 | Educate Staff on Code Changes and Available Assistance (p.87) | | | ✓ | | City Staff |
| 5.7c.1 | Support Appropriate Residential Additions (p.87) | | ✓ | | | City Officials, HLC, City Staff |
| 5.7d.1 | Allow Accessory Dwelling Units in Historic Districts (p.88) | | ✓ | | | City Officials, HLC, City Staff |
| 5.7e.1 | Affordable Housing Best Practice (p.88) | | | ✓ | | City Staff |
| 5.7e.2 | Program Development (p.88) | | | ✓ | | City Staff |
| 5.8a.1 | Create Targeted Maintenance Assistance Programs (p.88) | | | ✓ | | City Staff |
| 5.8a.2 | Coordinate Outreach to Property Owners (p.89) | ✓ | | | | City Staff |
| 5.8a.3 | Pursue and Create Funding Support (p.89) | ✓ | | | | City Officials, City Staff |

Appendix A: Historic Districts and Sites Field Analysis

Prepared by Tatanka Historical Associates

OVERVIEW

As part of the planning process, all local and national historic districts were visited during 2007 and 2008 to gain an idea of their current characteristics. Recommendations were made for each area as to whether district status should be reviewed, if additional survey work was warranted, or if the area did not warrant further consideration. Where surveys are recommended, they are proposed to be intensive-level surveys unless otherwise indicated in this appendix. These recommendations are summarized in the table below.

TABLE 1: HISTORIC DISTRICT RECOMMENDATIONS

| Historic District | District Boundary Status | Survey Recommended? | Survey Objective | Priority Level |
|----------------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------|---|----------------|
| Local Districts (also NR) | | | | |
| South Temple | Stable | ✓ | Inventory post WWII resources | Low |
| The Avenues | Stable | ✓ | Possible boundary revision, southwest corner | Low |
| Exchange Place | Stable | ✓ | Evaluate boundaries to reflect existing conditions | Moderate |
| Capitol Hill | Stable | ✓ | Reevaluate 200 West Area | Moderate |
| Central City | Compromised | ✓ | Reevaluate historic district status; consider as possible conservation district | High |
| University | Compromised | ✓ | Evaluate boundaries to reflect existing conditions | |
| National Districts | | | | |
| The Avenues Extension | Stable | | | |
| City Creek Canyon | Stable | | | |
| Westside Warehouse | Stable | | Consider local district nomination | |
| Gilmer Park | Stable | ✓ | Consider local district nomination | Moderate |
| Bennion-Douglas | Stable | | Consider local district nomination | |
| Bryant | Compromised | ✓ | Reevaluate historic district status; consider as possible conservation district | Moderate |
| Highland Park | Stable | ✓ | Reevaluate boundary rationale | Low |
| Northwest | Compromised | ✓ | Reevaluate boundary, especially eastern portions | Moderate |

| Historic District | District Boundary Status | Survey Recommended? | Survey Objective | Priority Level |
|------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------|---|----------------|
| Capitol Hill Extension | Compromised | ✓ | Reevaluate historic district status; consider as possible conservation district | High |
| Yalecrest | Compromised | | Consider stronger protections to control demolitions and teardowns | High |

In addition, visits and observations were made regarding additional areas or resources that were identified by preservation stakeholders as potential areas or resources for future survey consideration. These were reviewed and preliminary recommendations made regarding the merit of future survey activity. These recommendations are summarized in Table 2, below. Where surveys are recommended, they are proposed to be intensive-level surveys unless otherwise indicated.

TABLE 2: POTENTIAL HISTORIC AREA RECOMMENDATIONS

| Area | Survey Recommended? | Explanation | Priority Level |
|---|---------------------|--|----------------|
| Desoto-Cortez Neighborhood | | Consider alternatives to historic designation, such as conservation district | Low |
| Federal Heights Neighborhood | ✓ | Local and national candidate | High |
| City Cemetery | ✓ | Local and national candidate | High |
| Neighborhood North of the Avenues Extension Historic District | ✓ | | Moderate |
| Gentile Core | ✓ | Inventory for structures; thematic nomination candidate | High |
| West Liberty Neighborhood | | Consider alternatives to historic designation, such as conservation district | Low |
| West Temple Neighborhood | ✓ | Inventory for structures; district potential not likely | Low |
| Westmoreland Neighborhood | ✓ | Part of the significant Wasatch Hollow neighborhood | High |
| Westminster Avenue Neighborhood | ✓ | Notable structures to inventory in survey; district potential unclear | Low |
| Forest Dale (Nibley Park) Neighborhood | | Recently surveyed; National Register nomination being prepared | |
| Sugarhouse Neighborhood | ✓ | Consider alternatives to historic designation, such as conservation district | Moderate |
| Liberty Wells Neighborhood | ✓ | Inventory for structures; district potential not likely | Low |
| 900 West Neighborhood | | | Low |
| Euclid Neighborhood | ✓ | Recently adopted Euclid Master Plan calls for a historic survey. | Low |

| Area | Survey Recommended? | Explanation | Priority Level |
|---------------------------------|---------------------|---|----------------|
| Rose Park Neighborhood | ✓ | Reconnaissance level only | Low |
| Lower Ensign Downs Neighborhood | ✓ | Notable variety and quality of modern resources | Moderate |
| Industrial-Warehouse Area | ✓ | Notable structures to inventory in survey; district potential unclear | High |

PROJECT BACKGROUND

Salt Lake City has been engaged in efforts to protect its historic resources since the mid-1970s, when it adopted a preservation ordinance, created a Historic Landmark Commission, and established its first historic district. To address an ongoing loss of historic buildings in the City's historic core during the decades following World War II, the City began to designate individual sites and to establish historic districts. While many of these were designated to the Salt Lake City Register of Cultural Resources, others have been listed in the National Register of Historic Places. This process continues today, as the City is completing ongoing surveys and contemplating the establishment of additional historic districts.

By the early 2000s, the City began to see a need for a comprehensive preservation plan to address refinements to its policies, regulations, permit review and local designation processes. Clarion Associates was engaged to study the City and its preservation efforts, and to complete a preservation plan. Ron Sladek of Tatanka Historical Associates Inc. was brought onto the project to focus upon analysis of the City's designated and potential historic sites and districts. During the period from September 2007 through July 2008, Ron Sladek visited Salt Lake City several times and spent a total of several weeks touring the City in detail. The goal of this fieldwork was to visit all of the existing historic districts, a number of the City's historic areas of interest, and many of the individually designated properties. This level of field analysis was necessary to gain an understanding of the City's layout, historic resources, completed surveys, designated properties and districts, and preservation efforts. This study presents our analysis of existing conditions and how the City's survey and designation efforts might be improved in the future.

LOCAL DISTRICTS

SOUTH TEMPLE

The South Temple Historic District was established as a National Register district and was the first to be listed in the Salt Lake City Register in 1976. This long rectangular district stretches along South Temple Street from Virginia Street/University Street on the east to 300 East/A Street on the west. From north to south it is just one block wide. The district is occupied by many of the City's most elegant historic mansions and apartment buildings dating from the

late 1800s and early 1900s. The Governor's mansion is among these. In addition, the street is lined with prominent offices, churches and other buildings used by various community non-profit organizations, all of which front onto tree-lined South Temple Street. Historic street lighting adds to the district's sense of place.

Many important historic buildings and excellent examples of high-style architecture are located throughout the South Temple Historic District. However, it has also been compromised by a good number of office buildings and apartment buildings that date to the period from the 1960s to the 1990s. Most of these are located in the western 2/3 of the district in the stretch between A Street and N Street. Although the district has clearly experienced a number of changes since it was established, many of the post-1960 buildings that have been constructed there are excellent examples of modern architecture.

RECOMMENDATION

Given the character and importance of South Temple Street historically in the development of the City, consideration should be given to updating the district nomination with a re-survey designed to focus upon and incorporate the post-WWII evolution of the district and the construction of significant buildings there that reflect the modern era. While the National Register designation might be left as it is, changes to its listing in the Salt Lake City Register of Cultural Resources could address its broad range of both historic and modern architecture. This could also highlight the area's architectural variety and bring some of its more significant modern architecture within regulatory controls that are needed to ensure that the district's integrity does not continue to erode.

The district was last surveyed in 2006. The survey recommended, in part, amending the national nomination to update the boundaries that presently run through the middle of buildings and properties, remove certain properties, and overlap with adjacent districts.

THE AVENUES

The Avenues Historic District was established as a National Register district and listed in the Salt Lake City Register in 1978. Containing around 2,700 properties, it is the City's largest historic district. Developed between 1880 and 1930, the Avenues is primarily occupied by residences built along sloping streets that drop in elevation from north to south. Historic apartment buildings are also located there, primarily in the district's western area. In addition, the district contains a small number of churches, schools, and neighborhood-scale commercial uses such as restaurants and retail shops. Only some of these buildings are historic.

The Avenues Historic District is filled with numerous examples of historic middleclass residences in a variety of architectural styles. Many of the blocks throughout the district have a single intrusion of a non-historic building dating from the period after 1960. However, these are primarily small homes and apartment buildings that were constructed prior to the 1970s. Because they

are far outnumbered by the many hundreds of historically intact residences, these non-historic buildings do not appear to have negatively impacted the district's overall integrity. Two non-historic schools are found in the district, and one entire block contains a modern commercial building.

Few changes appear to have taken place in the district in the past couple of decades. The southwestern corner of the district, bordered by State Street, Canyon Road, 4th Avenue, A Street, and South Temple Street, holds a collection of large apartment and condominium buildings. While some of these are historic, a good number are non-historic and have compromised the integrity of this area of the district. In addition, this area is located adjacent to Temple Square and holds non-historic parking lots and garages used by the LDS church.

RECOMMENDATION

The southwestern area of the district should be examined through a more intensive survey. Future refinements to The Avenues may involve removing this area from the district.

EXCHANGE PLACE

The Exchange Place Historic District was established as a National Register district and was listed in the Salt Lake City Register in 1978. It is the City's only entirely commercial historic district and is based upon a collection of early 20th century buildings that were developed to create an alternative non-Mormon business center at the south end of Main Street. The district also includes the 1905 Federal Courthouse Building and Post Office, as well as the City's first skyscrapers, the twin Boston and Newhouse Buildings.

Exchange Place still contains a concentration of historic commercial buildings with excellent integrity. In addition to those mentioned, it also holds the 1909 Stock & Mining Exchange, 1909 Commercial Club, 1910 New Grand Hotel, 1910 Felt Building, and the Judge Building. The district is small and isolated, surrounded by non-historic buildings and parking lots. Its boundaries currently extend to the southwest across 400 South to include a vacant parking lot where a historic building once stood.

RECOMMENDATION

Essentially, the district boundaries need to be redrawn to reflect existing conditions in and around the district. Several historic buildings of the same general vintage are located nearby that should be considered for incorporation into the district's boundaries. These include the Hotel Plandome, Commercial Exchange Plaza, New York Building, Odd Fellows Hall, and the Clift Building. Expansion of the Federal Courthouse will evidently result in removal or demolition of a few of these buildings. Even so, re-survey of this district and its boundaries is recommended to eliminate non-historic vacant space and to add several of the area's surviving historic buildings that were not included in the district when it was established, although this might require broadening the statement of significance.

In addition, the 1955 International-style Ken Garff Building (historic First Security Bank Building) on the southeast corner of 400 South and Main Street should be documented by the City and considered for individual designation. This building does not fit within the period of significance of the Exchange Place Historic District and should only be addressed through individual designation.

Historic pavers are found along Exchange Pl. and can be seen where the asphalt has worn away. The City might want to consider exposing and restoring streets such as this where pavers are still found, even if such efforts are restricted to a limited number of locations. Although Exchange Place is lightly traveled, the restoration of brick or stone pavers contributes to the feeling and appearance of a historic district. This might be a good location to try out a restoration project like this to see how it goes and how it is received by the City's residents.

CAPITOL HILL

The Capitol Hill Historic District was established as a National Register district in 1982 and was listed in the Salt Lake City Register in 1984. This district is known for its steep narrow streets, irregular lots, and for holding some of the oldest surviving residences in the City. It encompasses the predominantly residential blocks that are found to the south, southwest, west, and northwest of the State Capitol complex. The Capitol Building is not included within the district, but is an individual Landmark Site. In this district are portions of the West Capitol Hill, Kimball, and Marmalade neighborhoods. Although the district had become derelict by the 1960s, it has experienced a revival through historic preservation in recent decades.

The blocks directly south of the Capitol Building are steeply sloped and contain a number of large residences exhibiting some of the finest high style architecture in Salt Lake City. The White Chapel and Council Hall, both important historic community buildings from the City's earlier decades, face onto 300 North across from the Capitol (though are not in their original locations). Southwest of the Capitol and north of the LDS Convention Center, the blocks within the district are occupied by some historic residences but also contain a number of modern high rise apartment and condominium buildings dating from the 1970s and 1980s. These dominate Main Street, Vine Street, Almond Street, and West Temple Street, resulting in a diminished degree of integrity in this area. West and northwest of the Capitol, between Main Street/Columbus Street/Darwin Street and 200 West, the blocks are filled with the Pioneer Museum, three LDS ward churches, numerous historic homes, and the modern Washington School. This area has particularly narrow, steep streets and exhibits a good degree of integrity, with just a few modern intrusions aside from the school.

RECOMMENDATION

Much of 200 West is a parkway. The area west of this, bordered by 200 West and 300 West, and by 300 North and Wall Street/800 North, contains modest

historic cottages, vacant land, and a number of non-historic intrusions of circa 1960s apartments and small industrial shop buildings. The houses in this area are of diminished quality in style, construction, and integrity compared to those located to the east of 200 West. The City should consider redrawing the western boundary of the district due to integrity problems west of 200 West, but the west side of 200 West should remain within the boundary.

The 1996 survey also recommended survey and expansion of the district boundaries to include the Kimball and DeSoto-Cortez neighborhoods; an intensive-level survey of Capitol Hill; and the implementation of action items from the Capitol Hill Community Master Plan.

CENTRAL CITY

The Central City Historic District was listed in the Salt Lake City Register in 1991. Two blocks wide and nine blocks long, the district is occupied by one of the City's oldest residential neighborhoods. While the northern edge of the district close to South Temple Street is occupied by larger homes and more upscale apartment buildings, the remainder holds modest brick cottages and bungalows that for many decades attracted working-class occupants. On its south end, the district abuts Liberty Park.

Both 500 East and 700 East are major north-south thoroughfares lined with both houses and commercial enterprises. A residential parkway is located along 600 East. Bisecting the district is 400 South, a primary east-west commercial and transportation corridor. Trolley Square, formerly the trolley barn for the Utah Electric & Railway Corporation, occupies an entire square block along 700 East. This facility has been converted into an indoor shopping center. While the district still contains numerous historic homes, it has experienced significant attrition of its historic building stock, particularly along its perimeters and major thoroughfares. The majority of these changes have taken place in the area between the north edge of the district and 500 South. The four square blocks between 300 South and 500 South have been so heavily impacted in recent decades by teardowns and modern commercial infill that they contain very little in the way of historic resources. Because of its central location in the City and its placement along several major transportation corridors, the district has been subjected to a substantial amount of historically insensitive commercial development in recent decades, resulting in negative impact to its integrity. This has resulted in a historic district that has effectively been split in two, with a substantial loss of integrity to the northern blocks and greater integrity to the south (particularly south of 600 South).

RECOMMENDATION

The status of this district is now questionable and further attrition may merit its removal from historic district standing. Some may argue that it has already reached this point and that other controls are needed to protect the diminishing number of historic resources that remain there. One possible approach might be to consider boundary realignments that divide the district

and create two new districts: Central City North and Central City South Historic Districts.

UNIVERSITY

The University Historic District was established as a National Register district and was listed on the Salt Lake City Register in 1991. It is located on the east bench of the valley west of the University of Utah, with panoramic views extending over the City toward the west. The district consists almost entirely of residences constructed between 1900 and 1920, many of them built and occupied for decades by faculty and staff from the University. It is bordered by South Temple Street on the north, 500 South on the south, University Street on the east, and by 1100 East on the west. Since the World War II era, the district has also been partially occupied by student apartments. The construction of apartment buildings in the neighborhood led to its district designation as owners of single family homes sought to reduce the impact of multi-family buildings that were resulting in higher densities.

Today the district contains many medium to large historic homes and apartment buildings exhibiting a variety of architectural styles. Commercial buildings geared to the student population are located around the intersection of 200 South and 1300 East near the University. Some of these are historic and others are modern. The northeast corner of the district is occupied by a small historic park with tennis courts, a water reservoir and an art barn. In and close to the southeast corner of the district are a couple of high-rise apartment buildings. Most of the non-historic intrusions in the district consist of small apartment buildings dating from the 1960s and 1970s. These are primarily found in the north half of the district. The University Ward LDS Chapel across from the campus is a particularly notable building, serving as one of the City's excellent examples of the Art Deco style of architecture.

RECOMMENDATION

In general, the University Historic District appears to exhibit a good level of integrity. However, stakeholders have noted pressures for teardowns and infill in the area, and recommend that a new survey be prepared to provide better documentation of the district's historic resources and to evaluate possible expansion of the district boundaries.

NATIONAL DISTRICTS

THE AVENUES EXTENSION

The Avenues Extension was established in 2008 to incorporate additional residential properties into the National Register district created in 1978. It is a long, narrow district that runs from A Street on the west to N. Street on the east, and primarily extends one block north of the original Avenues Historic District. This district is occupied by numerous houses, most of them middle-class cottages and bungalows that are very similar to those found in the

adjacent Avenues Historic District. Because of the rise in elevation, the residences all have panoramic views of the City toward the south. Most of this district is intact, with just a few non-historic intrusions that do not impact its integrity.

RECOMMENDATION

No changes or recommendations are made regarding the Avenues Extension. Expansion of the local district has been considered and would offer additional protections to those properties.

CITY CREEK CANYON

The City Creek Canyon Historic District was established as a National Register district in 1980. This district is a long narrow site that includes Memory Grove, the City's collection of war and veterans monuments, and the Memorial House. It is located to the east and northeast of the State Capitol building along Canyon Road. City Creek Canyon is notable for its natural landscape combined with historic landscape architecture dating back to the years after World War I, along with its monuments of varying sizes, styles and periods. A creek runs through the middle of the park, with small falls and ponds along the way. Pedestrian bridges cross the creek at various points, and the park's road, sidewalks and trails serve as a popular location for hikes within the City and adjacent to downtown. Mature landscaping occupies the valley floor, with rolling hillsides rising steeply above.

RECOMMENDATION

This district is intact, with no significant intrusions that might have diminished its integrity. It serves as one of Salt Lake City's most important historic landscapes and its most significant memorial location. No changes are recommended here, and the memorial park should continue to be open to the installation of new monuments approved by the City with care that the historic ones are maintained and preserved. As noted earlier in this plan, historic landscapes such as Memory Grove need design guidelines to control future development.

WESTSIDE WAREHOUSE

The Westside Warehouse Historic District was established as a National Register district in 1982. About one block square, it was created to include sixteen commercial and industrial-warehouse buildings dating from the 1880s through the early 1920s, many of them designed by leading Salt Lake City architects of the period. The district is bordered by approximately 200 South on the north, 300 South on the south, 300 West on the east, and by 400 West on the west. In recent years, most of the two- to five-story warehouse buildings have been converted to art studios, galleries, and residential lofts. Pierpont Ave. is lined along its south side by a long stretch of adjoining former two-story warehouse spaces that have been remodeled to hold small offices and shops. The district is small and somewhat isolated, surrounded by parking lots

and nonhistoric buildings in almost every direction. Exceptions to this are historic apartments to the northeast, the Holy Trinity Cathedral to the southeast, Pioneer Park to the south, and the Ford Building to the southwest. Several parking lots and a couple of non-historic buildings are also present within the district, although these do not appear to have diminished its integrity.

RECOMMENDATION

Local designation for the current National Register district might be considered in the future. As a historic warehouse district, it would not be logical to expand its boundaries to include the adjacent or nearby historic buildings mentioned above because these are not related to the district in architecture or history of use.

GILMER PARK

The Gilmer Park Historic District was established as a National Register district in 1996. A small district of 244 properties, it is significant in part due to its curvilinear street pattern, which differs from the compass grid pattern found throughout much of the rest of the historic City. In addition, this area holds the historic residences of a number of prominent and influential persons, among them professionals, business owners, and politicians who have been involved in the City's life and development over many decades. Finally, the district is occupied by high-end homes exhibiting a variety of architectural styles. Included among these are Classic Cottages, Bungalows, Prairie Style, Tudor, Foursquares, Craftsman, Colonial Revival, Mission Revival, and a small number of excellent examples of architecture from the 1950s to the 1970s. The majority of the residences in the district date from the 1920s through the 1950s, and include landscaping that is extensive and manicured. The only non-residential use is the Garden Park Ward LDS Church, which occupies a substantial landscaped property between Yale Ave. and Harvard Ave. Gilmer Park has very few modern intrusions and exhibits a high level of integrity.



RECOMMENDATION

The district has experienced some teardowns that have led to significant community discussion. This neighborhood might be a candidate for local district status.

The 2008 survey for this area recommended additional survey for approximately 50 properties; establishment of a local historic district; an update of the national nomination to expand the period of significance; and a verification of eligibility status for tax credit purposes.

BENNION-DOUGLAS

The Bennion-Douglas Historic District is essentially an eastward extension of the Central City Historic District, with a distinct rise in elevation from west to east. It was established due to its association with the early 1900s expansion of Salt Lake City into adjacent farmland. The district is filled with residential

cottages and bungalows. Its original demographic appears to have ranged from working class to upper middle class. In addition to homes, the district holds a number of non-Mormon churches and institutional buildings, suggesting that it was largely occupied by the Gentile community at a time when the City's population was more heavily dominated by the LDS church. Prominent among these buildings are the Unitarian Church, McGillis School (formerly Douglas Elementary Public School), Sarah Dart Retirement Home, First Baptist Church, and the Judge Memorial Catholic High School.

Bennion-Douglas includes a number of small to medium sized apartment buildings dating from the 1950s to 1960s. Two large high-rise apartment buildings are also present along the district's northern perimeter. These appear to date from the 1960s and 1970s. Commercial property uses are found along 400 South, 900 South, and 700 East. Some of these buildings are historic (such as the Salt Lake City Brewing Co.) and others are modern. The greatest amount of change has taken place along the district's northern edge, where the 400 South commercial and transportation corridor has resulted in teardowns and modern infill.

RECOMMENDATION

Although some modern intrusions are found in the district (which were present when the district was listed), it is largely intact and just needs to be protected against future attrition of its historic resources (either as a local historic district or as a conservation district).

BRYANT

The Bryant Historic District is, like Bennion-Douglas, an eastward extension of the Central City Historic District. Bryant was similarly established due to its association with the early 1900s expansion of Salt Lake City into adjacent farmland. The district is filled with residences of varying styles, including Bungalows, English Cottages, Edwardians, Foursquares and others. Its original demographic appears to have ranged from middle class to upper middle class. Residential parkways remain in place along 200 South and 800 East. In addition to homes, the district holds a number of small to medium-sized apartment buildings dating from the early 1900s through the 1960s. Two high-rise apartment buildings are present on the district's east and west margins.

Bryant includes a number of modern intrusions – most of which were present when the district was listed -- among them numerous small medical clinics. These are concentrated in this area due to the presence of two large medical centers. The first is the Salt Lake Regional Medical Center along 100 South between 1000 East and 1100 East. This facility includes a historic chapel surrounded by modern hospital buildings. The other is the Salt Lake Clinic, located along 400 South between 900 East and 1000 East. These complexes each take up most of a square block. The potential for greater negative impact to the district is in place, if expansions to the institutions occur. One of the

district's most notable individual historic resources is the 1927 St. Paul's Episcopal Church, a masterpiece of Tudor Revival architecture.

Commercial property uses in the district are concentrated along 400 South and 700 East. Most of these are modern buildings that have worn away the edges of the district. A few are significant examples of modern architecture.

Prominent among these are the Mt. Tabor Lutheran Church at the northeast corner of 200 South and 700 East, and the Zions Bank on the northeast corner of 400 South and 700 East. The 9th Ward LDS Church on 100 South between 900 East and 1000 East is also of note. In sum, the Bryant Historic District has experienced a substantial amount of attrition of its historic resources. This has occurred not only along its commercial margins, but also interior to the district.

RECOMMENDATION

While much remains intact, the district is becoming diminished by the loss of historic buildings. The area might be a candidate for a conservation district.

HIGHLAND PARK

The Highland Park Historic District was established in 1998 when it was listed in the National Register. With just over 600 buildings, the district is significant because of its history as an early planned trolley-car suburb. Highland Dr. bisects the district, with commercial property uses located just north of 2700 South. The district is almost entirely occupied by modest cottages and bungalows that appear to date from the 1920s to 1950s. Almost no non-historic intrusions are found there and its integrity has remained intact.

The district was designed to include the Highland Park Subdivision. Future district expansions might be considered to include the additional homes of the same quality, styles, and time period that are located to the north, east and south. This district does not necessarily need to be expanded. However, any physical demarcation between the established district and the adjacent blocks is non-existent. This simply raises a question regarding the rationale behind how the district boundaries were drawn.

RECOMMENDATION

While the Highland Park Historic District does not appear to be experiencing any imminent threats to its integrity, discussions with local preservation advocates indicate that threats to integrity here are incremental (such as siding and individual window replacement). The Utah Light & Railway Powerhouse along Highland Dr. just south of Interstate 80 is representative of the City's early power and rail system. However, it does not appear to have been designated on any level and was not included in the adjacent district. It is recommended that this facility, and others associated with it, be documented and locally designated in the near future.

NORTHWEST

The Northwest Historic District was established in 2001 when it was listed in the National Register. Within the district are the Guadalupe and Fairpark neighborhoods, which include almost 1,500 buildings. This area of the City is significant as a historic working class neighborhood and for the cultural diversity it represents. Many of its residents have historically been of African American and Hispanic heritage. The district straddles and is bisected by the north-south route of Interstate 15. A residential parkway is found along 800 West and North Temple Street is heavily commercial. Numerous modest residences are found throughout the district. The area east of the interstate holds older housing stock dating from the late 1800s to the early 1900s. West of the interstate, the houses are mostly cottages and ranches dating from the 1920s to the 1950s. The homes exhibit varying degrees of integrity and are generally in poor to good condition. Some newer residences are found there as well. A small number of more substantial homes and a couple of old commercial buildings are located along 400 North. The neighborhood was impacted decades ago when a number of buildings were removed to accommodate construction of the interstate.

Along 500 West, a series of industrial-warehouse buildings and yards occupy most of the blocks that form the eastern edge of the district. These buildings all appear to be non-historic. To the east of 500 West, the district is separated from the core of the City by a wide rail corridor that remains active today. Additional non-historic residences are found throughout the east side of the district. The presence of so many non-historic buildings east of the highway compromises this area's integrity as part of the district. Most of the non-historic buildings in the western area of the district are found along the North Temple Street commercial corridor. One historic property of interest in this area is Scotty's Motor Court.

RECOMMENDATION

This district appears to be threatened mostly by the presence of numerous non-historic industrial-warehouse buildings in its eastern area, the construction of modern housing projects there, and the completion of historically insensitive remodeling projects. I-15 effectively cut the neighborhood in two and eliminated many historic buildings, isolating the small eastern portion of the district with its many non-historic intrusions. As much as 40% of the eastern area contains non-historic buildings that diminish the district's overall integrity. The City should consider redrawing the district's eastern and southern boundaries to eliminate many of the non-historic buildings from the district.

CAPITOL HILL EXTENSION

The Capitol Hill Historic District Extension was established in 2002 to incorporate additional properties into the Salt Lake City Register district created in 1984. It is located in a Salt Lake City Redevelopment Agency (RDA) target area, allowing property owners to take advantage of both preservation tax credits and RDA funding. This is a five-block-long, one-block-wide district

with over 350 buildings, essentially extending the Capitol Hill Historic District by one block toward the west.

The area holds a diversity of housing stock, indicating that it was originally occupied by working class and middle class households. Today the residences vary from poor to good condition with a similar range of integrity. Better conditions are found among the buildings south of 600 North. In this area, the homes along the inner court known as Pugsley Street are of particular note. The two blocks north of 600 North are largely occupied by non-historic properties and this area does not contribute much to the district. Similarly, the southern edge of the district, along 300 North, also contains a series of non-historic properties. The core area of the district with the greatest integrity extends from just north of 300 North (about mid-block) to 600 North.

RECOMMENDATION

This district is threatened by the presence of a good number of non-historic buildings within its boundaries, which have diminished its overall integrity. A conservation district designation may be the most effective tool in an area like this to define parameters for appropriate infill development (keeping the current national district boundaries intact).

YALECREST

The Yalecrest neighborhood was nominated in 2007 for district status through the National Register of Historic Places. This area consists of well over 1,300 contributing buildings, most of them residences exhibiting a variety of period revival styles dating to the first few decades of the 20th century. The housing stock, with its architect-designed homes and manicured landscaping, provides evidence of middle class to upper class ownership from the first half of the 1900s.

Several characteristics of note are found in Yalecrest. Bonneville Glen, a deep wooded ravine that is open to the public for hiking, bisects the neighborhood from northeast to southwest. Shaped by the rolling topography around the ravine, the northwestern half of the district contains curvilinear streets (this is similar to the adjacent Gilmer Park Historic District to the west). Overlooking the ravine is the Bonneville LDS Church and another LDS church is found along Gilmer Dr. Cornell Circle, near the southeastern corner of the district, is lined with an arc of historic cottages. The finest homes in the district are the high-style examples of various architectural styles located along Harvard, Yale and Princeton Avenues between 1300 East and 1500 East. A small neighborhood commercial node is located at the intersection of 1300 South and 1700 East.

RECOMMENDATION

While the Yalecrest Historic District generally continues to exhibit a good level of physical integrity relative to many other neighborhoods in the City, numerous comments received during this planning process expressed concern about teardowns and inappropriate infill. The Yalecrest neighborhood



residents are committed to adopting stronger local controls to prevent demolitions of historic resources and to ensure that additions and alterations are sensitive to the local historic character. Active discussions are underway at the time of this planning process to determine the most effective tool.

ADDITIONAL AREAS OF HISTORIC INTEREST

A number of additional non-designated but historic areas of the City were brought forward during the course of this project as worthy of attention. Many of these were recommended by City staff, members of committees and commissions, preservation professionals, and members of the public who were interested in the topic. In addition, other areas were noted during the course of the fieldwork and are included for discussion, including the Industrial-Warehouse district and several individual utility buildings. As many of these as possible were visited within the cost and time parameters of the project. Some thoughts on these areas are presented here.

DESOTO-CORTEZ NEIGHBORHOOD

Located directly north of the State Capitol complex, this small neighborhood is a compact pocket of residences dating from the 1920s to the 1990s. Its most notable characteristic is the view that each home has over the Capitol Building and the City below. Many alterations and modern intrusions are found in the area. The most intact historic features are the homes along Desoto Street, which is tree-lined with homes that are almost all from the 1920s. Cortez Street mostly contains houses from the 1950s to the 1990s. Columbus Street has a few 1920s cottages, but non-historic homes and two- and four-plex apartments dating from the 1960s occupy much of the remainder of its length.



RECOMMENDATION

This neighborhood does not appear to exhibit an adequate degree of integrity for a historic district. A survey will be needed to confirm whether this area is makes a good district candidate or whether alternative tools, such as conservation district designation, would be more appropriate to preserve character.

FEDERAL HEIGHTS NEIGHBORHOOD

Located directly north of the University of Utah, this neighborhood holds an impressive collection of residences dating from the 1920s to the 1950s. Federal Heights is characterized by its rolling topography, curvilinear streets, manicured landscaping, and high-end homes exhibiting a variety of architect-designed high styles of architecture. This area is certainly one of the City's most important neighborhoods in the area of historic architecture. Located adjacent to the University, Federal Heights has served as the home of both faculty and administrative leaders, and prominent members of the Salt Lake City community, for many decades. Few alterations or modern intrusions are found



in the area, although it extends into more modern upscale housing toward the northeast and determining boundaries may be challenging.

RECOMMENDATION

This neighborhood exhibits a high degree of integrity and appears to be an excellent candidate for a future historic district on both the local and national levels. Staff notes that they have received several requests for local designation because of teardowns.

CITY CEMETERY

Located directly north of the eastern length of the Avenues District, the City Cemetery is a large site (around 250 acres) with rolling topography and mature landscaping. The main entrance is located at its southwest corner at the intersection of 4th Avenue and N Street. This location holds a formal gateway. Inside the gateway is a large 1906 Tudor Style building that looks like a mansion but actually houses the cemetery's offices. City Cemetery holds more than 119,000 graves containing the remains of Salt Lake City's pioneers and residents from the late 1840s through the present time. The first burial took place there in 1847, although the cemetery was not officially organized as part of the newly incorporated City until 1851. An irrigation system was installed in 1900, allowing the cemetery to develop and maintain the extensive landscaping that remains there today.

Common to all cemeteries, the City Cemetery holds the final resting places of the City's historic residents and is an invaluable source of genealogical information. In addition, this cemetery holds a remarkable collection of graves from the Mormon church's early history, along with most (if not all) of the church's past presidents through the present time. Many of the early Mormon graves include multiple wives buried near their husbands, and extensive multi-generational families congregated in the same areas. The graves throughout the cemetery provide excellent examples of a variety of types of funerary art. These are found in a diversity of sizes, materials and designs, showing how the art form changed over the decades. In addition, the site is a planned landscape with significance for its design. Extensive rock walls and gateways are found throughout the property. Those extending along Wasatch Dr. are notable for their completion as a Depression-era WPA project that lasted from 1938 to 1941.

In addition to the cemetery's expansive main section, sub-areas are also present. The Catholic Cemetery occupies the entire southeast corner. Two Jewish sections are found along the south-central edge of the cemetery and a third is located north of Wasatch Drive. Also north of Wasatch Dr. are the Japanese Veterans Cemetery and the burial ground of members of the Royal Canadian Legion. The cemetery also holds separate sections for Civil War veterans, Spanish-American War veterans, World War II veterans, and a pauper's field. A Stranger's Plat holds the graves of migrants who died while on the way to the California gold fields. The Chinese Association has its own section, and another is reserved for infants. In addition to prominent pioneers



and leaders of the Mormon church, the cemetery contains other notable individual graves. Among these are a recipient of the Congressional Medal of Honor, the Sundance Kid, and Franklin Wire, the inventor of the traffic light. All of the City's past mayors are buried here, except for Brigham Young who was buried on First Avenue.

RECOMMENDATION

The City Cemetery is in excellent condition and exhibits a high level of integrity. It is cared for by a full-time staff and does not appear to be subjected to any significant threats. The cemetery would make an excellent candidate for listing in the National Register of Historic Places as well as a local Landmark Site.

NEIGHBORHOOD NORTH OF THE AVENUES HISTORIC DISTRICT EXTENSION

This residential neighborhood extends about five blocks north of the Avenues Historic District Extension and is about eleven blocks wide from east to west. It is steeply sloped upward from south to north, with terracing that allows each home to enjoy a view of the City. Many of the houses include south-facing second story balconies. The neighborhood is occupied by hundreds of homes that are similar in architectural style to those found in the Avenues Historic District Extension. The primary exception to this is the numerous homes dating from the 1950s and 1960s along those streets at higher elevations. Clearly the entire area north of South Temple Street (including the Avenues and Avenues Extension) expanded northward as it developed over time, with the older homes below and newer homes at higher elevations. The historic Veterans Administration Hospital is located at the high end of E Street above 12th Avenue.



RECOMMENDATION

This area appears to exhibit a high level of integrity and would probably make a good candidate for district designation. A determination regarding its eligibility, along with which level of designation is appropriate, should be made following the completion of a neighborhood survey.

GENTILE CORE

This mixed residential and commercial neighborhood is located directly west of the Central City Historic District, from approximately South Temple Street to 900 South and from 500 East to State Street. Located in this area are numerous houses, apartment buildings, commercial buildings, and public facilities such as the City building and downtown library. The houses are predominantly small working class cottages dating from the 1890s to the 1920s. Many of these are in poor to fair condition. Historic Landmark Sites are scattered throughout the area. Included among these are the Oquirrh School, Second Ward Chapel, Trinity A.M.E. Church, and the B'nai Israel Temple. The area is broken up by the presence of numerous modern buildings, along with commercial and transit corridors along 400 South and 500 South. While

several downtown Landmark Sites are located along State Street, the rest of the historic buildings to the south along this major thoroughfare are sporadic and a number are in poor condition. Many of the area's individually eligible buildings have been designated, although some have yet to be recognized. One example of this is the building occupied by Anthony's Fine Art on the northeast corner of 300 South and 400 East.

RECOMMENDATION

The historic resources in this area of the City are not contiguous but could be good candidates for a thematic nomination. The lack of cohesiveness suggests that it is not a strong candidate for district designation. A survey will be needed to confirm as well as to identify candidates for listing on the national register individually or as a thematic multiple-property nomination. The City may wish to couple alternate conservation tools with continued designation of individual historic buildings.

WEST LIBERTY NEIGHBORHOOD

This neighborhood is located directly west of Liberty Park and is mostly occupied by hundreds of small cottages and bungalows dating from the 1890s to the 1950s. While the interior of the neighborhood exhibits a good level of integrity, its margins have been subjected to attrition, particularly along its north and west edges. Historic buildings along 900 South are few and the heavily commercial length of State Street includes very little that is historic. The old auto dealership on the southeast corner of State Street and 900 South appears to be the only building along these thoroughfares worthy of attention.

RECOMMENDATION

District eligibility for this area is unlikely but would be determined through the completion of a neighborhood survey. Conservation district status may be more appropriate. In addition, it is recommended that the western boundary be set along 200 East rather than extending it to State Street and including numerous non-historic properties.

WEST TEMPLE NEIGHBORHOOD

This neighborhood is located directly west and southwest of West Liberty. It runs from 900 South to 2100 South, and from State Street to 300 West. The neighborhood is mostly occupied by modest cottages and bungalows that are concentrated in the interior of the area. Many of these homes suffer from fair to moderate quality of original design and construction, and from non-historic alterations. The area's major thoroughfares (900 South, 2100 South, State Street, 300 West & Main Street) are all heavily commercial and include few historic buildings. Main Street does include a few historic houses south of 1700 South and West Temple is a residential street. One pocket of interest in the neighborhood is Boulevard Gardens, with its brick cottages facing toward one another across a central shared parkway.

RECOMMENDATION

The West Temple Neighborhood may be a fair candidate for survey, but does not appear to be a good candidate for district designation. This is due to the many non-historic intrusions and alterations noted there, along with a lack of historic resources along its margins and major thoroughfares. If future survey and analysis is contemplated there, it should focus upon the portion of the neighborhood located south of Franklin Covey Field.

WESTMORELAND NEIGHBORHOOD

This neighborhood is located directly south of the Yalecrest Historic District. Its main entry, complete with stone pillars, is set on a diagonal at the southeast corner of the intersection of 1300 South and 1500 East. Westmoreland is occupied by a fine collection of bungalows, large cottages, and miscellaneous architectural styles dating from the 1920s to the 1950s. The quality of design and craftsmanship in this area is above average, and the neighborhood is ornamented with tree-lined streets. This area is part of the Wasatch Hollow neighborhood, which preservation advocates note is highly vulnerable, and which is not listed locally or on the National Register.



RECOMMENDATION

Westmoreland appears to be a strong candidate for an intensive-level survey. A determination of district eligibility would be made based upon the survey results. Answering the question of what makes this area unique or representative will not only determine whether it is eligible, but also at what level of listing.



WESTMINSTER AVENUE NEIGHBORHOOD

This neighborhood is centered along Westminster Avenue between 1300 East and 1500 East. This two-block stretch is occupied by an excellent collection of Craftsman cottages and bungalows. A number of the homes have incorporated the use of stone walls and piers into their design, making them relatively unique in the City.



RECOMMENDATION

The neighborhood merits the completion of a survey to determine whether it is district eligible or if individual buildings might be Landmark Sites. Two of the homes along Westminster Ave. have already been listed in the National Register and others may also be eligible for designation.

FOREST DALE (NIBLEY PARK) NEIGHBORHOOD

This compact neighborhood is located in the southern area of the City, to the west of Fairmont Park. It primarily runs from 2100 South to Ashton Street, and from 700 East to 900 East. The neighborhood is occupied by a collection of cottages and bungalows that date from the 1890s to the 1920s. An abandoned Denver & Rio Grande Railroad corridor, running from east to west,

bisects the neighborhood. Forest Dale has experienced modest intrusion of modern apartment buildings dating from the 1960s to the 1970s. In addition, the northern area of the district along 2100 South is occupied by non-historic industrial facilities. In the southwest corner of the neighborhood are a large historic LDS church and the Cannon House, which has been individually designated on the City and national levels.

RECOMMENDATION

The neighborhood was recently surveyed by UDOT and a National Register nomination is being prepared and reviewed.

SUGARHOUSE NEIGHBORHOOD

This extensive neighborhood, in the southern area of the City north of Interstate 80, is centered around a commercial core at Highland Dr. and 2100 South. The commercial district is surrounded by residential neighborhoods filled with a variety of middle class homes dating from the early to mid-1900s. While "downtown" Sugarhouse holds a number of historic buildings, it has also been transformed in recent decades by the construction of numerous modern buildings. Because of this, the commercial core no longer appears to be predominantly historic. Some of the remaining older commercial buildings are in good condition. Others have been heavily altered through insensitive remodeling projects that appear to date from the period between the 1960s and 1980s. However, some of these have the potential to be restored and to add to the historic character of the neighborhood. A good example of this is the large two story historic brick commercial building on the northeast corner of Highland Dr. and 2100 South. This building is in dire need of an effort to remove inappropriate cladding and restore its street elevations to their original appearance. Sugarhouse's commercial core also holds the historic Sprague Library and a vacant post office along Highland Dr., and the prominent 1930 Sugarhouse Monument west of the intersection with 2100 South. Next to the monument is a plaque describing the historic Jordan & Salt Lake City Canal, which runs through a long culvert underneath this area.




RECOMMENDATION

Sugarhouse has an interesting historic past but its historic resources and integrity have been compromised by insensitive alterations and the construction of numerous modern buildings in its commercial core. While the area certainly merits survey and the designation of individual buildings, it may be a better candidate for protection through a conservation district or other regulatory mechanisms, rather than as a local historic district.

LIBERTY WELLS NEIGHBORHOOD

This large neighborhood is located to the south and southwest of Liberty Park. It includes the area from 1300 South to 2100 South, and from State Street to 700 East. The neighborhood is occupied by a collection of modest cottages and bungalows that appear to exhibit a good level of integrity.



RECOMMENDATION

While the neighborhood merits the completion of a survey, it is not apparent whether it is worthy of district designation. A survey will determine whether it is district eligible, and on what level, or if individual buildings might be designated as Landmark Sites. Essentially, the district contains the same type and quality of building stock as that found in the surrounding neighborhoods and districts.

A 2007 reconnaissance-level survey in this area also recommended that an intensive-level survey be undertaken for all "A" and "B" properties, and this survey is now underway.

900 WEST NEIGHBORHOOD

This neighborhood is located in the southwest area of the City, west of Interstate 15. It is bisected by 900 West and runs from 1300 South to 1700 South. The neighborhood is primarily occupied by a collection of modest working-class cottages and bungalows that exhibit a generally poor level of integrity. In addition, the properties along the east side of 900 West have experienced an overwhelming amount of modern construction. Many of the neighborhood's historic homes have experienced insensitive exterior remodeling efforts or are in deteriorated condition. A few larger historic homes are located there, but not enough to make up a district.

RECOMMENDATION

While the neighborhood merits the completion of a survey, it is not apparent whether it is worthy of district designation. Comments from the SHPO indicate that the areas with the greatest potential are between Indiana Street (900s) and California Street (1300s).

EUCLID NEIGHBORHOOD

This compact neighborhood is located in the western area of the City, directly south of the Northwest Historic District. It encompasses the area from North Temple Street to Interstate 80, and from Interstate 15 to Jordan River. An active rail corridor that runs along South Temple Street bisects the area. The neighborhood is filled with a collection of small working-class cottages, many of which are either in poor condition or have experienced insensitive alterations.

RECOMMENDATION

Due to a lack of historic integrity, this area is a lower priority for survey. However, this area will be impacted by the light rail extension to the airport.

ROSE PARK NEIGHBORHOOD

This large neighborhood is located in the northwestern area of the City near the Northwest Historic District. It is filled with a collection of small working-class cottages and ranch homes that appear to date from the 1950s and 1960s.

RECOMMENDATION

While most are in good condition, this area needs to be studied more closely (perhaps through a reconnaissance survey initially) to determine whether it is a good candidate for intensive-level survey and to establish possible boundaries. At this time, a determination of whether it might be worthy of district consideration cannot be made.

LOWER ENSIGN DOWNS NEIGHBORHOOD

This neighborhood is located on a high bench north of and significantly above the State Capitol building. Each home has a clear view of the City below. The houses are all architect-designed masterpieces and represent some of the finest architecture in the City dating from the second half of the 1900s.

RECOMMENDATION

The neighborhood merits the completion of a survey to determine whether it will be district eligible in the coming years for its variety and quality of modern architecture.

INDUSTRIAL-WAREHOUSE AREA

This area is located in the blocks surrounding the intersection of 800 South and 400 West. It is occupied by a number of significant and apparently overlooked industrial-warehouse buildings that date from the late 1800s and early 1900s. The buildings along 400 West are situated along an early rail corridor that is no longer active. Those facing onto this street, especially between 600 South and 800 South, are of great historic interest and appear to exhibit a good degree of integrity. These include the Utah Pickle Co., Bissinger & Co. Hides, the factory building at 380 West 800 South, and several additional nearby brick buildings. A short distance to the west along 800 South (at 600 West) is the Mountain Cement Company plant, complete with massive silos and hoppers. Other historic industrial buildings are found in this area.

RECOMMENDATION

While it may or may not form a cohesive historic district, some of these facilities are likely to be individually eligible for designation. This entire area is an excellent candidate for survey and should be considered a priority.

SALT LAKE CITY'S INDIVIDUALLY LISTED SITES

Numerous individual properties have been listed in the National Register of Historic Places and the Salt Lake City Register since the 1970s. Among these are major, well known Landmark Sites such as the Salt Lake City & County Building, Denver & Rio Grande Railroad Station, Wasatch Plunge, Trolley Square, and the Salt Lake Stock & Mining Exchange. Scores of less well-known properties have been listed as well. A good number of these resources were visited during the course of this project. While the City has done an excellent job of ensuring that many of its most important historic sites are recognized



and preserved, it was also surprising to see that others were overlooked. Presumably these have not been designated for a variety of reasons. Included among those non-listed sites that are likely to be eligible for designation are many of the City's historic school buildings, the City Cemetery, the architecturally unique LDS Ward Chapels, St. Paul's Episcopal Church, several historic powerhouses, and a number of early industrial buildings. Ongoing efforts are needed to prioritize these unique sites so they can be documented and designated in the coming years.

COMMENTS REGARDING SURVEY & DESIGNATION

Two types of field survey have been employed in Salt Lake City since the 1970s: reconnaissance and intensive-level. Each of these has focused upon a specific geographic area of the City, and it appears that few if any thematic surveys have been completed. Many of these areas are quite sizable because of the expansive historic street layout in Salt Lake City and the surveys have consequently included unusually large numbers of properties. Because intensive-level surveys require an in-depth level of documentation, and consequently are labor and cost intensive, the City frequently employed the use of reconnaissance surveys to complete a good number of its district documentation projects. Every one of these reconnaissance surveys appears to have resulted directly in the establishment of a historic district.

Reconnaissance level surveys are very useful tools. However, they are not typically employed as an end in themselves. Instead they were conceived of to help communities determine whether additional in-depth survey is merited within a specific area, and to establish geographic boundaries for such projects. In Salt Lake City, reconnaissance surveys were typically used as the basis for the establishment of historic districts, with no intensive-level survey involved. This approach resulted in the creation of many designated historic districts based upon a thin level of documentation, primarily determinations of architectural integrity based upon a cursory field evaluation of each building.

While this method was effective in helping the City to establish historic districts, reliance upon the reconnaissance level of survey alone appears to have resulted in the establishment of a couple of historic districts that may not have merited this status. In one case (the Capitol Hill Historic District Extension), it appears that the historic district route was taken simply to deal with redevelopment concerns that should have been countered through other means. Clearly the City needs other tools, in addition to the establishment of districts, to deal with change in its core areas. In addition, the lack of information about each property has left City planning staff with little to work with when permit requests come up for review. This then requires a slow property-by-property determination of historic and architectural significance at a point when the time and means may not be available and when redevelopment pressures are bearing down on decision-makers.

Fortunately, it appears that the City has recently come around to understanding the benefits of intensive-level surveys and they are being employed more often.

Over the past three decades, large areas of the City have been surveyed and designated as official historic districts, either on the Salt Lake City or National Register level. Most of these districts abut one another. If this approach continues into the future, the propensity to turn every surveyed area into a district will eventually result in the entire City being listed, with no non-historic areas in-between. In the long run, this is not good for preservation efforts because it raises important questions about what is truly historic and significant. This muddles public perceptions about what should be preserved. It appears that little distinction has been made in Salt Lake City between what is worthy of district status and what is not. So far, the underlying message coming from the City through its survey and designation process is that every area of the City over fifty years old will be surveyed and designated a historic district. This may not in fact match the City's true goals, but it is the perception that has been created.

Salt Lake City's preservation leadership needs to be engaging in pointed dialogue focused around one question: If everything old is potentially significant and eligible, then what makes each established or potential district in the City special or unique, particularly when compared to other neighborhoods that exhibit the same type of building stock from the same general time period and with the same level of integrity? In other words, how many bungalows and cottages (especially those of poor design and construction and integrity) need to be locally designated before the statement that they are significant becomes meaningless? Designation of historic properties, on any level, must discriminate between those resources that are important and eligible and exhibit characteristics of integrity, and those resources that may be old but do not merit this type of status. If these distinctions are not made, designation eventually loses all meaning and support for historic preservation begins to waver. Then it simply becomes an annoying impediment to property owners wanting to tear buildings down, redevelop sites, or make alterations to their homes.

The same type of careful discussion and planning must occur when establishing or defining district boundaries. Each district must have justifiable, defensible boundaries that match what is found on the ground, not just lines on a map that conveniently follow the courses of major streets. Many of Salt Lake City's established districts were observed to have boundary issues that need to be resolved. In some cases, such as the Bryant Historic District, these involve perimeters (and interior areas) that have experienced attrition of historic resources. Others, such as the Northwest Historic District, include numerous non-historic resources such as commercial and industrial-warehouse buildings that should not be part of the district. The Central City Historic District, possibly a worst-case scenario, has effectively been split in two by extensive redevelopment along the 400 South commercial and transportation corridor. If not drawn carefully, and periodically refined, questionable boundaries can result in questioning of a district's integrity. While some of Salt Lake City's historic district boundary issues were the result of ineffective surveys or poorly conceived perimeters, other boundaries have become problematic over time because of redevelopment and change. This situation places City staff in the

position of having to administratively deal with numerous non-historic properties located within indefensible historic districts. Sometimes that is a preferred scenario when a community is trying to control redevelopment. In other cases, it bogs the planning office and permit review process down in unnecessary and time-wasting situations. To address this issue, it is recommended that the City engage in efforts to refine the boundaries of each of the established districts. This will require what is essentially a reconnaissance level survey of each district, with the specific goal of bringing the boundaries into compliance with what exists in reality. In addition, the drafting of boundaries for future districts established in the City should be given careful attention.

Overall, Salt Lake City has made great strides in the area of historic preservation and in its work to preserve the City's numerous and important historic resources. What is needed at this juncture is simply a refinement or re-tooling of methods to ensure that the City's survey and designation work is effectively pursued into the future.

Appendix B: City Plans and Policies for Historic Preservation

Because the City has never had a Historic Preservation Plan, official historic preservation policy has been set sporadically based upon incremental approaches related to each department and planning area. The following sections review existing policy directions currently established in numerous City plans. For reasons of space and legibility, this summary conveys the broad directions established in each document; this summary should not be interpreted as a complete listing of the full policy statements in each document. Those interested in the exact language are encouraged to reference the original document.

CITY PLANS


The City has conducted several plans for the Downtown over the past 20 years, including:

- Salt Lake City Downtown Plan (1995)
- Neighborhood Park Neighborhood Plan (1994)
- City Vision and Strategic Plan (1993)
- Downtown Neighborhood Plan (1990)
- Salt Lake R/UDAT Our Downtown Future (1988)

In addition, the City has conducted some topic-specific citywide plans including plans for community housing and the parks and recreation system. Each of these plans contains policy direction related to historic preservation, as summarized in the following table.

Table 1: Summary of Historic Preservation Policy Directions in City Plans

| | Historic Resource Objectives and Goals |
|--|--|
| Salt Lake City Community Housing Plan (2000) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide historic preservation education to developers and property owners, including information on technical and financial assistance and incentives. |
| Salt Lake City Parks & Recreation Master Plan (1998) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Protect significant historical or prominent open space and/or natural amenities (Liberty Park improvements and completion of the Jordan River Parkway listed as implementation priorities). • Develop standards for maintenance for parks and open lands, including master plans for Washington Park and Parley's Historic Nature Park. |
| Salt Lake City Downtown Plan (1995) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establish Downtown as a diverse 24-hour activity center. • Preserve and protect existing neighborhoods. • Preserve existing housing and provide additional housing and hotel units, neighborhood support services, and amenities. • Reinforce physical qualities and historical development patterns that establish |



| | Historic Resource Objectives and Goals |
|---|---|
| | <p>the unique urban character of the Downtown.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preserve historically significant buildings and districts while accommodating new development and renovation. • Solidify and Promote specialized districts with unique identity, scale, intensity, and mix of uses. • Provide an efficient streamlined review process. • Use well-designed open space in the Downtown as a catalyst for investment. • This plan is in the process of being updated as of the spring 2009. |
| City Vision and Strategic Plan (1993) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Restore and adaptively reuse historic resources. • Develop programs to enhance and preserve the City's cultural history and character as expressed in the built environment. • Offer strong economic incentives to stop housing unit deterioration. • Facilitate the development of complementary neighborhood retail in the Downtown commercial and neighborhood areas. |
| Salt Lake R/LUDAT Our Downtown Future (1988) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maximize use of Historic Overlay ordinance. • Encourage use of deed restrictions to protect historic properties. • Promote the use of economic incentives for preservation through the mail and media as well as at the staff level. • Increase preservation funding and use a combination of strategies to offer local incentives for preservation. • Avoid easy or capricious variances in zoning that result in degradation of commercial and residential areas. • Keep historic resource inventory up-to-date. |
| Creating Tomorrow Together: Final Report of the Salt Lake City Futures Commission | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enforce preservation strategies for buildings and neighborhoods. • Rehabilitate historic buildings for cultural uses wherever possible. |
| Creating an Urban Neighborhood: Gateway District Land Use & Development Master Plan | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maintain and encourage diversity through retention of existing businesses and residents, retention of existing structures and uses, development of a broad range of housing types which can fit into virtually any area of Gateway and integration of social service providers and their clients into the fabric of the community |

PLANNING AREA MASTER PLANS

Long-range land use planning in the City is focused on specific planning areas rather than citywide. The City is divided into eight planning areas. Each area has an independent master plan with a future land use map and a number of goals and policies for the planning area covering a variety of topic areas including:

- Future land use types,
- Parks and open space,
- Urban design,
- Transportation and circulation,
- Public facilities and utilities,
- Environmental, and

- Historic preservation.

While the plans follow the same general format, there is some variety in the range of issues included and the level of detail and policy direction provided by each. For purposes of developing the historic preservation plan, these plans were reviewed for issues specific to historic preservation. The following table summarizes the key policy topics addressed by each plan that contains a historic preservation section or policy language. This is not intended as an exhaustive list of the goal and policy language provided in each plan. Please refer to the individual plans available on-line at the Salt Lake City Planning and Zoning Division website (www.slcgov.com/ced/planning/pages/masterplans.htm).

Table 2: Summary of Planning Area Master Plan Historic Preservation Policy Directions

| Planning Area | Historic Districts* | Historic Resource Objectives |
|--------------------------------|--|---|
| Avenues | Avenues (L) Avenues Extension (N) South Temple (L) City Creek (N) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide better information to the community on design guidelines. |
| Capitol Hill | Capitol Hill (L) Capitol Hill Extension (N) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implement historic signage and plaques. • Additional intensive survey and designation. • Place preservation easements on public buildings. • Expand zoning language to include historic landscape protections. • Designate historic landscapes. |
| Central Community | Central City (L) Exchange Place (L) University (L) Bryant (N) Bennion-Douglas (N) Gilmer Park (N) Westside Warehouse (N) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Create more historic district designations. • Increase historic preservation planning staff. • Coordinate historic preservation and Transit Oriented Development. • Ensure zoning is conducive to preservation. • Enforce regulations to maintain historic resources and ensure compatible development in historic districts. • Identify additional historic sites and districts. • Conduct additional outreach and education to promote historic preservation. |
| East Bench | N/A | N/A |
| East Central Neighborhood Plan | University District | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is important that the neighborhood's twentieth century architectural flavor, tree lined streets, and well maintained properties be conserved. • Conserve the low medium density character of the area • Encourage compatible infill housing on vacant lots • Encourage preservation of housing and |

| | | neighborhood elements |
|-----------------------------------|-------------------|---|
| East Downtown Neighborhood Plan | Central City | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Require new development to reflect the character of the neighborhood • Designate 600 East as an historic district • Strengthen demolition ordinance • Pursue all strategies for preservation and renovation of older apartment complexes • Identify historic districts with monuments and signage • Develop revolving loan fund for historic storefront renovation using CDBG funds • Designate placement of brownstone apartment buildings 50 years and older on the City Register of Cultural Resources |
| Northwest | Northwest (N) | N/A |
| Northwest Quadrant | N/A | N/A |
| Sugar House | Highland Park (N) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conduct reconnaissance-level survey work (areas specified). • Promote designation of historic sites. • Educate property owners on tax credits. • Support designation of national & local districts. • Investigate possibility of conservation district ordinance. • Educate about and promote the use of available loans and financial incentives for maintenance and repair. |
| West Salt Lake (3.20.06 Draft) | N/A | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conduct surveys of potential historic districts (areas specified). • Promote the designation of sites and districts in the planning area. • Educate property owners on neighborhood history and available tax incentives. |
| | | • |

* (L) denotes Local Historic Districts; (N) denotes National Historic Districts.

Appendix C: Potential Funding Sources for Historic Preservation

The following table lists potential funding sources for historic preservation projects in Salt Lake City.

| Name | Offered By | Available To | Description | Scale |
|---|---|--|---|----------|
| Tax Credits | | | | |
| Federal Income Tax Credit (established 1976) | National Parks Service via SHPO | Property owners of income-producing structures (residential properties and commercial properties). | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Income tax credit for up to 20% of eligible rehabilitation improvements; and Minimum Investment must exceed pre-rehabilitation value of the building over 2-5 years, depending on magnitude of project. | National |
| State Income Tax Credit (established 1993) | Utah State Historical Society (SHPO) | Residential properties (owner-occupied and non-owner occupied). | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 20% of eligible costs income tax credit; and Minimum Investment of \$10,000 over 3 years. | State |
| New Market Tax Credit (NMTC) (established 2000) | National Trust Community Investment Corporation (NTCIC) | Historic commercial rehabilitation projects in a census tract with a 20% poverty rate of household incomes at or below 80% of the area median (or statewide median, if lower). | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Equity investments funneled to qualified real estate projects from the Community Development Entity (in this case NTCIC) to private, public, and non-profit entities. Provide an investment tax credit to investors to the CDE of 39% on equity earned over a 7-year period. The NMTC can be claimed in conjunction with Federal and State income tax credits (a practice called twinning). Offered by Zions Bank, U.S. Bank, Wells Fargo Bank | National |

| Name | Offered By | Available To | Description | Scale |
|---|---|---|--|---|
| Government Funding | | | | |
| Community Development Block Grants (CDBG) | Federal Government | Eligible communities across the US. ¹ 70% of all funds must be used for projects benefiting low and medium- income residents of the community. Communities typically use funding to augment the operating budgets for a variety of departments and programs including housing, redevelopment, parks, and transportation. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Acquisition of real property; • Relocation and demolition; • Rehabilitation of residential and non-residential structures; • Construction of public facilities and improvements, such as water and sewer facilities, streets, neighborhood centers, and the conversion of school buildings for eligible purposes; • Public services, within certain limits; • Activities relating to energy conservation and renewable energy resources; and • Provision of assistance to profit-motivated businesses to carry out economic development and job creation/retention activities. | National, City |
| Loans | | | | |
| Building Renovation Loan Program | Redevelopment Agency (RDA) | Property owners in the central business district and Sugarhouse project areas. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Up to 50% low interest project loan for façade restoration, system upgrades, or residential conversions of upper floors of commercial structures. | RDA Central Business and Sugarhouse project areas |
| Building Renovation Loan Program for High Performance Buildings | Redevelopment Agency (RDA) | Building owners in eligible project area. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No interest loan upon proof of project LEED certification for up to 50% of the total renovation costs. | Designated RDA project areas in the City |
| Revolving Loan Fund | Utah Heritage Foundation | Owners of National Register or local register properties or contributing structures in a national historic district. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For exterior structural improvements and interior systems improvements. • Five-year loans with an interest rate fixed at half of prime. | State, City |
| Grants | | | | |
| Preserve America | Preserve America (White House Administrative Initiative through the Advisory Council) | Designated "Preserve America" communities. The City became a Preserve America community in 2007. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bolster local heritage preservation efforts; • Support better integration of heritage preservation and economic development; and • Foster and enhance intergovernmental and public-private partnerships to accomplish these goals | National |

¹ Salt Lake City, as a city with over 50,000 people, is an entitlement community meaning it received CDBG funding on an annual basis. The CDBG award amount is determined by one of two formulas that weigh the more prominent variable – population or age of housing stock.

| Name | Offered By | Available To | Description | Scale |
|--|--|--|---|----------------------------------|
| Utah Cultural Heritage Tourism Grants | Utah State Historical Society (SHPO) | Cities, towns, counties, non-profit cultural organizations. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Grant awards up to \$10,000 in a given year. All grants require a one-to-one local financial match. Grants aimed at proposals that will increase heritage tourism in Utah, including activities that will increase knowledge, employment, attendance, income, and participation. (May not be available every year—not funded in 2009.) | State |
| Certified Local Government (CLG) Grants | Utah State Historical Society (SHPO) | CLG cities, towns, and counties. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Conducting architectural and archaeological surveys Nominating properties to the National Register of Historic Places Printing walking tour booklets Preparing feasibility studies and working drawings for property improvements Rehabilitating National Register properties. | State |
| Utah Cemetery Inventory Project | Utah State Historical Society (SHPO) | Local cemeteries and local groups. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Grants for inventory database and GIS cemetery inventory development. All grants require a one-to-one local financial match. | State |
| Save America's Treasures | National Trust for Historic Preservation, National Park Service, President's Committee on the Arts and Humanities. | Non-profits, federal organizations, state and local governments, federally recognized Indian tribes. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Federal matching grants; must have dollar-for-dollar match to grant award amount. Historic property rehabilitation grants start at a \$125,000 minimum and have a \$700,000 maximum. For use on sites or collections of national historic significance. | National |
| Historic Preservation Tax Increment Reimbursement Program | Redevelopment Agency (RDA) | Buildings on the state and City historic register. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> RDA reimburses owners up to 50% tax increment generated from renovation development provided exterior of structure is retained to a degree approved by SHPO and HLC. | RDA Depot District project areas |
| HGTV Restore America | National Trust for Historic Preservation and HGTV | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> http://www.nationaltrust.org/restore_america | National |
| Johanna Favrot Fund for Historic Preservation and Cynthia Woods Mitchell Fund for Historic Interiors | Johanna Favrot Fund Cynthia Woods Mitchell Fund for Historic Interiors | National Historic Landmarks | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Matching grants to nonprofit organizations and public agencies grants for projects that contribute to preservation or recapture an authentic sense of place | National |
| National Trust Preservation Funds (formerly Preservation Services Funds) | National Trust for Historic Preservation | Non-profits, public agencies | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Two types of assistance: matching grants for preservation planning and education efforts and intervention funds for preservation emergencies. | National |

| Name | Offered By | Available To | Description | Scale |
|-------------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|--|-------|
| Easements | | | | |
| Preservation Easements | Utah Heritage Foundation | Historic property owners. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A conservation easement that protects the historic, architectural, or archeological significance of a property through a private legal easement that gives partial rights to the property to a qualified easement holder for a predetermined duration. • Protects against changes that would be inconsistent with the preservation of the property (demolition, inappropriate alterations, etc). • Qualifies the donor for a charitable contribution tax deduction for the assessed value of the easement. | State |

Appendix D: Definitions

The following definitions apply to terms that are commonly used throughout this plan.

Compatible

Designed to be in harmony with surrounding elements such as surrounding architecture and landscape in terms of massing, design, scale, and siting.

Contributing Structure

A contributing structure is a structure or site within an historic preservation overlay district that meets the criteria outlined in subsection C2 of section 21A.34.020 and is of moderate importance to the city, state, region or nation because it imparts artistic, historic or cultural values. A contributing structure has its major character defining features intact and although minor alterations may have occurred they are generally reversible. Historic materials may have been covered but evidence indicates they are intact.

Design Guidelines

Written tenets, based on the Secretary of Interior's Standards, according to which the Salt Lake City Historic Landmark Commission interprets the standards of the historic overlay ordinance for alterations, new construction, demolition, and moves of landmark sites and properties in historic districts.

Historic Context

Those patterns or trends in history by which a specific occurrence, property, or site is understood and its meaning (and ultimately its significance) within history or prehistory is made clear. Historic contexts are found at a variety of geographical levels or scales. The geographic scale selected may relate to a pattern of historical development, a political division, or a cultural area. Regardless of the scale, the historic context establishes the framework from which decisions about the significance of related properties can be made. (From the National Park Service)

Historic Landscape

A cultural landscape associated with events, persons, design styles, or ways of life that are significant in national or local history, landscape architecture, archaeology, engineering, or culture.

Historic Preservation

The process of preserving part of a community, from an individual building or part of a building to a whole neighborhood (including roadways, landscapes and waterways), because of its historical importance. (From UrbanPlanning.org.)

Historic Preservation Overlay District

A geographically or thematically definable area which contains buildings, structures, sites, objects, landscape features, archeological sites and works of art, or a combination thereof, that contributes to the historic preservation goals of Salt Lake City.

Landmark Site

A Landmark Site is any site included on the Salt Lake City register of cultural resources that meets the criteria outlined in subsection C2 of this section. Such sites are of exceptional importance to the city, state, region or nation and impart high artistic, historic or cultural values. A landmark site clearly conveys a sense of time and place and enables the public to interpret the historic character of the site.

Noncontributing Structure

A noncontributing structure is a structure within an historic preservation overlay district that does not meet the criteria listed in subsection C2 of section 21A.34.020 of the zoning ordinance. The major character defining features have been so altered as to make the original and/or historic form, materials and details indistinguishable and alterations are irreversible. Noncontributing structures also include those which are less than 50 years old.

Significant

Properties are significant for their association with important events or persons, for their importance in design or construction, or for their information potential. The basis for judging a property's significance and, ultimately, its eligibility for designation is historic context. (From the National Park Service.)

Standards of Ordinance

Local law based on state enabling legislation, which provides the general criteria against which work can be measured.

The National Park Service's Secretary of Interior's Standards includes four treatment approaches:

- *Preservation* places a high premium on the retention of all historic fabric through conservation, maintenance, and repair. It reflects a building's continuum over time, through successive occupancies, and the respectful changes and alterations that are made.
- *Rehabilitation* emphasizes the retention and repair of historic materials, but more latitude is provided for replacement because it is assumed the property is more deteriorated prior to work. (Both Preservation and Rehabilitation standards focus attention on the preservation of those materials, features, finishes, spaces, and spatial relationships that, together, give a property its historic character.)
- *Restoration* focuses on the retention of materials from the most significant time in a property's history, while permitting the removal of materials from other periods.

- *Reconstruction* establishes limited opportunities to re-create a non-surviving site, landscape, building, structure, or object in all new materials.

and preserved, it was also surprising to see that others were overlooked. Presumably these have not been designated for a variety of reasons. Included among those non-listed sites that are likely to be eligible for designation are many of the City's historic school buildings, the City Cemetery, the architecturally unique LDS Ward Chapels, St. Paul's Episcopal Church, several historic powerhouses, and a number of early industrial buildings. Ongoing efforts are needed to prioritize these unique sites so they can be documented and designated in the coming years.

COMMENTS REGARDING SURVEY & DESIGNATION

Two types of field survey have been employed in Salt Lake City since the 1970s: reconnaissance and intensive-level. Each of these has focused upon a specific geographic area of the City, and it appears that few if any thematic surveys have been completed. Many of these areas are quite sizable because of the expansive historic street layout in Salt Lake City and the surveys have consequently included unusually large numbers of properties. Because intensive-level surveys require an in-depth level of documentation, and consequently are labor and cost intensive, the City frequently employed the use of reconnaissance surveys to complete a good number of its district documentation projects. Every one of these reconnaissance surveys appears to have resulted directly in the establishment of a historic district.

Reconnaissance level surveys are very useful tools. However, they are not typically employed as an end in themselves. Instead they were conceived of to help communities determine whether additional in-depth survey is merited within a specific area, and to establish geographic boundaries for such projects. In Salt Lake City, reconnaissance surveys were typically used as the basis for the establishment of historic districts, with no intensive-level survey involved. This approach resulted in the creation of many designated historic districts based upon a thin level of documentation, primarily determinations of architectural integrity based upon a cursory field evaluation of each building.

While this method was effective in helping the City to establish historic districts, reliance upon the reconnaissance level of survey alone appears to have resulted in the establishment of a couple of historic districts that may not have merited this status. In one case (the Capitol Hill Historic District Extension), it appears that the historic district route was taken simply to deal with redevelopment concerns that should have been countered through other means. Clearly the City needs other tools, in addition to the establishment of districts, to deal with change in its core areas. In addition, the lack of information about each property has left City planning staff with little to work with when permit requests come up for review. This then requires a slow property-by-property determination of historic and architectural significance at a point when the time and means may not be available and when redevelopment pressures are bearing down on decision-makers.

Fortunately, it appears that the City has recently come around to understanding the benefits of intensive-level surveys and they are being employed more often.

Over the past three decades, large areas of the City have been surveyed and designated as official historic districts, either on the Salt Lake City or National Register level. Most of these districts abut one another. If this approach continues into the future, the propensity to turn every surveyed area into a district will eventually result in the entire City being listed, with no non-historic areas in-between. In the long run, this is not good for preservation efforts because it raises important questions about what is truly historic and significant. This muddles public perceptions about what should be preserved. It appears that little distinction has been made in Salt Lake City between what is worthy of district status and what is not. So far, the underlying message coming from the City through its survey and designation process is that every area of the City over fifty years old will be surveyed and designated a historic district. This may not in fact match the City's true goals, but it is the perception that has been created.

Salt Lake City's preservation leadership needs to be engaging in pointed dialogue focused around one question: If everything old is potentially significant and eligible, then what makes each established or potential district in the City special or unique, particularly when compared to other neighborhoods that exhibit the same type of building stock from the same general time period and with the same level of integrity? In other words, how many bungalows and cottages (especially those of poor design and construction and integrity) need to be locally designated before the statement that they are significant becomes meaningless? Designation of historic properties, on any level, must discriminate between those resources that are important and eligible and exhibit characteristics of integrity, and those resources that may be old but do not merit this type of status. If these distinctions are not made, designation eventually loses all meaning and support for historic preservation begins to waver. Then it simply becomes an annoying impediment to property owners wanting to tear buildings down, redevelop sites, or make alterations to their homes.

The same type of careful discussion and planning must occur when establishing or defining district boundaries. Each district must have justifiable, defensible boundaries that match what is found on the ground, not just lines on a map that conveniently follow the courses of major streets. Many of Salt Lake City's established districts were observed to have boundary issues that need to be resolved. In some cases, such as the Bryant Historic District, these involve perimeters (and interior areas) that have experienced attrition of historic resources. Others, such as the Northwest Historic District, include numerous non-historic resources such as commercial and industrial-warehouse buildings that should not be part of the district. The Central City Historic District, possibly a worst-case scenario, has effectively been split in two by extensive redevelopment along the 400 South commercial and transportation corridor. If not drawn carefully, and periodically refined, questionable boundaries can result in questioning of a district's integrity. While some of Salt Lake City's historic district boundary issues were the result of ineffective surveys or poorly conceived perimeters, other boundaries have become problematic over time because of redevelopment and change. This situation places City staff in the

position of having to administratively deal with numerous non-historic properties located within indefensible historic districts. Sometimes that is a preferred scenario when a community is trying to control redevelopment. In other cases, it bogs the planning office and permit review process down in unnecessary and time-wasting situations. To address this issue, it is recommended that the City engage in efforts to refine the boundaries of each of the established districts. This will require what is essentially a reconnaissance level survey of each district, with the specific goal of bringing the boundaries into compliance with what exists in reality. In addition, the drafting of boundaries for future districts established in the City should be given careful attention.

Overall, Salt Lake City has made great strides in the area of historic preservation and in its work to preserve the City's numerous and important historic resources. What is needed at this juncture is simply a refinement or re-tooling of methods to ensure that the City's survey and designation work is effectively pursued into the future.

Appendix B: City Plans and Policies for Historic Preservation

Because the City has never had a Historic Preservation Plan, official historic preservation policy has been set sporadically based upon incremental approaches related to each department and planning area. The following sections review existing policy directions currently established in numerous City plans. For reasons of space and legibility, this summary conveys the broad directions established in each document; this summary should not be interpreted as a complete listing of the full policy statements in each document. Those interested in the exact language are encouraged to reference the original document.

CITY PLANS


The City has conducted several plans for the Downtown over the past 20 years, including:

- Salt Lake City Downtown Plan (1995)
- Neighborhood Park Neighborhood Plan (1994)
- City Vision and Strategic Plan (1993)
- Downtown Neighborhood Plan (1990)
- Salt Lake R/UDAT Our Downtown Future (1988)

In addition, the City has conducted some topic-specific citywide plans including plans for community housing and the parks and recreation system. Each of these plans contains policy direction related to historic preservation, as summarized in the following table.

Table 1: Summary of Historic Preservation Policy Directions in City Plans

| | Historic Resource Objectives and Goals |
|--|--|
| Salt Lake City Community Housing Plan (2000) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide historic preservation education to developers and property owners, including information on technical and financial assistance and incentives. |
| Salt Lake City Parks & Recreation Master Plan (1998) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Protect significant historical or prominent open space and/or natural amenities (Liberty Park improvements and completion of the Jordan River Parkway listed as implementation priorities). • Develop standards for maintenance for parks and open lands, including master plans for Washington Park and Parley's Historic Nature Park. |
| Salt Lake City Downtown Plan (1995) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establish Downtown as a diverse 24-hour activity center. • Preserve and protect existing neighborhoods. • Preserve existing housing and provide additional housing and hotel units, neighborhood support services, and amenities. • Reinforce physical qualities and historical development patterns that establish |



| | Historic Resource Objectives and Goals |
|---|---|
| | <p>the unique urban character of the Downtown.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preserve historically significant buildings and districts while accommodating new development and renovation. • Solidify and Promote specialized districts with unique identity, scale, intensity, and mix of uses. • Provide an efficient streamlined review process. • Use well-designed open space in the Downtown as a catalyst for investment. • This plan is in the process of being updated as of the spring 2009. |
| City Vision and Strategic Plan (1993) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Restore and adaptively reuse historic resources. • Develop programs to enhance and preserve the City's cultural history and character as expressed in the built environment. • Offer strong economic incentives to stop housing unit deterioration. • Facilitate the development of complementary neighborhood retail in the Downtown commercial and neighborhood areas. |
| Salt Lake R/UDAT Our Downtown Future (1988) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maximize use of Historic Overlay ordinance. • Encourage use of deed restrictions to protect historic properties. • Promote the use of economic incentives for preservation through the mail and media as well as at the staff level. • Increase preservation funding and use a combination of strategies to offer local incentives for preservation. • Avoid easy or capricious variances in zoning that result in degradation of commercial and residential areas. • Keep historic resource inventory up-to-date. |
| Creating Tomorrow Together: Final Report of the Salt Lake City Futures Commission | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enforce preservation strategies for buildings and neighborhoods. • Rehabilitate historic buildings for cultural uses wherever possible. |
| Creating an Urban Neighborhood: Gateway District Land Use & Development Master Plan | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maintain and encourage diversity through retention of existing businesses and residents, retention of existing structures and uses, development of a broad range of housing types which can fit into virtually any area of Gateway and integration of social service providers and their clients into the fabric of the community |

PLANNING AREA MASTER PLANS

Long-range land use planning in the City is focused on specific planning areas rather than citywide. The City is divided into eight planning areas. Each area has an independent master plan with a future land use map and a number of goals and policies for the planning area covering a variety of topic areas including:

- Future land use types,
- Parks and open space,
- Urban design,
- Transportation and circulation,
- Public facilities and utilities,
- Environmental, and

- Historic preservation.

While the plans follow the same general format, there is some variety in the range of issues included and the level of detail and policy direction provided by each. For purposes of developing the historic preservation plan, these plans were reviewed for issues specific to historic preservation. The following table summarizes the key policy topics addressed by each plan that contains a historic preservation section or policy language. This is not intended as an exhaustive list of the goal and policy language provided in each plan. Please refer to the individual plans available on-line at the Salt Lake City Planning and Zoning Division website (www.slcgov.com/ced/planning/pages/masterplans.htm).

Table 2: Summary of Planning Area Master Plan Historic Preservation Policy Directions

| Planning Area | Historic Districts* | Historic Resource Objectives |
|--------------------------------|--|---|
| Avenues | Avenues (L) Avenues Extension (N) South Temple (L) City Creek (N) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide better information to the community on design guidelines. |
| Capitol Hill | Capitol Hill (L) Capitol Hill Extension (N) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implement historic signage and plaques. • Additional intensive survey and designation. • Place preservation easements on public buildings. • Expand zoning language to include historic landscape protections. • Designate historic landscapes. |
| Central Community | Central City (L) Exchange Place (L) University (L) Bryant (N) Bennion-Douglas (N) Gilmer Park (N) Westside Warehouse (N) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Create more historic district designations. • Increase historic preservation planning staff. • Coordinate historic preservation and Transit Oriented Development. • Ensure zoning is conducive to preservation. • Enforce regulations to maintain historic resources and ensure compatible development in historic districts. • Identify additional historic sites and districts. • Conduct additional outreach and education to promote historic preservation. |
| East Bench | N/A | N/A |
| East Central Neighborhood Plan | University District | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is important that the neighborhood's twentieth century architectural flavor, tree lined streets, and well maintained properties be conserved. • Conserve the low medium density character of the area • Encourage compatible infill housing on vacant lots • Encourage preservation of housing and |

| | | neighborhood elements |
|-----------------------------------|-------------------|---|
| East Downtown Neighborhood Plan | Central City | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Require new development to reflect the character of the neighborhood • Designate 600 East as an historic district • Strengthen demolition ordinance • Pursue all strategies for preservation and renovation of older apartment complexes • Identify historic districts with monuments and signage • Develop revolving loan fund for historic storefront renovation using CDBG funds • Designate placement of brownstone apartment buildings 50 years and older on the City Register of Cultural Resources |
| Northwest | Northwest (N) | N/A |
| Northwest Quadrant | N/A | N/A |
| Sugar House | Highland Park (N) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conduct reconnaissance-level survey work (areas specified). • Promote designation of historic sites. • Educate property owners on tax credits. • Support designation of national & local districts. • Investigate possibility of conservation district ordinance. • Educate about and promote the use of available loans and financial incentives for maintenance and repair. |
| West Salt Lake (3.20.06 Draft) | N/A | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conduct surveys of potential historic districts (areas specified). • Promote the designation of sites and districts in the planning area. • Educate property owners on neighborhood history and available tax incentives. |
| | | • |

* (L) denotes Local Historic Districts; (N) denotes National Historic Districts.

Appendix C: Potential Funding Sources for Historic Preservation

The following table lists potential funding sources for historic preservation projects in Salt Lake City.

| Name | Offered By | Available To | Description | Scale |
|---|---|--|---|----------|
| Tax Credits | | | | |
| Federal Income Tax Credit (established 1976) | National Parks Service via SHPO | Property owners of income-producing structures (residential properties and commercial properties). | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Income tax credit for up to 20% of eligible rehabilitation improvements; and Minimum Investment must exceed pre-rehabilitation value of the building over 2-5 years, depending on magnitude of project. | National |
| State Income Tax Credit (established 1993) | Utah State Historical Society (SHPO) | Residential properties (owner-occupied and non-owner occupied). | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 20% of eligible costs income tax credit; and Minimum Investment of \$10,000 over 3 years. | State |
| New Market Tax Credit (NMTC) (established 2000) | National Trust Community Investment Corporation (NTCIC) | Historic commercial rehabilitation projects in a census tract with a 20% poverty rate of household incomes at or below 80% of the area median (or statewide median, if lower). | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Equity investments funneled to qualified real estate projects from the Community Development Entity (in this case NTCIC) to private, public, and non-profit entities. Provide an investment tax credit to investors to the CDE of 39% on equity earned over a 7-year period. The NMTC can be claimed in conjunction with Federal and State income tax credits (a practice called twinning). Offered by Zions Bank, U.S. Bank, Wells Fargo Bank | National |

| Name | Offered By | Available To | Description | Scale |
|---|---|---|--|---|
| Government Funding | | | | |
| Community Development Block Grants (CDBG) | Federal Government | Eligible communities across the US. ¹ 70% of all funds must be used for projects benefiting low and medium- income residents of the community. Communities typically use funding to augment the operating budgets for a variety of departments and programs including housing, redevelopment, parks, and transportation. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Acquisition of real property; • Relocation and demolition; • Rehabilitation of residential and non-residential structures; • Construction of public facilities and improvements, such as water and sewer facilities, streets, neighborhood centers, and the conversion of school buildings for eligible purposes; • Public services, within certain limits; • Activities relating to energy conservation and renewable energy resources; and • Provision of assistance to profit-motivated businesses to carry out economic development and job creation/retention activities. | National, City |
| Loans | | | | |
| Building Renovation Loan Program | Redevelopment Agency (RDA) | Property owners in the central business district and Sugarhouse project areas. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Up to 50% low interest project loan for façade restoration, system upgrades, or residential conversions of upper floors of commercial structures. | RDA Central Business and Sugarhouse project areas |
| Building Renovation Loan Program for High Performance Buildings | Redevelopment Agency (RDA) | Building owners in eligible project area. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No interest loan upon proof of project LEED certification for up to 50% of the total renovation costs. | Designated RDA project areas in the City |
| Revolving Loan Fund | Utah Heritage Foundation | Owners of National Register or local register properties or contributing structures in a national historic district. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For exterior structural improvements and interior systems improvements. • Five-year loans with an interest rate fixed at half of prime. | State, City |
| Grants | | | | |
| Preserve America | Preserve America (White House Administrative Initiative through the Advisory Council) | Designated "Preserve America" communities. The City became a Preserve America community in 2007. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bolster local heritage preservation efforts; • Support better integration of heritage preservation and economic development; and • Foster and enhance intergovernmental and public-private partnerships to accomplish these goals | National |

¹ Salt Lake City, as a city with over 50,000 people, is an entitlement community meaning it received CDBG funding on an annual basis. The CDBG award amount is determined by one of two formulas that weigh the more prominent variable – population or age of housing stock.

| Name | Offered By | Available To | Description | Scale |
|--|--|--|---|----------------------------------|
| Utah Cultural Heritage Tourism Grants | Utah State Historical Society (SHPO) | Cities, towns, counties, non-profit cultural organizations. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Grant awards up to \$10,000 in a given year. All grants require a one-to-one local financial match. Grants aimed at proposals that will increase heritage tourism in Utah, including activities that will increase knowledge, employment, attendance, income, and participation. (May not be available every year—not funded in 2009.) | State |
| Certified Local Government (CLG) Grants | Utah State Historical Society (SHPO) | CLG cities, towns, and counties. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Conducting architectural and archaeological surveys Nominating properties to the National Register of Historic Places Printing walking tour booklets Preparing feasibility studies and working drawings for property improvements Rehabilitating National Register properties. | State |
| Utah Cemetery Inventory Project | Utah State Historical Society (SHPO) | Local cemeteries and local groups. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Grants for inventory database and GIS cemetery inventory development. All grants require a one-to-one local financial match. | State |
| Save America's Treasures | National Trust for Historic Preservation, National Park Service, President's Committee on the Arts and Humanities. | Non-profits, federal organizations, state and local governments, federally recognized Indian tribes. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Federal matching grants; must have dollar-for-dollar match to grant award amount. Historic property rehabilitation grants start at a \$125,000 minimum and have a \$700,000 maximum. For use on sites or collections of national historic significance. | National |
| Historic Preservation Tax Increment Reimbursement Program | Redevelopment Agency (RDA) | Buildings on the state and City historic register. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> RDA reimburses owners up to 50% tax increment generated from renovation development provided exterior of structure is retained to a degree approved by SHPO and HLC. | RDA Depot District project areas |
| HGTV Restore America | National Trust for Historic Preservation and HGTV | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> http://www.nationaltrust.org/restore_america | National |
| Johanna Favrot Fund for Historic Preservation and Cynthia Woods Mitchell Fund for Historic Interiors | Johanna Favrot Fund Cynthia Woods Mitchell Fund for Historic Interiors | National Historic Landmarks | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Matching grants to nonprofit organizations and public agencies grants for projects that contribute to preservation or recapture an authentic sense of place | National |
| National Trust Preservation Funds (formerly Preservation Services Funds) | National Trust for Historic Preservation | Non-profits, public agencies | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Two types of assistance: matching grants for preservation planning and education efforts and intervention funds for preservation emergencies. | National |

| Name | Offered By | Available To | Description | Scale |
|------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|--|-------|
| Easements | | | | |
| Preservation Easements | Utah Heritage Foundation | Historic property owners. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A conservation easement that protects the historic, architectural, or archeological significance of a property through a private legal easement that gives partial rights to the property to a qualified easement holder for a predetermined duration. • Protects against changes that would be inconsistent with the preservation of the property (demolition, inappropriate alterations, etc). • Qualifies the donor for a charitable contribution tax deduction for the assessed value of the easement. | State |

Appendix D: Definitions

The following definitions apply to terms that are commonly used throughout this plan.

Compatible

Designed to be in harmony with surrounding elements such as surrounding architecture and landscape in terms of massing, design, scale, and siting.

Contributing Structure

A contributing structure is a structure or site within an historic preservation overlay district that meets the criteria outlined in subsection C2 of section 2 IA.34.020 and is of moderate importance to the city, state, region or nation because it imparts artistic, historic or cultural values. A contributing structure has its major character defining features intact and although minor alterations may have occurred they are generally reversible. Historic materials may have been covered but evidence indicates they are intact.

Design Guidelines

Written tenets, based on the Secretary of Interior's Standards, according to which the Salt Lake City Historic Landmark Commission interprets the standards of the historic overlay ordinance for alterations, new construction, demolition, and moves of landmark sites and properties in historic districts.

Historic Context

Those patterns or trends in history by which a specific occurrence, property, or site is understood and its meaning (and ultimately its significance) within history or prehistory is made clear. Historic contexts are found at a variety of geographical levels or scales. The geographic scale selected may relate to a pattern of historical development, a political division, or a cultural area. Regardless of the scale, the historic context establishes the framework from which decisions about the significance of related properties can be made. (From the National Park Service)

Historic Landscape

A cultural landscape associated with events, persons, design styles, or ways of life that are significant in national or local history, landscape architecture, archaeology, engineering, or culture.

Historic Preservation

The process of preserving part of a community, from an individual building or part of a building to a whole neighborhood (including roadways, landscapes and waterways), because of its historical importance. (From UrbanPlanning.org.)

Historic Preservation Overlay District

A geographically or thematically definable area which contains buildings, structures, sites, objects, landscape features, archeological sites and works of art, or a combination thereof, that contributes to the historic preservation goals of Salt Lake City.

Landmark Site

A Landmark Site is any site included on the Salt Lake City register of cultural resources that meets the criteria outlined in subsection C2 of this section. Such sites are of exceptional importance to the city, state, region or nation and impart high artistic, historic or cultural values. A landmark site clearly conveys a sense of time and place and enables the public to interpret the historic character of the site.

Noncontributing Structure

A noncontributing structure is a structure within an historic preservation overlay district that does not meet the criteria listed in subsection C2 of section 21A.34.020 of the zoning ordinance. The major character defining features have been so altered as to make the original and/or historic form, materials and details indistinguishable and alterations are irreversible. Noncontributing structures also include those which are less than 50 years old.

Significant

Properties are significant for their association with important events or persons, for their importance in design or construction, or for their information potential. The basis for judging a property's significance and, ultimately, its eligibility for designation is historic context. (From the National Park Service.)

Standards of Ordinance

Local law based on state enabling legislation, which provides the general criteria against which work can be measured.

The National Park Service's Secretary of Interior's Standards includes four treatment approaches:

- *Preservation* places a high premium on the retention of all historic fabric through conservation, maintenance, and repair. It reflects a building's continuum over time, through successive occupancies, and the respectful changes and alterations that are made.
- *Rehabilitation* emphasizes the retention and repair of historic materials, but more latitude is provided for replacement because it is assumed the property is more deteriorated prior to work. (Both Preservation and Rehabilitation standards focus attention on the preservation of those materials, features, finishes, spaces, and spatial relationships that, together, give a property its historic character.)
- *Restoration* focuses on the retention of materials from the most significant time in a property's history, while permitting the removal of materials from other periods.

- *Reconstruction* establishes limited opportunities to re-create a non-surviving site, landscape, building, structure, or object in all new materials.

Exhibit 3
City Council Hearing Notice

NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING

The Salt Lake City Council will review **Petition No. PLNPCM2009-00171 for the Salt Lake City Historic Preservation Plan**. This is a citywide project. The Historic Preservation Plan is a comprehensive plan that will provide guidance relating to Historic Preservation Policy for all departments of Salt Lake City. This Plan will be the key strategic document that will guide preservation activity into the future and inform decisions such as amendments to master plans, budget priorities, development of incentives for rehabilitation, zoning text and map amendments, and site specific development decisions.

As part of this request the City Council is holding an advertised public hearing to receive comments regarding this petition request. During this hearing, the Planning staff may present information on the petition and anyone desiring to address the City Council concerning this issue will be given an opportunity to speak. The hearing will be held:

DATE:

TIME: 7:00 P.M.

PLACE: City Council Chambers
Room 415
City and County Building
451 South State Street
Salt Lake City

If you have any questions relating to this proposal, please attend the meeting or call Robin Zeigler at 535-7758, between the hours of 8:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m. Monday through Thursday.

People with disabilities may make requests for reasonable accommodation no later than 48 hours in advance in order to attend this City Council meeting. Accommodations may include alternate formats, interpreters, and other auxiliary aids. This is an accessible facility. For questions, requests, or additional information, please contact the ADA coordinator at 535-7971; TDD 535-6220.

Exhibit 3A
Mailing List

KEVIN JONES
EAST BENCH CHAIR
2500 SKYLINE DRIVE
SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84108

PETE TAYLOR
SUNNYSIDE EAST
933 SOUTH 2300 EAST
SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84108

ANGIE VORHER
JORDAN MEADOWS CHAIR
1988 SIR JAMES DRIVE
SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84116

GORDON STORRS
FAIRPARK CHAIR
159 NORTH 1320 WEST
SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84116

ELLEN REDDICK
BONNEVILLE HILLS CHAIR
2177 ROOSEVELT AVENUE
SALT LAKE CITY UT 84108

RANDY SORENSON
GLENDALE CHAIR
1184 SOUTH REDWOOD DR
SLAT LAKE CITY UT 84104

PHILIP CARLSON
SUGAR HOUSE CHAIR
1917 EAST 2700 SOUTH
SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84106

ESTHER HUNTER
UNIVERSITY NEIGHBORHOOD
1049 NORRIS PLACE
SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84102

BILL DAVIS
PEOPLE'S FREEWAY
332 WEST 1700 SOUTH
SALT LAKE CITY UT 84115

TERRY THOMAS
WESTPOINT CHAIR
1840 STALLION LANE
SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84116

VACANT
FOOTHILL/SUNNYSIDE CHAIR
SALT LAKE CITY UT

Joel Paterson
PO Box 145480
SLC, UT 84114-5480

D. CHRISTIAN HARRISON
DOWNTOWN CHAIR
336 WEST BROADWAY, #308
SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84101

JUDITH LOCKE
GREATER AVENUES CHAIR
407 7TH AVENUE
SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84103

DEWITT SMITH
LIBERTY WELLS
328 EAST HOLLYWOOD AVE
SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84115

LOGGINS MERRILL
EAST CENTRAL CHAIR
P.O. BOX 521809
SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84152

LISETTE GIBBONS
YALECREST CHAIR
1764 HUBBARD AVE
SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84108

MIKE HARMAN
POPLAR GROVE CHAIR
1044 WEST 300 SOUTH
SALT LAKE CITY UT 84104

BEVERLY NELSON
FEDERAL HEIGHTS
26 SOUTH WOLCOTT STREET
SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84102

RON JARRETT
ROSE PARK CHAIR
1441 WEST SUNSET DRIVE
SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84116

PAMELA PEDERSEN
EAST LIBERTY PARK
SALT LAKE CITY SCHOOL DIST.
440 EAST100 SOUTH
SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84111

POLLY HART
CAPITOL HILL CHAIR
355 NORTH QUINCE STREET
SALT LAKE CIYT, UT 84103

MARK BRINTON
WASATCH HOLLOW
1869 LOGAN AVE
SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84108

THOMAS MUTTER
CENTRAL CITY CHAIR
228 EAST 500 SOUTH #100
SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84111

Charles Shepherd
2040 E Aldo Circle
Salt Lake City, UT 84108

Leslie Reynolds-Benns, PHD
WestPointe Chair
1402 Miami Road
Salt Lake City, UT 84116

Ellen Reddick
Bonneville Hills Chair
2177 Roosevelt Avenue
Salt Lake City, UT 84108

Beth Bowman
1445 Harrison
Salt Lake City, UT 84105

Viky Orme
FairPark Chair
159 North 1320 West
Salt Lake City, UT 84116

Ken Jones
East Bench Chair
2500 Skyline Drive
Salt Lake City, UT 84108

Dawn Kattter
367 Trolley Square
Salt Lake City, UT 84102

Polly Hart
Capitol Hill Chair
355 North Quince Street
Salt Lake City, UT 84103

Angie Vorher
Jordan Meadows Chair
1988 Sir James Drive
Salt Lake City, UT 84116

Daniel Ball
748 E South Temple
Salt Lake City, UT 84102

Bill Davis
People's Freeway Chair
332 West 1700 South
Salt Lake City, UT 84115

Randy Sorenson
Glendale Chair
1184 South Redwood Dr
Salt Lake City, UT 84104

Sandra Marsh
1020 E Herbert Avenue
Salt Lake City, UT 84105

Diane Barlow
Sunnyside East Chair
859 South 2300 East
Salt Lake City, UT 84108

D. Christian Harrison
Downtown Chair
336 West Broadway #308
Salt Lake City, UT 84101

Milly Boden
1823 E Cottonwood Glen
Holladay, UT 84117

Jim Fisher
Liberty Wells Chair
PO Box 5223158
Salt Lake City, UT 84152

Mike Akerlow
Foothill/Sunnyside Chair
1940 Hubbard Avenue
Salt Lake City, UT 84108

Kent Brough
499 N 200 W #2
Bountiful, UT 84010

Ron Jarrett
Rose Park Chair
1441 West Sunset Drive
Salt Lake City, UT 84116

Maggie Shaw
Sugar House Chair
1150 Wilson Avenue
Salt Lake City, UT 84105

Gail Mealvins
1111 2nd Avenue
Salt Lake City, UT 84103

Mike Harman
Poplar Grove Chair
1044 West 300 South
Salt Lake City, UT 84104

Katherine Gardner
606 DeSoto
Salt Lake City, UT 84103

Judith Locke
Greater Avenues Chair
407 East 7th Avenue
Salt Lake City, UT 84103

Russ Watts
5200 S Highland Drive
Salt Lake City, UT 84117

Lisette Gibons
Yalecrest Chair
1764 Hubbard Avenue
Salt Lake City, UT 84108

Joel Paterson
P.O. Box 14580
SLC, UT 84114-5480

Nelson Knight
1273 N Mandalay Rd.
Salt Lake City, UT 84116

Warren Lloyd
911 S. Military Drive
Salt Lake City, UT 84108

Bill Davis
329 Harrison Avenue
Salt Lake City, UT 84115

Brett Crane
1139 West California Avenue
Salt Lake City, UT, 84104

Kirk Huffaker
PO Box 28
Salt Lake City, UT 84110

Bud Bevins
1256 E South Temple Street
Salt Lake City, UT 84102

Rob Pett
357 W Pierpont Avenue
Salt Lake City, UT 84101

Barbara Murphy
300 S Rio Grande St
Salt Lake City, UT 84101

Arla Funk
1235 East 200 South #602
Salt Lake City, UT 84102

Noreen Heid
668 S 600 East
Salt Lake City, UT 84102

David Richardson
814 E 100 South
Salt Lake City, UT 84102

Karen Nageli
111 East Broadway, Suite 150
Salt Lake City, UT 84111

Bee Lufkin
1460 E. Harrison Ave
Salt Lake City, UT 84105

Ben Logue
313 S Maryfield Drive
Salt Lake City, UT 84108

Robert Young
217 B Street
Salt Lake City, UT 84103

Lisette Gibson
1764 E. Hubbard Ave
Salt Lake City, UT 84108

Polly Hart
355 North Quince Street
Salt Lake City, UT 84103

David Geher
253 N Center
Salt Lake City, UT 84103

Elizabeth Giraud
2561 E Elm St
Salt Lake City, UT 84109

Carla Wiese
175 East 400 South #600
Salt Lake City, UT 84111

Shirley McLaughlan
160 W Clinton Aven
Salt Lake City, UT 84103

Bob Farrington
175 E 400 South #600
Salt Lake City, UT 84111

David Fitzsimmons
416 E Bryan Avenue
Salt Lake City, UT 84115

Cindy Cromer
816 E 100 S
Salt Lake City, UT 84102

Esther Hunter
337 S 1100 East
Salt Lake City, UT 84102

Sheleigh Harding
660 South 600 East
Salt Lake City, UT 84105

Ira Hickley
133 K Street
Salt Lake City, UT 84103


Anne Oliver
771 5th Avenue
Salt Lake City, UT 84114

Creed Haymond
336 South 1200 East
Salt Lake City, UT 84102

M. Jeppsen
1392 S 2200 E
Salt Lake City, UT 84108

Exhibit 4
Historic Preservation Plan Project
Summary

Salt Lake City Historic Preservation Plan Project Summary



WHY DEVELOP A HISTORIC PRESERVATION PLAN?

- To comprehensively address historic preservation issues throughout Salt Lake City;
- To protect the past while preparing for redevelopment and infill as the City grows;
- To acknowledge the many preservation successes achieved in the past, and to strengthen current preservation efforts; and
- To inform an array of City policy decisions and guide preservation activity into the future.

WHO WAS INVOLVED?

- The public - through workshops, an open house, the City's website, interviews, surveys, presentations, a public service announcement, and informational posters.
- Citizen Advisory Committee - made up of 17 citizens with diverse backgrounds.
- Historic Landmark Commission.
- Salt Lake City Planning staff of the Planning Division.



WHAT DOES THE PLAN SAY?

- The plan is organized around an overall Vision Statement, which is made up of five themes. Each of the five themes is described below.
- An implementation plan identifies specific actions that should be undertaken to achieve the City's preservation goals. The plan prioritizes each action and identifies responsible parties. Below, this project summary identifies the first-year implementation priorities for each of the five themes.

FOSTER A UNIFIED CITY COMMITMENT TO PRESERVATION

Historic preservation issues arise every day in the actions and decisions of a variety of City officials and agencies – from land use planning for older neighborhoods, to street and sidewalk improvements in historic districts, to transit planning along historic commercial corridors. Implementation of this plan will be achieved through many types of activities, including planning, regulations, funding, and other day-to-day decisions across the whole City government. Through aligning the City's goals, plans, and policies, a unified direction for historic preservation may be recognized. First-year implementation priorities include:

- Develop a list of preservation-related issues for Community Master Plans to address, if applicable;
- Establish a City Coordination Committee to help monitor plan implementation across departments;
- Educate City leaders and other departments on the benefits of historic preservation; and
- Assign staff planning teams to represent geographic planning areas.

DEVELOP A COMPREHENSIVE PRESERVATION TOOLBOX

This theme discusses opportunities to fine-tune and broaden the City's preservation toolbox in three important categories: the survey of historic properties, the historic designation process, and the land-use regulations that apply to development of designated historic properties. Sample first-year implementation priorities include:

- Establish criteria to determine where future historic survey work is needed;
- Pursue local historic designation for eligible City-owned properties;
- Assess underlying zoning to see where it may be inconsistent with preservation objectives, and pursue zoning map amendments if necessary;
- Assess building code barriers and conflicts that work against historic preservation;
- Prepare targeted ordinance revisions to improve the economic hardship and demolition process;
- Draft and adopt new standards to prohibit demolition of historic resources by neglect; and
- Update and clarify requirements for new construction in historic districts to be sure the original intent is achieved.



ADMINISTER A CONVENIENT AND CONSISTENT HISTORIC PRESERVATION PROGRAM

Clear and efficient administrative procedures, convenient resources available to the public, and consistent information on and application of the rules are crucial components to a successful historic preservation program. First-year implementation priorities for this theme include:

- Improve training for new Historic Landmark Commission (HLC) members on the City's preservation goals and the various tools available; and
- Establish an architectural review committee to provide informal, non-binding design feedback on specific projects.

IMPROVE EDUCATION AND OUTREACH

Conveying the message that historic preservation is valued in Salt Lake City is vital to the continuing success of future preservation efforts. This theme discusses ways to create and strengthen educational materials on historic preservation in order to help increase community pride and awareness of the City's history for residents and visitors. First-year implementation priorities include:

- Expand the City's website to include sections devoted to historic preservation;
- Reinstate the City's awards program to highlight preservation project successes for the prior year; and
- Modify the review procedures for City Housing and Small Business loans to include historic planning staff or Commission project review when a historic property is involved.

SUPPORT A SUSTAINABLE CITY


Historic preservation can be a cornerstone of the City's efforts to promote sustainable development. This section of the plan illustrates how preservation can support not just environmental sustainability, but also economic, social, and cultural sustainability. First-year implementation priorities include:

- Appoint a staff green building liaison;
- Enable broader use of solar collectors and alternative energy equipment on historic properties ;
- Preserve eligible historic parks as landmark sites;
- Ensure zoning allows residential reuses of nonresidential historic structures;
- Support appropriate residential additions in historic districts to meet a wide range of housing needs; and
- Draft rules to allow accessory dwelling units in historic districts, following neighborhood approval and subject to clear standards that protect neighborhood character.

For additional information, questions, or comments
please contact:

Robin Zeigler, Senior Historic Preservation Planner
801-535-7758
Robin.Zeigler@slcgov.com

Salt Lake City Historic Preservation Plan Project Summary



WHY DEVELOP A HISTORIC PRESERVATION PLAN?

- To comprehensively address historic preservation issues throughout Salt Lake City;
- To protect the past while preparing for redevelopment and infill as the City grows;
- To acknowledge the many preservation successes achieved in the past, and to strengthen current preservation efforts; and
- To inform an array of City policy decisions and guide preservation activity into the future.

WHO WAS INVOLVED?

- The public - through workshops, an open house, the City's website, interviews, surveys, presentations, a public service announcement, and informational posters.
- Citizen Advisory Committee - made up of 17 citizens with diverse backgrounds.
- Historic Landmark Commission.
- Salt Lake City Planning staff of the Planning Division.



WHAT DOES THE PLAN SAY?

- The plan is organized around an overall Vision Statement, which is made up of five themes. Each of the five themes is described below.
- An implementation plan identifies specific actions that should be undertaken to achieve the City's preservation goals. The plan prioritizes each action and identifies responsible parties. Below, this project summary identifies the first-year implementation priorities for each of the five themes.

FOSTER A UNIFIED CITY COMMITMENT TO PRESERVATION

Historic preservation issues arise every day in the actions and decisions of a variety of City officials and agencies – from land use planning for older neighborhoods, to street and sidewalk improvements in historic districts, to transit planning along historic commercial corridors. Implementation of this plan will be achieved through many types of activities, including planning, regulations, funding, and other day-to-day decisions across the whole City government. Through aligning the City's goals, plans, and policies, a unified direction for historic preservation may be recognized. First-year implementation priorities include:

- Develop a list of preservation-related issues for Community Master Plans to address, if applicable;
- Establish a City Coordination Committee to help monitor plan implementation across departments;
- Educate City leaders and other departments on the benefits of historic preservation; and
- Assign staff planning teams to represent geographic planning areas.

DEVELOP A COMPREHENSIVE PRESERVATION TOOLBOX

This theme discusses opportunities to fine-tune and broaden the City's preservation toolbox in three important categories: the survey of historic properties, the historic designation process, and the land-use regulations that apply to development of designated historic properties. Sample first-year implementation priorities include:

- Establish criteria to determine where future historic survey work is needed;
- Pursue local historic designation for eligible City-owned properties;
- Assess underlying zoning to see where it may be inconsistent with preservation objectives, and pursue zoning map amendments if necessary;
- Assess building code barriers and conflicts that work against historic preservation;
- Prepare targeted ordinance revisions to improve the economic hardship and demolition process;
- Draft and adopt new standards to prohibit demolition of historic resources by neglect; and
- Update and clarify requirements for new construction in historic districts to be sure the original intent is achieved.



ADMINISTER A CONVENIENT AND CONSISTENT HISTORIC PRESERVATION PROGRAM

Clear and efficient administrative procedures, convenient resources available to the public, and consistent information on and application of the rules are crucial components to a successful historic preservation program. First-year implementation priorities for this theme include:

- Improve training for new Historic Landmark Commission (HLC) members on the City's preservation goals and the various tools available; and
- Establish an architectural review committee to provide informal, non-binding design feedback on specific projects.

IMPROVE EDUCATION AND OUTREACH

Conveying the message that historic preservation is valued in Salt Lake City is vital to the continuing success of future preservation efforts. This theme discusses ways to create and strengthen educational materials on historic preservation in order to help increase community pride and awareness of the City's history for residents and visitors. First-year implementation priorities include:

- Expand the City's website to include sections devoted to historic preservation;
- Reinstate the City's awards program to highlight preservation project successes for the prior year; and
- Modify the review procedures for City Housing and Small Business loans to include historic planning staff or Commission project review when a historic property is involved.

SUPPORT A SUSTAINABLE CITY

Historic preservation can be a cornerstone of the City's efforts to promote sustainable development. This section of the plan illustrates how preservation can support not just environmental sustainability, but also economic, social, and cultural sustainability. First-year implementation priorities include:

- Appoint a staff green building liaison;
- Enable broader use of solar collectors and alternative energy equipment on historic properties ;
- Preserve eligible historic parks as landmark sites;
- Ensure zoning allows residential reuses of nonresidential historic structures;
- Support appropriate residential additions in historic districts to meet a wide range of housing needs; and
- Draft rules to allow accessory dwelling units in historic districts, following neighborhood approval and subject to clear standards that protect neighborhood character.

For additional information, questions, or comments
please contact:

Robin Zeigler, Senior Historic Preservation Planner
801-535-7758
Robin.Zeigler@slcgov.com

Exhibit 5
**Clarion Memo on Historic
Preservation Plan and Sustainable
Code Revisions**

C L A R I O N

Clarion Associates
621 17th Street, Suite 2250
Denver, CO 80293
303.830.2890 phone
303.860.1809 fax

Memorandum

To: Robin Ziegler, Salt Lake City Planning

From: Matt Goebel, Clarion Associates

Date: July 31, 2009

RE: Historic Preservation Plan and Sustainable Code Revision Projects

Salt Lake currently is engaged in two groundbreaking efforts – the Historic Preservation Plan and the Sustainable Code Revision project – that together will help protect the city's rich heritage while also ensuring that the city remains economically vibrant and a national model of high-quality, sustainable development. The preservation plan and the sustainability code updates are complimentary efforts. At your request, this memorandum summarizes these two efforts and provides examples of how similar issues are being addressed in the two projects.

HISTORIC PRESERVATION PLAN

The new Historic Preservation Plan has been in development for over two years. While the city has protected hundreds of historic resources and enjoyed some impressive preservation success stories over the past 30 years, this plan is actually the first comprehensive attempt to address historic preservation issues throughout Salt Lake City. Generally speaking, the plan's goals are to protect the city's historic resources while preparing for redevelopment and infill as the city grows; to acknowledge the many preservation successes achieved in the past; to strengthen current preservation efforts; and to inform an array of city policy decisions and guide preservation activity into the future.

A major emphasis of the preservation plan is that Salt Lake must practice preservation with an eye on the future. While areas qualifying for historic designation should be protected through appropriate regulations (such as design guidelines for additions to historic homes), the plan does not call for historic areas to be left untouched altogether. Indeed, historic preservation is intended to be a cornerstone of the city's efforts to promote sustainable development. An entire section of the plan illustrates how preservation can support not just environmental sustainability, but also economic, social, and cultural sustainability. First-year implementation priorities in this regard include:

- Appointing a staff green building liaison;
- Enabling broader use of solar collectors and alternative energy equipment on historic properties ;
- Preserving eligible historic parks as landmark sites;
- Ensuring zoning allows residential reuses of nonresidential historic structures;
- Supporting appropriate residential additions in historic districts to meet a wide range of housing needs; and

- Drafting rules to allow accessory dwelling units in historic districts, following neighborhood approval and subject to clear standards that protect neighborhood character.

SUSTAINABLE CODE REVISIONS

The Sustainable Code Revision Project is an ongoing effort designed to revise the city's zoning, subdivision, and other land development codes to promote more sustainable development patterns. A February 2009 diagnosis prepared for the project identifies existing regulatory barriers, incentives, and development standards found in the city's development codes that are directly related to ten sustainability categories identified by the city:

- Climate Change and Air Quality
- Water Quality and Conservation
- Alternative Energy Production and Energy Conservation
- Mobility and Transportation
- Urban Forestry
- Housing Accessibility and Diversity
- Community Health and Safety
- Food Production and Nutrition
- Recycling and Waste Reduction
- Open Space, Parks, and Trails

For each topic, the diagnosis first summarizes the issue and notes how land development regulations can help accomplish the city's goals in that arena. For example, in the area of water quality and conservation, the diagnosis notes that climate change, worsening drought, population growth, and the demands of new developments have called sharp attention to the need to sustain water resources and make more efficient use of local water supplies. A recommended Salt Lake Code revision intended to address this issue is: "Expand existing water-conserving landscaping regulations (including limits on irrigation) and restrict the use of turf grass, especially in commercial and residential development."

OVERLAP BETWEEN THE TWO PROJECTS

As stated, the preservation plan and the sustainability code updates are complimentary efforts. To the extent that they address the same issues, city officials and staff, working with Clarion, have strived to ensure consistency between the two projects. There are only a handful of issues on which the two projects directly address similar issues and in such areas the documents contain consistent recommendations. Two examples are listed below.

Regarding climate change and air quality, the Sustainable Code Revision project identifies regulatory options for addressing this issue. Generally, the diagnosis proposes that the city's zoning and land use regulations be updated to encourage development patterns that allow for and promote less reliance on automobiles for mobility and result in a reduction in vehicle miles traveled and a corresponding reduction in greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. Examples of development that would meet this standard include mixed-use and transit-oriented developments.

- Along these same lines and specifically related to historic preservation, the diagnosis recommends revising existing accessory use provisions to allow accessory dwelling units in selected residential areas and new developments. Strengthening compatibility standards for accessory units (e.g., limit to larger lots, special control in historic districts, etc.) also is recommended.

- The draft historic preservation plan specifically addresses this issue in the same manner as the sustainable code diagnosis. Policy 5.7d of the preservation plan states: "Work to develop appropriate policies on allowing accessory dwelling units in historic homes." The implementation action for this item calls for the city to "assess best practices for accessory dwelling units in historic areas and make appropriate regulatory modifications to allow accessory dwelling units in historic districts. Consider density bonuses to encourage provision of accessory dwelling units."

Regarding alternative energy and energy conservation, the Sustainable Code Revision project recommends identification and removal of obstacles in current zoning and historic preservation regulations that unnecessarily impede alternative or energy conservation devices such as solar panels.

- The sustainable code diagnosis recommends revising existing historic preservation design guidelines/policies to carefully accommodate solar panels in more locations on a building/site in historic districts.
- The historic preservation plan addresses in Policy 5.2b, which states: "Modify design guidelines to address solar collectors and other types of alternative energy equipment within local historic districts and on local Landmark Sites pending design review." The implementation action for this item calls for the city to "Evaluate design guidelines to determine whether modifications are necessary to allow solar collectors and other types of alternative energy equipment, as recommended by the sustainable code effort to enable broader use of renewable energy technology on historic properties. While the current version of the design guidelines (at the time of this planning effort) appear sufficient to allow the placement of solar collectors in historic districts, the guidelines should be reevaluated on an ongoing basis to address changing technologies."

Exhibit 6
Project Original Petition

Remarks:

Petition No: **PLNPMC2009-00171**

By: **Salt Lake City Planning Division**

Salt Lake City Preservation Plan

Date Filed: **06/29/2007**

Address: **Citywide**

Exhibit 7A
Planning Commission
September 23, 2009

Original Notice and Postmark/Agenda

SALT LAKE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING AGENDA
In Room 326 of the City & County Building at 451 South State Street
Wednesday, September 23, 2009 at 5:45 p.m.

The field trip is scheduled to leave at 4:00 p.m. Dinner will be served to the Planning Commissioners and Staff at 5:00 p.m., in Room 126. **Work Session**—The Planning Commission may discuss project updates and other minor administrative matters and proposed changes to alcohol regulations. This portion of the meeting is open to the public for observation.

Approval of Minutes from Wednesday, September 9, 2009

Report of the Chair and Vice Chair

Report of the Director

1. **Petition 410-08-44; Saxton Grove Time Extension**—a request for a one year extension for the Saxton Grove planned development, Petition 410-08-44 (Staff contact: Doug Dansie at 801.535.6182 or doug.dansie@slcgov.com).

Public Hearings

2. **River Glen Phase 1**—a request by Iverson Homes LLC for an amendment to a previously approved residential conditional use planned development and residential subdivision. The proposal is located at approximately 1368 South Dokos Lane located in an R-1-7000 Single Family Residential zoning district. The property is located in Council District Two, represented by Van Turner (Staff contact: Doug Dansie at 801.535.6182 or doug.dansie@slcgov.com).
 - a. **PLNSUB 2009-00293; Conditional Use /Planned Development Amendment**—The request is to eliminate the east/west public access strip between Dokos Lane and the Jordan River surplus canal.
 - b. **PLNSUB 2009-00292; Residential Subdivision Amendment**—an amendment to the subdivision is required to reflect the elimination of the east/west public access strip.
3. **Petition PLNPCM2009-00171; Citywide Historic Preservation Plan Rehearing**—a request by the Historic Landmark Commission to reconsider recommendation of the Citywide Historic Preservation Plan to the City Council. This is a city-wide project that was previously considered by the Planning Commission on July 8, 2009. However, adequate public notice was not provided at that time (Staff contact: Janice Lew at 801.535.7625 or janice.lew@slcgov.com).
4. **PLNPCM2009-00749; Planned Development Zoning Text Amendment**—The Planning Division is proposing to amend the City's Zoning Ordinance related to Planned Developments. The proposal includes the following changes:
 - Remove Planned Development regulations from the Conditional Use Chapter of the Zoning Ordinance, thereby creating a stand-alone chapter entitled "Planned Developments";
 - Enhance the "Purpose Statement" and the desired "Objectives" of the Planned Development land use process;
 - Reduce the minimum net lot area required for Planned Development eligibility, and;
 - Better define "Planned Development" in the definitions chapter in the Zoning Ordinance.The proposed zoning text amendment would apply citywide (Staff contact: Lex Traughber at 801.535.6184 or lex.traughber@slcgov.com).
5. **PLNPCM2009-00807; Deseret Industries Thrift Store Sugar House Conditional Use**—a request by The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints, represented by Craig Ames of PGAW Architects, for conditional use approval to convert the former Circuit City building located at approximately 724 East 2100 South and the lot at 774 East 2100 South into a Deseret Industries thrift store and donation center. The conditional use is required to expand the structure by approximately 7,000 square feet and combining an adjacent lot. This property is located in City Council District Seven, represented by Soren Simonsen (Staff contact: Casey Stewart at 801.535.6260 or casey.stewart@slcgov.com).
6. **PLNPCM2009-00870 The Road Home Conditional Use Permit**—a request by The Road Home for a conditional use approval to allow a Homeless Shelter to be located in the St. Vincent de Paul Center for housing of the homeless each year from October 1 to April 15. St. Vincent de Paul Center is located at approximately 437 West 200 South in the D-3 Downtown Zone. The property is in Council District 4, represented by Luke Garrott (Staff contact: Bill Peperone at 801.535.7214 or bill.peperone@slcgov.com).


Visit the Planning Division's website at www.slcgov.com/CED/planning for copies of the Planning Commission agendas, staff reports, and minutes. Staff Reports will be posted the Friday prior to the meeting and minutes will be posted two days after they are ratified, which usually occurs at the next regularly scheduled meeting of the Planning Commission.

*Bill Repovino
Planning Director
P.O. Box 145480*

PUBLIC HEARING NOTICE

Salt Lake City Planning Division
451 South State Street, Room 406
PO Box 145480
Salt Lake City UT 84114

02 1M 0004277032 SEP 09 2009
\$ 00.440
UNITED STATES POSTAGE
FIRST CLASS
MAILED FROM ZIP CODE 84116



FIRST CLASS

STATEMAIL SVCS 09/10/2009 09:02

1. Fill out registration card and indicate if you wish to speak and which agenda item you will address.
2. After the staff and petitioner presentations, hearings will be opened for public comment. Community Councils will present their comments at the beginning of the hearing
3. In order to be considerate of everyone attending the meeting, public comments are limited to two (2) minutes per person, per item. A spokesperson who has already been asked by a group to summarize their concerns will be allowed five (5) minutes to speak. Written comments are welcome and will be provided to the Planning Commission in advance of the meeting if they are submitted to the Planning Division prior to noon the day before the meeting.
Written comments should be sent to:

Salt Lake City Planning Commission
451 South State Street, Room 406
Salt Lake City UT 84111
4. Speakers will be called by the Chair.
5. Please state your name and your affiliation to the petition or whom you represent at the beginning of your comments.
6. Speakers should address their comments to the Chair. Planning Commission members may have questions for the speaker. Speakers may not debate with other meeting attendees.
7. Speakers should focus their comments on the agenda item. Extraneous and repetitive comments should be avoided.
8. After those registered have spoken, the Chair will invite other comments. Prior speakers may be allowed to supplement their previous comments at this time.
9. After the hearing is closed, the discussion will be limited among Planning Commissioners and Staff. Under unique circumstances, the Planning Commission may choose to reopen the hearing to obtain additional information.
10. The Salt Lake City Corporation complies with all ADA guidelines. People with disabilities may make requests for reasonable accommodation no later than 48 hours in advance in order to attend this meeting. Accommodations may include alternate formats, interpreters, and other auxiliary aids. This is an accessible facility. For questions, requests, or additional information, please contact the Planning Office at 535-7757; TDD 535-6220.

Salt Lake City, UT 84114

Exhibit 7B
Planning Commission
September 23, 2009
Newspaper Advertisement

PROOF OF PUBLICATION

| CUSTOMER NAME AND ADDRESS | ACCOUNT NUMBER | DATE |
|--|----------------|-----------|
| PLANNING DIVISION, PO BOX 145480 SALT LAKE CITY UT 84114 | 9001394298 | 9/14/2009 |

| ACCOUNT NAME | | | |
|---|------------|----------------|--------|
| PLANNING DIVISION, | | | |
| TELEPHONE | AD ORDER # | INVOICE NUMBER | |
| 8015356184 | 0000494604 | / | |
| SCHEDULE | | | |
| Start 09/11/2009 | | End 09/11/2009 | |
| CUST. REF. NO. | | | |
| PLNPCM2009-00171 | | | |
| CAPTION | | | |
| SALT LAKE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION SALT | | | |
| SIZE | | | |
| 29 | Lines | 2.00 | COLUMN |
| TIMES | | RATE | |
| 2 | | | |
| MISC. CHARGES | | AD CHARGES | |
| | | | |
| TOTAL COST | | | |
| 77.50 | | | |

**SALT LAKE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
SALT LAKE CITY HISTORIC PRESERVATION PLAN
PUBLIC HEARING**

On Wednesday September 23, 2009 at 5:45 P.M., the Salt Lake City Planning Commission will hold a public hearing to take comment on petition PLNPCM2009-00171 considering a recommendation to the City Council to adopt the Salt Lake City Historic Preservation Plan. This is a city-wide project.

The purpose of the Preservation Plan is to establish a city-wide vision for preservation as well as supporting goals, policies, and implementation strategies to guide future historic preservation efforts in the city. The Plan provides policy guidelines for Salt Lake City commissions, boards and administrative entities to use when directing, reviewing and implementing future development and programs related to historic preservation.

All persons interested and present will be given an opportunity to be heard. The hearing will be held in Room 326 of the Salt Lake City and County Building, 451 South State Street. Accessible parking and entrance is located on the east side of the building. Hearing impaired individuals who wish to attend this meeting should contact our TOD service number, 801-535-6220, four days in advance. For further information regarding this hearing, call Janice Lew at 801-535-7625.

494604 UPAXLP

AFFIDAVIT OF PUBLICATION

AS NEWSPAPER AGENCY CORPORATION LEGAL BOOKER, I CERTIFY THAT THE ATTACHED ADVERTISEMENT OF SALT LAKE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION SALT FOR PLANNING DIVISION, WAS PUBLISHED BY THE NEWSPAPER AGENCY CORPORATION, AGENT FOR THE SALT LAKE TRIBUNE AND DESERET NEWS, DAILY NEWSPAPERS PRINTED IN THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE WITH GENERAL CIRCULATION IN UTAH, AND PUBLISHED IN SALT LAKE CITY, SALT LAKE COUNTY IN THE STATE OF UTAH.

PUBLISHED ON Start 09/11/2009 End 09/11/2009

SIGNATURE *[Signature]*

9/14/2009

**Notary Public
ELIZABETH G. CORDOVA**
6462 West 4200 South
West Valley City, Utah 84128
My Commission Expires
January 16, 2010
State of Utah

[Signature]

**THIS IS NOT A STATEMENT BUT A "PROOF OF PUBLICATION"
PLEASE PAY FROM BILLING STATEMENT**

4770 S. 5600 W.
P.O. BOX 704005
WEST VALLEY CITY, UTAH 84170
FED.TAX I.D.# 87-0217663

PROOF OF PUBLICATION

CUSTOMER'S COPY

| CUSTOMER NAME AND ADDRESS | ACCOUNT NUMBER | DATE |
|--|----------------|-----------|
| PLANNING DIVISION, PO BOX 145480 SALT LAKE CITY UT 84114 | 9001394298 | 9/14/2009 |

| ACCOUNT NAME | | | |
|---|------------|----------------|------------|
| PLANNING DIVISION, | | | |
| TELEPHONE | ADDRESS | INVOICE NUMBER | |
| 8015356184 | 0000494604 | / | |
| SCHEDULE | | | |
| Start | 09/11/2009 | End | 09/11/2009 |
| BUS. REF. NO. | | | |
| PLNPCM2009-00171 | | | |
| CAPTION | | | |
| SALT LAKE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION SALT | | | |
| SIZE | | | |
| 29 | Lines | 2.00 | COLUMN |
| TIMES | | RATE | |
| 2 | | | |
| MISC. CHARGES | | AD. CHARGES | |
| | | | |
| TOTAL COST | | | |
| 77.50 | | | |

**SALT LAKE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
SALT LAKE CITY HISTORIC PRESERVATION PLAN
PUBLIC HEARING**

On Wednesday September 23, 2009 at 5:45 P.M., the Salt Lake City Planning Commission will hold a public hearing to take comment on petition PLNPCM2009-00171 considering a recommendation to the City Council to adopt the Salt Lake City Historic Preservation Plan. This is a city-wide project.

The purpose of the Preservation Plan is to establish a city-wide vision for preservation as well as supporting goals, policies, and implementation strategies to guide future historic preservation efforts in the city. The Plan provides policy guidelines for Salt Lake City commissions, boards and administrative entities to use when directing, reviewing, and implementing future development and programs related to historic preservation.

All persons interested and present will be given an opportunity to be heard. The hearing will be held in Room 326 of the Salt Lake City and County Building, 451 South State Street. Accessible parking and entrance is located on the east side of the building. Hearing impaired individuals who wish to attend this meeting should contact our TOD service number, 801-535-6220, four days in advance. For further information regarding this hearing, call Janice Law at 801-535-7625.

494604 UPAXLP

AFFIDAVIT OF PUBLICATION

AS NEWSPAPER AGENCY CORPORATION LEGAL BOOKER, I CERTIFY THAT THE ATTACHED ADVERTISEMENT OF SALT LAKE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION SALT FOR PLANNING DIVISION, WAS PUBLISHED BY THE NEWSPAPER AGENCY CORPORATION, AGENT FOR THE SALT LAKE TRIBUNE AND DESERET NEWS, DAILY NEWSPAPERS PRINTED IN THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE WITH GENERAL CIRCULATION IN UTAH, AND PUBLISHED IN SALT LAKE CITY, SALT LAKE COUNTY IN THE STATE OF UTAH.


Start 09/11/2009 End 09/11/2009

PUBLISHED ON _____

SIGNATURE _____

glurine

9/14/2009



Elizabeth G. Cordova

**THIS IS NOT A STATEMENT BUT A "PROOF OF PUBLICATION"
PLEASE PAY FROM BILLING STATEMENT**

Exhibit 7C
Planning Commission
September 23, 2009
Staff Report



Memorandum

Planning Division
Community & Economic Development Department

To: Planning Commission

From: Janice Lew, Principal Planner

Date: September 17, 2009

Re: **Re-hearing Historic Preservation Plan, PLNPCM2009-00171**

This is a request to re-hear a matter that was not properly noticed. On July 8, 2009, The Planning Commission passed a motion to recommend the City Council adopt the Historic Preservation Plan with the further recommendation that sustainability goals be revised, updated and expanded and that Economic Hardship be clarified. The vote was unanimous in favor. However, the Planning Division failed to properly notice the hearing before the Planning Commission. The July 8, 2009 staff report and minutes, and a memorandum from Matt Goebel, Clarion Associates, regarding the Sustainable Code Revision project are attached to this memo.

Potential Actions:

1. The Planning Commission could discuss the noticing problem, discuss their previous action, open the public hearing, and hold a vote.
2. The Planning Commission could refer to the minutes of the prior meeting with little or no further discussion, open the public hearing, and hold a vote.
3. The Commission could go back through all of the substance of the plan, open the public hearing, and hold a vote.

The City Council on September 8th discussed the preservation plan and other preservation questions to get a better understanding of this program. As soon as the Planning Commission takes action, the preservation plan will proceed to the Council to set the public hearing and action.



Memorandum

Planning Division
Community & Economic Development Department

To: Planning Commission

From: Robin Zeigler, Senior Planner

Date: July 8, 2009

Re: Preservation Plan, PLNPCM2009-00171

Adoption of the Salt Lake City Historic Preservation Plan began with a recommendation from the Historic Landmark Commission to City Council. The Planning Division is now seeking a recommendation from the Planning Commission.

A complete draft of the Plan was presented to the Planning Commission by Matt Goebel of Clarion and Associates on May 13, 2009. The Plan was discussed by the Planning Commission at their June 10, 2009 meeting. This memo is a response to the comments of that meeting.

1. The document is too large.

As a major element of the Salt Lake City General Plan, it is expected that the plan will go into more detail on what preservation is, what its objectives are, policies to guide future decision making, and descriptions of its various tools, e.g., tax credits, design guidelines. These are based on well-accepted preservation principles and best practices used by states and cities throughout the country as well for the National Register of Historic Places. Every one to two years, the Historic Landmark Commission will recommend to the Mayor, City Council, and planning managers a work plan to implement various aspects of the Plan.

2. The non-conforming uses create a property owner hardship in terms of adaptive reuse.

Nonconforming uses are not a historic preservation issue and so are not directly addressed in the Plan; however, the Plan does call for the balance of historic preservation with other City goals and actions. Currently, Planning Staff is working on amendments to the non-conforming uses and non-complying structures regulations and modifications to zoning regulations relating to lower intensive mixed use and commercial land uses. It is believed that these provisions will go a long way in removing a fair amount of non-conforming uses. Both of these projects will address this issue and include preservation, where applicable. For instance, the Small Business Ordinance will likely reference the *Commercial Design Guidelines* for historic structures that are currently being written.

3. Will the plan create another layer of government?

The Plan does not create another layer of government nor recommend changing the purpose and authority of the existing Historic Landmark Commission.

In 1995, the Council chose to establish the HLC on par with the Planning Commission rather than a subcommittee of the Planning Commission, as it had previously been. The Preservation Plan, design guidelines, application reviews are all tools the HLC uses to perform their responsibilities.

The Historic Landmark Commission was created by the City Council as part of the Zoning Code. (Section 21A.06.050). This Code establishes a Historic Landmark Commission of 9 to 15 members with the following purposes, authority and jurisdiction:

B. General Purposes: The purposes of the historic landmark commission are to:

- 1. Preserve buildings and related structures of historic and architectural significance as part of the city's most important cultural, educational and economic assets;*
- 2. Encourage proper development and utilization of lands and areas adjacent to historical areas and to encourage complimentary, contemporary design and construction;*
- 3. Protect and enhance the attraction of the city's historic landmarks for tourists and visitors;*
- 4. Safeguard the heritage of the city by providing for the protection of landmarks representing significant elements of its history;*

5. *Promote the private and public use of landmarks and the historical areas within the H historic preservation overlay district for the education, prosperity and general welfare of the people;*
 6. *Increase public awareness of the value of historic, cultural and architectural preservation; and*
 7. *Recommend design standards pertaining to the protection of H historic preservation overlay districts and landmark sites.*
- C. *Jurisdiction and Authority: In addition to carrying out the general purposes set forth in subsection B of this section, the historic landmark commission shall:*
1. *Conduct surveys of significant historic, architectural, and cultural landmarks and historic districts within the city;*
 2. *Petition the city council to designate identified structures, areas or resources as landmark sites or H historic preservation overlay districts;*
 3. *Review and approve or deny an application for a certificate of appropriateness pursuant to the provisions of chapter 21A.34 of this title;*
 4. *Develop and participate in public education programs to increase public awareness of the value of historic, architectural and cultural preservation;*
 5. *Review and approve or deny applications for the demolition of structures in the H historic preservation overlay district pursuant to chapter 21A.34 of this title;*
 6. *Recommend to the planning commission the boundaries for the establishment of an H historic preservation overlay district and landmark sites;*
 7. *Make recommendations when requested by the planning commission, the board of adjustment or the city council, as appropriate, on applications for zoning amendments, conditional uses and special exceptions involving H historic preservation overlay districts and landmark sites;*
 8. *Make recommendations to the city council concerning the utilization of state, federal or private funds to promote the preservation of landmark sites and H historic preservation overlay districts within the city;*
 9. *Make recommendations to the city council regarding the acquisition of landmark structures or structures eligible for landmark status where preservation is essential to the purposes of section 21A.34.010, "H Historic*

Preservation Overlay District", of this title, and where private preservation is infeasible;

10. Make recommendations to the planning commission in connection with the preparation of the general plan of the city; and

11. Make recommendations to the city council on policies and ordinances that may encourage preservation of buildings and related structures of historic and architectural significance.

4. Will the plan require additional funding?

Some recommendations of the Plan will require additional resources, either direct funding or additional staff. Some funding may be obtained through grants. The City Council may allocate funding as it sets priorities for implementing different goals or actions of the Plan.

The Council chose to add a preservation planner in the FY 2010 budget to build this program. In September, once the Council has reviewed the preservation plan, the Mayor and Council will discuss what their priorities for this new position will be.

5. How does the Plan balance preservation with other goals of the City?

A fundamental goal of this planning effort has been to articulate why preservation is important to Salt Lake City, and balance its purposes and objectives with other important City goals. Throughout the plan, language has been included to suggest how preservation should work alongside and be supportive of City programs and policies. A good example is Theme 5, in which the plan identifies at length how preservation can help support the City's sustainability programs.

The role of this Plan, as one of several resources to help the City reach its goals, is also evident in Theme 1: Foster a Unified City Commitment to Preservation. Within that theme, the Plan calls for goals, plans and policies of the City to be aligned, "eliminating potential conflicts and forging a unified direction. Collaboration extends to community organizations, and business and special interest groups, with which the historic preservation program will enjoy a high degree of trust and communication (p.10)."

6. The Plan states that the current economic hardship process is "convoluted and ineffectual". In what way is this the case?

The Plan recommends changing the Economic Hardship Ordinance but does not provide specifics, as that process requires research, review and public hearings before recommending a Text Amendment to the Planning Commission and City Council.

Changes to this portion of the Ordinance have been researched and discussed by the HLC for the last year. In addition to researching other ordinances across the country, Staff interviewed prior Economic Hardship panelists, held an Open House for public comment and met with staff members of RDA. Following is a summary of the purpose of this portion of the ordinance to address the concerns that came out of the interviews.

Purpose of Economic Hardship provision in Ordinance

The proposed alterations to the ordinance are a response to a 1999 Petition for amendments requested by the Planning Commission, a 2004 Legislative Action, and the 2008 Citygate Study of the Salt Lake City Planning Processes.

The purpose of Economic Hardship is to provide an applicant an opportunity to show that denial of an application for demolition of a structure with local historic designation will result in an economic hardship (taking of all reasonable economic use of the property). All property owners are protected from overly burdensome regulations through the Fifth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution. Economic Hardship provisions provide assurance to property owners that relief is available in situations where the impact of a particular action proves to be especially harsh.

The changes recommended are to assist both the Commission and the applicant to understand the requirements to determine Economic Hardship and to improve the process. The issues were identified through discussions with current and past Commissioners, Economic Hardship Review panelists, and applicants. A much more effective system needs to be established so the property owners and those reviewing applications for demolition know what to expect.

The Preservation Plan's language on this issue will be changed to explain the issues with the current ordinance. The Plan will read, "Comments received during this planning process indicated that the current demolition provisions of the ordinance, including economic hardship process, are seen as convoluted and ineffectual do not state clear processes and provide an applicant with understandable direction. In some cases, this ..."

7. Who was involved with creating the Plan?

The Preservation Plan kicked-off in August of 2007 with the following:

- Discussion with the HLC (that took a few meetings)
- Discussion with Planning Commission. Commissioners received a list of CAC members and stakeholder groups.

- An Open House at Central City Community Center. Advertised through listserv and an advertisement in the *Salt Lake Tribune*
- Community Council Chair Meeting
- Stakeholder Interviews

CAC—Community Advisory Committee

The Community Advisory Committee representatives were “appointed” by each City Councilmember for each City Council district. Additional members included representatives from the City’s preservation partners such as the Utah Heritage Foundation and the State Historic Preservation Office. Three Historic Landmark Commissioners served as liaisons between the CAC and the HLC.

The CAC helped to coordinate the development of the Preservation Plan. The Committee was charged with the responsibility of providing input, identifying issues and recommending policies and actions to address the issues relating to historic preservation in Salt Lake City. In addition, the committee members reviewed drafts of the plan.

The CAC included:

| Name | Representation |
|------------------|--|
| Nelson Knight | CC District 1 |
| Brett Crane | CC District 2 (was not able to participate) |
| Rob Pett | CC District 3 |
| Noreen Heid | Former HLC member from District 4 (replaced Freitas) |
| Bee Lufkin | CC District 5 |
| Lisette Gibson | CC District 6 |
| Elizabeth Giraud | CC District 7 |
| Bob Farrington | Downtown |
| Esther Hunter | HLC |
| Anne Oliver | HLC |
| Warren Lloyd | LEED architect |
| Kirk | UHF |

| Name | Representation |
|-----------------------|---|
| Huffaker | |
| Barbara Murphy | SHPO |
| David Richardson | AIA |
| Ben Logue | Developer |
| Polly Hart | HLC (replaced Hunter) |
| Carla Wiese | Downtown (replaced Farrington) |
| Patrick de Freitas | CC District 4 (was not able to participate) |

Stakeholders

A Stakeholder group was a group of no more than five individuals with specific perspectives relating to historic preservation. (Please see attached “Stakeholder Interview Summary.”) They met with the consultants for “round table” discussions relating to their perspectives on the overall goals of the project and received input on relevant issues. These groups discussed their impressions of the strengths and weaknesses of the current ordinances, existing policies and their general expectations of the planning effort. The stakeholder groups included the following:

- City Council members/ Planning Commissioners
- Architects
- Past Economic Review Panel Members
- Realtors
- City Staff (outside of Planning)
- Citizens
- Developers

Public Outreach

In addition to the guidance of the CAC, the public was encouraged to participate in the development of the Plan.

Summary of Outreach for Preservation Plan

City Council/ Planning Commission Meetings

4 Public Workshops/Presentations (not including public hearings and meetings)

Additional Presentations

10/23/07 Initial meeting with Community Council Chairs
2/12/08 Utah Heritage Foundation Board
2/9/08 Liberty Wells Community Council
8/19/08 Downtown Alliance
9/17/08 Two public workshops (noon and after work)
2/18/09 Public Workshop of complete draft
5/6/09 Central City Community Council

Flier and/or Posters distributed to or at:

Utah Heritage Foundation
Chamber of Commerce
State Historic Preservation Office
Planning Division offices
Fisher Mansion Open House
Downtown Alliance
Avenues 2008 Street Fair
9th & 9th 2008 Street Fair
2008 Capitol Discovery Days

Television

PSA- City Cable Channel 17

Letters/Newsletters

Letters from the Mayor to his mailing list
Historic Landmark Commission print newsletters
Planning Division enewsletter
Article sent to all Community Councils to use in their newsletter or listserv, as they wished—not all agreed to forward the article
Utilities bill insert article

Listservs

Planning Division Listserv
Listserv created by respondents to online questionnaire
Vest Pocket Business Coalition listserv
Utah Heritage Foundation

Meetings/Interviews

Stakeholder interviews
Multiple meetings with RDA staff

One-on-one meetings with City Council members

Press

Press releases were sent regularly
August ad in *Salt Lake Tribune*
4/22/09 Article in *City Weekly*
KCPW Interview

Website

All drafts and presentations are posted on the Planning Division's website
There is a direct link for the Plan off the city's main page
Website included an online questionnaire and an area to submit direct comments

8. Would like to see a 6th theme: "To work side-by-side with preservation and development and business economy of the city."

The themes for the Plan were developed based on stakeholder interviews and the input of the CAC.

Although not its own theme, Staff believes that the sentiment of the suggested theme is covered in the theme "Foster a Unified City Commitment to Preservation". Within this chapter (theme) the Plan covers "Citywide Planning, Interdepartment Coordination; and A Shared Understanding of Preservation Benefits" (p. 13). For example, Action 1.2b.2 calls for "Coordination with Economic Development." Action 1.3c.1 suggests an economic study of historic preservation.

The importance of the economic health and growth of the City is woven throughout the Plan. For instance, the Plan calls for the development of a heritage tourism strategy (5.3a.1). Studies show that heritage tourists spend more money and stay longer than other types of tourists. Studies also show that local districts, which the Plan supports, maintain and in most cases, increase property values which in turn stabilize or increase City revenues while improving investments made by property owners.

It is the intent of the Preservation Plan and HLC to work together with the development and business communities to enhance our City while maintaining its character-defining features and neighborhoods.

9. How does this plan fit into any state or county policies already in place?

The Plan relates to State policy in that State enabling legislation allows for historic zoning overlays and the development of historic landmark commissions to steward the ordinance. (The county policies do not apply within cities). Our policies and regulations are adopted by the City Council.

At the same time, both the State Preservation Office and the Salt Lake City Historic Landmarks Commission follow the Secretary of Interior Standards for Historic Preservation which are used as a foundation for all historic preservation programs across the country.

10. How will the Master Plans be updated to incorporate the Preservation Plan?

The Plan does not specify when Master Plans should be updated or how. The Planning Commission and City Council will determine, based on staff and funding resources in addition to other factors, when Master Plans will be updated as well as the extent of the updates. It is the intent of the Planning Division to ensure a planner with historic preservation background is a member of each of our planning teams when we develop new or updates existing plans so that historic preservation opportunities are reviewed along side other planning issues.

11. The plan needs definitions for terms such as “contributing” and “historic preservation”.

Definitions from the ordinance, as well as additional definitions that help the reader to understand the text, have been added to the plan as an additional appendix to provide clarity. (Please see revised Plan.)

12. The new construction requirements only address an example of height. Need more examples.

A second example provided in the Preservation Plan is allowable materials. Beyond those two examples, no other specifics are provided in the plan. The intent is to convene a separate process at some point in the future in which users of the Design Guidelines and other stakeholders can identify other specific issues that may need to be addressed for new construction. The language in the preservation plan is kept general to keep from influencing or constraining that subsequent effort in any way.

13. There were several comments about the Architectural Review Committee (ARC) and how it works. There was concern that the ARC should not have the authority to direct applicants.

The ARC has changed over the years to address changing needs of the Commission. Originally, the ARC was mainly included Commissioners who were architects by profession and who could provide specific technical suggestions on how an applicant could meet their needs while still meeting the historic district regulations. The ARC did not have approval

authority, but was used by the full HLC and Planning Staff to give technical construction advise to assist applicants. The ARC met on a regular basis, two times a month. Currently, the ARC meets on an as-needed basis at either the request of the applicant or the Historic Landmark Commission. The ARC was created as an additional resource for the applicant, and has lessened the frustration of many. At this time, it is not mandatory or part of a formal process. As a part of updating the Historic Overlay Ordinance, the HLC will be reviewing this committee and defining its role. The ordinance will, at a minimum, provide clarity on the ARC's purpose, when they meet and what expertise members of the committee should have.

14. Examples of additional financial incentives would be helpful.

An extensive list of financial incentives available to support historic preservation is provided in Appendix C, *Potential Funding Sources for Historic Preservation*. In addition, a sidebar has been added to action 2.8 which states:

This plan proposes a wide range of possible financial incentives for preservation, including new programs such as transfer of development rights, and a variety of tax credits, loans, and grant programs in Appendix C: Potential Funding Sources for Historic Preservation. Other incentives the city might propose in the future include:

- Density bonuses
- Tax waivers or deferrals
- Waiver or postponement of permit fees
- Relief from zoning or building code requirements

15. RDA's letter states that the language suggests that preservation should be the first priority of the City.

The letter from RDA, as well as all other public comments included in the staff report, were based on earlier drafts of the Plan. The current Plan has been updated to address these concerns. (Please see memo from Clarion and Associates outlining the changes made.)

16. It is critical to inform people about designation before a property changes hands.

Historic Overlays are not about imposing rules, but about a community working together to preserve their history which are reflected in the character-defining features of our historic structures. For that reason, property owner buy-in on the benefits and requirements of a historic overlay is essential. Any action that can be taken to inform potential property owners about historic overlays and remind current owners about incentives results in a stronger program. The Plan recognizes the importance of education and provides multiple recommendations.

Currently, local historic designation is on property deeds. Staff is also working on changing the state disclosure forms to include historic districts. In addition, education of the general public about what local historic designation means and how it differs from the National Register of Historic Places will help. Currently, the Historic Landmark Commission hopes to accomplish this with an updated website and with an informational video on SLC-TV. The HLC will implement other educational tools as recommended in the Plan once resources allow.

17. Not all parks should be designated.

The Historic Overlay provides standards for designating property with the intent to preserve those resources which are important to our history and not just every old building or landscape. In keeping with this concept, the Plan does *not* recommend designation of *all* parks but instead, those historic parks that meet the standards of the Historic Overlay Ordinance for a Landmark Site or a contributing site in a historic district. Designation would allow parks to grow and change to meet modern needs but guide that change in a way that maintains the landscape's important historic features.

18. How will regulation of historic landscapes work?

The Plan recommends preserving historic landscapes and education about historic landscapes. Action 5.5c.2 states, "Determine appropriate preservation for historic landscape features." The description of this action calls for the *elimination* or *streamlining* of preserving landscape features such as streets and sidewalks. It also recommends a tiered process based on the level of significance of the resource. It does not recommend stricter guidelines than what are already in place.

In terms of individual yards, the Plan recommends education for property owners, not additional regulation.

19. How will the downtown be preserved? The Plan should state which properties will be designated.

The Plan identifies multiple areas of potential designation and recommends that the HLC review and prioritize these areas.

Designation itself is a public process different from the adoption process for this Plan. Once areas are identified, a series of public meetings should be held with affected property owners and the general public to determine if there is interest in the benefits of designation before moving forward.

20. Will new buildings be historic in the future?

In the early years of historic preservation, only the homes of our country's white leaders were considered worthy of preservation. Now we recognize that our country includes multiple stories that are told through sites such as worker's housing, Native American landscapes and roadside attractions. It is to be assumed that our idea of what is historic will continue to evolve and change over time. What buildings will be historic in the future can only be determined by future generations based on the standards and best practices then in place.

21. Does the city plan to annex additional property for the purpose of preservation?

Not to our knowledge, nor is it a recommendation of the Preservation Plan.

22. What actions are being taken to preserve the ridgelines above City Creek, Red Butte Canyon and Parley's Canyon?

Historic preservation is about preserving the built environment, such as buildings, planned landscapes, and public art and monuments. Conservation of natural resources is not an historic preservation issue. An example of where the two issues may cross, would be the preservation of Ensign Peak which has historic significance in the development of Salt Lake City but which may also be considered by some as a 'natural resource.' From an historic preservation standpoint, a trail is part of a "built environment." Ensign Peak is a Landmark Site.

23. If a new planner is hired they should have an urban design background, rather than be an architect or planner.

The role of a new preservation planner, will be determined by the Mayor's Office and the City Council. The experience required of this position will be based on the job description for that position.

24. A tiered review processes was recommended.

With a review process, it is important for an applicant to understand all steps of the process so that they know what to expect. A clear process also helps to ensure that every applicant is treated equally. So long as procedures are clear and administered consistently, a tiered review process can lead generally to greater efficiencies, as the bulk of the city's resources are directed toward those projects that are larger, more complex, or potentially controversial. The city is already using a tiered review process by allowing many minor projects to be reviewed administratively, while requiring major projects to be publically noticed and

decided by the HLC. Any future revisions to the review procedures for historic resources should be undertaken only after a thorough review of the ordinance.

25. Need supportive data on the following two topics:

Pg. 19 preservation increases property value

A variety of resources are available that document the positive effect of local historic designation on property values. This project's consultant, Clarion Associates, produced a report that analyzed that issue, among others, for the State of Colorado in 2004; a copy will be provided to the Planning Commissioners upon request. That project found that property values in locally designated historic districts in Denver, Durango, and Fort Collins rose at either the same rate or higher rates than in similar, undesignated areas. Examples of other similar studies are available on the web; for example, the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation includes links to several studies at: <http://www.achp.gov/economic-propertyvalues.html>.

Pg. 24 step down strategy from higher density to lower density.

Many communities have adopted zoning regulations that require building heights to gradually "step down" from higher-density areas, such as around transit stations, to lower-density areas, such as residential neighborhoods. This type of architectural transition generally is intended to help blend old areas with new infill development, while still allowing the higher densities that often are encouraged with new infill projects. A few examples of this concept are as follows:

Arlington County, VA

Development is required to taper down with increased distance from the transit station. The highest densities and building heights are located near the transit stations, with development required to step down as it gets closer to the surrounding, existing single-family residential neighborhoods.

Washington DC

The *NoMA Vision Plan and Development Strategy* directs that within the East NoMA area "the scale is larger near the tracks and H Street and tapers-down towards the existing neighborhood fabric." This plan hopes to provide a transition between older historic buildings and new buildings. This plan also requires that height limits step down for new PUDs and zoning changes as they encroach existing rowhouse development and may step up closer to the railroad tracks.

http://www.planning.dc.gov/planning/lib/planning/Section_5_Part_2-Character_Area_Development_Guidelines_2.pdf

Chesapeake, VA

The *Design Guideline Manual for the Suburban Overlay District* controls building massing through a few different requirements, one of which is to “step down to the street/step back from the build-to line with increasing heights.” These requirements are designed to respect the scale and context of the surroundings by making building massing “compatible with the size, height, and shape of existing adjacent buildings as seen from the street and public areas and safeguard the provision of light, air, and views at street level.” These provisions ensure that there is a transition in building height that minimizes the impacts that taller buildings can have on near by lower buildings, streets, and open space.

<http://www.chesapeake.va.us/services/depart/planning/pdf/design-guidelines/Chapter-III.pdf>

Glendale, CA

The *Glendale Design Guidelines for Residential Buildings in Adopted Historic Districts* requires larger buildings to step down in height as they get closer to smaller buildings. This provision is intended to ensure that new construction “respects the rhythm of massing and setbacks within a historic district.” However, buildings are allowed to be taller in the back than they are in the front because they will still appear to be in scale with adjacent buildings.

http://www.ci.glendale.ca.us/planning/pdf_files/HistoricDistrictsDesignGuidelines/council%20draft%20HDDG/22_Infill.pdf

Portland, OR

The *Portland Streetcar System Plan* calls for a transition from the mixed use district to single family residential uses in order to respect the existing character and scale of the single family residences. One requirement is to use step-downs to reduce the massing of the building. Providing a sufficient transition in height from taller buildings to shorter building also is intended to ensure sufficient solar exposure.

<http://www.portlandonline.com/TRANSPORTATION/index.cfm?a=225462&c=461>

38

26. The plan should reference the historic street pattern, specifically small secondary streets and alleys. We have a lot of pressure to vacate alleys and we are compromising that character of our community.

Because the historic street patterns vary by neighborhood, it would be valuable for the community master plans to include information on local historic street patterns that are worthy of protection. The preservation plan calls for the master plans to be amended over time to address preservation-related issues; historic street patterns is a good example of such an issue.

27. The Plan is too general. For instance, what is Demolition by Neglect?

The Plan is a recommended outline for historic preservation in Salt Lake City, but does not provide specific details on suggested projects such as “Demolition by Neglect” nor does it list properties that will be designated in the future, because these types of actions require their own processes. For instance, Demolition by Neglect, is the destruction of a building through abandonment or lack of maintenance. Whether or not it is a useful tool for Salt Lake City, and if so, how it would be more specifically defined, stewarded and enforced will require careful research, discussions among different City departments and agencies, review of state law and multiple public meetings and hearings.

28. The Plan needs to state that sometimes a historic structure must be torn down to plan for more housing and business needs for the city and its future growing population.

There is nothing in the Plan that states that ALL old or historic buildings should be retained. The fact that there are standards that must be met before a building can be protected by the Certificate of Appropriateness process shows that there is a difference between old buildings and those that are historically important to the community. In addition, current language of the ordinance concedes that a property that is in poor condition may no longer have historic integrity and therefore is not required to be preserved.

Reuse of existing buildings, whether or not they are historic, is a good policy since this is the ultimate in recycling. In a recent speech, Richard Moe, President of the National Trust, provided the following example: Buildings are vast repositories of energy. It takes energy to manufacture or extract building materials, more energy to transport them to a construction site, still more energy to assemble them into a building. All of that energy is embodied in the finished structure – and if the structure is demolished and landfilled, the energy locked up in it is totally wasted. What's more, the process of demolition itself uses more energy – and, of course, the construction of a new building in its place uses more yet.

Let me give you some numbers that will translate that concept into reality.

- According to a formula produced for the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, about 80 billion BTUs of energy are embodied in a typical 50,000-square-foot commercial building. That's the equivalent of 640,000 gallons of gasoline. If you tear the building down, all of that embodied energy is wasted.
- What's more, demolishing that same 50,000-square-foot building would create nearly 4,000 tons of waste. That's enough debris to fill 26 railroad boxcars – a train nearly a quarter of a mile long, headed for a landfill that is already almost full.
- Once the old building is gone, putting up a new one in its place takes more energy, of course, and it also uses more natural resources and releases new pollutants and greenhouse gases into our environment. It is estimated that constructing a 50,000-square-foot

commercial building releases about the same amount of carbon into the atmosphere as driving a car 2.8 million miles.

- One more point: You might think that all the energy used in demolishing an older building and replacing it is offset by the increased energy efficiency of the new building – but that's simply not true. Recent research indicates that even if 40% of the materials are recycled, it takes approximately 65 years for a green, energy-efficient new office building to recover the energy lost in demolishing an existing building. And let's face it: Most new buildings aren't designed to last anywhere near 65 years.

A report from the Brookings Institution projects that by 2030 we will have demolished and replaced nearly 1/3 of all existing buildings, largely because the vast majority of them weren't designed and built to last any longer. How much energy will it take to demolish and replace those buildings? Enough to power the entire state of California for 10 years. A specific example is the San Francisco City Hall constructed in 1915. City Hall has approximately 500,000 square feet of space, enclosed and decorated with a lot of stone and bricks and iron and wood. When you consider the amount of energy it took to extract or manufacture all those materials, then transport them to the site and put them all together, the total embodied energy in that building is the equivalent of 7 million gallons of gasoline. If we assume the average vehicle gets about 22 miles to the gallon, that means there's enough embodied energy in the San Francisco City Hall to drive a car about 150 million miles. All of that energy would be wasted if the building were to be demolished and landfilled. What's more, the demolition itself would require the equivalent of thousands of gallons of gas – and would create thousands of tons of waste.

It all comes down to this simple fact: We can't build our way out of the global warming crisis. We have to conserve our way out. That means we have to make better, wiser use of what we've already built.

Anthropologist Ashley Montague has said that the secret to staying young is to die young – but the trick is to do it as late as possible. All over the United States, people are showing that old buildings put to new uses can stay young to a ripe old age. If that's not sustainability, I don't know what else to call it.

Still, too many people just don't see the connection. They don't yet understand that preservation must be an integral part of any effort to encourage environmental responsibility and sustainable development. They don't yet realize that our buildings are renewable – not disposable – resources.

The UN report that I quoted a bit earlier, for instance, doesn't stress the importance of reusing the buildings we have. Similarly, most recent efforts by the green community place heavy emphasis on new technologies rather than on tried-and-true preservation practices that focus on reusing existing buildings. The most popular green-building rating system, the Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design, or LEED program developed by the U. S. Green Building Council, was designed principally for new construction – an emphasis that is completely wrong-headed.

All available statistics tell us clearly that buildings are the problem – but incredibly, we propose to solve the problem by constructing more and more new buildings while ignoring the ones we already have. No matter how much green technology is employed in its design and construction, any new building represents a new impact on the environment. The bottom line is that the greenest building is one that already exists.

It's often alleged that historic buildings are energy hogs – but in fact, some older buildings are as energy-efficient as many recently-built ones. Data from the U.S. Energy Information Agency suggests that buildings constructed before 1920 are actually more energy-efficient than buildings built at any time afterwards – except for those built after 2000. Furthermore, in 1999, the General Services Administration (GSA) examined its buildings inventory and found that utility costs for historic buildings were 27% less than for more modern buildings.

It's not hard to figure out why. Many historic buildings have thick, solid walls, resulting in greater thermal mass and reducing the amount of energy needed for heating and cooling. Buildings designed before the widespread use of electricity feature transoms, high ceilings, and large windows for natural light and ventilation, as well as shaded porches and other features to reduce solar gain. Architects and builders paid close attention to siting and landscaping as tools for maximizing sun exposure during the winter months and minimizing it during warmer months.

Unlike their more recent counterparts that celebrate the concept of planned obsolescence, most historic and many other older buildings were built to last. Their durability gives them almost unlimited "renewability" – a fact that underscores the folly of wasting them instead of recognizing them as valuable, sustainable assets.


I'm not suggesting that all historic buildings are perfect models of efficient energy use – but, contrary to what many people believe, older buildings can "go green." The marketplace now offers a wide range of products that can help make older buildings even more energy-efficient without compromising the historic character that makes them unique and appealing. And there's a large and growing number of rehab/reuse projects that offer good models of sustainable design and construction – including several here in the Bay Area. At the Presidio in San Francisco, for instance, the former Letterman Hospital complex now houses the Thoreau Center for Sustainability. Even though the conversion was completed before LEED certification standards were developed, it has become a model for sustainable design in preservation – not only in California but also around the world.

Attachments:

Summary of Preservation Plan

Clarion Memo: Summary of Plan Edits Related to RDA Comments

Salt Lake City Historic Preservation Plan Project Summary



WHY DEVELOP A HISTORIC PRESERVATION PLAN?

- To comprehensively address historic preservation issues throughout Salt Lake City;
- To protect the past while preparing for redevelopment and infill as the City grows;
- To acknowledge the many preservation successes achieved in the past, and to strengthen current preservation efforts; and
- To inform an array of City policy decisions and guide preservation activity into the future.

WHO WAS INVOLVED?

- The public - through workshops, an open house, the City's website, interviews, surveys, presentations, a public service announcement, and informational posters.
- Citizen Advisory Committee - made up of 17 citizens with diverse backgrounds.
- Historic Landmark Commission.
- Salt Lake City Planning staff of the Planning Division.



WHAT DOES THE PLAN SAY?

- The plan is organized around an overall Vision Statement, which is made up of five themes. Each of the five themes is described below.
- An implementation plan identifies specific actions that should be undertaken to achieve the City's preservation goals. The plan prioritizes each action and identifies responsible parties. Below, this project summary identifies the first-year implementation priorities for each of the five themes.

FOSTER A UNIFIED CITY COMMITMENT TO PRESERVATION

Historic preservation issues arise every day in the actions and decisions of a variety of City officials and agencies – from land use planning for older neighborhoods, to street and sidewalk improvements in historic districts, to transit planning along historic commercial corridors. Implementation of this plan will be achieved through many types of activities, including planning, regulations, funding, and other day-to-day decisions across the whole City government. Through aligning the City's goals, plans, and policies, a unified direction for historic preservation may be recognized. First-year implementation priorities include:

- Develop a list of preservation-related issues for Community Master Plans to address, if applicable;
- Establish a City Coordination Committee to help monitor plan implementation across departments;
- Educate City leaders and other departments on the benefits of historic preservation; and
- Assign staff planning teams to represent geographic planning areas.

DEVELOP A COMPREHENSIVE PRESERVATION TOOLBOX

This theme discusses opportunities to fine-tune and broaden the City's preservation toolbox in three important categories: the survey of historic properties, the historic designation process, and the land-use regulations that apply to development of designated historic properties. Sample first-year implementation priorities include:

- Establish criteria to determine where future historic survey work is needed;
- Pursue local historic designation for eligible City-owned properties;
- Assess underlying zoning to see where it may be inconsistent with preservation objectives, and pursue zoning map amendments if necessary;
- Assess building code barriers and conflicts that work against historic preservation;
- Prepare targeted ordinance revisions to improve the economic hardship and demolition process;
- Draft and adopt new standards to prohibit demolition of historic resources by neglect; and
- Update and clarify requirements for new construction in historic districts to be sure the original intent is achieved.



ADMINISTER A CONVENIENT AND CONSISTENT HISTORIC PRESERVATION PROGRAM

Clear and efficient administrative procedures, convenient resources available to the public, and consistent information on and application of the rules are crucial components to a successful historic preservation program. First-year implementation priorities for this theme include:

- Improve training for new Historic Landmark Commission (HLC) members on the City's preservation goals and the various tools available; and
- Establish an architectural review committee to provide informal, non-binding design feedback on specific projects.

IMPROVE EDUCATION AND OUTREACH

Conveying the message that historic preservation is valued in Salt Lake City is vital to the continuing success of future preservation efforts. This theme discusses ways to create and strengthen educational materials on historic preservation in order to help increase community pride and awareness of the City's history for residents and visitors. First-year implementation priorities include:

- Expand the City's website to include sections devoted to historic preservation;
- Reinstate the City's awards program to highlight preservation project successes for the prior year; and
- Modify the review procedures for City Housing and Small Business loans to include historic planning staff or Commission project review when a historic property is involved.

SUPPORT A SUSTAINABLE CITY

Historic preservation can be a cornerstone of the City's efforts to promote sustainable development. This section of the plan illustrates how preservation can support not just environmental sustainability, but also economic, social, and cultural sustainability. First-year implementation priorities include:

- Appoint a staff green building liaison;
- Enable broader use of solar collectors and alternative energy equipment on historic properties ;
- Preserve eligible historic parks as landmark sites;
- Ensure zoning allows residential reuses of nonresidential historic structures;
- Support appropriate residential additions in historic districts to meet a wide range of housing needs; and
- Draft rules to allow accessory dwelling units in historic districts, following neighborhood approval and subject to clear standards that protect neighborhood character.

For additional information, questions, or comments
please contact:

Robin Zeigler, Senior Historic Preservation Planner
801-535-7758
Robin.Zeigler@slcgov.com

C L A R I O N

Clarion Associates
621 17th Street, Suite 2250
Denver, CO 80293
303.830.2890 phone
303.860.1809 fax

Memorandum

To: Robin Ziegler, Salt Lake City Planning
From: Matt Goebel, Clarion Associates
Date: June 29, 2009
RE: Draft Historic Preservation Plan – Summary of Plan Edits Related to RDA Comments

Per your request, the following summarizes comments on the draft Salt Lake City Historic Preservation Plan received from the Redevelopment Agency of Salt Lake City in their memo of February 25, 2009, and relevant edits that have been made to the draft plan.

- **Theme**

- *RDA comments:* Generally, RDA's memo noted that the agency believes that too much emphasis is placed in the plan on preservation at the expense of other city goals/policies. "The language...seems to suggest that preservation is the preeminent goal of the City, rather than one of many important objectives." The memo argues that the plan language calls for all other city goals to be subordinated to preservation.
- *How Addressed in June 2009 Draft Plan:* In our view, it was never the city's intent to use this plan to assert a preeminent role for preservation over other city interests. The HLC, citizen advisory committee, and numerous other stakeholders that participated in the planning process instead simply wanted the plan to make the case that preservation should have "a seat at the table" in future policy-making decisions.

The February 25 RDA memo was prepared in response to an earlier version of the draft plan, dated February 2009. Since that time, several relevant edits have been made to various sections of the plan to soften any implication that historic preservation takes precedence over other city goals.

- Beginning with the March 2009 draft, Goal 1.1 was changed from: "Ensure all city plans and policies are compatible with the Historic Preservation Plan" to "Ensure consistency between the Historic Preservation Plan and all other adopted city plans." The earlier language did indeed imply that the preservation plan should be the foundation for determining consistency; the language has been softened to merely state that all plans should be consistent.
- Beginning with the March 2009 draft, Policy 1.1b was changed from: "Update other adopted city plans to ensure consistency with the goals and policies of the Historic Preservation Plan" to "Update other adopted city plans to ensure compatibility with the goals and policies of the Historic Preservation Plan." The change is intended to make this language less rigorous, and not require strict uniformity between the various adopted plans.
- Beginning with the March 2009 draft, Goal 1.2 was changed from: "Ensure all city plans and policies are consistent with the adopted Historic Preservation Plan" to "Ensure consistency between the Historic Preservation Plan and all city policies." As with Goal

1.1, the change here was intended to remove the implication that the preservation plan should be the foundation for determining consistency.

- The old Policy 1.1 a from the February 2009 draft was relocated to be the new Policy 1.2a. That policy states: "At all levels of city government, make decisions on historic resources and preservation that are in accordance with the Historic Preservation Plan." The language in this policy is directly relevant to the point made by RDA. When conflicts arise between the preservation plan and other adopted city plans, the policy explicitly calls for the city to "attempt to balance conflicting goals, giving due consideration to the historic preservation goals and policies expressed in this plan, *in addition to other city objectives* [emphasis added]. While all decisions will continue to be made by city officials on a case-by-case basis, factors affecting historic resources (e.g., the potential loss of irreplaceable resources) will be considered."

The RDA memo notes that this is clearly an interest of semantics; additional text edits may be necessary to further clarify the city's intent.

- **Demolition**

- *RDA comments:*

- Proposed revisions to economic hardship process (separate from this plan) disproportionately favor preservation.
 - In several places, the plan's language regarding the current demolition process is too negative.

- *How Addressed in June 2009 Draft Plan:*

- The revisions to the economic hardship process are not addressed in detail in the preservation plan. They are being reviewed and acted upon through a separate process.
 - In terms of the language in the preservation plan itself being too negative, the language has been changed in at least two instances beginning with the June 2009 draft to address this concern:
 - Under "Objectives of this Plan," under the subsection "Address Concerns with the Demolition Provisions of the Ordinance," the first sentence has been changed to read: "Current demolition provisions of the historic overlay ordinance, including the economic hardship process, are seen as not providing applicants with clear and understandable direction." This replaces the earlier version that had drawn criticism from RDA and others: "Current demolition provisions of the historic overlay ordinance, including the economic hardship process, are seen as convoluted and ineffectual." (page 9 of June 2009 draft)
 - Under Action 2.7.a.1, "Assess Underlying Zoning," the fourth sentence has been changed to: "Comments received during this planning process indicated that the current demolition and economic hardship provisions of the ordinance do not state clear processes and provide an applicant with understandable direction." The "convoluted and ineffectual" language from the prior versions has been removed. (page 47 of June 2009 draft)

- **Preserving New Buildings**

- *RDA comments:* The RDA supports a fixed threshold for determining historic eligibility; the agency objects to the plan's calls for preserving resources from the recent past.
 - *How Addressed in June 2009 Draft Plan:* This comment has not been addressed in the draft plan. The HLC and citizen advisory committee members felt strongly that the plan should

acknowledge the occasional need to protect resources that are less than 50 years old, if appropriate based on exceptional historic and/or architectural significance. This issue is addressed primarily in the text box on page 45 of the June 2009 draft. The plan does not call for all new buildings to be protected. The plan recognizes that the 50-year mark continues to be the traditional threshold for determining historic significance, but calls for the city to retain the flexibility to recognize important resources that are less than 50 years old if merited. Any potential landmark designation would require approval by the City Council.

- **Committee Membership**

- *RDA comments:* The RDA does not support the plan's proposal for joint membership between the HLC and the Redevelopment Advisory Committee, since such joint membership would violate city policy regarding board membership.
- *How Addressed in June 2009 Draft Plan:* Beginning with the March 2009 draft plan, the recommendation for joint membership was deleted.

- **Conservation Districts**

- *RDA comments:* RDA does not oppose the objective behind conservation districts, but believes more prescriptive zoning regulations are a better approach for protecting neighborhood character. The RDA memo expresses concern about the conservation district approach pitting one group of neighborhood residents against another.
- *How Addressed in June 2009 Draft Plan:* The conservation district concept has many strong advocates and has been discussed extensively at stakeholder meetings regarding the preservation plan. Many neighborhood advocates admit that the conservation district approach may essentially be a "band-aid" to address perceived deficiencies with the underlying zoning rules, and acknowledge that clearer citywide design standards might be a more straightforward solution. However, neighborhood leaders also see the conservation district tool as the only short-term option to prevent what they see as inappropriate tear-downs and additions. They express continuing dissatisfaction with the city's infill compatibility ordinance (both the time involved in developing the approach, and the ultimate standards).

- **Project and Loan Review**

- *RDA comments:* RDA staff supports the plan's call for preservation staff to participate in the review of new projects in historic districts.
- *How Addressed in June 2009 Draft Plan:* No edits necessary.

- **Architectural Review Committee**

- *RDA comments:* The RDA expresses concern that, unless the proposed Architectural Review Committee is able to provide a firm commitment that the full HLC will approve the proposal, then the ARC simply adds another level of uncertainty to the development process, which will discourage investment in Salt Lake City.
- *How Addressed in June 2009 Draft Plan:* No edits have been made to this plan thus far on this issue.

Stakeholder Interview Summary

Local Preservation in Brief

Revised Plan

SALT LAKE CITY HISTORIC PRESERVATION PLAN

Interview Summary – *Organized By Interview Group*

August 22-23, 2007; December 4-5, 2007

INTRODUCTION

Salt Lake City kicked off the project to develop a historic preservation plan with a series of interviews and meetings on August 22-23, 2007, and also on December 4-5, 2007. The project consultants informally met with small groups of stakeholders for interviews about various aspects of the city's existing historic preservation program. Each interview session began with a brief overview of the plan objectives as defined by the city and the steps through which the plan will be developed in the coming year. Interviewees included members of the following groups and departments:

- City Council,
- Planning Commission,
- Historic Landmark Commission,
- SLC Redevelopment Agency (RDA),
- SLC Housing and Neighborhood Development,
- SLC Public Services Division,
- SLC Planning and Zoning Division,
- Developers,
- Architects,
- Realtors, and
- Other citizens.

Interviewees were asked to comment on preservation issues in any of three general areas:

- Planning and Outreach,
- Historic Resource Inventories and Surveys, and
- Regulations and Incentives.

The following pages summarize the cumulative feedback received during these interviews. **All comments are from the interviewees themselves and do not necessarily reflect the opinions of the city or the consulting team.** Along with the results of public surveys and the consulting team's review of various background materials, this feedback will be used to inform the development of the draft plan vision and goals.

Please note that a separate document has been prepared that organizes all interview notes by theme.



CITY COUNCIL AND PLANNING COMMISSION MEMBERS

- There are many potential conflicts between city goals related to housing, transit-oriented development, and historic preservation. Currently, no one is situated to resolve conflicts between these groups.
- Preservation can play a role in creating healthy communities.
- Sometimes the HLC acts on projects without the benefit of understanding city's policies in other areas.
- "Preservation" sometimes is used as a straw-man to stop growth. The city must allow growth to occur, but needs better tools to evaluate what types of growth are appropriate. (In particular, what type of modern development can occur that is consistent with historic character?)
- Guidelines should allow modern development to occur that is consistent with historic character.
- Need to see HLC prioritize battles so Planning Commission and City Council know when it's meaningful. Right now HLC seems to react uniformly to all.
- The development community is reactionary to historic preservation because it is such an onerous process. There is a lack of predictability about getting through the process.
- HLC sometimes is seen as too narrowly focused. They need to focus on the big picture, not just micro-manage the details.
- We also need policy tools to guide appropriate development outside of historic districts. The city needs policy direction in changing areas.
- The city should not empower lots of small design review boards.
- Need to develop city-wide policy guidance for preservation, and then bring the master plans into alignment with the city-wide policies. Now, there are conflicts between master plans and historic preservation.
 - Example: The Marmalade project was zoned according to the applicable master plan to provide a high-density commercial node for the surrounding area, but then ran into preservation-related conflicts because the site involved three contributing historic structures -- despite the fact that many had degraded in quality since the area was surveyed and would no longer be counted as contributing. The HLC felt "backed into a corner" because they didn't have any good options or tools to review the status of those buildings apart from the rigid historic district standards.
- Development pressure is especially prominent at the edges of districts. Should there be varying standards within districts (e.g., along an arterial or TOD corridor versus inside local streets)? Need a policy for these transitional zones at the edges.
- Restrictions on home expansion are gradually driving families out of the city. This is impacting the neighborhood composition and city school enrollment numbers.
- Need to provide a range of housing types in urban neighborhoods so that there are options for a range of household sizes, including singles, couples, and families. Address the need for affordable single-family housing in the city so people don't have to move to the suburbs to buy a home. Designating all neighborhoods as "historic" once they reach 50 years old could lead to unnecessary inflation in housing prices.
- HLC trumps the compatible infill regulations in historic districts, and so the HLC acts like a compatible infill body, yet has no policy to guide their decisions. Need clearly defined criteria for compatibility. The review bodies need guidance on what they are considering in the decision. This could also help shorten the timeframe.
- Other areas that should be looked at for possible historic resources? Rose Park, Fairpark, Poplar Grove.
- Good case study: Pugsley North. The RDA worked in partnership with other agencies *on land assemblage and did compatible remodel and infill work. Enabled new development while protecting historic resources.



- There is a lot of development pressure in certain "hot spot" areas (e.g., West College, Harvard-Yale) and, more generally, along the edges of existing historic districts. This plan needs to address how to manage that pressure and develop recommendations for treatment of these "transitional zones."
- Some locations are likely to experience increased development pressure. Which areas may be appropriate to transition to more intensive use over time as part of the city's "big picture?" In the absence of a Comprehensive Plan, what processes and tools are the city and neighborhoods using to determine appropriate future land uses?
- Need an interim pathway between nothing and local standards that are tailored to character preservation.
-
- Infill ordinance is a "dismal failure." Too arbitrary (especially height rules).
- Need more help thinking through where preservation should be focused.
- City needs to decide if we want flexibility in what we preserve, or go for comfort and clear rules but no flexibility. Or, can flat, objective standards work together with some sort of alternative compliance?
- Need design review that allows creative design.
- Need broader set of tools to protect neighborhood character (e.g., conservation districts). Especially need design tools outside of historic districts. Citizen group pushed for conservation districts 15 years ago in Salt Lake City, but didn't succeed.
- Planned development often is used for infill projects. Allows huge room for negotiation.
- High frustration with lack of planning staff leadership.
- This plan should help identify appropriate levels of protection for various areas.
- There is lots of interest in this project.

ARCHITECTS

- Need updated surveys to bridge the gap between compatible infill and historic preservation and to eliminate the "surprise" element from development projects.
- Boundaries and edges are in need of particular attention and evaluation in survey work.
- Current historic preservation process is very cumbersome – it can take 2+ years to get through.
- Potential thematic nominations for the city include: churches, triple-decker apartments (survey work done), and could expand inventory of historic warehouses.
- New surveys and national district designation is needed for Harvard-Yale, Federal Heights, and citywide thematic survey work.
- Slippery slope of what counts for stronger protection – what is old and good and what is just old?
- Big question is how to merge the old and new? There is some compatibility via the design guidelines; how do we balance controls with incentives (need more incentives)?
- HLC vary their interpretation of rules from project to project and Commission to Commission.
- HLC decisions seem to respond more or less favorably based on who is making the presentation rather than what is being presented.
- The compatible infill process is currently such that the HLC is the more flexible alternative in historic districts where the programs overlap.
- Design guidelines do work but have the bad side effect of eliminating more creative or progressive development. Should have some voluntary provisions that people can use to earn more creative license. Need to inject some creative latitude into the historic process and have clear goals and priorities for how projects are evaluated.
- The financial hardship process is not working – you can pay someone to work the numbers to show hardship in every case.
- The 5% rule for seismic upgrades is contributing to demolitions.
- The sign ordinance conflicts with historic signs.



- Need design guidelines for public/institutional and commercial buildings. (Example: No standards to guide whether Trolley Square could have been sandblasted).
- Sugarhouse – there is a disconnect between zoning and character.
- The HLC administers the program inconsistently.
- The planner-of-the-day system is not working – forces you to deal with people without the necessary knowledge or expertise and increases subjective interpretation of regulations.
- The head of the HLC should be a certified historic planner.
- The planning director is the third in one year – I think staff is scared of political fallout and afraid to make any decisions. 10 of 14 staffers quit in the past year.
- City Council supports preservation but hears a lot of complaints about HLC.
- Utah Heritage Foundation is a good advocate for preservation in the City.
- Need more incentives – what do other communities do to incentivize preservation?
- The goal should be to keep neighborhoods vital and that means the homes need to adapt to how people live today, not be frozen in time to how people lived in some pre-selected “ideal” era of the past.
- There should be a tiered approach. Some homes are worth preserving in their original state because they hold some historic significance. Old does not mean significant. Many of the older homes are not particularly significant beyond their age and should be able to evolve to suit modern needs.
- Renovations can and should be appropriate to the character and construction of the original structure. Good renovations are possible and necessary to long-term demand and viability.
- Cities grow and change over time in conjunction with preservation. Salt Lake City needs clear criteria for determining what is worth of strict preservation.
- There need to be clear rules and consistent interpretation of the compatible infill ordinance.
- Right now there is hysterical backlash against bad infill that needs to settle down so there can be a balanced and rational conversation on the subject.
- HLC used to be more reasonable and take an approach during review where they had to prove “why not.” Now that is reversed and the applicant has to prove “why.”
- Neighborhoods are empowered but are running amok with very little leadership.
- Some of the regulations (e.g., setbacks and porches) are not having the desired impact. The plans encourage porches, for example, but can’t rebuild a porch on a historic structure because would violate setback rules.
- Some regulations are having the result of discouraging investment in economically disadvantaged neighborhoods.
- Historic preservation and the green building movement seem to be opposed (e.g., insulation, windows, solar).

ECONOMIC REVIEW PANEL

- Interviewees are interested in having Clarion bring forward some “best practice” demolition and economic process examples from comparable communities.
- Standards are very tough. See extensive discussion of issue in 2004 audit. “The city has never won an EH case.”
- This process is “highly dysfunctional” – anyone can find someone to crunch the numbers to make their case. The process needs to be completely revised.
- 5% rule for seismic upgrades is resulting in a lot of demolitions.
- Economic Review Panel:
 - Existing ERP process is too easy for developer to take advantage of.
 - “Reasonable” is the problematic word in the definition of “economic hardship.”
 - Lack of surveys hinders the functioning of this process.
- Appeals on demolitions should go to the council, not the unelected LUAB. See discussion in 2004 audit.



- Underlying zoning is, in some cases, providing an incentive for demolition rather than preservation by providing for a maximum allowable density far beyond the potential of the existing structure. See extensive discussion of issue in 2004 audit. Lack of mixed-use zoning in particular is a problem. Areas where this is particularly evident include:
 - Central City
 - Sugarhouse (commercial area)
- Need a demolition by neglect ordinance.
- TDRs could be useful to encourage preservation.
- From a citizen perspective, it often appears that the RDA doesn't want to comply with the city's ordinances, especially historic preservation.
- Residential design guidelines are not flexible enough.
- Areas to survey: Harvard-Yale, 9th and 9th, 15th and 15th, 3d south retail, Lower Sugarhouse, areas surrounding Liberty Park below 7E
- Staff should get back to doing pre-application conferences.

REALTORS

- A big threat is the trend of scrapes and McMansion development in historic neighborhoods – particularly threatening areas like Harvard-Yale.
- Need to pay more attention to preservation at the subdivision level and retaining features of the original neighborhoods aside from individual structures (e.g., brass markers in sidewalks). This will take interdepartmental coordination with public works (in particular) in how they maintain streets sidewalks, and landscaping.
- Need more consistency in HLC administration. There should be concrete rules for evaluating projects and defining what is flexible and what is not.
- The timing of the review process can vary from a few weeks to a few years.
- Perhaps there should be a clear description of how presentations should be made (methods, structure, standards).
- Need more financial incentives for preservation, especially with rising loan interest rates.
- Utah Heritage has done a study on "orange properties", properties that are endangered.
- RDA tends to conflict with preservation.
- Some requirements do not support preservation (e.g., EPA requirements, parking requirements).

CITY STAFF

(Parks, Engineering, Building, Housing, RDA)

- Organization for processing projects is poor – it is unclear where projects should go.
- Preservation needs to prioritize projects – what is worth saving and what is not? How are investments justified? How is the historic value evaluated? ("Jewels" versus "filler")
- The approval process for development in historic areas needs to be able to circumvent NIMBYism and emotionalism.
- Cost versus benefit for projects – is paying twice as much worth it? It may be, but it should be evaluated clearly so we know that the cost is commensurate with the gain.
- Need checks and balances for determining what is contributing and non-contributing and how projects go forward.
- Need to modernize the approach to materials – what are there such strict materials limitations in districts?
- There is a perception that the requirements of being in a local district (e.g., perceived higher home maintenance costs) can be economically prohibitive to those living on limited incomes.



- For example, there is a perception that painting of the home is required in historic districts; some interviewees noted that this would be problematic for the elderly, who can't paint themselves and can't afford to pay someone to paint their homes.
- Housing Authority assistance is not working for most of these owners because they are not enough to make up the difference. Result is that homes are suffering from deferred maintenance.
- Housing avoids historic districts because can't meet the energy efficiency requirements of HUD which would require energy efficient windows, etc.
- Need to seek out the mutual purpose opportunities and think about how to make the old work in relation to other City objectives and within the current and future city.
- There is already some gentrification on the west side in the Guadalupe area (300 west and I-15).
- Need more education about the restrictions – and benefits -- that come with living in a historic district. Right now people are scared away by the perceived process and financial commitment.
- Co-advertise programs when appropriate (e.g., with RDA, Housing, and Historic Preservation).
- Education – some people don't know about the restrictions when they buy.
- Landscapes are dynamic! Trees age and die. Parks has run into conflicts with HLC over tree removal because HLC wants to keep the old trees regardless of their condition. It's a safety hazard and a maintenance headache. This has been an issue in both Pioneer and Liberty parks.
- Parks is supportive of maintaining historic components and overall design of historic landscapes but do not see the sense of trying to keep a dying tree.
- Also a cost issue, have spend time and resources battling this issue and trying to work around it. Have hired numerous arborists to help document and explain the poor health of the tree and have had to fence off trees because they pose such a threat to public safety but can't remove them because they are historic.
- Checks and balances – who can override HLC if they make a decision that is contrary to what all other parties think?
- Unfortunate because it amounts to throwing the baby out with the bath water (on the tree issue). HLC could be ensuring that future landscapes are sustainable for future generations by planting trees now and making sure they are the right kind (resistant to disease, water thrifty).
- Parks has also run into opposition with HLC on issue of tree species. Perhaps 100 years ago they didn't know that certain tree species were non-native, prone to disease, and too thirsty for our climate but we know now! Why do we need to replace with the exact tree species against all environmental knowledge just because it is what someone planted 100 years ago?
- Don't see transit as compatible with preservation because of the infill and density. Portland did make it work by converting buildings but adaptive reuse needs more flexibility in this city for that to be an option.
- The HLC process is too difficult and some developers avoid it altogether.
- Pierpont and Artspace are historic commercial areas.
- Historic preservation is done through a population transition.
- RDA tries to avoid projects that will involve HLC and historic process.

CITIZEN INTERVIEWS

- The preservation regulations are not enforced, and this is common knowledge. Please provide examples of other communities that do a better job of enforcing preservation regulations.
 - Example: citizen went through six-month process for 2d story addition; house across street simply skipped the process (knew there was no enforcement) and added a non-conforming addition. Leads to sense of arbitrariness.
 - Typical violations include garage conversions into living space, and illegal multi-family housing.
- Citizen applicants requested more specific feedback from HLC. Some applicants have been told that additions should be "compatible but not identical," and then not told specifically how to achieve that.



- Property owners feel that plan review often receives a “no” without any suggestions or recommendations for what alterations are needed.
- Get citizen volunteers (and the community councils) to help with new historic surveys.
- There are big conflicts between what zoning allows versus what the preservation district allows.
- The Planning Commission is not always helpful in thinking through the conflicts between zoning and preservation.
- Why has Sugarhouse been surveyed twice, yet those plans keep being put on the shelf?
- Design guidelines need to be consistently administered by the HLC. They often contradict.
- There’s a big focus on wood windows in the historic district, without an understanding that there are strong financial impacts.
- Public comment often means nothing in historic cases.
- The planning department is like a dysfunctional family, and there is not institutional memory because of the high rate of turnover.
- Existing city program (in which city recommends contractors, and there is a small pot of funding) was heavily criticized, on grounds of too little money and ambiguous eligibility.
- Need more incentives to encourage preservation. Especially TDR.
- The ordinance is not allowing the densification of the city.
- Historic landscapes should be protected. Parks, creekways, etc.
- Economic hardship process is atrocious. Not true that burden is on the developer.
- Consider broadening notice for land use applications that are administrative.
- Ought to publish annual report on administrative approvals.
- Look back at use of tax credits – what properties have been protected?
- The community needs to recognize the value of business in historic districts.
- Too many demolitions in the downtown, and losing affordable housing downtown.

DEVELOPERS

- I used historic tax credits for an apartment (listed on national but not local register) renovation and found City staff very unsupportive of preservation. Planning, permitting, and building inspection all advised me not to try to pursue a historic renovation.
- If I was not so determined to make the renovation historic and gotten great help from the SHPO office (Nelson), I would not have been able to do the renovation. I got no support at the City.
- Get inconsistent answers from City.
- No lists of permits needed, model plans for projects that would be desired or appropriate for historic areas, or any other user-friendly resources to make the process easy. Need more procedural guidance.
- Need someone who can help guide you through the entire process, especially for the small guys who have less experience and tighter resources.
- The historic process, staff, and HLC are seen as obstructionist to development. They will let you sit on loans while in the process (process is not fast or predictable).
- ADA standards – must have the condos built to ADA standards
- Staff turnover under this administration has hurt the program.
- In the late 90s it took about 2 weeks to get a regular project through and 6-8 months to get a historic project through. Now, HLC wants to save everything.
- Planner-of-the-day system is not effective – people tend to not have strong knowledge of the zoning code or historic preservation regulations. Historically, specialized planners for historic preservation and each had certain areas of expertise.
- Fire code issues with historic renovations (e.g., dropped ceilings).
- Tax credits don’t mean too much to smaller guys because it’s hard to capture benefit because income is too small.

- Right now the City Council is pro-development. Not much support for preservation.
- Developers feel they have an adversarial relationship with staff – they are wrong until proven right.
- Written resources used to exist to help guide you through the process – where have these gone?
- It is hard to navigate what is appropriate – need written and illustrated guidance.
- Sign code has a one sign allowance so old signs tend to get torn down because need to put up their own business sign.
- Walker Bank sign is down now, people miss it but it can't be replaced because now it is non-conforming.
- There is a disincentive to preserve older signs.
- Renovation regulations and procedures are tailored to new development and interpreted differently by different departments and individuals.
- There are task force meetings with multiple departments but they only say what you can't do, they don't make suggestions for how you can refine the development plan to address the issue though. Everyone is afraid to take a stand.
- Planners no longer go to the site.
- There is a definite low-density bend to this city.
- Zoning code does not support infill with its parking and setback requirements.
- Energy issue needs to be addressed – there are no incentives to pursue energy efficiency.
- HLC response varies by presenter. They seem to listen to the advice of an architect presenter more than any non-architect presenter.
- Need to look at the composition of HLC. Is it reflective of the community?
- Do not want an onerous process. Hope to see the process streamlined and made more clear and strategic. It should be made as easy as possible to use to promote its use.
- Seismic factor is a major hurdle to retaining buildings (e.g., historic Elks building).

UTAH HERITAGE FOUNDATION

- Need to identify the recent past structures that should be protected (e.g., Old Main Library).
- There should be better prioritization of surveys and outreach.
- Think about more opportunities for education.
- Preservation tends to only make the news when there is a problem with a project. The City's awards used to be a way to get positive press but they have been discontinued. This is unfortunate because the awards were a nice way to recognize property owners for their participation, highlighted positive projects, and helped to tell the story of the process and program. (UHF has its own awards process with set awards, criteria, and an independent jury.)
- The endangered list method (popular in some other states) does not work as a public PR strategy in Utah because culturally it is better received to work collaboratively behind the scenes than to call someone out on a "bad" list. It more productive here to give good press to recognize positive actions than bad press to apply pressure for action.
- Financial resources for the UHF revolving loan fund are very limited. Operate a statewide pool (\$150,000) and citywide pool (\$250,000) but always have a waiting list. UHF will be evaluating its loan program in the next year and seeking models for how to expand its reach. This may include trying to fundraise to enlarge the pool since it has been operating only on the initial funding pool.
- Inconsistency in permitting and staff approval of projects in how interpreting the infill ordinance. It was implemented poorly with no staff training on how to use the ordinance.
- Staff could try a collective review of preservation projects with the same set group of specialized staff to promote a more consistent interpretation of how to administer the program.
- More training for HLC would be beneficial. People are coming from different backgrounds and there is a lot to learn just to get started not to mention keeping up with new ideas, trends, and materials. HLC currently does not get sent to conferences and there is no orientation or orientation handbook. Guidance

on how meeting conduct and project review would help get people up and running faster and with more consistency.

- HLC needs a big picture perspective so can stop getting bogged down in the details.
- The UHF walking tour guides and school group tours have great demand and are always running out of materials and tour slots.
- SHPO takes the lead on heritage tourism; UHF has not gotten involved in that aspect.
- UHF is struggling to keep the dual role of local city and state group. City may eventually need its own non-profit to help manage the demand.

STATE HISTORIC PRESERVATION OFFICE (SHPO)

- City seems to have struggled to integrate historic preservation into its overall planning strategy. Preservation is frequently at cross purposes with other community goals and sometimes is viewed in such cases as the lesser priority.
- City officials and staff need some targeted education and outreach about the benefits of historic preservation. They tend to only hear about the projects with conflict of some kind. This has been amplified even more since the city awards have fallen away.
- Need to focus on the big picture vision and value positioning of historic preservation in the city. Once that is clearly understood and established all of the little details should fall into place and resolve.
- Tax credit is a good driver for National Register listings.
- Planner-of-the-day system has created a relationship barrier between planning and SHPO.
- HLC training needed on ordinances as well as how to participate and run a meeting. National Alliance of Preservation Commission (every two years) may be a good conference for HLC members. In the past, SHPO coordinated group workshops with communities practicing design review but it was discontinued due to low attendance.
- SHPO works to provide design review to CLGs, but not for individuals.
- The Main Street program has died in the past two years. Salt Lake City RDA and Economic Development did not participate with the Main Street Program.
- State Tax Credit – there is a proposal to replace all tax credits with a flat tax. This has come up before and will likely continue to be an issue. 85% of the tax credit is used in Salt Lake City; 70% is in the Avenues alone.
- Need better interdepartmental coordination – e.g., RDA has a façade program but historic preservation is generally seen as an impediment.
- Heritage tourism has been relatively nonexistent in the state. It is currently a personal campaign effort of Wilson at SHPO.
- Ben Logue has been perhaps the most successful at working to couple state and federal tax incentives and achieve energy efficiency and solar in his projects (e.g., Carty, Stratford Hotel).
- City historic preservation does not distinguish itself against other entities. People are not clear on the different roles of SHPO, the City, and Utah Heritage Foundation, even in the Avenues where preservation activity is common. The City needs to have some branding of its program in the community.





Historic Fisher Mansion, photo by Anne Beck.

Local Preservation in Brief

The purpose of this summary is to provide a brief summary of the Salt Lake City Historic Preservation processes, program, and tools.

The information provided follows the best practices of the National Park Service and the National Trust for Historic Preservation.

CONTENTS

- What is Historic Preservation?**
- Historic Landmark Commission**
- Local Historic Designation**
- Benefits of Local Historic Designation**
- What is a Certificate of Appropriateness?**
- Design Guideline Guidance:**
 - Wood Windows
 - New Windows
 - Vinyl & Aluminum Siding
 - Substitute Materials
 - Ten Ways to Green Your Home
 - Solar Collectors
 - Additions
 - Infill Design
- The Historic Landmark Commission Meeting and You**
- Financial Incentives for Preservation**



WHAT IS HISTORIC PRESERVATION?

WHAT PRESERVATION IS NOT:

- Saving every old building
- Design police
- Protecting pretty buildings


WHAT PRESERVATION IS:

- Downtown and neighborhood revitalization
- Affordable housing
- Preservation of natural resources
- Increased city revenues
- Stable neighborhoods
- Alternative to sprawl
- Protection of property values
- Saving what makes our community special

SALT LAKE CITY HISTORIC PRESERVATION

GOAL

Preserve historically significant buildings, districts, structures and sites.





WHAT IS THE HISTORIC LANDMARK COMMISSION (HLC)?

WHO?

The Salt Lake City Historic Landmark Commission consists of nine to fifteen members, appointed by the Mayor with the advice and consent of the City Council, to serve a three year term.

WHAT?


The Commission makes recommendations to the City Council on matters related to the City's neighborhood master plans, zoning ordinance, and other city planning policies and regulations. The Historic Landmark Commission also considers applications for Certificates of Appropriateness for exterior alterations of properties with an Historic Overlay (Landmark Sites and Historic Districts).

WHERE?

The Commission meets the first Wednesday of every month at 5:00 p.m. in the City and County Building at 451 South State Street. All meetings are open to the public.

Section 21A.06.050 of the Salt Lake City Zoning Code lays out the specific responsibilities of the Commission:

1. Preserve buildings and related structures of historic and architectural significance as part of the city's most important cultural, educational and economic assets;
2. Encourage proper development and utilization of lands and areas adjacent to historical areas and to encourage complimentary, contemporary design and construction;
3. Protect and enhance the attraction of the city's historic landmarks for tourists and visitors;
4. Safeguard the heritage of the city by providing for the protection of landmarks representing significant elements of its history;
5. Promote the private and public use of landmarks and the historical areas within the H historic preservation overlay district for the education, prosperity and general welfare of the people;
6. Increase public awareness of the value of historic, cultural and architectural preservation; and
7. Recommend design standards pertaining to the protection of H historic preservation overlay districts and landmark sites.



LOCAL HISTORIC DESIGNATION

The City preserves its valuable historic resources by designating certain structures to the Salt Lake City Register of Cultural Resources. The process for designation is by an Historic Overlay as outlined in the zoning ordinance. Once designated, any work or change proposed to the exterior of the structure must be approved by the City. The City staff will review the work and if it meets, historic design guidelines, the staff will issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for any exterior

changes.

The main purpose of these guidelines is to ensure that no “character-defining features” of the building are altered. It is these architectural features which give the structure its importance and contributes to the overall character of the neighborhood around it.

QUESTIONS

Before a property can receive an Historic Overlay (Landmark Sites and Historic Districts), several questions must be answered.

1. Is it historic or just old?

Designation usually begins with an Historic Resource Survey following the methods of the State Historic Preservation Office. The survey helps to identify what is historic and determine boundaries for districts.


2. Does it meet the standards of the Ordinance for designation?


Not every old building or site is worthy of being designated to the historic register. The Salt Lake City Zoning Ordinance requires a property or district to meet standards, based on the National Register of Historic Places standards.

3. Is there public support?

The purpose of local historic designation is to guide future change in a way that preserves history, but keeps a building, district, or site useful in today's world. Property owners in historic districts agree to an extra process in order to preserve their community; therefore, it is important that at least a majority of property owners desire the designation.

LOCAL HISTORIC DESIGNATION PROCESS





BENEFITS OF LOCAL HISTORIC DESIGNATION

There are many benefits to preservation. Preservation is environmentally, socially, financially and culturally sustainable. Here are a few examples of benefits:

A Smaller Carbon Footprint. Old buildings have a great deal of embodied energy. The extraction and processing of building materials (e.g., wood, stone, brick), the transportation of those materials, and labor represented in the final structure mean that demolition of an existing structure is less energy-efficient than rehabilitating or constructing an addition to the existing structure.

Energy Efficiency. Older homes, constructed before heating and cooling systems were as effective as they are today, used a variety of methods to maximize the natural heating and cooling capability of the structure. Older buildings tend to make wise use of solar orientation and have better air flow than new buildings. Also, research shows that properly maintained old wood windows can be just as energy-efficient as new vinyl windows.

Enhanced Recycling. According to the EPA, building construction debris constitutes around a third of all waste generated in this country. Rehabilitation of an historic building reduces waste. Reusing an historic building increases recycling by the fact that the entire entity is recycled rather than just pieces.

Affordable Housing. Old homes disproportionately meet the housing needs of those of modest means. If we had to replace the pre-1950s homes occupied by households below the poverty level it would cost the taxpayers \$355 million.

Strengthen Local Economy. Restoration is better for the economy. A million dollars spent in new construction generates 30.6 jobs. But that same million dollars in the rehabilitation of an historic building creates 35.4 jobs.

Maintains or Increases Property Values. Studies show that local historic districts maintain property values, and in most cases, increase property values which protect a property owner's value in their investment.

Cultural Sustainability. Maintaining as much of the original fabric as preserves the "stage" on which to learn about and explore our culture. Preserving our important sites provides for tangible ways to remember and educate about our past.



Design Guideline Guidance:

WOOD WINDOWS

In the majority of cases, original wood windows should be repaired and kept. Situations where replacement windows might be allowed would be:

Photo by William Edward Hook, (c) 2006 Utah State Historical Society.

- Where there is more than 50% deterioration
- Rear windows that will not be seen from the street
- When the existing windows are not original
- When the structure is non-contributing or non-historic

WHY DO I HAVE TO KEEP THEM?

Windows are an important architectural and character defining feature of a building. Keeping original features of an historic home maintains the value of the home and the historic character of the district.

BUT I WANT THE ENERGY SAVINGS OF NEW WINDOWS.

- The majority of energy loss in a building is through the roof. Consider attic insulation with an R value of at least 30 before spending money on windows.
- In addition, the old growth wood actually lasts longer than newer materials, especially new wood windows.
- In most cases, the time it takes to realize the savings from replacement windows is often past the expected life of the window. The new window usually has to be completely replaced so why not keep those old windows that can be repaired? See comparison on next page.

OPTIONS

- Exterior or interior storm windows may be added.
- Keeping windows caulked and painted helps with energy efficiency.

RESOURCES

- "Save Your Wood Windows"
www.historichomeworks.com/hhw/reports/WoodWindowsSample.PDF
- "Preservation Brief #9: Repair of Historic Wooden Windows"
www.nps.gov/history/hps/tps/briefs/brief09.htm

Historic Landmark Commission's "Local Preservation In Brief"

Let the Numbers Convince You: Do the Math

| U-Value | Cost | Description | Annual Energy Savings | Annual Savings per Window** | Simple Payback |
|---------|--------|---|-----------------------|-----------------------------|----------------|
| 1.10 | \$50* | TUNE-UP STRATEGIES Storm window over single-pane original window | 722,218 Btu | \$13.20 | 4.5 Years |
| 0.58 | \$450* | Double-pane thermal replacement of single-pane window | 625,922 Btu | \$11.07 | 40.5 Years |
| 0.35 | \$550* | Low-e glass double-pane thermal replacement of single-pane window | 902,772 Btu | \$16.10 | 34 Years |
| 0.35 | \$550* | Low-e glass double-pane thermal replacement of single-pane window with storm window | 132,407 Btu | \$2.29 | 240 Years |

*Cost of 3' x 5' window, installed
 **Assuming gas heat at \$1.09/therm
 Source: Keith Haberm PE., R.A.
 Collingswood Historic District Commission

Old House Journal Oct 2007



Photo by Nelson Knight

Design Guideline Guidance:

NEW WINDOWS

SO YOU NEED NEW WINDOWS?

Before planning on replacing your windows, read the Design Guidelines for windows and the “Design Guideline Brief: Wood Windows”. **If your situation meets the rare instance where replacement windows are allowed, read on.**

WHAT SHOULD MY NEW WINDOWS LOOK LIKE?

In most cases the original casing of the window can be retained and just the sashes replaced. This is encouraged, not only because it is less expensive but also because it retains more historic materials and the dimensions of the original window.

New windows should mimic the old windows as much as possible. For instance, if your existing windows have four different panes in each sash, then you will want the same configuration for your new windows.

In traditional windows the sections that divide the panes are called muntins. You might also hear them referred to as dividers. You do not need to go to the expense of having windows constructed with the different panes of glass actually divided by muntins. You may choose to use “simulated divided lights” but “snap-in muntins” or dividers will not be allowed. The reason is that the “snap-in” type or the type that is permanently affixed between two window panes is very flat and doesn’t mimic the dimension of original muntins, the way “simulated divided lights” do.

WHAT SHOULD THEY BE MADE OF?

New wood isn’t as hardy as old growth wood so we encourage materials such as aluminum clad wood windows. From the outside, the wood window is protected from the elements while maintaining the profile of the original window and from the inside the windows are still wood. Old windows from a salvage company are also a good option.



Design Guideline Guidance:

VINYL & ALUMINUM SIDING

Aluminum and vinyl siding is not allowed in historic districts. If you do see a house with synthetic siding it was likely in place before the historic district was created.

I WANT THE INSULATING VALUE OF VINYL SIDING.

- Siding backed with a thin layer of insulating foam or applied over rigid board insulation creates the same "R" value as two to four inches of air space.

I WANT THE MAINTENANCE FREE PROPERTIES OF SYNTHETIC SIDING.

- There is no such thing as maintenance-free. It is true that vinyl never deteriorates but vinyl and aluminum siding can dent, cup and warp and the color will fade over time. Eventually the surface will need to be cleaned and even painted. Most manufacturers void the warranty once the synthetic siding is painted.
- Vinyl and aluminum siding work well to keep water away from the building exterior but it can trap moisture inside a building causing deterioration that you never see until it is too late and is very costly to repair.

OPTIONS

- Seventy-five percent of energy loss is through the roof so you are better off providing good insulation in the attic.
- Keeping windows caulked and painted helps with energy efficiency.
- Insulate inside the walls, when possible.
- Add exterior or interior storm windows.

RESOURCES

- "Vinyl Siding: The Real Issues" <http://www.cttrust.org/index.cgi/1745>
- "Preservation Brief #8: Aluminum and Vinyl Siding on Historic Buildings The Appropriateness of Substitute Materials for Resurfacing Historic Wood Frame Buildings" www.nps.gov/history/hps/tps/briefs/brief08.htm
- "Preservation Brief #10: Exterior Paint Problems on Historic Woodwork" www.nps.gov/history/hps/tps/briefs/brief10.htm



Design Guideline Guidance:

SUBSTITUTE MATERIALS IN HISTORIC DISTRICTS

In most cases, substitute materials are not appropriate on historic buildings. The most appropriate time to use modern materials is with new construction. However, there are a few cases where modern materials might be appropriate on existing structures.

When making the decision about what types of materials to use consider these points.

- Advantages of traditional materials are that they are mostly still readily available, they are easily repairable, and we know how they age. When considering a new material, research it well to be sure that it is the best material for your needs and is one approved by the Historic Landmark Commission.
- What materials are appropriate depend on the use and the location of the materials. Are you repairing or reconstructing? If you are repairing areas of decayed wood you will want to use wood to replace the decayed sections. If, however, you adding on to a historic building or constructing a new accessory structure, you might want to consider another more durable material, assuming the material and the proposed use meets the Design Guidelines.
- When new materials are appropriate, choose materials that act the same as more traditional materials. For instance, a wood polymer that can be sanded and painted like real wood, might be a good product for your project that includes new construction.

RESOURCES

- "Preservation Brief #16: The Use of Substitute Materials on Historic Buildings"
www.nps.gov/history/hps/tps/briefs/brief16.htm




Design Guideline Guidance:

TEN WAYS TO GREEN YOUR HOME

Information from the National Trust for Historic Preservation's *Preservation Magazine*

1. Keep original windows intact. Studies show that old windows can perform as well as vinyl replacements. Weather strip them so that they seal tightly, caulk the exterior trim and repair cracked glazing or putty around glass panels. You will reduce landfill waste and the demand for vinyl, a non biodegradable material that gives off toxic byproducts when it is made.
2. Use light paint colors for your home's exterior. Light colors reflect heat better than darker ones.
3. Insulate attic, basement and crawl space. About 20 percent of energy costs come from heat loss in those areas.
4. Reuse old materials such as brick, glass, stone, and slate when making home improvements. If you're rebuilding a staircase, for example, use wood from the shed that couldn't be saved.
5. Install fireplace draft stoppers, attic door covers and dryer vent seals that open only when your dryer is in use. An open damper in a fireplace can increase energy costs by 30 percent, and attic doors and dryer vents are notorious energy sieves.
6. Plant trees. Evergreen trees on the north and west sides of your house can block winter winds, and leafy trees on the south and west provide shade from the summer sun. Using old photos of your house, try to match the historic landscape.
7. Have an energy audit done by your local utility company or visit Home Energy Saving's website (<http://hes.lbl.gov>). Audits can help pinpoint problem areas and measure energy savings after you improve your home's efficiency.
8. In the summer, open the windows and use fans and evaporative coolers, which consume less energy than air conditioning. Many old houses were designed with good cross ventilation; take advantage of your home's layout.
9. Keep doors airtight by weather stripping, caulking and painting them regularly.
10. Restore porches and awnings. Porches, awnings, and shutters were intended for shade and insulation. To save energy, draw shades on winter nights and summer days.



Photograph provided by the BBC.

Design Guideline Guidance:

SOLAR COLLECTORS

Historic buildings were often designed with energy efficient features such as skylights for daylighting and transoms for air flow; however, new technology is providing additional ways for buildings to be "green".

When planning for solar collectors keep these location and installation issues in mind to protect the historic character of your building and neighborhood.

Solar panels do have a place in historic districts and on historic buildings as long as they do not interfere with the historic character of the site. Even Dunster Castle in Somerset England, shown above, is using the technology to lower energy costs. The owner of the property, The National Trust, approved the panels because they were designed so that no loading or direct contact of the panels or frame will touch the roof itself, they are easily removable, and they are not visible from the ground.

- Locate so that the collector is not readily visible from public streets
- Locate on the rear or sides of a pitched roof
- Do not change an historic roofline
- Do not obscure a character defining feature
- Install below the ridgeline of a pitched roof
- Install in such a way so that it can be removed without damage to the historic fabric of the building
- If locations on the primary structure are inappropriate, consider accessory structures or free-standing panels in the rear yard.



Susan Workman Photography

Design Guideline Guidance: **ADDITIONS**

Sometimes property owners believe that Local Historic Designation means that they cannot add on to their home. This is not the case. Local Historic Designation does not attempt to freeze time but instead guides change so that it is compatible with the historic character of the neighborhood.

PLANNING AN ADDITION:

These basic rules will help you with planning a compatible addition. Where possible:

- Try to add on to the rear of the building instead of the sides or roof.
- Generally keep the addition from being any taller or wider than the original building.
- Consider designing the addition with a connector that lessens the impact on the historic building and clearly defines the old from the new.
- Use compatible materials and do not think that you have to match the materials of the existing house.
- Preserve character defining features of the original building.

According to *Celebrating Compatible Design*, the rear addition shown on the above Avenues home was designed to be appropriate to the historic house but to also give the owners the light and spacious rooms they desired. Because it cannot be seen from the street, it does not impact the historic character of the neighborhood.

If the addition has to be seen, be sure to design it in such a way that it is compatible with the historic building but does not try to look historic.

RESOURCES

- *Celebrating Compatible Design: Creating New Spaces in Historic Homes* by Rob White, available through the Utah Heritage Foundation, online at www.utahheritagefoundation.com.
- "Preservation Brief #14: New Exterior Additions to Historic Buildings Preservation Concerns" www.nps.gov/history/hps/tps/briefs/brief14.htm



Design Guideline Guidance:

INFILL DESIGN

PLANNING A NEW BUILDING IN A HISTORIC DISTRICT

These basic rules will help you with planning a new building in a historic district.

- Match the historic district in terms of massing, scale, height and setback
- Do not attempt to mimic historic buildings. This creates a false sense of history and diminishes the historic character of the district.
- Choose compatible materials
- Do not pick historic elements seen elsewhere in the district, but instead use contemporary interpretations of historic features.

RESOURCES

Design and Development: Infill Housing Compatible with Historic Neighborhoods by Ellen Beasley, available through the National Trust for Historic Places at www.preservationbooks.org.



THE HISTORIC LANDMARK COMMISSION MEETING & YOU

Library of Congress Prints and Photographs Division

So you have an application that will be reviewed by the Historic Landmark Commission, you are probably wondering what to expect.

You will receive a copy of the agenda to which your project has been assigned. This will be your notice of the time, date, and location of the meeting as well as the contact for the assigned staff person. You or a legal representative, such as an architect or contractor, will need to attend the meeting.

HOW DOES THE MEETING WORK?

1. Staff will make a presentation about your project and explain how it does or does not meet the Design Guidelines, Ordinance, and Policy Document.
2. As the applicant, you or your representative will have an opportunity to answer questions of the Commission and to make a short presentation, if you wish.
3. The general public will have two minutes to comment on your application.
4. The Chair may allow you an opportunity to respond.
5. The Chair will close the "public hearing" and the Commission will go into "executive session" which means there is no more opportunity for public or applicant comments.
6. The Commission will then make a decision which could be to approve, deny, approve with conditions, send to the Architectural Committee, or postpone the decision with a request for additional information.
7. If you feel that the decision was in error, you may appeal to the Land Use Appeals Board within 30 days.

HINTS FOR PREPARING YOUR PRESENTATION:

- You will receive a copy of the staff report prior to the meeting. Review it and contact staff with any questions you may have. You may refer to the staff report in your presentation.
- Organize your notes well so that you are sure to cover every important aspect of your project during the presentation.
- Keep in mind that staff will present an overview of a staff report, prior to your presentation. Do not waste time by repeating what has already been said.
- Visual aids help the Commissioners to imagine your project. Consider bringing material samples, photographs, maps, and/or an electronic presentation, if you have not already given these items to staff.
- If you plan to make an electronic presentation you may bring your laptop, CD, or jump drive. A laptop and LCD projector will be available at the meeting for your use but please contact staff in advance to coordinate.
- Be careful when choosing neighborhood examples to strengthen the argument for your project. Just because something is seen on your street or in your neighborhood doesn't mean it meets the Design Guidelines.


RESOURCES

HLC Agendas and Minutes, www.slcgov.com/boards/HLC/hlc-agen.htm

HLC General Information, www.slcgov.com/ced/hlc/

Historic Landmark Commission's "Local Preservation In Brief"

CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS (COA) PROCESS



FINANCIAL INCENTIVES FOR PRESERVATION

LOANS

UHF Low Interest Loan: www.utahheritagefoundation.com

SLC's Business Revolving Loan Fund: www.ci.slc.ut.us/ED/sbi.htm

SLC Office of Economic Development: www.slcgov.com/ED/default.htm

Building Renovation Loan Program: www.slcrda.com/First/programs.htm

The Neighborhood Business Loan Program: www.slcrda.com/First/programs.htm

SLC Home Repair Program: www.slcgov.com/ced/hand/new/pages/housing.htm

SLC First Time Home Buyers Program:
www.slcgov.com/ced/hand/new/pages/housing.htm

SLC Housing Trust Fund: www.slcgov.com/ced/hand/new/pages/housing.htm

Neighborhood Matching Grant: www.slcgov.com/ced/hand/new/pages/grants.htm

TAX INCENTIVES

Federal and State Tax Credits for Rehab:

http://history.utah.gov/historic_buildings/financial_assistance/index.html

Utah Heritage Foundation Easement Program: www.utahheritagefoundation.com

LOW INCOME ASSISTANCE

ASSIST Inc.: www.assistutah.org

ENERGY EFFICIENCY

Solar Credits: <http://geology.utah.gov/SEP/incentives/rincentives.htm>

Questar: Thermwise.com

Rocky Mountain Power: www.rockymountainpower.net

Energy Star Federal Tax Credits:

www.energystar.gov/index.cfm?c=products.pr_tax_credits#2

**The Draft Historic Preservation Plan was
omitted to reduce redundant copying**

**To view the Draft Historic Preservation Plan
see Exhibit 2**

Exhibit 7D
Planning Commission
September 23, 2009
Minutes

SALT LAKE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

In Room 326 of the City & County Building

451 South State Street, Salt Lake City, Utah

Wednesday, September 23, 2009

Present for the Planning Commission meeting were Chair Mary Woodhead Vice Chair Susie McHugh; Commissioners Michael Gallegos, Michael Fife, Prescott Muir, Tim Chambless, and Matthew Wirthlin. Commissioners Frank Algarin, Angela Dean and Babs De Lay were excused.

6:09:33 PM **Petition PLNPCM2009-00171; Citywide Historic Preservation Plan Rehearing**—a request by the Historic Landmark Commission to reconsider recommendation of the Citywide Historic Preservation Plan to the City Council. This is a city-wide project that was previously considered by the Planning Commission on July 8, 2009. However, adequate public notice was not provided at that time.

Chair Woodhead recognized Janice Lew as staff representative.

Chair Woodhead stated that this item was being re-heard do to some problems with the public noticing.

Ms. Lew stated that the Commission should have received the original staff report, as well as the minutes from the July 8, 2009 meeting. She stated a document from Clarion, the consulting group that produced the plan was also included in the packet, along with discussion regarding the Sustainability issue.

Chair Woodhead stated it was not so much an expansion of the Sustainability plan, but more of a flag to the City Council to be aware of possible conflicts between the sustainability goals and the preservation goals, and to be cognizant of those as they consider the plan.

Ms. Lew stated that was passed on to the City Council and those issues have been discussed. She stated that from this point the plan would be forwarded to the City Council after the re-hearing by the Commission.

6:12:44 PM **Public Hearing**

Chair Woodhead opened the public hearing; she noted there were no members of the public present to speak to the petition. Chair Woodhead closed the public hearing.

6:14:14 PM **Motion**

Commissioner Wirthlin made a motion regarding the Historic Preservation Plan, PLNPCM2009-00171, that the Commission re-affirms the motion made at the July 8, 2009 Planning Commission meeting which stated: based on the findings of facts presented in the staff report and testimony heard at the meeting, the Planning Commission forwards a positive recommendation to the City Council for approval with the recommendation that the sustainability plan and goals within the Preservation Plan be revised, updated, and expanded to prevent potential conflicts between the City's preservation plan and the City's sustainability plan and goals, and that the economic hardship section be clarified.

Commissioner Fife seconded the motion.

Commissioners Fife, Hill, Chambless, Gallegos, Muir, Wirthlin, and McHugh voted, "Aye". The motion passed.

Exhibit 8A
Planning Commission
July 8, 2009

Original Notice and Postmark/Agenda

SALT LAKE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING AGENDA**In Room 326 of the City & County Building at 451 South State Street****Wednesday, July 8, 2009 at 5:45 p.m.**

The field trip is scheduled to leave at 4:00 p.m. Dinner will be served to the Planning Commissioners and Staff at 5:00 p.m., in Room 126. **Work Session**—Staff may discuss project updates and other minor administrative matters. This portion of the meeting is open to the public for observation.

Approval of Minutes from Wednesday, June 24, 2009**Report of the Chair and Vice Chair****Report of the Director****Public Hearings**

1. **Petition PLNPCM2009-00203; Diamond Parking Conditional Use**—a request by Chris Furstenau, Furst Construction on behalf of Diamond Parking, to amend and expand conditional use 410-07-31 for an existing commercial parking lot located at approximately 1925 West North Temple Street. The purpose of the request is to allow construction of a new private vehicular driveway to be located at approximately 1969 West North Temple Street. The new driveway will become the primary entrance into the existing commercial parking lot, which is owned and operated by Diamond Parking. The zoning designation for the property is CC Corridor Commercial District and CG General Commercial District. The property is located in City Council District Two, represented by Van Turner (Staff contact: Michael Maloy at 801.535.7118 or michael.maloy@slcgov.com).
2. **Petition PLNPCM2009-00434; Jefferson Street Closure**—a request by Jefferson Partners LLC that the remaining portion of Jefferson Street north of 800 South, east of 200 West, be declared surplus by the City, closed, and sold to the applicant. The purpose of the request is to incorporate the remaining portion of this street into the Mark Miller auto dealership. The property is located in City Council District Four, represented by Luke Garrott (Staff contact: Kevin LoPiccolo at 801.535.6003 or kevin.lopiccolo@slcgov.com).
3. **Petition PLNPCM2009-00171; Citywide Historic Preservation Plan adoption**—a request by the Historic Landmark Commission to consider recommendation of the Citywide Historic Preservation Plan to the City Council. This is a city-wide project (Staff contact: Robin Zeigler at 801.535.7758 or robin.zeigler@slcgov.com).
4. **Petition PLNPCM2009-00161; City of the Seven Gates**— a request by Brylan Schultz, on behalf of City of the Seven Gate, for conditional use approval for an art studio, a community center, and a caretaker's quarters at approximately 2904 West 500 South. The subject property is in the M-2 (Heavy Manufacturing) Zoning District and in Council District Two, represented by Van Turner (Staff contact: Nick Britton at 801.535.6107 or nick.britton@slcgov.com).

Briefing

5. **Petitions PLNPCM2009-00170 and PLNPCM2009-00483; Euclid Small Area Plan**—Staff is seeking feedback from the Planning Commission regarding options for future land use and zoning amendments for a portion of the Euclid Small Area Plan (Staff contact: Nick Britton at 801.535.6107 or nick.britton@slcgov.com).

Visit the Planning Division's website at www.slcgov.com/CED/planning for copies of the Planning Commission agendas, staff reports, and minutes. Staff Reports will be posted the Friday prior to the meeting and minutes will be posted two days after they are ratified, which usually occurs at the next regularly scheduled meeting of the Planning Commission.

Tami Hansen
PO Box 145480

PUBLIC HEARING NOTICE

MAILED FROM ZIP CODE 84114
JUN 23 2009
\$ 00.440
02 1A
0004632097
FITNEY BOWES
UNITED STATES POSTAGE



FIRST CLASS

STATE MAIL SVCS 06/23/09

Salt Lake City Planning Division
451 South State Street, Room 406
PO Box 145480
Salt Lake City UT 84114

1. Fill out registration card and indicate if you wish to speak and which agenda item you will address.
2. After the staff and petitioner presentations, hearings will be opened for public comment. Community Councils will present their comments at the beginning of the hearing.
3. In order to be considerate of everyone attending the meeting, public comments are limited to two (2) minutes per person, per item. A spokesperson who has already been asked by a group to summarize their concerns will be allowed five (5) minutes to speak. Written comments are welcome and will be provided to the Planning Commission in advance of the meeting if they are submitted to the Planning Division prior to noon the day before the meeting. Written comments should be sent to:

Salt Lake City Planning Commission
451 South State Street, Room 406
Salt Lake City UT 84111

4. Speakers will be called by the Chair.
5. Please state your name and your affiliation to the petition or whom you represent at the beginning of your comments.
6. Speakers should address their comments to the Chair. Planning Commission members may have questions for the speaker. Speakers may not debate with other meeting attendees.
7. Speakers should focus their comments on the agenda item. Extraneous and repetitive comments should be avoided.
8. After those registered have spoken, the Chair will invite other comments. Prior speakers may be allowed to supplement their previous comments at this time.
9. After the hearing is closed, the discussion will be limited among Planning Commissioners and Staff. Under unique circumstances, the Planning Commission may choose to reopen the hearing to obtain additional information.
10. The Salt Lake City Corporation complies with all ADA guidelines. People with disabilities may make requests for reasonable accommodation no later than 48 hours in advance in order to attend this meeting. Accommodations may include alternate formats, interpreters, and other auxiliary aids. This is an accessible facility. For questions, requests, or additional information, please contact the Planning Office at 535-7757; TDD 535-6220.

Exhibit 8B
Planning Commission
July 8, 2009
Staff Report

**The July 8, 2009 Staff Report and
attachments omitted to reduce redundant
copying**

**To view Staff Report and attachments see
Exhibit 7c**

**To view the Draft Historic Preservation Plan
see Exhibit 2**

Exhibit 8C
Planning Commission
July 8, 2009
Minutes

6:04:03 PM Motion

Commissioner Fife made a motion regarding Petition PLNPCM2009-00434, that the Planning Commission transmit a favorable recommendation to the City Council to close the subject street, and recommend to the Mayor to sell the property to the applicant at a value determined by the Property Management Division, subject to the following conditions:

- 1. All requirements and comments outlined in this staff report and attached as Exhibit C in the staff report shall be met.**
- 2. Prior to City Council consideration the applicant will work with the City Property Management Division to obtain a compensation price for the subject property.**
- 3. Compliance with City Code 2.58 which regulates the disposition of City owned real property.**

Commissioner De Lay seconded the motion.

Commissioners De Lay, Hill, Fife, Gallegos, Dean, Chambless, Muir, and Wirthlin voted, "Aye". The motion passed unanimously.

6:05:33 PM Petition PLNPCM2009-00171; Citywide Historic Preservation Plan adoption—a request by the Historic Landmark Commission to consider recommendation of the Citywide Historic Preservation Plan to the City Council. This is a city-wide project. View: [Staff Report](#)

Acting Chair McHugh recognized Robin Zeigler and Pat Comarell as staff representatives.

Ms. Zeigler stated that the Commission should have received a memorandum and a two page summary to help highlight some of the important parts of the preservation plan. She stated that there was also a multi-page response from Clarion & Associates explaining how the plan incorporated the City Redevelopment Agency's (RDA) comments. She stated that stake-holder interviews were also included so the Commission could see the variety of groups and individuals that had previously reviewed and commented on the plan.

Ms. Zeigler stated she would go through a few of the questions and comments that she had received. The first comment was the document was too large. She stated it was large because it was covering a long period of time and it was also viewed as an educational tool. She stated that in addition to making recommendations to the City on what could be done, the document also reflected how other cities had accomplished some of these recommendations, and explained why Salt Lake City might want to go forward with the recommendations.

Ms. Zeigler stated that another concern was if the preservation plan would create another layer of government. She stated that the Historic Landmark Commission and the ordinance already existed, so this plan was not recommending a new board or new layer of government. She stated that another concern was that the plan would require addition funding. She noted that certain parts of the plan would need additional resources; however, this was a big document that covered a long period of time, which could be broken down into parts year-by-year for the City Council and the Mayor's office to decide on what additional projects to fund. She noted another question was in regards to the plan balancing other City goals. Ms. Zeigler stated that this was woven throughout the entire plan; there were many recommendations for all of the different City

Ms. Zeigler noted that historic designation was a separate process, and input from property owners and the neighborhood played a big role, but the plan could not specify areas that would be designated because of the that process. She stated that a suggestion was made that the plan should reference a historic street pattern and Clarion & Associates agreed, but felt that should be part of the master plan process.

Commissioner Muir stated that Clarion suggested putting some sustainability language into the preservation plan, and inquired if they had done that.

Ms. Zeigler stated that the sustainability concept was woven throughout the report. Sustainability had always been a key component of the plan as one of the five themes, but others working with Clarion on sustainability, provided language specifically on solar panels that could be included in the City's design guidelines.

Commissioner Muir inquired about the idea of embodied energy.

Ms. Zeigler stated that the concept of embodied energy in an existing building was the idea that energy went into creating the materials that made that building, transporting those materials to the site, and putting all the materials together to build the building. She stated that once the building was torn down all of that embodied energy was lost, so it was greener and more sustainable economically and environmentally to keep existing buildings wherever possible so that the embodied energy was not lost.

Commissioner Muir stated that currently loss of embodied energy was not reviewed during the economic hardship analysis, or the conventional wisdom in construction regarding when a building was remodeled, twice as much energy and cost was invested in demolition as there was in rebuilding new. He stated that economies typically leaned toward demolition and new construction, as opposed to adaptive reuse. He inquired if the conventional wisdom within the historic preservation community would eventually manifest in the construction economies.

Ms. Zeigler stated that economic hardship was a separate process to ensure that there was not a taking.

Commissioner Muir inquired if the cost of adaptive reuse, upgrade, or restoration was supported by the market place, because if economic hardship could not be demonstrated, then it was not supported by the market place. He stated that embodied energy was a great notion and a sustainable idea, but he had not seen it manifest in the market place—it was still cheaper to demolish and rebuild from scratch.

Ms. Zeigler stated she disagreed, but it would depend on the building, some it would not make sense to keep and some buildings it would.

Acting Chair McHugh stated that a new building, even if it was LEED certified, could take up to 65 years to recoup what was lost from the destruction of embodied energy, plus what it took to create the new building.

Ms. Zeigler stated that it also created more landfill.

Commissioner De Lay stated that on page 11 of the plan it stated, *currently local historic designation is on property deeds*. She stated that she rarely saw this, so what does that statement actually mean.

Ms. Zeigler stated that historic information was given to the County and they placed it on the deeds.

maintaining the status quo in single-family neighborhoods would make it more difficult to bring about those initiatives.

Ms. Comarell stated that Clarion & Associates not only did this preservation plan, but they were also working with the City on the sustainability ordinance, which related to historic preservation in areas like solar panels, as well as other aspects of City ordinances that particularly relate to planning and zoning. She stated that there was funding already in place for this and staff was working with the Mayor on this as well. She suggested that the heightened interest was already there.

Mr. Sommerkorn stated that the sustainability efforts were ongoing and accessory units were part of that. He stated it might be wise to start with areas that were not so sensitive in a newly developing area like the Northwest Quadrant, as well as in other areas of the community where it may be something that would be easily accepted. He stated that there was heightened sensibility for sustainability goals and historic preservation, along with a number of other issues, and there would be some balancing that would need to be taken into consideration.

Ms. Coffey stated that one way that preservation and sustainability might be able to come together may be that large houses in historic districts that are zoned single-family could be allowed to have more units in that building, or opening up the types of uses that are allowed in historic sites, because currently it was very limited.

Commissioner Muir stated that Salt Lake City is relatively young and if a 50 year benchmark is used, then go back 50 years and Salt Lake City was predominately a single-family residential City. He stated that by moving forward with this the City was saying we are going to preserve these single-family neighborhoods, and then each subsequent neighborhood will want the same type of recognition. He stated that he was concerned that this would not enable the growth potential that this City has to have in order to help solve the fundamental and more critical everyday sustainability issues, which is people living together with common walls and floors within walking and biking distance of their jobs.

Ms. Zeigler stated that preservation was about preserving the building structures and sites, not about how those buildings were necessarily used. She stated that just because a neighborhood originated as single-family did not mean the City was trying to preserve it as such. She stated that some single-family dwellings could be used as commercial or multi-family.

Commissioner De Lay stated that the sustainability needs to be bumped up in the preservation plan, to plan for the future. She stated the rules about the economic hardship were either too difficult or not reasonable and those needed to be reviewed, but other than that she would be in favor of sending a positive recommendation to the City Council.

Commissioner Dean stated that on Page 74 there was a list of ten items which included: climate change and air quality, water quality and conservation, alternative energy production and energy conservation, mobility and transportation, urban forestry, housing and accessibility and diversity, community health and safety, food production and nutrition, recycling and waste reduction, and open space, parks, and trails. She stated that housing accessibility and diversity was not discussed elsewhere in the document and she would like to see more information and insight added to that framework, along with the other nine elements of sustainability.

Ms. Zeigler stated that those were all part of the sustainability plan, not the preservation plan.

Exhibit 9A
Planning Commission
May 27, 2009

Original Notice and Postmark/Agenda

SALT LAKE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING AGENDA

In Room 326 of the City & County Building at 451 South State Street

Wednesday, May 27, 2009 at 5:45 p.m.

The field trip is scheduled to leave at 4:00 p.m. Dinner will be served to the Planning Commissioners and Staff at 5:00 p.m., in Room 126. **Work Session**—The Planning Commission will discuss the LEED process and certification, the petition initiated by the Planning Commission to develop a city-wide energy plan, and may discuss project updates and other minor administrative matters. This portion of the meeting is open to the public for observation.

Approval of Minutes from Wednesday, May 13, 2009

Report of the Chair and Vice Chair

Report of the Director

1. 2040 Plan presentation by Val Halford of Wasatch Front Regional Council.

Public Hearings

2. **Petition PLNPCM2009-00171 Citywide Historic Preservation Plan adoption**—a request by the Historic Landmark Commission to consider recommendation of the Citywide Historic Preservation Plan to the City Council. This is a city-wide project (Staff contact: Robin Zeigler at 801.535.7758 or robin.zeigler@slcgov.com).
3. **PLNPCM2009-000191 City of the Seven Gates Conditional Use**—a request by Brylan Schultz located at approximately 2904 West 500 South for conditional use approval to have living quarters for an on-site caretaker. The property is in the M-2 (Heavy Manufacturing) zoning district and in Council District Two, represented by Van Turner (Staff contact: Nick Britton at 801.535.6107 or nick.britton@slcgov.com)
4. **Zoning Text Amendment; Petition PLNPCM2009-00422**—The Planning Division is reviewing a petition initiated by the Salt Lake City Planning Commission to amend the Salt Lake City Zoning Ordinance. The purpose of the petition is to allow "Public/private utility transmission wires, lines, pipes, and poles" in the Lowland Conservancy Overlay District as a Conditional Use. The Lowland Conservancy Overlay District is generally located west of the Salt Lake International Airport and north of I-80. This area is located in City Council District One, represented by Carlton Christensen (Staff contact: Nole Walkingshaw at 801.535.7128 or nole.walkingshaw@slcgov.com).
5. **UNEV Pipeline Project; Petition PLNPCM2009-00423**—The Salt Lake City Planning Division is processing a request for approval of a conditional use by UNEV Pipeline to develop an underground petroleum distribution pipeline. The UNEV Pipeline Project, located at approximately 705 N Wright Brothers Drive and approximately 1070 North 5200 West. The property is zoned M-1 light manufacturing, and portions of the property are within the Lowland Conservancy Overlay District. This application is being processed in conjunction with petition PLNPCM2009-00422. This property is located in City Council District One, represented by Carlton Christensen (Staff contact: Nole Walkingshaw at 535-7128 or nole.walkingshaw@slcgov.com).
6. **Our Lady of Guadalupe at 715 West 300 North**—a request by Catholic Diocese of Salt lake City, represented by John Sparano, for various approvals to accommodate a place of worship, related uses and expansion of the parking lot. The project is located in an R-1/5000 Single Family Residential Zoning District. The property is located in City Council District Two, represented by Van Turner (Staff contact: Ana Valdemoros at 801.535.7236 or ana.valdemoros@slcgov.com).
 - a. **PLNSUB2008-00698 Preliminary Subdivision**—a request by the applicant for preliminary approval to combine four lots into one single lot.
 - b. **PLNSUB2008-00856 Conditional Use Planned Development**—a request by the applicant to accommodate more than one principal structure in one lot including the place of worship and the rectory.
 - c. **PLNPCM2008-00697 Conditional Use**—a request by the applicant to accommodate the existing place of worship and expand the parking lot on a lot smaller than 4 acres.

Issues Only Public Hearing (The Planning Commission will make no final decisions on Issues Only Public Hearing items.)



7. **Capitol Park Planned Development Phases 1-3 and The Maridien at Capitol Park Amended**—a request by the Capitol Park Planned Development Homeowner's Association to transfer ownership of roads within the subdivision from private to public ownership. The land is located in the Foothill Residential (FR-3) zone in City Council District three, represented by Eric Jergensen (Staff contact: Ray Milliner 801.535.7645 or ray.milliner@slcgov.com).
 - a. **PLNSUB2009-00445 Conditional Use Planned Development Amendment**—a request by the applicant to amend a planned development approved on August 10, 1995 to allow the transfer of Capitol Park Avenue, Penny Parade Drive, Redbrick Court, Charity Cove, and Caring Cove from private ownership to public.
 - b. **PLNSUB2008-00902 Subdivision Amendment**—a request by the applicant to dedicate Capitol Park Avenue, Penny Parade Drive, Redbrick Court, Charity Cove, and Caring Cove to the City.

Visit the Planning Division's website at www.slcgov.com/CED/planning for copies of the Planning Commission agendas, staff reports, and minutes. Staff Reports will be posted the Friday prior to the meeting and minutes will be posted two days after they are ratified, which usually occurs at the next regularly scheduled meeting of the Planning Commission.

TAM! THURSDAY
2.00 145480

PUBLIC HEARING NOTICE

MAILED FROM ZIP CODE 84116
0004631635 MAY 14 2009
\$ 00.440
02 1A



SVCS 05/15/2009 02:54 STATE MAIL

Salt Lake City Planning Division
451 South State Street, Room 406

P.O. Box 145480
Salt Lake City UT 84114

1. Fill out registration card and indicate if you wish to speak and which agenda item you will address.
2. After the staff and petitioner presentations, hearings will be opened for public comment. Community Councils will present their comments at the beginning of the hearing
3. In order to be considerate of everyone attending the meeting, public comments are limited to two (2) minutes per person, per item. A spokesperson who has already been asked by a group to summarize their concerns will be allowed five (5) minutes to speak. Written comments are welcome and will be provided to the Planning Commission in advance of the meeting if they are submitted to the Planning Division prior to noon the day before the meeting.
Written comments should be sent to:

Salt Lake City Planning Commission
451 South State Street, Room 406
Salt Lake City UT 84111
4. Speakers will be called by the Chair.
5. Please state your name and your affiliation to the petition or whom you represent at the beginning of your comments.
6. Speakers should address their comments to the Chair. Planning Commission members may have questions for the speaker. Speakers may not debate with other meeting attendees.
7. Speakers should focus their comments on the agenda item. Extraneous and repetitive comments should be avoided.
8. After those registered have spoken, the Chair will invite other comments. Prior speakers may be allowed to supplement their previous comments at this time.
9. After the hearing is closed, the discussion will be limited among Planning Commissioners and Staff. Under unique circumstances, the Planning Commission may choose to reopen the hearing to obtain additional information.
10. The Salt Lake City Corporation complies with all ADA guidelines. People with disabilities may make requests for reasonable accommodation no later than 48 hours in advance in order to attend this meeting. Accommodations may include alternate formats, interpreters, and other auxiliary aids. This is an accessible facility. For questions, requests, or additional information, please contact the Planning Office at 535-7757; TDD 535-6220.

Exhibit 9B
Planning Commission
May 27, 2009
Staff Report

PLANNING COMMISSION STAFF REPORT

CITYWIDE HISTORIC PRESERVATION PLAN, Master Plan Adoption & PLNPCM2009-00171 City-wide May 27, 2009



Planning and Zoning Division
Department of Community and
Economic Development

Applicant: Salt Lake City
Planning Commission

Staff: Robin Zeigler, 535-7758,
robin.zeigler@slcgov.com

Notification

- Notice mailed on May 19, 2009
- Agenda posted on the Planning Division and Utah Public Meeting Notice websites May 19, 2009

Attachments:

- A. Draft Plan
- B. Department Comments
- C. Public Comments
- D. Planning Commission Memo, May 4, 2009
- E. Historic Landmark Commission Minutes, April 1, 2009

Request

A request by the Planning Commission to adopt a citywide Historic Preservation Plan. The citywide Historic Preservation Plan is a comprehensive plan that formally defines a vision for the preservation program and sets long-term, citywide goals and objectives to guide specific actions and decisions.

Staff Recommendation

Based on the findings listed in the staff report, it is the Planning Staff's opinion that proposed master plan meets the applicable standards and therefore, recommends the Planning Commission forward a positive recommendation to the City Council to adopt the Citywide Historic Preservation Master Plan.

Background

Project Description

The citywide Historic Preservation Plan is a comprehensive plan that provides guidance for all departments of Salt Lake City. This plan will be the key strategic document that will guide preservation activity into the future and inform decisions such as amendments to master plans, budget priorities, development of incentives for rehabilitation, text and map amendments, and site-specific development decisions.

The need for a comprehensive preservation plan began with a 2003 Legislative Action from City Council. In response, the Planning Division presented "A Review of Salt Lake City's Approach to Historic Preservation: Administration Response to the City Council's Legislative Action" to the City Council in 2004.

The Preservation Plan was a recommendation of the Legislative Intent. Consultants, Clarions Associates, began work on the plan in late 2007. They "used an interactive process that involved and incorporated feedback from a variety of groups." A 17-member Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC) was created that included people with a variety of background, interests and geographic areas, including preservation architects, historians and property owners. The group met regularly and reviewed and commented on each stage of the project. A subcommittee of the Historic Landmark Commission (HLC) was also a member of the Citizen group and served as a liaison between the CAC and the HLC. The general public was invited to participate throughout the process through four public meetings and with an online questionnaire and comment section.

Clarion Associates developed a vision statement for the development of the plan through a collaborative process that included the Historic Landmark Commission, the Citizen Advisory Committee, and city residents. Clarion states that, "the vision provides strategic guidance regarding how the city should maintain, strengthen, and expand its preservation activities in a manner that is consistent with other city objectives, in order to identify and maximize mutual benefits." This vision is expressed through five themes:

1. Foster a Unified City Commitment to Preservation.
2. Develop a Complete Preservation Toolbox.
3. Administer a Convenient and Consistent Historic Preservation Program.
4. Improve Education and Outreach.
5. Support a Sustainable City.

On April 1, 2008, the Historic Landmark Commission reviewed the plan and an errata sheet which has been incorporated into the attached document and unanimously approved recommendation of the Plan to the Planning Commission and City Council.

The plan includes the following chapters:

1: Introduction

2: A Vision for Historic Preservation in Salt Lake City (See above.)

This chapter contains the five-theme vision statement for historic preservation activity in the city. These themes serve as the basis for the rest of the content and recommendations of the plan.

3: Foster a Unified City Commitment to Preservation

This chapter presents an overview of the conditions and dynamics of preservation planning, including a review of the geographic and programmatic overlaps that exist between preservation and other departments and planning activities of the City. The chapter establishes goals and

policies for how the City can practice a unified city approach to preservation. The following goals are provided along with specific recommended actions.

Goal 1.1 Ensure consistency between the Historic Preservation Plan and all other adopted city plans.

Goal 1.2 Ensure consistency between Historic Preservation Plan and all city policies.

Goal 1.3 Foster a shared understanding of preservation with in the City.

This chapter recognizes the ability of historic preservation to be a valuable planning tool and the actions recommended encourage preservation be a factor in all City planning components such as zoning, housing, neighborhood development and preservation, public services, redevelopment, transportation, and sustainability.

4: Adopt a Comprehensive Preservation Toolbox

This chapter discusses the tools and incentives currently used in the city and presents numerous recommendations for improvements and additions to broaden the regulatory tools and incentives available to support historic preservation.

Goal 2.1: Strategically pursue the identification of historic resources through surveys.

Goal 2.2: Ensure that up-to-date and complete surveys are used to inform preservation decision-making.

Goal 2.2: Ensure that up-to-date and complete surveys are used to inform preservation decision-making.

Goal 2.3: Ensure the long-term health and viability of existing historic districts.

Goal 2.4: Protect exemplary groupings of historic properties as local historic districts.

Goal 2.5: Protect significant individual properties as designated local Landmark Sites.

Goal 2.6: Encourage the listing of significant historic properties on the National Register of Historic Places to complement local designation.

Goal 2.7: Align preservation-related City regulations with the goals and policies of this plan.

Goal 2.8: Broaden the range of tools available to encourage the preservation of historic properties.

Goal 2.9: Offer economic hardship and demolition provisions that achieve their intended purpose.

Goal 2.10: Refine existing design guidelines and create new guidelines to address multi-family and non-residential development and properties in local historic districts and Local Landmark Sites.

This chapter provides advice on using, conducting, funding and prioritizing surveys. It recommends that boundaries of current districts be evaluated and that properties listed in the National Register and city-owned eligible historic properties be locally designated to assure their protection. An important recommendation is an assessment of underlying zoning to assure that it is compatible with historic overlays. The plan also recommends consideration of additional tools such as conservation districts. Some suggested projects are already in the works and include revision of the economic hardship ordinance. With the financial assistance of the Redevelopment Agency, commercial design guidelines are in the process of development.

5: Administer a Clear, Convenient, and Consistent Historic Preservation Program

This chapter provides an overview of how the preservation program is administered and recommends ways to improve information sharing, staffing levels, and outreach methods to improve overall user-friendliness and efficiency of the program. The following goals are provided along with specific recommended actions.

- Goal 3.1 Provide knowledgeable, consistent and fair program administration.*
- Goal 3.2 Ensure the preservation program has full and knowledgeable staff.*
- Goal 3.3 Improve user-friendliness of the historic process.*
- Goal 3.4 Ensure preservation regulations are enforced.*
- Goal 3.5 Build the city's technological capacity to facilitate program administration.*

Recommendations of this chapter include providing for regular training of commissioners and staff and better defining the role of the commission and subcommittees. Customer service is a component of this chapter with recommendations to improve processes, increase technical capacity and hire an enforcement officer trained in preservation.

6: Increase Community Pride and Awareness of Historic Preservation

This chapter reviews current outreach approaches used to support preservation by the city and its preservation partners, and identifies additional recommendations to further appreciation and understanding of historic resources. The following goals are provided along with specific recommended actions.

- Goal 4.1 Increase public awareness of the historic preservation program and its benefits.*
- Goal 4.2 Improve coordination with preservation partners.*
- Goal 4.3 Increase public visibility of historic preservation.*
- Goal 4.4 Increase financial incentives for preservation.*

Some of the actions recommended have already begun such as updating the website, providing informational brochures and attending community events and fairs. Many of the actions will require working with partners such as the Utah Heritage Foundation and the State Historic Preservation Office. One recommendation, to increase incentives, could have a much greater impact than just encouraging restoration. For instance, the incentives could help decrease the number of economic hardship cases the Commission hears since incentives would make it difficult to make the case of economic hardship. Incentives could also be directed towards helping property owners lower energy expenses within existing buildings.

7: Support a Sustainable City

This chapter illustrates how preservation can help support environmental, economic, social and cultural sustainability, specifically energy efficiency, heritage tourism, downtown revitalization, parks and landscapes, transportation, and housing. The following goals are provided along with specific recommended actions.

- Goal 5.1 Improve public understanding of the life-cycle energy benefits of historic preservation.*
- Goal 5.2 Encourage the use of sustainable buildings practices in the renovation and maintenance of historic structures.*
- Goal 5.3 Support historic tourism to Salt Lake City.*
- Goal 5.4 Increase coordination between historic preservation and Downtown revitalization and economic development efforts.*
- Goal 5.5 Preserve historic parks and other historic landscapes in Salt Lake City.*
- Goal 5.6 Support a range of transportation modes.*
- Goal 5.7 Promote a range of housing options in historic areas to meet a variety of needs.*
- Goal 5.8 Assist homeowners in overcoming age, income, or ability challenges of home maintenance requirements.*

This chapter coincides with the current draft of the Sustainability Plan and follows the same thematic framework. An example of a recommendation from this chapter is Action 1 under Policy 5.7d “Work to develop appropriate policies on allowing accessory dwelling units in historic homes.” Allowing for accessory units is one way of helping a property owner cover the expenses of maintaining a large historic home and can increase density in a low-impact manner. The language stresses that this action should follow best practices and be appropriate for the neighborhood.

8: Implementation Action Plan

This chapter summarizes the actions identified in each of the preceding chapters of the historic preservation plan, and identifies priorities, responsible parties, and potential funding sources for their implementation.

Comments

Public Comments

Many public comments have been received throughout the process of creating the plan. A final public workshop was held on February 18, 2009 at the Cathedral of the Madeleine. Please see Attachment C.

Division Comments

The Redevelopment Agency submitted written comments. Please see Attachment B.

Analysis and Findings

State Code identifies the procedures for adopting general plans and identifies historic preservation as an element that may be included in a general plan. The draft Historic Preservation Plan was developed through an open process that included public workshops and a citizen advisory group and therefore reflects the desires of the City as a whole.

Finding: The development of a historic preservation plan is allowed by State Code. The proposed Historic Preservation Plan is consistent with the vision and goals of the City's community master plans and supports the preservation of neighborhood character and local history.

Options

Deny. The Planning Division may recommend denial of this plan. If denied, the Historic Landmark Commission will explore other means of providing guidance for preservation of the City's historic sites.

Approve. The Planning Commission may recommend approval of this plan to the City Council. If approved, the plan will be presented to the City Council.

Table Decision. The Planning Commission may table acting on this plan and request additional information or research.

**The Draft Historic Preservation Plan and
Historic Landmark Commission minutes
from April 1, 2009 were omitted to reduce
redundant copying**

**To view the Draft Historic Preservation Plan
see Exhibit 2**

**To view the Historic Landmark Commission
Minutes from April 1, 2009 see Exhibit 11C**

ATTACHMENT B
Department Comments

MEMORANDUM

TO: Robin Zeigler
FROM: D.J. Baxter, Valda Tarbet, Matt Dahl
RE: Historic Preservation Plan
DATE: February 25, 2009
CC: David Everitt, Wilf Sommerkorn

The RDA Staff appreciates the opportunity to provide its comments on the proposed Preservation Plan. As an agency focused on the built environment, we devote substantial resources toward the restoration of historic structures, and appreciate the enormous qualitative ways in which renovation contributes to our urban fabric and enhances our community. As the City's primary vehicle for eliminating blight and encouraging reinvestment, the RDA also clearly understands the degree to which perpetual neglect and inaction with regard to dilapidated structures can harm a community. While we wholeheartedly believe in the value of restoring and preserving historically significant structures, we also know the economic hurdles that make the prospect infeasible in many situations. We believe that any city must be permitted to grow and evolve as times and circumstances warrant, and we hope that our input and involvement can help Salt Lake City to strike the appropriate balance between preservation and new development. We understand that both values are shared by City leaders and each has to be balanced with the other priorities of the City.

The Redevelopment Agency staff (RDA) has thoroughly reviewed the draft Historic Preservation Plan (the "Plan") and has identified several concerns with its approach and specific policy recommendations. The following is a list of our concerns and, where possible, recommended changes. We fully support several of the Plan's proposals, which we also identify here.

Theme: The language used in the Plan seems to suggest that preservation is *the* preeminent goal of the City, rather than one of many important objectives. Examples include the Plan's call for City's master plans to be updated for consistency with the Plan (Page 16), and its suggestion that all city regulations should be made to conform to preservation objectives, without any acknowledgement that the City codes must also meet a variety of other city priorities. ("By bringing regulations of the city into alignment with preservation objectives, the city will help reduce internal conflicts and contradictions ..." (Page 91).) It is certainly a valuable goal to eliminate internal inconsistencies within city plans and regulations, the language of the draft Plan infers that the other objective of a community plan being revised will be subordinated to the need for consistency with the Historic Preservation Plan. We would favor adding some language to state that this consistency effort will not override or weaken the other objectives of an adopted master plan. A statement on page 9 raises similar concerns: "All city departments, agencies,

overlap frequently enough to warrant such an arrangement on an ongoing basis, but could instead be effectively addressed through increased coordination at the staff level.

Conservation Districts: The RDA staff does not oppose the objective of Conservation Districts, but also does not believe an additional set of rules is the best way to preserve neighborhood character in the City. Rather, any elements of neighborhood character that need to be preserved should be reflected in the zoning ordinance, providing a single source of guidance on building requirements for the area. The RDA staff supports adopting more prescriptive zoning codes that include specific design guidelines and limit or eliminate subjective design review at multiple stages of the development process. RDA staff is also of the opinion that preservation tools should designate and protect specific historic structures whereas the zoning code, derived from an adopted city master plan, should establish the parameters according to which neighborhoods are developed or redeveloped.

The idea that Conservation Districts would be voluntarily created and self-enforced (Page 48) raises the specter that one resident or group of residents could impose its view of compatibility on others. We are seeing in several neighborhoods now the degree to which this pits neighbors against one another, and undermines the very sense of community our neighborhoods are intended to enhance. In our view, a single set of clear and unambiguous rules, adopted in the zoning code, should serve this function.

Project and Loan Review: The Plan calls for preservation staff to participate in the review of new projects (Page 65) and City loans (Page 74). In the case of reviewing new projects, the RDA staff supports the preservation staff's review of projects that are in historic districts, provided their review does not increase the amount of time required for the building permit process.

Design Guidelines: The Plan calls for refining current design guidelines and the development of new ones (Page 55-56). The RDA staff supports the inclusion of specific design guidelines in the City's zoning code that are based on City master plans. Optimally, these design guidelines should be carefully crafted to provide a predictable, consistent set of rules under which expectations are clear. To that end, they should limit or remove the subjective review of a project's design. Developers have stated that they can work with a long compendium of design requirements so long as they are clearly and consistently articulated from the outset, but they find the multiple layers of subjective review that sometimes accompany design guidelines can become unpredictable and time consuming.

This is specifically mentioned in the Plan when it calls for the establishment of an Architectural Review Committee (Page 60), which we understand exists already. In the description of the committee, it indicates that the committee can only provide an opinion on a project's design and that opinion may or may not reflect the opinion of the commission (HLC). If the Architectural Review Committee is comprised of HLC members and is still not able to determine whether a project conforms to the design guidelines, and provides no firm commitment that the full HLC will likewise approve the recommended changes, then neither the guidelines nor the committee has added to the predictability of the process. We worry that anytime the full HLC varies from the advice offered by the committee, this proactive review, which has the potential to be very helpful to an applicant, will instead add another layer of uncertainty to the development process that will only further discourage investment in Salt Lake City.

ATTACHMENT C
Public Comments

Comments made at the Final Public Workshop for the draft Preservation Plan

Workshop with Clarion on March 18, 2009

Matt Goebel with Clarion and Robin Zeigler, Joel Patterson and Janice Lew with the Planning Division attended.

A Liberty Wells property owner asked if conservation districts could control demolition. Matt recommended that they should not.

Pete Ashdown stated that there is not adequate strategy for protection of downtown buildings. There is an emphasis towards overlays and districts, but it is his belief that the downtown property owners will never agree to it. He feels there should be a way to designate important properties even if there is not owner consent.

An attendee asked what kind of demolition ordinance was being proposed and how does it differ from what is already in place. Matt explained that the plan is not proposing a specific ordinance but making recommendations.

One attendee claimed that there are "real problems" with the design guidelines. Matt stated that in Clarion's interviews they found that there are missing definitions and there could be better illustrations but that, other than that, the guidelines seem to work pretty well. The workshop attendee was encouraged to submit his concerns in writing.

One attendee stated that there is a Main Street program although Matt Goebel had stated that there was not. (Note: The National Trust has officially taken SLC off the Main Street list as there is no Main Street program.)

There were several comments made during the meeting and to Robin after the meeting congratulating the City in undertaking this process.

What types of incentives is the plan suggesting? Tax incentives, code leniency, TDRs, accelerated plan processing, increased density, etc.

Yalecrest property owners said that the "stable" comment about Yalecrest should be changed as the neighborhood is threatened by teardowns and incompatible infill.

Based on the recommendation that the local historic district boundaries be changed for the Bryant neighborhood, Cindy Cromer stated that she would not want the National Register boundaries changed as that would impact her ability to use the tax credits. Matt stated that it was unlikely that resources would be used to delist the district from the National Register, but that the boundaries of the local historic district should be changed.

An attendee asked how delisting portions of the district would help. Matt explained that the recommendation to delist was really saying that the district was compromised and some areas no longer qualify for listing.

Bob Young asked how the sustainability initiatives will be addressed if the Secretary of Interior's Standards, which govern a tax credit projects, conflict.

One question was how do you allow new growth that is not a threat to historic districts and does not create architectural stagnation. Matt answered that a broad range of tools, as recommended in the plan, is the answer.

Pete Ashdown asked if there was a formulaic approach for review of demolition requests outside a district. Matt stated that some communities have tried a review of all demolition applications for properties more than 50 years old but, have since backed off because it is too much to administer.

Esther Hunter recommended that the wording in the charts may not be the best choice.

Another attendee recommended changing "preservation district" to "historic district" for consistency and clarity.

Comments received in writing on the draft presented at the Final Public Workshop

Jon Dewey, 2/19/09, emailed

Overall, this is an exciting document and long overdue. Thank you for your involvement. It's heartening to see our city, and its leaders recognizing this important issue.

I'd like to add a few comments specifically in regards to the Yalecrest neighborhood. As some background, I have been involved in the neighborhood community council for several years, was past chair and participated in the Yalecrest Compatible Infill Committee. I continue to be involved in preservation aspects of our community.

The first comment is an easy semantics fix re: our designation as being listed on the National Register of Historic Places. The document says we were nominated which is true, but our designation was also granted.

Secondly, I am concerned with the Appendix A chart that lists individual neighborhoods and states whether they are stable or compromised (those are the only two words used). Yalecrest is listed as stable, and this was determined by Ron who did an eyeball assessment without formal interviews or contact with local councils (as was disclosed at the meeting last night when I asked to what extent Ron's survey entailed). Those of us living in Yalecrest who are concerned with preservation are keenly aware that our neighborhood is not stable, especially with regards to teardowns and out of scale rebuilds and additions. They actually are quite prevalent in our neighborhood and we would like that addressed and believe the term 'stable' must be changed. We just lost another house to demolition last week.

Lastly, I'd like to call your attention to the sentence, "Its historic resources do not appear to be threatened by any significant pressures or concerns at this time." also in the Appendix A section under Yalecrest. There are many pressures in our neighborhood currently at work to undermine the preservation of its integrity, scale, privacy and original character. For example, we continue to be notified of Board of Adjustments hearings re: the building of garages that exceed what is allowed in our neighborhood, those are pressures. So, again, I believe this sentence is inaccurate and would lead those in power to believe all is well as far as preservation in the Yalecrest neighborhood, which is not the case.

I understand Ron did not have the ability or latitude to interview or schedule meetings with those concerned. And because of the residents care and pride in the neighborhood the number of unkmpt and dilapidated housing stock is minimal at most, giving the appearance of a stable neighborhood. But there is an underlying pattern continuing to grow and reduce our 91% (it is less now) contributing structure tally as determined by those that surveyed and applied for the Historic designation.

Five Yalecrest residents showed up last night specifically with taming what is going on in our neighborhood in mind, and by the number of districts on your maps and the total number of people that showed up last night minus employees and cohorts, five from Yalecrest was a disproportionate amount. Statistically our five makes a substantial statement, we were also quite vocal, and engaged if you didn't notice.

Thank you for accepting comments.

George and Cathy Kelner, 2/23/09, email

First of all, please accept our thanks for a much needed and long overdue commitment from the city to preserve its rich historic character. We are so pleased that the city is committed to educating the city's citizens to the benefits, both economic and aesthetic, in preservation and creating a future vision with regulations and incentives to preserve our neighborhoods. We've perused the draft plan and offer the following comments:

We take issue with the Yalecrest neighborhood being described as "stable". Please know that we have lived in the Yalecrest neighborhood for almost 30 years, first on Harvard Avenue, then Princeton Avenue and now currently on Military Drive. We have seen significant erosion of the character of our neighborhood with numerous out-of-character remodels, additions and oversize inappropriate garages. More recently we have seen an increasing and alarming number of homes being torn down and replaced with large out-of-character new homes. There is hardly a street in all of Yalecrest that hasn't been impacted with one of these remodels, garages or teardowns. If we look at our own street as an example and take the eight houses in closest proximity to ours, five of the eight have had significant remodels with large additions. The house directly next door to ours has just completed addition of 3500 square feet which more than doubled the size of the original structure. We strongly believe that Yalecrest deserves the designation of "compromised" and that the citywide preservation plan needs to recognize that and recommend some immediate actions to mitigate further degradation.

We also would like to take issue with the recommendation that would increase density of our historic neighborhoods by promoting the approval of "mother-in-law" apartments or living units in auxiliary structures such as garages. While this may be somewhat appropriate in some neighborhoods, we strongly believe that such a policy would erode rather than enhance Yalecrest's historic character. Parking congestion which is already a problem in some areas of our district is just one of the negative impacts that could happen with such a policy. We recommend that this be removed from the plan.

Finally, we are excited about the possibility of the city creating conservation districts. We spoke after the presentation of the draft last week with a gentleman from Nashville who described what they have been able to do with conservation districts. He said that they have almost eliminated teardowns by some on the conservation district regulations and have created additional regulations regarding the size and style of additions and remodels. We are very interested in learning more about conservation districts as a way to preserve neighborhoods in the city.

Again, thanks to you and other city officials for your current and future work to preserve our city and its beautiful historic structures.

PS We didn't get a chance to sign the roll at last week's plan presentation. Please add our names.

Pete Ashdown, 2/24/09, email

Robin, as I commented in the meeting at the Cathedral, it seems to me that there is not adequate strategy for protection of downtown buildings. There is an emphasis towards overlays and districts, but it is my belief that that the downtown property owners will never agree to anything like that. I believe there should be a way for citizens to designate buildings independent of owners, so they would come under review for modification or demolition.

Loggins Merrill, 2/24/09, online questionnaire

I understand the need to preserve areas of our city which are currently not protected by an historic district. My biggest fear with this plan is that we are going to restrict the design guidelines too much. This plan to me starts to feel like I'm living out in Lehi or some town/ suburb that has strict rules about what materials I'm supposed to have on my home, how many (and which type) of trees can go in my front yard, etc. It just all smacks of taking away an individual's right to have the style of home they want.

My biggest issue is that while I live in SLC, I would like to continue to live in the city but in a completely modern home. These too are and can be done beautifully. I don't want to live in a place where everything looks the same, however I also don't want to live in a neighborhood where there is an atrocious house either.

Please make room in your plan for those of us who would love to live in the city but in a different style of home.

Ira Hinckley, 2/24/09, online questionnaire

I have now attended two of the historic preservation plan meetings as I am very much in favor of preserving our historic structures. However I am very worried that this "Preservation Plan" may in fact hurt our preservation goals. For example I don't understand how delisting central city from a historic district to a conservation overlay is going to make it harder to tear down historic buildings! I am worried that this will be a tool in the city's hands to make it easier to tear down. My suggestion is that no approval for demolition should be allowed for any building built prior to 1930. The only exception would be allowed for relocation of such buildings and only with approval by the community! We have already lost too much of our heritage!

Unknown, 2/25/09, online questionnaire

Work with the owner of the property. Please remember that it is the property owner who owns the building and has to pay the expenses. Current methods for historic preservation tend to focus on only a few certain aspects in the historic preservation process instead of the full process. Also incentives are far more favorable to getting a really well done restoration verses rigid regulations.

Lisette Gibson, 3/1/2009, email

Historic District Recommendations pg 97

Yalecrest: As of 11/07, the Yalecrest Historic District had 91% contributing buildings! Over the years, the neighborhood has been feeling the impact of teardowns, incompatible additions and oversized new primary and accessory structures. I feel that the Survey Objective should be changed to "Compromised" instead of just left blank. We have been told for years that a Conservation District could be a great fit for the neighborhood. I

would like to see the priority level bumped up to Moderate or High and to be looked at for a Conservation or Local District. As you know, we have a new teardown planned on 1700 E block of Yale / Yalecrest. That block is a gem of the neighborhood and has been pretty much untouched until recently. We worry about the cluster effect that seems to happen when new construction begins. Refer to pg. 40, Goal 2.4a: "Pursue local historic district listings for significant concentrations of historic properties to ensure their continued protection through the historic preservation plan".

- Consider adding the Wasatch Hollow Community Council area, (1300 E to 1900 E, 1300 S to 1700 S) to potential Historic Area Recommendations and or include them with the Yalecrest Infill Ordinance and/or Conservation District.

- Add area boundaries (street addresses) to All sections where it is possible. Example for Yalecrest is "800 S to 1300 S, 1300 E to 1900 E".

Additional Areas of Historic Interest:

- Federal Heights - how can a recommendation be made for Federal Heights to be on a local historic level when it isn't on the national level yet?

- West Liberty Neighborhood

My son purchased his first home at 180 E Yale Ave (950 So). His home is at the east end of a two-block stretch of cottages between State and 200 East. It is recommended that future boundaries should end at 200 East. I disagree. The homes are all very consistent and appear to still be in pretty good condition. I recommend that the boundary end with any residential properties east of State Street. If not, deterioration of this neighborhood will surely increase. Encouraging home ownership and education surrounding financial incentives for home repairs should increase.

- Westminster Avenue Neighborhood

This is also referred to as the Wasatch Hollow Community Council area. Should the descriptive name be changed? I recommend that the entire area be surveyed and that the boundaries encompass the community council boundaries (1300 E to 1900 E, 1300 S to 1700 S). A large portion of the Wasatch Hollow neighborhood is very similar to the upper Yalecrest Neighborhood area.

- Sugarhouse

Is there any reference to residential? If so, I didn't see it. Sugarhouse covers a very large area. The report seems to only focus on the business core. I know there are pockets of residential properties worth preserving in one way or another.

GOALS/POLICIES

2.3.a. Make sure that the "intent" language of perimeter zoning is compatible with neighboring historic structures or neighborhoods, e.g. CN zone. Define "demolition" accurately and track city-wide.

EDUCATION and OUTREACH

Community Council - not all councils have newsletters. More help is needed to assist councils to increase awareness and education around preservation. Councils could use a preservation planner assigned to their area that is familiar with their issues.

Teardowns (city-wide) for residential and commercial structures. Implement a "Cooling Off Period" and a "Notification Process" for nearby residents, business and community councils. This is an excellent opportunity to educate property owners and nearby residents about any historic significance of the property they are planning to demolish. Historic renovation education and assistance could be provided. Be proactive rather than reactionary. Track teardowns city wide.

Add a "Glossary of Terms".

Kent Brough, 4/2/2009, email

I am sorry I was not able to make it to the meeting on **Thursday, February 19th** with the [Commercial] Design Guidelines. I was tied up with some issues at work. However, I do want to commend you and your consultants on the excellent meeting on **Wednesday, February 18th**. I enjoyed the discussion very much. One thought that occurred to me is it would be good to seek more support and exposure to the media for what is being done. I believe that if Mayor Becker were to come out supporting this initiative and even being there when some of the community meetings are held, we could get better support in the long run. Other than that, I have no other suggestions.

I hope that your changes will provide us with a **model document** that can be used in other cities throughout the area. Next comes the challenges faced with implementation of the document. Thanks for the opportunity to review and respond. Keep up the great effort.

Ed Merrill, 4/3/09, online questionnaire

I support the city's effort to update & refine the preservation plan. My house is 115 years old, but has been modified to support a family in the 21st century. The new contrasts with the old as one method of a solution. Architects & owners must decide how to best solve the problem of modernizing historic housing. Guidelines must allow for interpretations that are appropriate based on scale, materials, existing development pattern & so forth. I heartily support the preservation of historic structures, but also recognize the need to allow a city & neighborhood to mature & evolve, as long as it is NOT at the expense of the existing character & fabric of a neighborhood. I also believe that commercial development should be allowed, as with homes, to be a modern expression of the times, as long as the quality, massing, scale, proportions, etc., contribute to the character of the neighborhood.

Additional comments: Important historic sites are Trolley Square, Gilgal Garden, Historic commercial buildings downtown, monuments, hundreds of homes & buildings (small & large). Historic neighborhood character (a whole fabric thing) where new and old co-exist, contrast, and add richness.

Improvement of infrastructure, revision of Master Plans to show commitment of city to existing housing stock (removal of RMF zoning in areas of already medium density, but detached historic housing except at certain places that make sense to community).

Find ways a property owner/architect/developer can come to an understanding about what changes would be allowable & appropriate early & easily.

Comments on previous drafts of the Plan and the Plan in general

Anonymous, 2/9/09, online questionnaire

An owner in the Avenues neighborhood north of the current district would like to see free or discounted consultations with people that could give advice or design help.

Anonymous, 2/9/09, online questionnaire

This responder to questionnaire listed the following as historic areas worth preserving: the homes on 5th E near 1700 South, older churches in the area, mill house on 6th E., Isaac Museum in the park, larger homes around Liberty Park - the NW corner of 1300 S and 500 E, homes near the ballpark and some around 200 E just above 1300 S.

I live in an older home (1908) and there is something about older homes that make the neighborhood feel established - the larger trees - substantial - it's still here - and there is some history to them, some one has been here before - their stories surround you.

Upgrading a building, retrofitting, can be done with modern energy efficient materials while maintaining the design intent of the historical exterior. Education on the why of preservation would be good for developers.

The guidelines seem to have good intent, but we can all name many design atrocities which have slipped into a neighborhood supposedly under the guidelines. At this point the guidelines serve no purpose, and it makes you wonder who pocketed the oversight fees!

Anonymous, 1/24/09, online questionnaire

I am adding a small comment, that I would like to see some respect for and appreciation of signs around town. A building may not be significant, but there are signs and logos around that are. I am thinking of the ice cream cone on 4th South, for example, which was painted black. I know that we cannot always convey our sentimental interests to a newcomer in town, but, perhaps there could be a Registry of Sentimental Interests which would be of public record and available to people coming in new to the community who think they want to make changes.

Anonymous, 1/24/09, online questionnaire

I am third generation in my family home that was built approximately 1910 (still searching for closer date) - Block was deeded to David Young in 1857 and my father and his folks moved in 1916 - the same year the Capitol Bldg was completed. Dome of the Cap can be seen in the background of a photo of my Dad standing in the front yard on 13th Ave and there is NOTHING between the home and the Capitol...there were three homes built on the block around the same time and occupied around the same time. They were the only homes above 9th Avenue for some time.

I am currently trying to do that on my own - I am not thrilled about the idea of involving government - it seems that there are always ties - If government gives funding under certain restrictions and those restrictions are met, and then the government butts out, that's fine. I understand the need for oversight for the funding and renovation, but once the renovation's done, then the government should keep out of it unless other restrictions are mandated.....it's almost like a down hill slope - it does cause me concern....some people are very responsible

in a renovation job and their homes reflect that, but others would seemingly just as soon "renovate" and then dump the property or let it fall into disrepair....mixed feelings as you can see.

Anonymous, 11/13/08, online questionnaire

Worth preserving is the Harvard Yale area, but I feel that most older neighborhoods are at risk of losing their character and charm. I am concerned and appalled at the rate of destruction, and size of additions to the older homes. This area has been recognized nationally as an historic district but there are no preservation/restrictions/building regulations that come with that. Outside the lower Avenues there is nothing preventing the destruction of historic buildings and neighborhoods.

Anonymous, 9/25/08, online questionnaire

My seismic upgrade would need to be subsidized. I have no plans to structurally rehab my 1910 house.

Anonymous, 5/7/08, online questionnaire

The block between 2100 South and Redondo Ave. near 400 and 500 East has some fantastic old burned out buildings that are sitting vacant and not being restored. Behind these (on Redondo) is a neat little bungalow that is a perfect candidate for restoration however the owner will not sell, and does not show interest in restoration. Demolition of these homes would destroy some of the oldest homes in that area. Perhaps the city could compile a list of homes for sale that need historic preservation for people coming into Salt Lake City that need a home and desire the style and charm that only an historic home can provide?

Merrill Loggins, 4/29/08

I understand the importance of having a preservation plan in order to not lose so much history and identity of our neighborhoods. My biggest fear is that the plan will be too restrictive for people who want to update/remodel their home but not to any historic standard. I actually chose my home location in SLC based on where there is not a historic site. This is because I have heard many terrible stories of people who get hassled by the city because they live in a historic district and have to follow certain guidelines while remodeling their home. Just please remember there are people like myself who love to live in an older neighborhood but love modern design and would love to have an older home remodeled but to look new, not old. I hope this plan allows for different styles and supports property owners who wish to upgrade and improve the housing structures but in their own style (which may not be a historic style).

Anonymous, 4/22/08, online questionnaire

It seems that the city has competing interests in this area — both the desire to preserve valuable historical buildings (not all old buildings, but those with significance) and to encourage new growth through infill construction that will not, by definition, meet historical standards. There seems to be a city-wide assumption that everyone wants to live in a restored historical building — leave room for those of us interested in what Salt Lake has to offer but who also desire an infill, modern home.

Kersten, 5/7/08, online questionnaire

Mid-century modern homes above the Capital building and throughout some neighborhoods of Salt Lake City are worth preserving. It doesn't have to be a Victorian to be considered historic! Restrictive and disheartening — the historic districts north of downtown (Capital Hill and Avenues) do all but prohibit economically feasible new buildings.

Christina Stanley, 2/28/09, online questionnaire

I'm excited about the possibility of attention being paid to Rose Park for its historical significance. I am a young mother of 2 children at 9th N and 9th W. I would love to see the commercial areas surrounding this neighborhood become more pedestrian-friendly, while maintaining the old and showing off the new cultures of Rose Park. Our shopping areas are not historic, but I am certain that adding more chain stores would detract from this area, and I hope to see more support for local businesses. Ideally, a historic "main street" that incorporates elements of the Mexican American (and other minority) culture with the post WWII charm of Rose Park could be integrated with the commercial needs of the area (food, house wares, clothing, convenience items). As it is now, businesses are mish mashed without much planning for appearance and foot traffic. Anyway, please contact me if there's something specific I could do (but not overly time-consuming) to help out.

Barbara Burt, 2/1/08, online questionnaire

I would like to see stricter property maintenance requirements for multi unit apartment buildings here in the Avenues.

There are too many ugly and unkempt apartment buildings in the Avenues area and it isn't fair to the residential homeowners who spend a lot of money and time maintaining their historical properties.

Our properties increase the value of the ugly apartment buildings, while their properties decrease the value of ours.

How about charging higher property taxes for those who don't maintain their rental properties as they should and give those of us who do keep our properties nice, a tax break.

I'd love to hear your comments.

Anonymous, date unknown, questionnaire

Resource information needed for restoration and incentives.

Anonymous, date unknown, questionnaire

Need demolition by neglect. Establish philosophy and intent for character and evaluate with professional board "with teeth."

Anonymous, date unknown, questionnaire

Need to landmark commercial 1950-1960s on South State Street, Main to West Temple below 5th South.

Anonymous, date unknown, questionnaire

Support community with architects, contractors, consultants

Mary Dell and Raymond Gunne, date unknown, questionnaire

My husband and I have a love and appreciation for old buildings. We live within the boundaries of Wasatch Hollow Community Council (the east side of 1300 East to the west side of 1900 east, the south side of 1300 South to the north side of 1700 south). The house we reside in was built in 1926, and the others on our block were built in or around the same year (except for one totally incompatible home built in 2005). The original owners of our house would recognize it, as no changes have been made to the exterior since it was built. It is obvious that the people who constructed our homes were craftsmen who took pride in their work.

We would like our area to be evaluated and considered for the appropriate historic or conservation district designation, as I believe many of the homes would be contributing structures. There have been several tear downs and jump ups and there seem to be no protection at all to mitigate what is happening to the character of our neighborhood. Historic preservation deserves a higher profile in Salt Lake City. WE subscribe to Preservation and American Bungalow magazines and I often wonder why there are no articles on home and buildings in Salt Lake City. We have wonderful housing stock in every neighborhood of this city. Granted, a lot of it is in need of restoration/renovation, but it is a wonderful nevertheless.

There are some masonry issues with our 82-year-old foundation, steps, etc, as well as plumbing and electrical that need to be restored/repared/renovated, but we do not qualify for the Federal and State incentives or the Utah Heritage Foundation's low-interest loans because our home is not in an historic district.

No effort seems to be made to salvage materials and record the history of historic homes or commercial buildings that are demolished. I wonder how much old growth timber was in the buildings that were just demolished in Sugar House.

I am aware of the Design Guidelines but have not had occasion to use them. Reading them was helpful to me in learning what is accepted practice and what is not. What would make them more useful is to make their existence more well-known and their use more widespread, even if the home is not in an historic district. Homeowners in our areas seem to have no idea where to find this kind of information. We need more public education on historic preservation, so that people might begin to view their homes as historic homes, not just old houses. They need to know the resources available to them, (the contractor's directory listed on the landmark commission's resource web page, various books, magazines and catalogues) so that when they do want to add on or renovate, they know their options and can have some confidence in the experience of the contractor. Most contractors working in our area do not seem to be sensitive to the aesthetics of historic homes and appear to be looking at their bottom line only, not what is best for the home, homeowner and neighborhood. The result is re-muddling of the worst kind.

Meeting Notes from Citizen Advisory Committee meetings

HLC COMMUNITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE (CAC) FOR PRESERVATION PLAN

December 4, 2007 MEETING NOTES HLC COMMUNITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE (CAC) FOR PRESERVATION PLAN

Future meeting Dates:

Will take place monthly between January and June

First Tuesday of each month 4pm to 6pm

Outreach

- Recommendation that HLC staff set up a message board or blog for the larger community.
- Request of Clarion for best practices for outreach and education
- Create "Roadshow"

Planning

- Preservation is not in its rightful place within the city's goals and values
- Needs to be a balanced between regulations and incentives maybe even a person and funds dedicated to incentives
- Preservation is weak because it is not integrated into the broader pictures
- Recommendation to use the preservation plan to drive a comprehensive plan.

Surveys

- There is a need for context. How can the public access current information and understand how it relates to their building?
- Concern that the studies were recently done are not being used and not accessible to the public
- Concern that Ron Sladec was duplicating efforts already done or taking place. It was suggested that a work session be conducted with the CAC and Ron before he comes back for additional work.
- According to Matt, what people really care about are financial incentives and improved processing
- Concern about the lack of enforcement and that HLC is understaffed

Visioning Worksheet

Matt and Amy with Clarion presented a draft of the Visioning Worksheet and said that another electronic version would be sent to them. (Worksheet was sent via email on January 2, 2007).

JANUARY 8, 2008 MEETING NOTES

Members Attending: Lisette Gibson, Elizabeth Giraud, Kirk Huffaker, Nelson Knight, Warren Lloyd, Barbara Murphy, Anne Oliver, Rob Pett, David Richardson

Staff Attending: Cheri Coffee, Robin Zeigler, Janice Lew, Kati Weiler

Anne Oliver opened the meeting by announcing that Esther Hunter will no longer be on the Historic Landmark Commission because of an appointment in the Mayor's office. For this reason, she will also not be directly involved with the CAC.

Future Meeting Dates

Will take place monthly between January and June
SECOND Tuesday of each month from 4pm to 6pm

Existing Conditions Report

- One member stated that the Clarion's "Existing Conditions Report" was a good first draft but that it was overall negative in tone, folded in too many opinions and not enough actual conditions, not very thorough.
- Members suggested: a bibliography, a timeline graphic, better history that includes the successes of SLC preservation over the years.

Visioning Statement

- Preservation is not in its rightful place within the city's goals and values.
- Needs to be a balance between regulations and incentives, maybe even a staff person and funds dedicated to incentives.
- Preservation is weak because it is not integrated into the broader picture.
- Recommendation to use the preservation plan to drive a comprehensive plan

Additional Survey

Members debated whether or not an additional survey was needed and useful and if so, what format, timing, promotion would work best. The reasons stated for the need for a new survey included the lackluster response of the initial survey, the need to keep the general public informed and involved throughout the process, the fact that the initial survey did not include all preservation partners. The group agreed that an additional survey would be useful. It will be a shortened version of the existing survey with some additional questions. Members of the CAC will share the survey by making presentations about the plan to the group(s) they represent. In addition, responses can be solicited through special events such as the Greater Avenues Street Festival and the state-wide preservation conference. Information may also be posted in public areas such as the Library.

Staff asked that members email their ideas as to which questions should be included and excluded by the following Friday. A draft would be created and sent to them for their approval. The final version will be available on the website.

Public Involvement

Each member agreed to make presentations to the groups they represent at the time that each product becomes available or at each milestone of the plan development process. Members agreed that they need a "toolkit" with which to go into these meetings. Power point and visual boards were discussed. Vision Utah was given as an example of a good campaign. Staff agreed to put together an initial power point for Kirk Huffaker to use at the Utah Heritage Foundation's next board meeting on January 17th.

One member asked if the plan information available on the web had an easy link to give out. Staff told him no but that they were working on a banner to be placed on the City's homepage that will provide a direct link to the site.

A member commented that the Avenues district would be having its 30th birthday as a district this year and several others would be celebrating their 25th. She suggested a "happy birthday" card/letter as way to remind them about the tax credits and other benefits of being an historic district.

Future Meetings & Communication:

The group agreed that the second Tuesday will work well for the regular monthly meeting, as opposed to the first Tuesday schedule originally discussed.

Staff corrected an email stating that all future meetings would take place in room 126. Although most meetings will take place in room 126, members were asked to check the agenda each month to confirm the meeting location.

The group agreed to the following topics for the next agenda: presentations, additional questionnaire, promotion and perpetuation of plan, and initial discussion of the partner's roles and responsibilities.

Members requested additional communication between the HLC and the CAC. Staff was asked to regularly send meeting notes from the HLC meetings about any discussions regarding the preservation plan and to be sent as much information as possible, in advance, about any preservation related topics that are expected to take place at HLC meetings.

**HLC COMMUNITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR PRESERVATION PLAN
MEETING NOTES
February 12, 2008**

Members Attending: Lisette Gibson, Elizabeth Giraud, Kirk Huffaker, Barbara Murphy, Rob Pett, David Richardson, Bob Farrington,
Staff Attending: Cheri Coffee, Robin Zeigler, Janice Lew

Future Meeting Dates

The group agreed that rather than meet regularly each month that they would prefer to have meetings scheduled around Clarion's visits and products.

Plan Update

Progress on the plan is currently suspended as Staff reviews the revised work plan of the consultants and determines whether or not the additional costs can be funded. Once these issues are finalized a new schedule will be created.

The group expressed concern that there was not a revised Conditions Report and did not feel that the current work plan revision should hold up the completion of Phase I.

Promotion of Plan

Robin Zeigler gave an update on what had been done to promote the plan and gain public input. On the website there are two ways for people to comment. One is just general comments and the other is the revised questionnaire. Currently the questionnaire is available as a pdf but staff is working on getting an electronic form. In addition, a banner link directly to the Preservation Plan has been placed on the City's homepage.

Kirk Huffaker gave an update on his presentation to the Utah Heritage Foundation. He said that he kept the presentation to about five minutes and encouraged the Board to complete the questionnaires while they listened to the presentation. Although people might have missed portions of the presentation they were able to leave completed questionnaires at the end of the meeting rather than try to remember to mail them in. He said the power point presentation was a good one for those audiences who already have some information about preservation.

Staff has been invited to make a presentation to the Business Advisory Board and took the questionnaire and flier to the Fisher Mansion Open House.

Bob Farrington volunteered to schedule a presentation with the RDA and asked if Kirk Huffaker could make the presentation. Robin Zeigler will attend as well and bring copies of the questionnaire and fliers. Bob also stated that he had many preservation comments from the planning of the Downtown Rising Plan. Cheri Coffee volunteered a Planning Division staff member to go through the emails received and pull out the preservation related comments.

Lisette Gibson and Elizabeth Giraud both volunteered to present to groups they represent. Robin said that she would send everyone the power point presentation, which is available for public review online. She will also send a pdf version of the flier but can make copies of the flier or questionnaire for anyone who needs them.

Kirk encouraged everyone to review and comment on the draft of the Downtown Master Plan, which is online. Preservation is not adequately covered in the plan.

There were several suggestions on how to promote the plan:

- Check to see if it would be a good Salt Lake Solutions project
- Check with City's marketing team for their ideas
- Check to see if the questionnaire and/or flier be included with the water bill
- Check to see if the questionnaire and/or flier could be sent with the Community Council newsletters or agendas.

HLC COMMUNITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR PRESERVATION PLAN JUNE 18, 2008 MEETING NOTES

Future Meeting Dates

June 24th, 5pm, Room 126

Participants: Barbara Murphy, Nelson Knight, Lisette Gibson, Noreen Heid, Warren Lloyd, Polly Hart, Kirk Huffaker, Anne Oliver, Elizabeth Giraud

Staff: Esther Hunter, Joel Patterson, Janice Lew, Robin Zeigler

Consultants: Matt Goebel and Amy Kacala with Clarion Associates

Robin opened the workshop by welcoming everyone back and thanking them for their continued enthusiasm for the project. She explained that the project was placed on hold for several months due to the reorganization of the planning division but was now back on track.

Matt and Amy, with Clarion Associates, presented a draft of the "Historic Preservation Vision, Goals, and Policies" document. Matt explained that although the document included specific policies, the objective of this first workshop was to brainstorm overall themes and goals. Each subgroup completed a worksheet and presented the highlights to the entire group. Additional comments will be accepted over the next couple of weeks and should be sent to robin.zeigler@slcgov.com.

Follows is a very brief summary of the comments made by participants. Clarion will use the comments listed below as well as the additional comments on the worksheets and that they will receive over the next couple of weeks to revise the Vision and Goals document. The revised document will be presented at one or two public workshops for further comment before finalizing.

Summary of Comments:

RDA

- Recognize the shared goals of the RDA and preservation and find new ways to work with/and include RDA in preservation programs and education
- Consider working with RDA to develop a program where people receive additional funding for preservation sensitive work. Would not necessarily need to be administered by HLC or HLC staff

Staff & Funding

- Need additional staff and funding
- Need monies for survey and other projects as a regular budgetary line item rather than having to ask for it each year
- Need preservation dedicated review and enforcement staff

Surveys

- Continue to designate local districts as surveys identify them
- Provide education about all the information provided in surveys and how they can be used
- Shift the responsibility of public/electronic access of surveys to SHPO, who already has the project underway

Zoning

- Emphasis the need to change underlying zoning to be more consistent with preservation overlays
- Might be more appropriate to allow conditional use for all historic structures—not just those that are Landmarked.
- Maybe extend conditional uses to include more uses
- Evaluate appropriate boundaries of historic districts

Incentives

- Need incentives for preservation and for local districting
- One-size-fits-all incentives do not work—need to find different types of incentives for different types of neighborhoods

Housing Code

- Alternative codes could be used as an incentive to get people to Landmark individual buildings

Ordinance

- Amend ordinance to take out “advocacy” and better define the HLC’s role in preservation. Having one agency be an advocate and a regulatory body is problematic
- Encourage the development of a city-wide non-profit that would take on the advocacy role along with the Utah Heritage Foundation
- Remove Economic Hardship review committee
- Enforce landscaping regulations after demolition
- Encourage interim protection for endangered buildings where there is public benefit—demolition delay ordinance?

Education

- Encourage the education of all staff members, not just preservation staff members or planners
- Initiate awards event

Design Guidelines

- Encourage consistent signage for parks and trails that could also be used in private developments that include public spaces
- Need design guidelines for signage
- Need design guidelines for multi-family (include new construction) and non-residential
- Need design guidelines for historic landscapes (include cemeteries, parks, open space)
- Include recent past issues in design guidelines and ordinance

Sustainability

- Concerned that sustainability does not always match with preservation
- Do we want to get into regulating historic plant material?

Economy

Move economic section earlier in the document
Educate about the economic benefits of preservation
Provide more emphasis on the economic benefits

The public workshops will be two hours long. There is a possibility of scheduling two workshops on the same day to increase the potential for participation. At the workshop(s) Clarion will provide an overview of the draft document and the goals for the meeting. A large group will likely be broken into smaller groups and provided direction on a task that will help to strengthen and revise the Vision and Goals document.

The Community Advisory Committee (CAC) discussed the best time of day and the best date to schedule a public workshop. After discussion with the CAC and further discussion with staff, we are looking into a lunch workshop and a second evening public workshop on September 17th. Clarion will present the results of this workshop during a breakfast meeting the next day. This meeting would include both the HLC and the CAC. Staff thought it might be a good idea to combine the two groups since there are new members of both and this will give them an opportunity to meet each other.

The CAC ended the workshop with a discussion about promotional tools and how the CAC can help promote the workshops. Many agreed that personal invitations to targeted individuals would be best. Additional tools will be a short article that can be inserted into a neighborhood, business or community council newsletter, a newsletter, and a prepackaged presentation available on the web. At the CAC meeting and the HLC subcommittee meeting several lists were recommended for targeted invitations: attendees of early preservation plan meetings, property owners of designated property, AIA members, UHI² members, transportation, Certificate of Appropriateness applicants from the last two to three years

The next CAC meeting is scheduled on June 24th, 5pm, room 126. The purpose of this meeting is to provide consultant Ron Sladek with feedback on potential historic districts and individual properties and recommended changes to district boundaries.

**HLC COMMUNITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR PRESERVATION PLAN
JUNE 24, 2008 MEETING NOTES**

Participants: Nelson Knight, Lisette Gibson, Noreen Heid, Warren Lloyd, Kirk Huffaker, Anne Oliver, Elizabeth Giraud, Bee Lufkin

Staff: Joel Patterson, Janice Lew, Robin Zeigler

The purpose of this workshop was to brainstorm areas or individual sites that should be considered for documentation and/or designation to provide direction to the consultants of the Preservation Plan.

The discussion focused on potential districts, changes to existing districts, thematic surveys and individual sites. All were marked on maps but follows is a brief summary. In addition to the notes of the meeting, the last two pages include research of recommendations made by preservation consultants in survey reports since 1993.

Summary of Potential Districts:

Wasatch Hollow Area between 1300 East and 1900 East and 1300 South and 1700 South (possibly extending south to 2100 South)

East of State Street to 500 East and south from South Temple to 900 South

Central Business District/Main Street (potential theater area)

City Cemetery (including Chinese Cemetery)

Mt. Olivet Cemetery (including the gatehouse and lodge)

West Temple Area between 900 South to 2100 South and West of State Street to 300 West

Federal Heights

Westmoreland Place

Indian Hills (roughly "This is the Place" to the interstate)

Lower Ensign Downs (recent past district)

Country Club

Summary of Existing District Changes

Expand Warehouse Historic District to include Japan Town, Greek Town, and south to 600 South

Omit the Newhouse Hotel site from the Exchange Place Historic District and expand north to include smaller Main Street buildings

Omit the 400 South corridor from the Central City district or make it a conservation district

Extend the Avenues

Extend Capitol Hill

Individual Sites (includes sites that may already be designated but are neglected)

666 East 300 South
336 South 400 East
Reservoir Park
Lindsey Gardens
Hawk Cabin
Trinity A&E Church

Potential Thematic Surveys
Ecclesiastic Resources/ "Gentile Core"
Modernist buildings
Double houses
Innerblock courts

Additional comments:

The EIS for TRAX that was done when the line was expanded to the University should be checked to see if there are any resources on the planned airport line (North Temple).

Are the Westside Cannon Homes listed in the National Register?

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS MADE IN SURVEY REPORTS FROM 2003-2007

Capitol Hill RLS, 2006

- Survey and expand district boundaries to include the Kimball and DeSoto-Cortez neighborhoods
- ILS survey of Capitol Hill
- Implement action items within the Capitol Hill Community Master Plan

East Liberty Neighborhood, 2003

- ILS for all A rated properties not already studied
- NR for entire district
- Landmark for entire district
- Create public awareness and education programs: historic home tours, historic walking tours, publicize potential for tax credits, media exposure about designation

Liberty Wells RLS, SWCA, 2007

- ILS survey for all A and B rated properties (*in process*)
- National Register nominations for individual properties suggested and those found to be eligible during the ILS (*in process*)
- Propose listing in the entire area in the NR through a series of thematic nominations.

South Temple RLS, Lufkin, 2006

- Amend the NR nomination to change the period of significance to include the importance of modern construction in the area
- Amend the NR nomination to update the boundaries which presently run through the middle of buildings and properties, cut out four Haxton Place properties and overlap with adjacent districts (*in process with local districts*)
- ILS for all properties not already studied

Sugar House Business District, RLS, Blaes, Broschinsky and Lufkin, 2007

- ILS for all properties not already studied
- Establish a conservation district overlay zone which would share boundaries with the proposed Sugar House Business District
- Expand on the "Business District Design Guidelines Handbook" found in the Sugar House Master Plan using the survey information

SUMMARY OF SURVEY PROJECTS 2008-2009

| SURVEY PROJECT | CONTRACT # | CONTRACTOR | DUE DATE |
|------------------------------|-------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------|
| Avenues ILS Phase II | 06-1-07-2253 | Preservation Documentation Resource | June 2008 |
| Gilmer Park ILS and DG | 06-1-07-2341 | Preservation Documentation Resource | June 2008 |
| Liberty Wells ILS | In process | SWCA, Inc. | June 2009 |
| University ILS for Expansion | 06-1-07-2437 | Preservation Documentation Resource | August 2008 |
| University ILS | 06-01-08-2793 | Brockington & Associates Inc. | August 2009 |

HLC COMMUNITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR PRESERVATION PLAN July 14, 2008 MEETING NOTES

Participants: Lisette Gibson, Warren Lloyd, Elizabeth Giraud, Bee Lufkin

Staff: Robin Zeigler

Consultants: Ron Sladek, Tatanka Historical Associates

Evaluation of Historic Resources

Ron Sladek gave an update on his evaluation of historic resources. This is his last trip to look at the representative list of sites and districts culled from the suggestions made by the Community Advisory Committee (CAC), staff, and others in previous meetings. He will complete his overview this Thursday. The purpose of the evaluation is to gain an understanding of the types of resources in the City. Ron stated that Salt Lake City has a tremendous collection, especially of 1960s and 1970s era buildings.

Ron was asked when the prioritization of resources to document/designate would take place and he explained that that would be a part of writing the preservation plan.

Several members asked Ron his advice and thoughts on changing the boundaries of local districts that have pockets of new development. Ron said that most of the National Register districts are very pristine, at the present, but are in danger of being altered to the extent that they would no longer be eligible for the National Register. He stated that changing boundaries might be appropriate in some cases or that less restrictive overlays might also be a good tool.

Warren asked if it was Ron's recommendation that the City locally designate National Register properties. Ron referred this question to Matt Goebel with Clarion.

Promotion of Public Workshop

Robin recommended September 17th as a possible date for two public workshops. One would take place at lunch time and the other would be after 5pm. The members present did not express any concerns with the date.

Robin handed out a draft article written by Clarion that could be included in Community Council newsletters. She explained that there was an emphasis on "sustainability" since this is a hot topic and might gain the attention of some who would not otherwise be interested. The members agreed that it was a good idea but thought maybe there was too much of an emphasis and recommended that the article be tweaked to tone it down slightly.

Robin said that she has contacted the Community Council chairs to ask about festivals where the public workshop could be promoted. She has learned about four that she will attempt to book:

- August 5, Jordan Meadows Night Out Against Crime
- August or September, Sugarhouse Farmers Market (tentative)
- September 6, Greater Avenues Street Fair
- November 1, Sugarhouse Turkey Trot

Members also recommended the following as avenues for promotion:

- A sidewalk sale organized by King's English
- Foothill Village sidewalk sale
- U of U's orientation
- Utah Architectural Foundation, Elizabeth Mitchell, executive director
- July 29, SLC Open House for LEED standards

The next meeting has not yet been scheduled.

**HLC COMMUNITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR PRESERVATION PLAN
NOVEMBER 18, 2008 MEETING NOTES**

Participants: Nelson Knight, Noreen Heid, Warren Lloyd, Polly Hart, Elizabeth Giraud, Earle Bevins, Arla Funk, Warren Lloyd, Rob Pett, David Fitzsimmons, David Richardson,

Staff: Mary De La Marc-Schaefer, Wilf Sommerkorn, Pat Comarell, Joel Patterson, Janice Lew, Robin Zeigler, Katie Weiler, Andrew McCreary (intern), Gail Meakins

Consultants: Matt Goebel with Clarion Associates

This meeting included both the HLC and the CAC to give the two groups an opportunity to work together. The session was a workshop to review the "action items" for themes 2 and 5. A summary of comments is provided on the attached worksheet.

At 10:30 am the same day, Matt Goebel provided an update to the Community Council. Attendees included Commissioner Carlton Christensen, Mary De La Marc-Schaefer, Joel Patterson, Pat Comarell, Janice Lew, Cindy Gust-Jensen, Janice Jardine, Gail Meakins, John Dewey (former chair of Yalecrest neighborhood), Elizabeth Ziegler (reporter for KCPW), and Robin Zeigler.

Although the session was mainly an update, attendees provided some valuable comments.

Pat Comarell was asked if Transfer of Development Rights was included in the plan and a viable option for SLC. Matt Goebel stated that some cities did not find them useful because they were labor intensive to create and implement. Commissioner Christensen stated that it would be problematic to find an appropriate location to receive the additional density. Janice Jardine remarked that Frank Gray had suggested that a transfer of rights within the same block might be a better option. Matt agreed that that scenario would be easier to accomplish.

Janice Jardine recommended ASSIST's document on rehabbing existing housing as a good resource to mention in the plan.

Commissioner Christensen stated the plan should not identify conflicts only.



March 16, 2009

Robin Zeigler
Salt Lake City Historic Landmarks Commission
451 S. State Street
Salt Lake City, UT 84111

Dear Robin:

The following are my comments on the draft Historic Preservation Plan for Salt Lake City that is dated February 2009. Thank you for the opportunity to participate in the process as a member of the Community Advisory Committee. I believe the work of the committee, the Historic Landmarks Commission, you, your colleagues in the Planning Division, and the consultant have made this an enriching experience about the goals for the city's community resources and priorities.

General Comment

Throughout the document, please omit 'the' in front of both UHF and Utah Heritage Foundation. It is our preference to refer to our organization simply as Utah Heritage Foundation.

Specific Comments (PDF page #s)

Theme 1 - Goal 1.1 - Policy 1.1b

Action 2 (pg. 23) – Developing a preservation issues list for community master plans seems timely as the Avenues Community Council looks to start a new master planning process soon. Please keep this on your 0-12 month agenda.

Action 3 (pg. 23) – Encourage the Planning Division to take into account the annual priorities of Community Council undertakings that they initiate on their own. Planning and coordination with the councils through regular interaction could help in the budgeting process.

Theme 1 - Goal 1.3 - Policy 1.3a

Action 1 (pg. 33) – Recommend adding HLC staff making at least two presentations per year to City Council at work sessions to provide updates on the Historic Preservation/HLC program.

Theme 2 - Policy 2.7b

Actions 1 / 2 (pg. 52) – Though the current building code does enable remodeling of commercial structures, I agree there could be a clearer path for business and property owners wishing to do quality rehabilitation work to work with the building code and city building officials. Therefore, I would recommend that the title of this policy include the word 'clearly' prior to enable for clarification. The implementation of a historic building smart code would be a path to make this clearer.

ATTACHMENT D
Planning Commission Memo
May 4, 2009



Memorandum

Planning Division
Community & Economic Development Department

To: Planning Commission

From: Robin Zeigler, Senior Planner

Date: May 4, 2009

Re: Preservation Plan, PLNPCM2009-00171

During the Planning Commission's work session (dinner hour) on May 13, Matt Goebel of Clarion and Associates will present a briefing on the citywide Historic Preservation Plan. A draft of the plan is attached for the Planning Commission's review. Any questions, comments or direction the Planning Commission has at the work session is greatly appreciated. A public hearing on the plan will be scheduled for a later date. On April 1, 2008, the Historic Landmark Commission reviewed the plan and an errata sheet which has been incorporated into the attached document and unanimously approved recommendation of the Plan to the Planning Commission and City Council.

The Historic Preservation Plan is a comprehensive plan that provides guidance relating to historic preservation policy for all departments of Salt Lake City. This plan will be the key strategic document that will guide preservation activity into the future and inform decisions such as amendments to master plans, budget priorities, development of incentives for rehabilitation, zoning text and map amendments, and site-specific development decisions.

The need for a comprehensive preservation plan began with a 2003 Legislative Action from City Council. In response, the Planning Division presented "A Review of Salt Lake City's Approach to Historic Preservation: Administration Response to the City Council's Legislative Action" to the City Council in 2004.

The Preservation Plan was a recommendation of the Legislative Intent. Consultants, Clarions Associates, began work on the plan in late 2007. They "used an interactive process that involved and incorporated feedback from a variety of groups." A 17-member Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC) was created with members who represent a variety of background, interests and geographic areas, including preservation architects, historians and property owners. The group met regularly and reviewed and commented on each stage of

the project. A subcommittee of the Historic Landmark Commission (HLC) was also a member of the Citizen group and served as a liaison between the CAC and the HLC. The general public was invited to participate throughout the process through four public meetings and with an online questionnaire and comment section.

Clarion Associates developed a vision statement for the development of the plan through a collaborative process that included the Historic Landmark Commission, the Citizen Advisory Committee, and city residents, property owners and business owners. Clarion states that, “the vision provides strategic guidance regarding how the city should maintain, strengthen, and expand its preservation activities in a manner that is consistent with other city objectives, in order to identify and maximize mutual benefits.” This vision is expressed through five themes. Following are the themes and related goals that the plan recommends.

Foster a Unified City Commitment to Preservation

- Goal 1.1 Ensure consistency between the Historic Preservation Plan and all other adopted city plans.*
- Goal 1.2 Ensure consistency between Historic Preservation Plan and all city policies.*
- Goal 1.3 Foster a shared understanding of preservation with in the City.*

Adopt a Comprehensive Preservation Toolbox

- Goal 2.1: Strategically pursue the identification of historic resources through surveys.*
- Goal 2.2: Ensure that up-to-date and complete surveys are used to inform preservation decision-making.*
- Goal 2.2: Ensure that up-to-date and complete surveys are used to inform preservation decision-making.*
- Goal 2.3: Ensure the long-term health and viability of existing historic districts.*
- Goal 2.4: Protect exemplary groupings of historic properties as local historic districts.*
- Goal 2.5: Protect significant individual properties as designated local Landmark Sites.*

- Goal 2.6: *Encourage the listing of significant historic properties on the National Register of Historic Places to complement local designation.*
- Goal 2.7: *Align preservation-related City regulations with the goals and policies of this plan.*
- Goal 2.8: *Broaden the range of tools available to encourage the preservation of historic properties.*
- Goal 2.9: *Offer economic hardship and demolition provisions that achieve their intended purpose.*
- Goal 2.10: *Refine existing design guidelines and create new guidelines to address multi-family and non-residential development and properties in local historic districts and Local Landmark Sites.*

Administer a Clear, Convenient, and Consistent Historic Preservation Program

- Goal 3.1 *Provide knowledgeable, consistent and fair program administration.*
- Goal 3.2 *Ensure the preservation program has full and knowledgeable staff.*
- Goal 3.3 *Improve user-friendliness of the historic process.*
- Goal 3.4 *Ensure preservation regulations are enforced.*
- Goal 3.5 *Build the city's technological capacity to facilitate program administration.*

Increase Community Pride and Awareness of Historic Preservation

- Goal 4.1 *Increase public awareness of the historic preservation program and its benefits.*
- Goal 4.2 *Improve coordination with preservation partners.*
- Goal 4.3 *Increase public visibility of historic preservation.*
- Goal 4.4 *Increase financial incentives for preservation.*

Support a Sustainable City

- Goal 5.1 Improve public understanding of the life-cycle energy benefits of historic preservation.*
- Goal 5.2 Encourage the use of sustainable buildings practices in the renovation and maintenance of historic structures.*
- Goal 5.3 Support historic tourism to Salt Lake City.*
- Goal 5.4 Increase coordination between historic preservation and Downtown revitalization and economic development efforts.*
- Goal 5.5 Preserve historic parks and other historic landscapes in Salt Lake City.*
- Goal 5.6 Support a range of transportation modes.*
- Goal 5.7 Promote a range of housing options in historic areas to meet a variety of needs.*
- Goal 5.8 Assist homeowners in overcoming age, income, or ability challenges of home maintenance requirements.*

The Plan includes an implementation plan. Following are priorities that the plan recommends implementing in the first year. The plan does not specify which projects may require additional funding; however, staff, for the purpose of this memo, has identified those projects that may require additional funding or other resources. Some projects are already underway, as identified in this chart.

| Action Ref # | Implementation Action | Responsible Parties | Additional Funding Needed | Progress |
|---------------------|--|----------------------------|--|-----------------|
| 1.1a.1 | Master Plan Assessment | City Staff | This may require the services of a consultant or additional staff. | |
| 1.1a.3 | Establish Annual Priorities and Pursue Funding | HLC, City Staff | | |
| 1.1b.1 | Citywide Plan Assessment | City Staff | | |

| | | | | |
|--------|---|--|-----------------------|---|
| 1.2a.1 | Decision-Making Priority | City Officials, City Staff | | |
| 1.2b.2 | Coordinate with Economic Development | HLC, RDA | | |
| 1.2b.3 | Coordinate with Transportation Planning | City Staff | | |
| 1.2b.4 | Coordinate with City Sustainability Efforts | City Staff | | This is underway. Consultants for the sustainability plan have provided a draft ordinance for solar panels. |
| 1.2c.1 | Annual Action Plan for Implementation | HLC, City Staff | | |
| 1.2c.2 | Periodic Implementation Progress Reports | City Staff | | Currently the HLC provides an annual progress report but a more formal presentation to the City Council and Planning Commission would be welcome. |
| 1.3c.2 | Understand Mutual Interests | City Officials, HLC, RDA, City Staff | | |
| 2.1a.2 | Identify Areas Where New Surveys Are Needed | HLC, City Staff | | The plan itself has done this. |
| 2.2b.1 | Support Archive | HLC, City Staff, | Will need funding for | |

| | | | | |
|--------|---|---------------------------------|--|---|
| | Development | SHPO | scanning old files. | |
| 2.2b.2 | Promote Electronic Archive Use | HLC, City Staff, SHPO, UHF | | |
| 2.3a.1 | Track Development Activity Near District Boundaries | HLC, City Staff, SHPO, UHF | Will require additional staff or consultant. | |
| 2.5a.1 | Identify Landmark Site Candidates | HLC, City Staff, SHPO, UHF | | Part of this action is underway with discussions on updating the ordinance. |
| 2.6a.1 | Encourage National Register Nominations for Properties Identified Through Survey Work | City Staff, SHPO, UHF | | |
| 2.8a.3 | Explore Other Tools and Incentives | City Officials, HLC, City Staff | May or may not require additional funding. | |
| 2.8b.1 | Educate About Existing Incentives | City Staff, SHPO, UHF | May or may not require additional funding. | |
| 2.8b.2 | Improve Preservation Program Incentives | City Staff, RDA | May or may not require additional funding. | |
| 2.9a.2 | Examine Best Practices and Lessons Learned | | | |

| | | | | |
|----------|---|------------------------------------|--|---|
| 2.10a.2 | Align Design Guidelines | City Officials, HLC, City Staff | | This has begun with the start of design guidelines for commercial properties. |
| 2.10.b.1 | Encourage the Retention of Historic Signs | City Officials, HLC, City Staff | | This has begun with the start of design guidelines for commercial properties. |
| 3.1a.1 | Annual Commissioner Retreats | City Officials, HLC, City Staff | | This is being scheduled. |
| 3.1a.2 | Facilitate Additional Training | City Officials, HLC, City Staff | Some can be done with existing funding, additional training will require additional funding. | |
| 3.1a.4 | HLC Mentoring Program | HLC, City Staff | | |
| 3.2a.1 | Develop a Staff Workload Tracking System | City Staff | | Part of this is accomplished with Accela. |
| 3.2b.1 | Track Target Staffing Levels | City Staff | | |
| 3.2b.2 | Maintain Adequate Staffing Levels | City Officials, City Staff | If additional staff is identified as a need, additional funding will be necessary. | |

| | | | | |
|---------|--|--------------------------------------|--|---|
| 3.2b.3 | Provide Education for Staff | City Officials, City Staff | Requires funding to attend conferences and training workshops. | |
| 4.1a.1 | Annual Property Owner Newsletter | City Staff, Community Councils | Requires additional funding. | A grant was used to send one newsletter this year. |
| 4.2a.1 | Periodic Education and Outreach | City Staff, SHPO, UHF | | |
| 4.2c.2 | Gather Relevant "Best Practice" Highlights | City Staff | Additional funding required. | |
| 4.2d.1 | Highlight Community Best Practices | City Staff | | |
| 4.2e.1 | Project Financing Workshops | City Staff, SHPO | | |
| 4.3.b.1 | Pursue Broader Recognition of Salt Lake City Preservation Activities | City Officials, HLC, City Staff | | |
| 4.3e.1 | Attend Community Events and Fairs | City Staff | | Attended several last summer, plan on doing so again. |
| 4.4a.2 | Offer Periodic Tax Credit Workshops | City Staff, SHPO | | The SHPO already provides this service. |
| 4.4b.1 | Help Expand UHF Loan Pool | City Officials, HLC, City Staff, UHF | May require additional funding. | |

| | | | | |
|--------|--|----------------------------|------------------------------|--|
| 4.4c.1 | Promote Preservation Easements | City Staff, SHPO, UHF | | |
| 5.2a.1 | Research New Green Building Materials, Technologies, and Practices | City Staff | | |
| 5.2a.2 | Update Design Guideline on Regular Basis | HLC, City Staff | | |
| 5.5c.3 | Public Services Department Coordination | HLC, City Staff | | |
| 5.6a.2 | Represent Preservation Priorities in the Transit Planning Process | City Officials, City Staff | | |
| 5.8a.2 | Coordinate Outreach to Property Owners | City Staff | Requires additional funding. | |
| 5.8a.3 | Pursue and Create Funding Support | City Officials, City Staff | Requires additional funding. | |

Exhibit 9C
Planning Commission
May 27, 2009
Minutes

SALT LAKE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

In Room 326 of the City & County Building

451 South State Street, Salt Lake City, Utah

Wednesday, May 27, 2009

Present for the Planning Commission meeting were Chair Mary Woodhead and Vice Chair Susie McHugh; Commissioners Babs De Lay, Frank Algarin, Matthew Wirthlin, Michael Gallegos, Angela Dean, Prescott Muir, Michael Fife, Tim Chambless, and Kathleen Hill.

Public Hearings

6:45:18 PM **Petition PLNPCM2009-00171 Citywide Historic Preservation Plan adoption**—a request by the Historic Landmark Commission to consider recommendation of the Citywide Historic Preservation Plan to the City Council. This is a city-wide project. View: [Staff Report](#)

Chair Woodhead recognized Robin Zeigler as staff representative.

6:47:30 PM **Public Hearing**

Chair Woodhead opened the public hearing portion of the petition.

The following people spoke or submitted a hearing card in *support* of the proposed petition: **Warren Lloyd** (911 Military Drive) stated he was the Vice Chair of the Historic Landmark Commission (HLC) and also served on the Mayor's Citizen's Advisory Committee that had worked on this plan. He stated that this was a large document and there are some specific topics that would help the HLC and on a larger scale it would help the City by giving a better understanding to how preservation worked with redevelopment and sustainability, as well as economic development. He stated that there were five themes and the second one talked about a broader range of tools that might be developed to help all the Boards and Commissions deal with the ideas of preservation including: conservation districts, transfer of development rights, and insights into what needed to be improved relating to economic hardship and that process. It gave clarification to demolition by neglect, how to achieve housing density in the City, which works with current and future districts. He stated that there were also some suggestions about education relative to sustainability and preservation. **Sandra Hatch** (1141 Michigan Avenue) stated she was an architect and she had represented the spectrum of economic backgrounds, a lot of her clients did not know what to do in the historic districts due to costs. She stated that the tax reductions were helpful, but it should be spread out over the entire City. She cautioned to keep in mind that not everybody that lived in historic districts have the money to bring their homes up to what was considered a high preservation level, they just wanted to get by and make their houses comfortable. She stated that the size of the document was overwhelming and she would suggest something that would be easily implemented and easy to follow.

Commissioner De Lay inquired what Ms. Hatch determined to be the biggest obstacle for her clients when working with the City.

Ms. Hatch stated that windows, material choices, and looking into alternative materials, and when people were approached by sales representatives they were not quite sure how they fit into the historic context.

Commissioner De Lay suggested putting her concerns into written format and submitting them to Ms. Zeigler.

Kirk Huffaker (Utah Heritage Foundation) stated that he respected Ms. Hatch's perspective because she was out working in the community and if she says the document was too big it probably was for most people. He stated he also served on the

SALT LAKE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

In Room 326 of the City & County Building

451 South State Street, Salt Lake City, Utah

Wednesday, May 27, 2009

Present for the Planning Commission meeting were Chair Mary Woodhead and Vice Chair Susie McHugh; Commissioners Babs De Lay, Frank Algarin, Matthew Wirthlin, Michael Gallegos, Angela Dean, Prescott Muir, Michael Fife, Tim Chambless, and Kathleen Hill.

Public Hearings

6:45:18 PM **Petition PLNPCM2009-00171 Citywide Historic Preservation Plan adoption**—a request by the Historic Landmark Commission to consider recommendation of the Citywide Historic Preservation Plan to the City Council. This is a city-wide project. View: [Staff Report](#)

Chair Woodhead recognized Robin Zeigler as staff representative.

6:47:30 PM **Public Hearing**

Chair Woodhead opened the public hearing portion of the petition.

The following people spoke or submitted a hearing card in *support* of the proposed petition: **Warren Lloyd** (911 Military Drive) stated he was the Vice Chair of the Historic Landmark Commission (HLC) and also served on the Mayor's Citizen's Advisory Committee that had worked on this plan. He stated that this was a large document and there are some specific topics that would help the HLC and on a larger scale it would help the City by giving a better understanding to how preservation worked with redevelopment and sustainability, as well as economic development. He stated that there were five themes and the second one talked about a broader range of tools that might be developed to help all the Boards and Commissions deal with the ideas of preservation including: conservation districts, transfer of development rights, and insights into what needed to be improved relating to economic hardship and that process. It gave clarification to demolition by neglect, how to achieve housing density in the City, which works with current and future districts. He stated that there were also some suggestions about education relative to sustainability and preservation. **Sandra Hatch** (1141 Michigan Avenue) stated she was an architect and she had represented the spectrum of economic backgrounds, a lot of her clients did not know what to do in the historic districts due to costs. She stated that the tax reductions were helpful, but it should be spread out over the entire City. She cautioned to keep in mind that not everybody that lived in historic districts have the money to bring their homes up to what was considered a high preservation level, they just wanted to get by and make their houses comfortable. She stated that the size of the document was overwhelming and she would suggest something that would be easily implemented and easy to follow.

Commissioner De Lay inquired what Ms. Hatch determined to be the biggest obstacle for her clients when working with the City.

Ms. Hatch stated that windows, material choices, and looking into alternative materials, and when people were approached by sales representatives they were not quite sure how they fit into the historic context.

Commissioner De Lay suggested putting her concerns into written format and submitting them to Ms. Zeigler.

Kirk Huffaker (Utah Heritage Foundation) stated that he respected Ms. Hatch's perspective because she was out working in the community and if she says the document was too big it probably was for most people. He stated he also served on the

Citizen's Advisory Committee and the scope was asking for everything from the beginning of the preservation movement in the City to the ambitions of ten plus years out, which was why this document was so large and such a technical document. He stated that the 2040 plan had also reviewed a lot of these same concerns. He stated the technical aspects of how this document was executed were important and this plan was the basis for that.

Chair Woodhead closed the public hearing portion of the petition.

6:59:18 PM Discussion

7:40:06 PM Motion

Commissioner De Lay made a motion regarding PLNPCM2009-00171, based on the findings listed in the staff report and public testimony, that the Planning Commission continues this item to a later date.

Commissioner Wirthlin seconded the motion.

All in favor voted, "Aye". The motion passed unanimously.

Exhibit 10A
Planning Commission
May 13, 2009

Original Notice and Postmark/Agenda

AGENDA FOR THE SALT LAKE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
In Room 326 of the City & County Building at 451 South State Street
Wednesday, May 13, 2009 at 5:45 p.m.

The field trip is scheduled to leave at 4:00 p.m. Dinner will be served to the Planning Commissioners and Staff at 5:00 p.m., in Room 126. **Work Session**—the Planning Commission may discuss project updates and other minor administrative matters. This portion of the meeting is open to the public for observation.

Approval of Minutes from Wednesday, April 8 and April 22, 2009

Report of the Chair and Vice Chair

Report of the Director

Public Hearings

1. **Petition PLNSUB2009-00388; Nilsson Construction Subdivision Amendment**—a request by Kevan Nilsson Construction has submitted an application to amend lots 8 and 9 of the Imladris Subdivision, located at approximately 540 West 400 North, in the SR-1A Zone. This property is located in City Council District Three, represented by Eric Jergensen (Staff contact: Bill Peperone at 801.535.7214 or bill.peperone@slcgov.com).
2. **Petition PLNSUB2009-00305; Minor Subdivision**—a request by the Salt Lake City Property Management Division for a minor subdivision approval for a three-lot subdivision, located at approximately 1189 West 700 South, in a R-1/5000 Zone. This property is located in City Council District Two, represented by Van Turner (Staff contact: Bill Peperone at 801.535.7214 or bill.peperone@slcgov.com).
3. **Petition PLNHLC2008-00021; Boundary Adjustment and Map Amendment**—a request by the Historic Landmark Commission to reconsider the boundaries of historic districts for clarification purposes. The project affects properties in various areas of the City in the City's six locally designated historic districts (Staff contact: Robin Zeigler at 801.535.7758 or robin.zeigler@slcgov.com).
4. **Petition PLNPCM2009-00171 Citywide Historic Preservation Plan adoption**—a request by the Historic Landmark Commission to consider recommendation of the Citywide Historic Preservation Plan to the City Council. This is a city-wide project (Staff contact: Robin Zeigler at 801.535.7758 or robin.zeigler@slcgov.com).
5. **Petition PLNPCM2009-00398 Rescue Mission of Salt Lake Zoning Text Amendment**—a petition submitted by the Rescue Mission of Salt Lake, represented by Stephen Trost, to amend the definition of a "homeless shelter" as listed in Zoning Ordinance section 21A.62.040 Definitions and to amend Zoning Ordinance 21A.28.040 Table of Permitted and Conditional Uses for Manufacturing Districts by adding a homeless shelter to the table as a conditional use. The purpose of the zoning text amendment is to facilitate the relocation of the Rescue Mission of Salt Lake facility to property located at approximately 2945 West 900 South. The property is zoned M-1 Light Manufacturing and is located in City Council District two represented by Van Turner (Staff contact: Nick Norris at 801.535.6173 or nick.norris@slcgov.com).
6. **Petition PLNPCM2009-00288; Declaration of Surplus Property**—a request by Salt Lake City Corporation, Property Management Division, to declare the property located at approximately 1838 South 1500 East, former Garfield School, as surplus property. The zoning designation for the property is I Institutional District. The purpose for the declaration of surplus property is to facilitate the sale of the property. The property is located in City Council District 6 represented by J.T. Martin (Staff contact: Michael Maloy at 801.535.7118 or michael.maloy@slcgov.com).


Visit the Planning Division's website at www.slcgov.com/CED/planning for copies of the Planning Commission agendas, staff reports, and minutes. Staff Reports will be posted the Friday prior to the meeting and minutes will be posted two days after they are ratified, which usually occurs at the next regularly scheduled meeting of the Planning Commission.

TAMI HANSEN
451 S. STATE ST.
PM 406

PUBLIC HEARING NOTICE

Salt Lake City Planning Division
451 South State Street, Room 406
PO Box 145480
Salt Lake City UT 84114

MAILED FROM ZIP CODE 84116
02 1M
\$ 00.42
FIRST CLASS
UNITED STATES POSTAGE
PRIMEVOR



FIRST CLASS

1. Fill out registration card and indicate if you wish to speak and which agenda item you will address.
2. After the staff and petitioner presentations, hearings will be opened for public comment. Community Councils will present their comments at the beginning of the hearing.
3. In order to be considerate of everyone attending the meeting, public comments are limited to two (2) minutes per person, per item. A spokesperson who has already been asked by a group to summarize their concerns will be allowed five (5) minutes to speak. Written comments are welcome and will be provided to the Planning Commission in advance of the meeting if they are submitted to the Planning Division prior to noon the day before the meeting. Written comments should be sent to:

Salt Lake City Planning Commission
451 South State Street, Room 406
Salt Lake City UT 84111
4. Speakers will be called by the Chair.
5. Please state your name and your affiliation to the petition or whom you represent at the beginning of your comments.
6. Speakers should address their comments to the Chair. Planning Commission members may have questions for the speaker. Speakers may not debate with other meeting attendees.
7. Speakers should focus their comments on the agenda item. Extraneous and repetitive comments should be avoided.
8. After those registered have spoken, the Chair will invite other comments. Prior speakers may be allowed to supplement their previous comments at this time.
9. After the hearing is closed, the discussion will be limited among Planning Commissioners and Staff. Under unique circumstances, the Planning Commission may choose to reopen the hearing to obtain additional information.
10. The Salt Lake City Corporation complies with all ADA guidelines. People with disabilities may make requests for reasonable accommodation no later than 48 hours in advance in order to attend this meeting. Accommodations may include alternate formats, interpreters, and other auxiliary aids. This is an accessible facility. For questions, requests, or additional information, please contact the Planning Office at 535-7757; TDD 535-6220.




Exhibit 10B
Planning Commission
May 13, 2009
Newspaper Advertisement

PROOF OF PUBLICATION

| CUSTOMER NAME AND ADDRESS | ACCOUNT NUMBER | DATE |
|---|----------------|-----------|
| BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT, C/O DEBORAH MARTIN 451 S STATE, RM 406 SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84111 | 9001381805 | 5/13/2009 |

| ACCOUNT NAME | |
|--|--------------------------|
| BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT, | |
| TELEPHONE | ADDRESS / INVOICE NUMBER |
| 8015357741 | 0000453832 / |
| SCHEDULE | |
| Start 05/12/2009 | End 05/12/2009 |
| COST REF. NO. | |
| | |
| CAPTION | |
| AGENDA FOR THE SALT LAKE CITY PLANNING C | |
| SIZE | |
| 32 Lines | 2.00 COLUMN |
| PIECES | RATE |
| 2 | |
| MISC. CHARGES | AD CHARGES |
| | |
| TOTAL COST | |
| 85.00 | |

AGENDA FOR THE SALT LAKE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
 In Room 326 of the City & County Building at 451 South State Street
 Wednesday, May 13, 2009 at 5:45 p.m.
 The field trip is scheduled to leave at 4:00 p.m. Dinner will be served to the Planning Commissioners and Staff at 5:00 p.m., in Room 126. Work Session-The Planning Commission will discuss the LEED process and certification and may discuss project updates and other minor administrative matters. This portion of the meeting is open to the public for observation. Approval of Minutes from Wednesday, April 8 and April 22, 2009
 Report of the Chair and Vice Chair
 Report of the Director
 Public Hearings
 1. Petition PLNPCA2009-00171 Citywide Historic Preservation Plan adoption-a request by the Historic Landmark Commission to consider recommendation of the Citywide Historic Preservation Plan to the City Council. This is a city-wide project (Staff contact: Robin Zeigler at 801-535-7758 or robin.zeigler@slcgov.com).
 Visit the Planning Division's website at www.slcgov.com/CED/planning for copies of the Planning Commission agendas, staff reports, and minutes. Staff Reports will be posted the Friday prior to the meeting and minutes will be posted two days after they are ratified, which usually occurs at the next regularly scheduled meeting of the Planning Commission.
 453832 UPAKLP

AFFIDAVIT OF PUBLICATION

AS NEWSPAPER AGENCY CORPORATION LEGAL BOOKER, I CERTIFY THAT THE ATTACHED ADVERTISEMENT OF AGENDA FOR THE SALT LAKE CITY PLANNING C FOR BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT, WAS PUBLISHED BY THE NEWSPAPER AGENCY CORPORATION, AGENT FOR THE SALT LAKE TRIBUNE AND DESERET NEWS, DAILY NEWSPAPERS PRINTED IN THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE WITH GENERAL CIRCULATION IN UTAH, AND PUBLISHED IN SALT LAKE CITY, SALT LAKE COUNTY IN THE STATE OF UTAH.

PUBLISHED ON Start 05/12/2009 End 05/12/2009

SIGNATURE

Arroy Craft

5/13/2009

Notary Public
ELIZABETH G. CORDOVA
 6482 West 4200 South
 West Valley City, Utah 84128
 My Commission Expires
 January 16, 2010
 State of Utah

Elizabeth G. Cordova

THIS IS NOT A STATEMENT BUT A "PROOF OF PUBLICATION"
 PLEASE PAY FROM BILLING STATEMENT

PROOF OF PUBLICATION

CUSTOMER'S COPY

| CUSTOMER NAME AND ADDRESS | ACCOUNT NUMBER | DATE |
|---|----------------|-----------|
| BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT, C/O DEBORAH MARTIN 451 S STATE, RM 406 SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84111 | 9001381805 | 5/13/2009 |

| ACCOUNT NAME | |
|--|--------------------------|
| BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT, | |
| TELEPHONE | ORDER # / INVOICE NUMBER |
| 8015357741 | 0000453832 / |
| SCHEDULE | |
| Start 05/12/2009 | End 05/12/2009 |
| CUST. REF. NO. | |
| | |
| CAPTION | |
| AGENDA FOR THE SALT LAKE CITY PLANNING C | |
| SIZE | |
| 32 Lines | 2.00 COLUMN |
| TIMES | RATE |
| 2 | |
| VISC. CHARGES | AD. CHARGES |
| | |
| TOTAL COST | |
| 85.00 | |

AGENDA FOR THE SALT LAKE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
in Room 326 of the City & County Building at 451 South State Street
Wednesday, May 13, 2009 at 5:45 p.m.
The field trip is scheduled to leave at 4:00 p.m. Dinner will be served to the Planning Commissioners and Staff at 5:00 p.m., in Room 126. Work Session-The Planning Commission will discuss the LEED process and certification and may discuss project updates and other minor administrative matters. This portion of the meeting is open to the public for observation. Approval of Minutes from Wednesday, April 8 and April 22, 2009 -
Report of the Chair and Vice Chair
Report of the Director
Public Hearings
1. Petition PLNPCA2009-00171: Citywide Historic Preservation Plan adoption-a request by the Historic Landmark Commission to consider recommendation of the Citywide Historic Preservation Plan to the City Council. This is a city-wide project (Staff contact: Robin Zeigler at 801.535.7758 or robin.zeigler@slcgov.com).
Visit the Planning Division's website at www.slcgov.com/CEP/planning for copies of the Planning Commission agendas, staff reports, and minutes. Staff Reports will be posted the Friday prior to the meeting and minutes will be posted two days after they are ratified, which usually occurs at the next regularly scheduled meeting of the Planning Commission.
453832 UPAKLP

AFFIDAVIT OF PUBLICATION

AS NEWSPAPER AGENCY CORPORATION LEGAL BOOKER, I CERTIFY THAT THE ATTACHED ADVERTISEMENT OF AGENDA FOR THE SALT LAKE CITY PLANNING C FOR BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT, WAS PUBLISHED BY THE NEWSPAPER AGENCY CORPORATION, AGENT FOR THE SALT LAKE TRIBUNE AND DESERET NEWS, DAILY NEWSPAPERS PRINTED IN THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE WITH GENERAL CIRCULATION IN UTAH, AND PUBLISHED IN SALT LAKE CITY, SALT LAKE COUNTY IN THE STATE OF UTAH.

PUBLISHED ON Start 05/12/2009 End 05/12/2009

SIGNATURE *Jerry Craft*
5/13/2009

Notary Public
ELIZABETH G. CORDOVA
6482 West 4200 South
West Valley City, Utah 84128
My Commission Expires
January 16, 2010
State of Utah

Elizabeth Cordova

THIS IS NOT A STATEMENT BUT A "PROOF OF PUBLICATION"
PLEASE PAY FROM BILLING STATEMENT

Exhibit 10C
Planning Commission
May 13, 2009
Staff Memo



Memorandum

Planning Division
Community & Economic Development Department

To: Planning Commission

From: Robin Zeigler, Senior Planner

Date: May 4, 2009

Re: Preservation Plan, PLNPCM2009-00171

During the Planning Commission's work session (dinner hour) on May 13, Matt Goebel of Clarion and Associates will present a briefing on the citywide Historic Preservation Plan. A draft of the plan is attached for the Planning Commission's review. Any questions, comments or direction the Planning Commission has at the work session is greatly appreciated. A public hearing on the plan will be scheduled for a later date. On April 1, 2008, the Historic Landmark Commission reviewed the plan and an errata sheet which has been incorporated into the attached document and unanimously approved recommendation of the Plan to the Planning Commission and City Council.

The Historic Preservation Plan is a comprehensive plan that provides guidance relating to historic preservation policy for all departments of Salt Lake City. This plan will be the key strategic document that will guide preservation activity into the future and inform decisions such as amendments to master plans, budget priorities, development of incentives for rehabilitation, zoning text and map amendments, and site-specific development decisions.

The need for a comprehensive preservation plan began with a 2003 Legislative Action from City Council. In response, the Planning Division presented "A Review of Salt Lake City's Approach to Historic Preservation: Administration Response to the City Council's Legislative Action" to the City Council in 2004.

The Preservation Plan was a recommendation of the Legislative Intent. Consultants, Clarions Associates, began work on the plan in late 2007. They "used an interactive process that involved and incorporated feedback from a variety of groups." A 17-member Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC) was created with members who represent a variety of background, interests and geographic areas, including preservation architects, historians and property owners. The group met regularly and reviewed and commented on each stage of

the project. A subcommittee of the Historic Landmark Commission (HLC) was also a member of the Citizen group and served as a liaison between the CAC and the HLC. The general public was invited to participate throughout the process through four public meetings and with an online questionnaire and comment section.

Clarion Associates developed a vision statement for the development of the plan through a collaborative process that included the Historic Landmark Commission, the Citizen Advisory Committee, and city residents, property owners and business owners. Clarion states that, “the vision provides strategic guidance regarding how the city should maintain, strengthen, and expand its preservation activities in a manner that is consistent with other city objectives, in order to identify and maximize mutual benefits.” This vision is expressed through five themes. Following are the themes and related goals that the plan recommends.

Foster a Unified City Commitment to Preservation

- Goal 1.1 Ensure consistency between the Historic Preservation Plan and all other adopted city plans.*
- Goal 1.2 Ensure consistency between Historic Preservation Plan and all city policies.*
- Goal 1.3 Foster a shared understanding of preservation within the City.*

Adopt a Comprehensive Preservation Toolbox

- Goal 2.1: Strategically pursue the identification of historic resources through surveys.*
- Goal 2.2: Ensure that up-to-date and complete surveys are used to inform preservation decision-making.*
- Goal 2.2: Ensure that up-to-date and complete surveys are used to inform preservation decision-making.*
- Goal 2.3: Ensure the long-term health and viability of existing historic districts.*
- Goal 2.4: Protect exemplary groupings of historic properties as local historic districts.*
- Goal 2.5: Protect significant individual properties as designated local Landmark Sites.*

- Goal 2.6: *Encourage the listing of significant historic properties on the National Register of Historic Places to complement local designation.*
- Goal 2.7: *Align preservation-related City regulations with the goals and policies of this plan.*
- Goal 2.8: *Broaden the range of tools available to encourage the preservation of historic properties.*
- Goal 2.9: *Offer economic hardship and demolition provisions that achieve their intended purpose.*
- Goal 2.10: *Refine existing design guidelines and create new guidelines to address multi-family and non-residential development and properties in local historic districts and Local Landmark Sites.*

Administer a Clear, Convenient, and Consistent Historic Preservation Program

- Goal 3.1 *Provide knowledgeable, consistent and fair program administration.*
- Goal 3.2 *Ensure the preservation program has full and knowledgeable staff.*
- Goal 3.3 *Improve user-friendliness of the historic process.*
- Goal 3.4 *Ensure preservation regulations are enforced.*
- Goal 3.5 *Build the city's technological capacity to facilitate program administration.*

Increase Community Pride and Awareness of Historic Preservation

- Goal 4.1 *Increase public awareness of the historic preservation program and its benefits.*
- Goal 4.2 *Improve coordination with preservation partners.*
- Goal 4.3 *Increase public visibility of historic preservation.*
- Goal 4.4 *Increase financial incentives for preservation.*

Support a Sustainable City

- Goal 5.1 Improve public understanding of the life-cycle energy benefits of historic preservation.*
- Goal 5.2 Encourage the use of sustainable buildings practices in the renovation and maintenance of historic structures.*
- Goal 5.3 Support historic tourism to Salt Lake City.*
- Goal 5.4 Increase coordination between historic preservation and Downtown revitalization and economic development efforts.*
- Goal 5.5 Preserve historic parks and other historic landscapes in Salt Lake City.*
- Goal 5.6 Support a range of transportation modes.*
- Goal 5.7 Promote a range of housing options in historic areas to meet a variety of needs.*
- Goal 5.8 Assist homeowners in overcoming age, income, or ability challenges of home maintenance requirements.*

The Plan includes an implementation plan. Following are priorities that the plan recommends implementing in the first year. The plan does not specify which projects may require additional funding; however, staff, for the purpose of this memo, has identified those projects that may require additional funding or other resources. Some projects are already underway, as identified in this chart.

| Action Ref # | Implementation Action | Responsible Parties | Additional Funding Needed | Progress |
|---------------------|--|----------------------------|--|-----------------|
| 1.1a.1 | Master Plan Assessment | City Staff | This may require the services of a consultant or additional staff. | |
| 1.1a.3 | Establish Annual Priorities and Pursue Funding | HLC, City Staff | | |
| 1.1b.1 | Citywide Plan Assessment | City Staff | | |

| | | | | |
|--------|--|--|--------------------------|---|
| 1.2a.1 | Decision-Making Priority | City Officials, City Staff | | |
| 1.2b.2 | Coordinate with Economic Development | HLC, RDA | | |
| 1.2b.3 | Coordinate with Transportation Planning | City Staff | | |
| 1.2b.4 | Coordinate with City Sustainability Efforts | City Staff | | This is underway. Consultants for the sustainability plan have provided a draft ordinance for solar panels. |
| 1.2c.1 | Annual Action Plan for Implementation | HLC, City Staff | | |
| 1.2c.2 | Periodic Implementation Progress Reports | City Staff | | Currently the HLC provides an annual progress report but a more formal presentation to the City Council and Planning Commission would be welcome. |
| 1.3c.2 | Understand Mutual Interests | City Officials, HLC, RDA, City Staff | | |
| 2.1a.2 | Identify Areas Where New Surveys Are Needed | HLC, City Staff | | The plan itself has done this. |
| 2.2b.1 | Support Archive | HLC, City Staff, | Will need funding for | |

| | | | | |
|--------|---|---------------------------------|--|---|
| | Development | SHPO | scanning old files. | |
| 2.2b.2 | Promote Electronic Archive Use | HLC, City Staff, SHPO, UHF | | |
| 2.3a.1 | Track Development Activity Near District Boundaries | HLC, City Staff, SHPO, UHF | Will require additional staff or consultant. | |
| 2.5a.1 | Identify Landmark Site Candidates | HLC, City Staff, SHPO, UHF | | Part of this action is underway with discussions on updating the ordinance. |
| 2.6a.1 | Encourage National Register Nominations for Properties Identified Through Survey Work | City Staff, SHPO, UHF | | |
| 2.8a.3 | Explore Other Tools and Incentives | City Officials, HLC, City Staff | May or may not require additional funding. | |
| 2.8b.1 | Educate About Existing Incentives | City Staff, SHPO, UHF | May or may not require additional funding. | |
| 2.8b.2 | Improve Preservation Program Incentives | City Staff, RDA | May or may not require additional funding. | |
| 2.9a.2 | Examine Best Practices and Lessons Learned | | | |

| | | | | |
|----------|---|------------------------------------|--|---|
| 2.10a.2 | Align Design Guidelines | City Officials, HLC, City Staff | | This has begun with the start of design guidelines for commercial properties. |
| 2.10.b.1 | Encourage the Retention of Historic Signs | City Officials, HLC, City Staff | | This has begun with the start of design guidelines for commercial properties. |
| 3.1a.1 | Annual Commissioner Retreats | City Officials, HLC, City Staff | | This is being scheduled. |
| 3.1a.2 | Facilitate Additional Training | City Officials, HLC, City Staff | Some can be done with existing funding, additional training will require additional funding. | |
| 3.1a.4 | HLC Mentoring Program | HLC, City Staff | | |
| 3.2a.1 | Develop a Staff Workload Tracking System | City Staff | | Part of this is accomplished with Accela. |
| 3.2b.1 | Track Target Staffing Levels | City Staff | | |
| 3.2b.2 | Maintain Adequate Staffing Levels | City Officials, City Staff | If additional staff is identified as a need, additional funding will be necessary. | |

| | | | | |
|---------|--|--------------------------------------|--|---|
| 3.2b.3 | Provide Education for Staff | City Officials, City Staff | Requires funding to attend conferences and training workshops. | |
| 4.1a.1 | Annual Property Owner Newsletter | City Staff, Community Councils | Requires additional funding. | A grant was used to send one newsletter this year. |
| 4.2a.1 | Periodic Education and Outreach | City Staff, SHPO, UHF | | |
| 4.2c.2 | Gather Relevant "Best Practice" Highlights | City Staff | Additional funding required. | |
| 4.2d.1 | Highlight Community Best Practices | City Staff | | |
| 4.2e.1 | Project Financing Workshops | City Staff, SHPO | | |
| 4.3.b.1 | Pursue Broader Recognition of Salt Lake City Preservation Activities | City Officials, HLC, City Staff | | |
| 4.3e.1 | Attend Community Events and Fairs | City Staff | | Attended several last summer, plan on doing so again. |
| 4.4a.2 | Offer Periodic Tax Credit Workshops | City Staff, SHPO | | The SHPO already provides this service. |
| 4.4b.1 | Help Expand UHF Loan Pool | City Officials, HLC, City Staff, UHF | May require additional funding. | |

| | | | | |
|--------|--|----------------------------|------------------------------|--|
| 4.4c.1 | Promote Preservation Easements | City Staff, SHPO, UHF | | |
| 5.2a.1 | Research New Green Building Materials, Technologies, and Practices | City Staff | | |
| 5.2a.2 | Update Design Guideline on Regular Basis | HLC, City Staff | | |
| 5.5c.3 | Public Services Department Coordination | HLC, City Staff | | |
| 5.6a.2 | Represent Preservation Priorities in the Transit Planning Process | City Officials, City Staff | | |
| 5.8a.2 | Coordinate Outreach to Property Owners | City Staff | Requires additional funding. | |
| 5.8a.3 | Pursue and Create Funding Support | City Officials, City Staff | Requires additional funding. | |

**The Draft Historic Preservation Plan was
omitted to reduce redundant copying**

**To view the Draft Historic Preservation Plan
see Exhibit 2**

Exhibit 10D
Planning Commission
May 13, 2009
Minutes

SALT LAKE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

In Room 326 of the City & County Building

451 South State Street, Salt Lake City, Utah

Wednesday, May 13, 2009

Present for the Planning Commission meeting were Chair Mary Woodhead and Vice Chair Susie McHugh; Commissioners Babs De Lay, Frank Algarin, Matthew Wirthlin, Michael Gallegos, Angela Dean, Prescott Muir, and Michael Fife. Commissioners Tim Chambless and Kathleen Hill were excused.

A field trip was held prior to the meeting. Planning Commissioners present were: Tim Chambless, Angela Dean, Michael Fife, Michael Gallegos, Prescott Muir, and Matthew Wirthlin. Staff members present were: Joel Paterson, Bill Peperone, Michael Maloy, Cheri Coffey, and Nick Norris.

A roll is being kept of all who attended the Planning Commission Meeting. Chair Woodhead called the meeting to order at 5:51 p.m. Audio recordings of the Planning Commission meetings are retained in the Planning Office for an indefinite period of time. Planning staff members present at the meeting were: Frank Gray, Community and Economic Development Director; Pat Comarell, Assistant Planning Director; Cheri Coffey, Programs Manager; Joel Paterson, Programs Manager; Paul Neilson, City Attorney; Nick Norris, Senior Planner; Bill Peperone, Senior Planner; Michael Maloy, Principal Planner, and Tami Hansen, Planning Commission Secretary.

POSTPONED Petition PLNPCM2009-00171 Citywide Historic Preservation Plan adoption—a request by the Historic Landmark Commission to consider recommendation of the Citywide Historic Preservation Plan to the City Council. This is a city-wide project.

Chair Woodhead noted that this item had been postponed.

Exhibit 11A
Historic Landmark
Commission
April 1, 2009

Original Notice and Postmark/Agenda

**NOTICE OF REGULAR PUBLIC MEETING
SALT LAKE CITY HISTORIC LANDMARK COMMISSION**

PUBLIC NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that the Historic Landmark Commission of Salt Lake City, Utah, will hold a regular public meeting in the City and County Building, Room 315, 451 South State Street, on Wednesday, April 1, 2009. The agenda for the meeting is as follows:

**AGENDA FOR THE SALT LAKE CITY
HISTORIC LANDMARK COMMISSION MEETING**

In Room 315 of the City & County Building at 451 South State Street

Wednesday, April 1, 2009 at 5:45 p.m.

The Field Trip is scheduled to leave at 4:00 P.M.

BRIEFINGS/DINNER – 5:00 P.M.

Dinner will be served to the Historic Landmark Commission and staff at 5:00 P.M. in Room 126. The Historic Landmark Commission may discuss the Salt Lake City Preservation Plan process and other work topics. The Commission may also discuss project updates and minor administrative matters. This portion of the meeting is open to the public for observation.

WORK SESSION – 5:15 P.M.

The Commission will review a discussion paper titled “Solar Systems and Historic Preservation District Design Review” submitted by Clarion Associates and the Division of Sustainability. This portion of the meeting is open to the public for observation.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES from March 4, 2009

REPORT OF THE CHAIR AND VICE CHAIR

COMMENTS TO THE COMMISSION

Comments will be taken on any item not scheduled, as well as on any other issues affecting the historic districts and historic preservation in Salt Lake City (Comments will be limited to two minutes).

OTHER BUSINESS

1. **Petition 470-07-15 - Huntington Condominiums** - A request by Huntington Condominiums, represented by Eric Richardson, for an extension of time for an approved new construction project located at 540 East 500 South. The project is a residential condominium development that was originally approved on May 7, 2008. Due to the current economic conditions, the applicants are requesting that the approval be granted an 24-month extension. The project is located in the Central City Historic District and in City Council District 4, represented by Luke Garrott. (staff contact Nick Norris at 535-6173 or nick.norris@slcgov.com)

PUBLIC HEARINGS

NEW BUSINESS

1. **PLNHL2008-00674 - Peery Hotel Minor Alteration** - A request by Peery Hotel LP, represented by AK Smith Architects, for a minor alterations to the Peery Hotel at 110 West 300 South. The Peery Hotel is a Landmark Site on the City’s Register of Cultural Resources. The request includes adding an entry canopy on the south façade of the building. The awning would extend over the sidewalk across public property and is based off of historic photographs. The property is located in City Council District 4, represented by Council Member Luke Garrott. (Staff: Nick Norris, 535-6173, nick.norris@slcgov.com)

- 2. **Petition PLNHLC2008-00738 Carl Jones Minor Alteration** - A request by Carl Jones, property owner, for a minor alteration located at 104 North F Street in the Avenues Historic District. The proposed project involves replacement windows that differ from the original windows approved by the Commission in June 2008. The property is zoned SR-1A, Special Development Pattern Residential District in the Avenues Historic District. The property is located in City Council District 3, represented by Council Member Eric Jergensen. (Staff contact: Robin Zeigler, 535-7758, robin.zeigler@slcgov.com.)
- 3. **Petition PLNPCM2008-00938 Landscape Ordinance Text Change** - A request by the Planning Commission to consider an amendment to section 21A.34.020 of the zoning ordinance. The amendment would include a definition of historic landscapes (not yards of historic buildings), clarification that existing standards may be applied to landscapes as well as buildings, and two additional standards for historic landscapes. This is a city-wide project. (Staff contact: Robin Zeigler, 535-7758, robin.zeigler@slcgov.com.)
- 4. **Petition PLNPCM2009-00171 Citywide Historic Preservation Plan adoption** - A request by the Planning Commission to consider recommendation of the Citywide Historic Preservation Plan to the Planning Commission and City Council. This is a city-wide project. (Staff contact: Robin Zeigler, 535-7758, robin.zeigler@slcgov.com.)

The next HLC meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, May 6, 2009 in Room 315 at 5:45 p.m. Notification will be provided if there are any changes.

Visit the Historic Landmark Commission's website at <http://www.slcgov.com/boards/HLC/hlc-agen.htm> for copies of the Historic Landmark Commission's agendas, staff reports, and minutes. Staff reports will be posted by the end of the business day on the Friday prior to the meeting and minutes will be posted by the end of the business day two days after they are ratified, which usually occurs at the next regularly scheduled meeting of the Historic Landmark Commission.

NOTE: Please turn off cellular phones during the meeting. We comply with all ADA guidelines. People with disabilities may make requests for reasonable accommodation no later than 48 hours in advance in order to attend this meeting. Accommodations may include alternate formats, interpreters, and other auxiliary aids. This is an accessible facility. For questions, requests, or additional information, please contact the Historic Landmark Commission secretary at 535-6189 regarding this agenda or ADA accommodations; TDD 535-6220.

On Monday, March 16, 2009, I personally posted copies of the foregoing notice within the City and County Building at 451 South State Street at the following locations: Planning Division, Room 406; City Council Bulletin Board, Room 315; and the Community Affairs Bulletin Board, outside Room 306. A copy of the agenda has also been faxed/e-mailed to all Salt Lake City Public Libraries for posting and to the Salt Lake Tribune and Deseret News.

Signed: *Deborah Martin*
Deborah Martin, Senior Secretary

STATE OF UTAH)
SS
COUNTY OF SALT LAKE)

SUBSCRIBED AND SWORN to before me this 16th day of March, 2009.

Diana L. Hansen
NOTARY PUBLIC residing in Salt Lake County, Utah




Exhibit 11B
Historic Landmark
Commission
April 1, 2009
Staff Report

HISTORIC LANDMARK COMMISSION STAFF REPORT



Planning and Zoning Division
Department of Community and
Economic Development

CITYWIDE HISTORIC PRESERVATION PLAN, Master Plan Adoption & PLNPCM2009-00171 City-wide April 1, 2009

Applicant: Salt Lake City
Planning Commission

Staff: Robin Zeigler, 535-7758,
robin.zeigler@slcgov.com

Notification

- Notice mailed on March 17, 2009
- Agenda posted on the Planning Division and Utah Public Meeting Notice websites March 17, 2009

Attachments:

- A. Draft Plan
- B. Department Comments
- C. Public Comments
- D. Memo

Request

A request by the Planning Commission to adopt a citywide Historic Preservation Plan. The citywide Historic Preservation Plan is a comprehensive plan that formally defines a vision for the preservation program and sets long-term, citywide goals and objectives to guide specific actions and decisions.

Potential Motions

Approval

I move to forward a positive recommendation to adopt Petition PLNPCM2009-00171 as proposed by consultants, Clarion and Associates.

Or

I move to forward a positive recommendation to adopt Petition PLNPCM2009-00171 based on the findings and facts of the staff report and with the following changes...

Denial

I move to forward a negative recommendation to deny Petition PLNPCM2009-00171 to the Planning Commission and City Council based on ...

Table

I move to table a recommendation of Petition PLNPCM2009-00171 to the Planning Commission and request additional information and/or research including...

- Goal 1.1 Ensure consistency between the Historic Preservation Plan and all other adopted city plans.*
- Goal 1.2 Ensure consistency between Historic Preservation Plan and all city policies..*
- Goal 1.3 Foster a shared understanding of preservation with in the City.*

This chapter recognizes the ability of historic preservation to be a valuable planning tool and the actions recommended encourage preservation be a factor in all City planning components such as zoning, housing, neighborhood development and preservation, public services, redevelopment, transportation, and sustainability.

4: Adopt a Comprehensive Preservation Toolbox

This chapter discusses the tools and incentives currently used in the city and presents numerous recommendations for improvements and additions to broaden the regulatory tools and incentives available to support historic preservation.

- Goal 2.1: Strategically pursue the identification of historic resources through surveys.*
- Goal 2.2: Ensure that up-to-date and complete surveys are used to inform preservation decision-making.*
- Goal 2.2: Ensure that up-to-date and complete surveys are used to inform preservation decision-making.*
- Goal 2.3: Ensure the long-term health and viability of existing historic districts.*
- Goal 2.4: Protect exemplary groupings of historic properties as local historic districts.*
- Goal 2.5: Protect significant individual properties as designated local Landmark Sites.*
- Goal 2.6: Encourage the listing of significant historic properties on the National Register of Historic Places to complement local designation.*
- Goal 2.7: Align preservation-related City regulations with the goals and policies of this plan.*
- Goal 2.8: Broaden the range of tools available to encourage the preservation of historic properties.*
- Goal 2.9: Offer economic hardship and demolition provisions that achieve their intended purpose.*
- Goal 2.10: Refine existing design guidelines and create new guidelines to address multi-family and non-residential development and properties in local historic districts and Local Landmark Sites.*

This chapter provides advice on using, conducting, funding and prioritizing surveys. It recommends that boundaries of current districts be evaluated and that properties listed in the National Register and city-owned eligible historic properties be locally designated to assure their protection. An important recommendation is an assessment of underlying zoning to assure that it is compatible with historic overlays. The plan also recommends consideration of additional tools such as conservation districts. Some suggested projects are already in the works and include revision of the economic hardship ordinance. With the financial assistance of the Redevelopment Agency, commercial design guidelines are in the process of development.

7: Support a Sustainable City

This chapter illustrates how preservation can help support environmental, economic, social and cultural sustainability, specifically energy efficiency, heritage tourism, downtown revitalization, parks and landscapes, transportation, and housing. The following goals are provided along with specific recommended actions.

- Goal 5.1 Improve public understanding of the life-cycle energy benefits of historic preservation.*
- Goal 5.2 Encourage the use of sustainable buildings practices in the renovation and maintenance of historic structures.*
- Goal 5.3 Support historic tourism to Salt Lake City.*
- Goal 5.4 Increase coordination between historic preservation and Downtown revitalization and economic development efforts.*
- Goal 5.5 Preserve historic parks and other historic landscapes in Salt Lake City.*
- Goal 5.6 Support a range of transportation modes.*
- Goal 5.7 Promote a range of housing options in historic areas to meet a variety of needs.*
- Goal 5.8 Assist homeowners in overcoming age, income, or ability challenges of home maintenance requirements.*

This chapter coincides with the current draft of the Sustainability Plan and follows the same thematic framework. An example of a recommendation from this chapter is Action 1 under Policy 5.7d “Work to develop appropriate policies on allowing accessory dwelling units in historic homes.” Allowing for accessory units is one way of helping a property owner cover the expenses of maintaining a large historic home and can increase density in a low-impact manner. The language stresses that this action should follow best practices and be appropriate for the neighborhood.

8: Implementation Action Plan

This chapter summarizes the actions identified in each of the preceding chapters of the historic preservation plan, and identifies priorities, responsible parties, and potential funding sources for their implementation.

Small portions of the plan were not complete at the time of publication of this staff report. Please note that maps on pages 18, 20 and 38 will be updated. Some photographs need to be given credit information. “Eard” should be changed to “Ward” on the caption which appears on page 27. In addition, on page 95, the priority level of Yalecrest is not complete. The consultants plan to provide an errata list at the public hearing.

Comments

Public Comments

Many public comments have been received throughout the process of creating the plan. A final public workshop was held on February 18, 2009 at the Cathedral of the Madeleine. Please see Attachment C.

ATTACHMENT A
Draft Preservation Plan

HISTORIC LANDMARK COMMISSION STAFF REPORT

CITYWIDE HISTORIC PRESERVATION PLAN, Master Plan Adoption & PLNPCM2009-00171 City-wide April 1, 2009



Planning and Zoning Division
Department of Community and
Economic Development

Applicant: Salt Lake City
Planning Commission

Staff: Robin Zeigler, 535-7758,
robin.zeigler@slcgov.com

Notification

- Notice mailed on March 17, 2009
- Agenda posted on the Planning Division and Utah Public Meeting Notice websites March 17, 2009

Attachments:

- A. Draft Plan
- B. Department Comments
- C. Public Comments
- D. Memo

Request

A request by the Planning Commission to adopt a citywide Historic Preservation Plan. The citywide Historic Preservation Plan is a comprehensive plan that formally defines a vision for the preservation program and sets long-term, citywide goals and objectives to guide specific actions and decisions.

Potential Motions

Approval

I move to forward a positive recommendation to adopt Petition PLNPCM2009-00171 as proposed by consultants, Clarion and Associates.

Or

I move to forward a positive recommendation to adopt Petition PLNPCM2009-00171 based on the findings and facts of the staff report and with the following changes...

Denial

I move to forward a negative recommendation to deny Petition PLNPCM2009-00171 to the Planning Commission and City Council based on ...

Table

I move to table a recommendation of Petition PLNPCM2009-00171 to the Planning Commission and request additional information and/or research including...

- Goal 1.1 Ensure consistency between the Historic Preservation Plan and all other adopted city plans.*
- Goal 1.2 Ensure consistency between Historic Preservation Plan and all city policies.*
- Goal 1.3 Foster a shared understanding of preservation with in the City.*

This chapter recognizes the ability of historic preservation to be a valuable planning tool and the actions recommended encourage preservation be a factor in all City planning components such as zoning, housing, neighborhood development and preservation, public services, redevelopment, transportation, and sustainability.

4: Adopt a Comprehensive Preservation Toolbox

This chapter discusses the tools and incentives currently used in the city and presents numerous recommendations for improvements and additions to broaden the regulatory tools and incentives available to support historic preservation.

- Goal 2.1: Strategically pursue the identification of historic resources through surveys.*
- Goal 2.2: Ensure that up-to-date and complete surveys are used to inform preservation decision-making.*
- Goal 2.2: Ensure that up-to-date and complete surveys are used to inform preservation decision-making.*
- Goal 2.3: Ensure the long-term health and viability of existing historic districts.*
- Goal 2.4: Protect exemplary groupings of historic properties as local historic districts.*
- Goal 2.5: Protect significant individual properties as designated local Landmark Sites.*
- Goal 2.6: Encourage the listing of significant historic properties on the National Register of Historic Places to complement local designation.*
- Goal 2.7: Align preservation-related City regulations with the goals and policies of this plan.*
- Goal 2.8: Broaden the range of tools available to encourage the preservation of historic properties.*
- Goal 2.9: Offer economic hardship and demolition provisions that achieve their intended purpose.*
- Goal 2.10: Refine existing design guidelines and create new guidelines to address multi-family and non-residential development and properties in local historic districts and Local Landmark Sites.*

This chapter provides advice on using, conducting, funding and prioritizing surveys. It recommends that boundaries of current districts be evaluated and that properties listed in the National Register and city-owned eligible historic properties be locally designated to assure their protection. An important recommendation is an assessment of underlying zoning to assure that it is compatible with historic overlays. The plan also recommends consideration of additional tools such as conservation districts. Some suggested projects are already in the works and include revision of the economic hardship ordinance. With the financial assistance of the Redevelopment Agency, commercial design guidelines are in the process of development.

7: Support a Sustainable City

This chapter illustrates how preservation can help support environmental, economic, social and cultural sustainability, specifically energy efficiency, heritage tourism, downtown revitalization, parks and landscapes, transportation, and housing. The following goals are provided along with specific recommended actions.

- Goal 5.1 Improve public understanding of the life-cycle energy benefits of historic preservation.*
- Goal 5.2 Encourage the use of sustainable buildings practices in the renovation and maintenance of historic structures.*
- Goal 5.3 Support historic tourism to Salt Lake City.*
- Goal 5.4 Increase coordination between historic preservation and Downtown revitalization and economic development efforts.*
- Goal 5.5 Preserve historic parks and other historic landscapes in Salt Lake City.*
- Goal 5.6 Support a range of transportation modes.*
- Goal 5.7 Promote a range of housing options in historic areas to meet a variety of needs.*
- Goal 5.8 Assist homeowners in overcoming age, income, or ability challenges of home maintenance requirements.*

This chapter coincides with the current draft of the Sustainability Plan and follows the same thematic framework. An example of a recommendation from this chapter is Action 1 under Policy 5.7d "Work to develop appropriate policies on allowing accessory dwelling units in historic homes." Allowing for accessory units is one way of helping a property owner cover the expenses of maintaining a large historic home and can increase density in a low-impact manner. The language stresses that this action should follow best practices and be appropriate for the neighborhood.

8: Implementation Action Plan

This chapter summarizes the actions identified in each of the preceding chapters of the historic preservation plan, and identifies priorities, responsible parties, and potential funding sources for their implementation.

Small portions of the plan were not complete at the time of publication of this staff report. Please note that maps on pages 18, 20 and 38 will be updated. Some photographs need to be given credit information. "Eard" should be changed to "Ward" on the caption which appears on page 27. In addition, on page 95, the priority level of Yalecrest is not complete. The consultants plan to provide an errata list at the public hearing.

Comments

Public Comments

Many public comments have been received throughout the process of creating the plan. A final public workshop was held on February 18, 2009 at the Cathedral of the Madeleine. Please see Attachment C.

ATTACHMENT A
Draft Preservation Plan

MEMORANDUM

TO: Robin Zeigler
FROM: D.J. Baxter; Valda Tarbet; Matt Dahl
RE: Historic Preservation Plan
DATE: February 25, 2009
CC: David Everitt, Wilf Sommerkorn

The RDA Staff appreciates the opportunity to provide its comments on the proposed Preservation Plan. As an agency focused on the built environment, we devote substantial resources toward the restoration of historic structures, and appreciate the enormous qualitative ways in which renovation contributes to our urban fabric and enhances our community. As the City's primary vehicle for eliminating blight and encouraging reinvestment, the RDA also clearly understands the degree to which perpetual neglect and inaction with regard to dilapidated structures can harm a community. While we wholeheartedly believe in the value of restoring and preserving historically significant structures, we also know the economic hurdles that make the prospect infeasible in many situations. We believe that any city must be permitted to grow and evolve as times and circumstances warrant, and we hope that our input and involvement can help Salt Lake City to strike the appropriate balance between preservation and new development. We understand that both values are shared by City leaders and each has to be balanced with the other priorities of the City.

The Redevelopment Agency staff (RDA) has thoroughly reviewed the draft Historic Preservation Plan (the "Plan") and has identified several concerns with its approach and specific policy recommendations. The following is a list of our concerns and, where possible, recommended changes. We fully support several of the Plan's proposals, which we also identify here.

Theme: The language used in the Plan seems to suggest that preservation is *the* preeminent goal of the City, rather than one of many important objectives. Examples include the Plan's call for City's master plans to be updated for consistency with the Plan (Page 16), and its suggestion that all city regulations should be made to conform to preservation objectives, without any acknowledgement that the City codes must also meet a variety of other city priorities. ("By bringing regulations of the city into alignment with preservation objectives, the city will help reduce internal conflicts and contradictions..." (Page 91).) It is certainly a valuable goal to eliminate internal inconsistencies within city plans and regulations, the language of the draft Plan infers that the other objective of a community plan being revised will be subordinated to the need for consistency with the Historic Preservation Plan. We would favor adding some language to state that this consistency effort will not override or weaken the other objectives of an adopted master plan. A statement on page 9 raises similar concerns: "All city departments, agencies,

overlap frequently enough to warrant such an arrangement on an ongoing basis, but could instead be effectively addressed through increased coordination at the staff level.

Conservation Districts: The RDA staff does not oppose the objective of Conservation Districts, but also does not believe an additional set of rules is the best way to preserve neighborhood character in the City. Rather, any elements of neighborhood character that need to be preserved should be reflected in the zoning ordinance, providing a single source of guidance on building requirements for the area. The RDA staff supports adopting more prescriptive zoning codes that include specific design guidelines and limit or eliminate subjective design review at multiple stages of the development process. RDA staff is also of the opinion that preservation tools should designate and protect specific historic structures whereas the zoning code, derived from an adopted city master plan, should establish the parameters according to which neighborhoods are developed or redeveloped.

The idea that Conservation Districts would be voluntarily created and self-enforced (Page 48) raises the specter that one resident or group of residents could impose its view of compatibility on others. We are seeing in several neighborhoods now the degree to which this pits neighbors against one another, and undermines the very sense of community our neighborhoods are intended to enhance. In our view, a single set of clear and unambiguous rules, adopted in the zoning code, should serve this function.

Project and Loan Review: The Plan calls for preservation staff to participate in the review of new projects (Page 65) and City loans (Page 74). In the case of reviewing new projects, the RDA staff supports the preservation staff's review of projects that are in historic districts, provided their review does not increase the amount of time required for the building permit process.

Design Guidelines: The Plan calls for refining current design guidelines and the development of new ones (Page 55-56). The RDA staff supports the inclusion of specific design guidelines in the City's zoning code that are based on City master plans. Optimally, these design guidelines should be carefully crafted to provide a predictable, consistent set of rules under which expectations are clear. To that end, they should limit or remove the subjective review of a project's design. Developers have stated that they can work with a long compendium of design requirements so long as they are clearly and consistently articulated from the outset, but they find the multiple layers of subjective review that sometimes accompany design guidelines can become unpredictable and time consuming.

This is specifically mentioned in the Plan when it calls for the establishment of an Architectural Review Committee (Page 60), which we understand exists already. In the description of the committee, it indicates that the committee can only provide an opinion on a project's design and that opinion may or may not reflect the opinion of the commission (HLC). If the Architectural Review Committee is comprised of HLC members and is still not able to determine whether a project conforms to the design guidelines, and provides no firm commitment that the full HLC will likewise approve the recommended changes, then neither the guidelines nor the committee has added to the predictability of the process. We worry that anytime the full HLC varies from the advice offered by the committee, this proactive review, which has the potential to be very helpful to an applicant, will instead add another layer of uncertainty to the development process that will only further discourage investment in Salt Lake City.

ATTACHMENT C
Public Comments

Pete Ashdown asked if there was a formulaic approach for review of demolition requests outside a district. Matt stated that some communities have tried a review of all demolition applications for properties more than 50 years old but have since backed off because it is too much to administer.

Esther Hunter recommended that the wording in the charts may not be the best choice.

Another attendee recommended changing "preservation district" to "historic district" for consistency and clarity.

Comments received in writing on the draft presented at the Final Public Workshop

Jon Dewey, 2/19/09, emailed

Overall, this is an exciting document and long overdue. Thank you for your involvement. It's heartening to see our city, and its leaders recognizing this important issue.

I'd like to add a few comments specifically in regards to the Yalecrest neighborhood. As some background, I have been involved in the neighborhood community council for several years, was past chair and participated in the Yalecrest Compatible Infill Committee. I continue to be involved in preservation aspects of our community.

The first comment is an easy semantics fix re: our designation as being listed on the National Register of Historic Places. The document says we were nominated which is true, but our designation was also granted.

Secondly, I am concerned with the Appendix A chart that lists individual neighborhoods and states whether they are stable or compromised (those are the only two words used). Yalecrest is listed as stable, and this was determined by Ron who did an eyeball assessment without formal interviews or contact with local councils (as was disclosed at the meeting last night when I asked to what extent Ron's survey entailed). Those of us living in Yalecrest who are concerned with preservation are keenly aware that our neighborhood is not stable, especially with regards to teardowns and out of scale rebuilds and additions. They actually are quite prevalent in our neighborhood and we would like that addressed and believe the term 'stable' must be changed. We just lost another house to demolition last week.

Lastly, I'd like to call your attention to the sentence, "Its historic resources do not appear to be threatened by any significant pressures or concerns at this time." also in the Appendix A section under Yalecrest. There are many pressures in our neighborhood currently at work to undermine the preservation of its integrity, scale, privacy and original character. For example, we continue to be notified of Board of Adjustments hearings re: the building of garages that exceed what is allowed in our neighborhood, those are pressures. So, again, I believe this sentence is inaccurate and would lead those in power to believe all is well as far as preservation in the Yalecrest neighborhood, which is not the case.

I understand Ron did not have the ability or latitude to interview or schedule meetings with those concerned. And because of the residents care and pride in the neighborhood the number of unkempt and dilapidated housing stock is minimal at most, giving the appearance of a stable neighborhood. But there is an underlying pattern continuing to grow and reduce our 91% (it is less now) contributing structure tally as determined by those that surveyed and applied for the Historic designation.

Pete Ashdown, 2/24/09, email

Robin, as I commented in the meeting at the Cathedral, it seems to me that there is not adequate strategy for protection of downtown buildings. There is an emphasis towards overlays and districts, but it is my belief that that the downtown property owners will never agree to anything like that. I believe there should be a way for citizens to designate buildings independent of owners, so they would come under review for modification or demolition.

Loggins Merrill, 2/24/09, online questionnaire

I understand the need to preserve areas of our city which are currently not protected by an historic district. My biggest fear with this plan is that we are going to restrict the design guidelines too much. This plan to me starts to feel like I'm living out in Lehi or some town/ suburb that has strict rules about what materials I'm supposed to have on my home, how many (and which type) of trees can go in my front yard, etc. It just all smacks of taking away an individual's right to have the style of home they want.

My biggest issue is that while I live in SLC, I would like to continue to live in the city but in a completely modern home. These too are and can be done beautifully. I don't want to live in a place where everything looks the same, however I also don't want to live in a neighborhood where there is an atrocious house either.

Please make room in your plan for those of us who would love to live in the city but in a different style of home.

Ira Hinckley, 2/24/09, online questionnaire

I have now attended two of the historic preservation plan meetings as I am very much in favor of preserving our historic structures. However I am very worried that this "Preservation Plan" may in fact hurt our preservation goals. For example I don't understand how delisting central city from a historic district to a conservation overlay is going to make it harder to tear down historic buildings! I am worried that this will be a tool in the city's hands to make it easier to tear down. My suggestion is that no approval for demolition should be allowed for any building built prior to 1930. The only exception would be allowed for relocation of such buildings and only with approval by the community! We have already lost too much of our heritage!

Unknown, 2/25/09, online questionnaire

Work with the owner of the property. Please remember that it is the property owner who owns the building and has to pay the expenses. Current methods for historic preservation tend to focus on only a few certain aspects in the historic preservation process instead of the full process. Also incentives are far more favorable to getting a really well done restoration verses rigid regulations.

Lisette Gibson, 3/1/2009, email

Historic District Recommendations pg 97

Yalecrest: As of 11/07, the Yalecrest Historic District had 91% contributing buildings! Over the years, the neighborhood has been feeling the impact of teardowns, incompatible additions and oversized new primary and accessory structures. I feel that the Survey Objective should be changed to "Compromised" instead of just left blank. We have been told for years that a Conservation District could be a great fit for the neighborhood. I

Teardowns (city-wide) for residential and commercial structures. Implement a "Cooling Off Period" and a "Notification Process" for nearby residents, business and community councils. This is an excellent opportunity to educate property owners and nearby residents about any historic significance of the property they are planning to demolish. Historic renovation education and assistance could be provided. Be proactive rather than reactionary. Track teardowns city wide.

Add a "Glossary of Terms".

Kent Brough, 4/2/2009, email

I am sorry I was not able to make it to the meeting on **Thursday, February 19th** with the [Commercial] Design Guidelines. I was tied up with some issues at work. However, I do want to commend you and your consultants on the excellent meeting on **Wednesday, February 18th**. I enjoyed the discussion very much. One thought that occurred to me is it would be good to seek more support and exposure to the media for what is being done. I believe that if Mayor Becker were to come out supporting this initiative and even being there when some of the community meetings are held, we could get better support in the long run. Other than that, I have no other suggestions.

I hope that your changes will provide us with a **model document** that can be used in other cities throughout the area. Next comes the challenges faced with implementation of the document. Thanks for the opportunity to review and respond. Keep up the great effort.

Ed Merrill, 4/3/09, online questionnaire

I support the city's effort to update & refine the preservation plan. My house is 115 years old, but has been modified to support a family in the 21st century. The new contrasts with the old as one method of a solution. Architects & owners must decide how to best solve the problem of modernizing historic housing. Guidelines must allow for interpretations that are appropriate based on scale, materials, existing development pattern & so forth. I heartily support the preservation of historic structures, but also recognize the need to allow a city & neighborhood to mature & evolve, as long as it is NOT at the expense of the existing character & fabric of a neighborhood. I also believe that commercial development should be allowed, as with homes, to be a modern expression of the times, as long as the quality, massing, scale, proportions, etc., contribute to the character of the neighborhood.

Additional comments: Important historic sites are Trolley Square, Gilgal Garden, Historic commercial buildings downtown, monuments, hundreds of homes & buildings (small & large). Historic neighborhood character (a whole fabric thing) where new and old co-exist, contrast, and add richness.

Improvement of infrastructure, revision of Master Plans to show commitment of city to existing housing stock (removal of RMF zoning in areas of already medium density, but detached historic housing except at certain places that make sense to community).

Find ways a property owner/architect/developer can come to an understanding about what changes would be allowable & appropriate early & easily.

in a renovation job and their homes reflect that, but others would seemingly just as soon "renovate" and then dump the property or let it fall into disrepair....mixed feelings as you can see.

Anonymous, 11/13/08, online questionnaire

Worth preserving is the Harvard Yale area, but I feel that most older neighborhoods are at risk of losing their character and charm. I am concerned and appalled at the rate of destruction, and size of additions to the older homes. This area has been recognized nationally as an historic district but there are no preservation/restrictions/building regulations that come with that. Outside the lower Avenues there is nothing preventing the destruction of historic buildings and neighborhoods.

Anonymous, 9/25/08, online questionnaire

My seismic upgrade would need to be subsidized. I have no plans to structurally rehab my 1910 house.

Anonymous, 5/7/08, online questionnaire

The block between 2100 South and Redondo Ave. near 400 and 500 East has some fantastic old burned out buildings that are sitting vacant and not being restored. Behind these (on Redondo) is a neat little bungalow that is a perfect candidate for restoration however the owner will not sell, and does not show interest in restoration. Demolition of these homes would destroy some of the oldest homes in that area. Perhaps the city could compile a list of homes for sale that need historic preservation for people coming into Salt Lake City that need a home and desire the style and charm that only an historic home can provide?

Merrill Loggins, 4/29/08

I understand the importance of having a preservation plan in order to not lose so much history and identity of our neighborhoods. My biggest fear is that the plan will be too restrictive for people who want to update/remodel their home but not to any historic standard. I actually chose my home location in SLC based on where there is not a historic site. This is because I have heard many terrible stories of people who get hassled by the city because they live in a historic district and have to follow certain guidelines while remodeling their home. Just please remember there are people like myself who love to live in an older neighborhood but love modern design and would love to have an older home remodeled but to look new, not old. I hope this plan allows for different styles and supports property owners who wish to upgrade and improve the housing structures but in their own style (which may not be a historic style).

Anonymous, 4/22/08, online questionnaire

It seems that the city has competing interests in this area — both the desire to preserve valuable historical buildings (not all old buildings, but those with significance) and to encourage new growth through infill construction that will not, by definition, meet historical standards. There seems to be a city-wide assumption that everyone wants to live in a restored historical building — leave room for those of us interested in what Salt Lake has to offer but who also desire an infill, modern home.

Anonymous, date unknown, questionnaire

Support community with architects, contractors, consultants

Mary Dell and Raymond Gunne, date unknown, questionnaire

My husband and I have a love and appreciation for old buildings. We live within the boundaries of Wash Hollow Community Council (the east side of 1300 East to the west side of 1900 east, the south side of 1300 South to the north side of 1700 south). The house we reside in was built in 1926, and the others on our block were built in or around the same year (except for one totally incompatible home built in 2005). The original owners of our house would recognize it, as no changes have been made to the exterior since it was built. It is obvious that the people who constructed our homes were craftsmen who took pride in their work.

We would like our area to be evaluated and considered for the appropriate historic or conservation district designation, as I believe many of the homes would be contributing structures. There have been several tear downs and jump ups and there seem to be no protection at all to mitigate what is happening to the character of our neighborhood. Historic preservation deserves a higher profile in Salt Lake city. WE subscribe to Preservation and American Bungalow magazines and I often wonder why there are no articles on home and buildings in Salt Lake City. We have wonderful housing stock in every neighborhood of this city. Granted, a lot of it is in need of restoration/renovation, but it is a wonderful nevertheless.

There are some masonry issues with our 82-year-old foundation, steps, etc, as well as plumbing and electrical that need to be restored/repaired/renovated, but we do not qualify for the Federal and State incentives or the Utah Heritage Foundation's low-interest loans because our home is not in an historic district.

No effort seems to be made to salvage materials and record the history of historic homes or commercial buildings that are demolished. I wonder how much old growth timber was in the buildings that were just demolished in Sugar House.

I am aware of the Design Guidelines but have not had occasion to use them. Reading them was helpful to me in learning what is accepted practice and what is not. What would make them more useful is to make their existence more well-known and their use more widespread, even if the home is not in an historic district. Homeowners in our areas seem to have no idea where to find this kind of information. We need more public education on historic preservation, so that people might begin to view their homes as historic homes, not just old houses. They need to know the resources available to them, (the contractor's directory listed on the landmark commission's resource web page, various books, magazines and catalogues) so that when they do want to add on or renovate, they know their options and can have some confidence in the experience of the contractor. Most contractors working in our area do not seem to be sensitive to the aesthetics of historic homes and appear to be looking at their bottom line only, not what is best for the home, homeowner and neighborhood. The result is re-muddling of the worst kind.

Future Meeting Dates

Will take place monthly between January and June
SECOND Tuesday of each month from 4pm to 6pm

Existing Conditions Report

- One member stated that the Clarion's "Existing Conditions Report" was a good first draft but that it was overall negative in tone, folded in too many opinions and not enough actual conditions, not very thorough.
- Members suggested: a bibliography, a timeline graphic, better history that includes the successes of SLC preservation over the years.

Visioning Statement

- Preservation is not in its rightful place within the city's goals and values.
- Needs to be a balance between regulations and incentives, maybe even a staff person and funds dedicated to incentives.
- Preservation is weak because it is not integrated into the broader picture.
- Recommendation to use the preservation plan to drive a comprehensive plan

Additional Survey

Members debated whether or not an additional survey was needed and useful and if so, what format, timing, promotion would work best. The reasons stated for the need for a new survey included the lackluster response of the initial survey, the need to keep the general public informed and involved throughout the process, the fact that the initial survey did not include all preservation partners. The group agreed that an additional survey would be useful. It will be a shortened version of the existing survey with some additional questions. Members of the CAC will share the survey by making presentations about the plan to the group(s) they represent. In addition, responses can be solicited through special events such as the Greater Avenues Street Festival and the state-wide preservation conference. Information may also be posted in public areas such as the Library.

Staff asked that members email their ideas as to which questions should be included and excluded by the following Friday. A draft would be created and sent to them for their approval. The final version will be available on the website.

Public Involvement

Each member agreed to make presentations to the groups they represent at the time that each product becomes available or at each milestone of the plan development process. Members agreed that they need a "toolkit" with which to go into these meetings. Power point and visual boards were discussed. Vision Utah was given as an example of a good campaign. Staff agreed to put together an initial power point for Kirk Huffaker to use at the Utah Heritage Foundation's next board meeting on January 17th.

One member asked if the plan information available on the web had an easy link to give out. Staff told him no but that they were working on a banner to be placed on the City's homepage that will provide a direct link to the site.

A member commented that the Avenues district would be having its 30th birthday as a district this year and several others would be celebrating their 25th. She suggested a "happy birthday" card/letter as way to remind them about the tax credits and other benefits of being an historic district.

HLC COMMUNITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR PRESERVATION PLAN
MEETING NOTES
February 12, 2008

Members Attending: Lisette Gibson, Elizabeth Giraud, Kirk Huffaker, Barbara Murphy, Rob Pett, David Richardson, Bob Farrington,

Staff Attending: Cheri Coffee, Robin Zeigler, Janice Lew

Future Meeting Dates

The group agreed that rather than meet regularly each month that they would prefer to have meetings scheduled around Clarion's visits and products.

Plan Update

Progress on the plan is currently suspended as Staff reviews the revised work plan of the consultants and determines whether or not the additional costs can be funded. Once these issues are finalized a new schedule will be created.

The group expressed concern that there was not a revised Conditions Report and did not feel that the current work plan revision should hold up the completion of Phase I.

Promotion of Plan

Robin Zeigler gave an update on what had been done to promote the plan and gain public input. On the website there are two ways for people to comment. One is just general comments and the other is the revised questionnaire. Currently the questionnaire is available as a pdf but staff is working on getting an electronic form. In addition, a banner link directly to the Preservation Plan has been placed on the City's homepage.

Kirk Huffaker gave an update on his presentation to the Utah Heritage Foundation. He said that he kept the presentation to about five minutes and encouraged the Board to complete the questionnaires while they listened to the presentation. Although people might have missed portions of the presentation they were able to leave completed questionnaires at the end of the meeting rather than try to remember to mail them in. He said the power point presentation was a good one for those audiences who already have some information about preservation.

Staff has been invited to make a presentation to the Business Advisory Board and took the questionnaire and flier to the Fisher Mansion Open House.

Bob Farrington volunteered to schedule a presentation with the RDA and asked if Kirk Huffaker could make the presentation. Robin Zeigler will attend as well and bring copies of the questionnaire and fliers. Bob also stated that he had many preservation comments from the planning of the Downtown Rising Plan. Cheri Coffee volunteered a Planning Division staff member to go through the emails received and pull out the preservation related comments.

Lisette Gibson and Elizabeth Giraud both volunteered to present to groups they represent. Robin said that she would send everyone the power point presentation, which is available for public review online. She will also send a pdf version of the flier but can make copies of the flier or questionnaire for anyone who needs them.

Kirk encouraged everyone to review and comment on the draft of the Downtown Master Plan, which is online. Preservation is not adequately covered in the plan.

HLC COMMUNITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR PRESERVATION PLAN JUNE 18, 2008 MEETING NOTES

Future Meeting Dates

June 24th, 5pm, Room 126

Participants: Barbara Murphy, Nelson Knight, Lisette Gibson, Noreen Heid, Warren Lloyd, Polly Hart, Kirk Huffaker, Anne Oliver, Elizabeth Giraud

Staff: Esther Hunter, Joel Patterson, Janice Lew, Robin Zeigler

Consultants: Matt Goebel and Amy Kacala with Clarion Associates

Robin opened the workshop by welcoming everyone back and thanking them for their continued enthusiasm for the project. She explained that the project was placed on hold for several months due to the reorganization of the planning division but was now back on track.

Matt and Amy, with Clarion Associates, presented a draft of the "Historic Preservation Vision, Goals, and Policies" document. Matt explained that although the document included specific policies, the objective of this first workshop was to brainstorm overall themes and goals. Each subgroup completed a worksheet and presented the highlights to the entire group. Additional comments will be accepted over the next couple of weeks and should be sent to robin.zeigler@slc.gov.

Follows is a very brief summary of the comments made by participants. Clarion will use the comments listed below as well as the additional comments on the worksheets and that they will receive over the next couple of weeks to revise the Vision and Goals document. The revised document will be presented at one or two public workshops for further comment before finalizing.

Summary of Comments:

RDA

- Recognize the shared goals of the RDA and preservation and find new ways to work with/and include RDA in preservation programs and education
- Consider working with RDA to develop a program where people receive additional funding for preservation sensitive work. Would not necessarily need to be administered by HLC or HLC staff

Staff & Funding

- Need additional staff and funding
- Need monies for survey and other projects as a regular budgetary line item rather than having to ask for it each year
- Need preservation dedicated review and enforcement staff

Surveys

- Continue to designate local districts as surveys identify them
- Provide education about all the information provided in surveys and how they can be used
- Shift the responsibility of public/electronic access of surveys to SHPO, who already has the project underway

The public workshops will be two hours long. There is a possibility of scheduling two workshops on the same day to increase the potential for participation. At the workshop(s) Clarion will provide an overview of the draft document and the goals for the meeting. A large group will likely be broken into smaller groups and provided direction on a task that will help to strengthen and revise the Vision and Goals document.

The Community Advisory Committee (CAC) discussed the best time of day and the best date to schedule a public workshop. After discussion with the CAC and further discussion with staff, we are looking into a lunch workshop and a second evening public workshop on September 17th. Clarion will present the results of this workshop during a breakfast meeting the next day. This meeting would include both the HLC and the CAC. Staff thought it might be a good idea to combine the two groups since there are new members of both and this will give them an opportunity to meet each other.

The CAC ended the workshop with a discussion about promotional tools and how the CAC can help promote the workshops. Many agreed that personal invitations to targeted individuals would be best. Additional tools will be a short article that can be inserted into a neighborhood, business or community council newsletter, a newsletter, and a prepackaged presentation available on the web. At the CAC meeting and the HLC subcommittee meeting several lists were recommended for targeted invitations: attendees of early preservation plan meetings, property owners of designated property, AIA members, UHF members, transportation, Certificate of Appropriateness applicants from the last two to three years

The next CAC meeting is scheduled on June 24th, 5pm, room 126. The purpose of this meeting is to provide consultant Ron Sladek with feedback on potential historic districts and individual properties and recommended changes to district boundaries.

Individual Sites (includes sites that may already be designated but are neglected)

666 East 300 South
336 South 400 East
Reservoir Park
Lindsey Gardens
Hawk Cabin
Trinity A&E Church

Potential Thematic Surveys
Ecclesiastic Resources/ "Gentile Core"
Modernist buildings
Double houses
Innerblock courts

Additional comments:

The EIS for TRAX that was done when the line was expanded to the University should be checked to see if there are any resources on the planned airport line (North Temple).

Are the Westside Cannon Homes listed in the National Register?

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS MADE IN SURVEY REPORTS FROM 2003-2007

Capitol Hill RLS, 2006

- Survey and expand district boundaries to include the Kimball and DeSoto-Cortez neighborhoods
- ILS survey of Capitol Hill
- Implement action items within the Capitol Hill Community Master Plan

East Liberty Neighborhood, 2003

- ILS for all A rated properties not already studied
- NR for entire district
- Landmark for entire district
- Create public awareness and education programs: historic home tours, historic walking tours, publicize potential for tax credits, media exposure about designation

Liberty Wells RLS, SWCA, 2007

- ILS survey for all A and B rated properties (*in process*)
- National Register nominations for individual properties suggested and those found to be eligible during the ILS (*in process*)
- Propose listing in the entire area in the NR through a series of thematic nominations.

HLC COMMUNITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR PRESERVATION PLAN

July 14, 2008 MEETING NOTES

Participants: Lisette Gibson, Warren Lloyd, Elizabeth Giraud, Bee Lufkin

Staff: Robin Zeigler

Consultants: Ron Sladek, Tatanka Historical Associates

Evaluation of Historic Resources

Ron Sladek gave an update on his evaluation of historic resources. This is his last trip to look at the representative list of sites and districts culled from the suggestions made by the Community Advisory Committee (CAC), staff, and others in previous meetings. He will complete his overview this Thursday. The purpose of the evaluation is to gain an understanding of the types of resources in the City. Ron stated that Salt Lake City has a tremendous collection, especially of 1960s and 1970s era buildings.

Ron was asked when the prioritization of resources to document/designate would take place and he explained that that would be a part of writing the preservation plan.

Several members asked Ron his advice and thoughts on changing the boundaries of local districts that have pockets of new development. Ron said that most of the National Register districts are very pristine, at the present, but are in danger of being altered to the extent that they would no longer be eligible for the National Register. He stated that changing boundaries might be appropriate in some cases or that less restrictive overlays might also be a good tool.

Warren asked if it was Ron's recommendation that the City locally designate National Register properties. Ron referred this question to Matt Goebel with Clarion.

Promotion of Public Workshop

Robin recommended September 17th as a possible date for two public workshops. One would take place at lunch time and the other would be after 5pm. The members present did not express any concerns with the date.

Robin handed out a draft article written by Clarion that could be included in Community Council newsletters. She explained that there was an emphasis on "sustainability" since this is a hot topic and might gain the attention of some who would not otherwise be interested. The members agreed that it was a good idea but thought maybe there was too much of an emphasis and recommended that the article be tweaked to tone it down slightly.

Robin said that she has contacted the Community Council chairs to ask about festivals where the public workshop could be promoted. She has learned about four that she will attempt to book:

- August 5, Jordan Meadows Night Out Against Crime
- August or September, Sugarhouse Farmers Market (tentative)
- September 6, Greater Avenues Street Fair
- November 1, Sugarhouse Turkey Trot

HLC COMMUNITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR PRESERVATION PLAN NOVEMBER 18, 2008 MEETING NOTES

Participants: Nelson Knight, Noreen Heid, Warren Lloyd, Polly Hart, Elizabeth Giraud, Earle Bevins, Arla Funk, Warren Lloyd, Rob Pett, David Fitzsimmons, David Richardson,
Staff: Mary De La Mare-Schaefer, Wilf Sommerkorn, Pat Comarell, Joel Patterson, Janice Lew, Robin Zeigler, Katie Weiler, Andrew McCreary (intern), Gail Meakins
Consultants: Matt Goebel with Clarion Associates

This meeting included both the HLC and the CAC to give the two groups an opportunity to work together. The session was a workshop to review the "action items" for themes 2 and 5. A summary of comments is provided on the attached worksheet.

At 10:30 am the same day, Matt Goebel provided an update to the Community Council. Attendees included Commissioner Carlton Christensen, Mary De La Mare-Schaefer, Joel Patterson, Pat Comarell, Janice Lew, Cindy Gust-Jensen, Janice Jardine, Gail Meakins, John Dewey (former chair of Yalecrest neighborhood), Elizabeth Ziegler (reporter for KCPW), and Robin Zeigler.

Although the session was mainly an update, attendees provided some valuable comments.

Pat Comarell was asked if Transfer of Development Rights was included in the plan and a viable option for SLC. Matt Goebel stated that some cities did not find them useful because they were labor intensive to create and implement. Commissioner Christensen stated that it would be problematic to find an appropriate location to receive the additional density. Janice Jardine remarked that Frank Gray had suggested that a transfer of rights within the same block might be a better option. Matt agreed that that scenario would be easier to accomplish.

Janice Jardine recommended ASSIST's document on rehabbing existing housing as a good resource to mention in the plan.

Commissioner Christensen stated the plan should not identify conflicts only.

Theme 2 - Policy 2.8

Conservation District box (pg. 53-54) – Suggestion to rearrange and de-emphasize the sentence about "meeting criteria for local, state or national historic designation" and put more emphasis on "preserving the residential character of a neighborhood..." etc.
TDR box (pg. 55) – Recommend adding to the last sentence in second paragraph "or on the same block" as another alternative.

Within Table 2

Page 56 - Add to NMTC / Offered by - Zions Bank, U.S. Bank, Wells Fargo Bank
Page 57 - Omit Main Street Program. We discussed how this program is currently defunct and non-functional, and therefore is not being promoted at any level of preservation for use.

Theme 3

Page 65, sidebar on right with list of trainings – Would you consider adding the annual UHF Preservation Conference?

Theme 4

Since SHPO and UHF have major efforts to increase awareness, outreach, and public education as well, coordination before action can avoid duplication of efforts in many of these areas. Our organizations and agencies may want to begin meeting on a quarterly basis to begin coordinating closer on outreach and public education, as well as other issues.

Goal 4.2 - Policy 4.2e

Action 2 (pg. 78) – Would you consider adding the UHF workshops to assisting SHPO in this section? Some of these are done at the annual UHF preservation conference, but they have also been done at UHF rehabilitation workshops as part of our series.

Theme 5

Intro/Overview (pg. 82-83) How can life-cycle assessments, its factors, and costs be included in the overview as a broad idea to communicate and as a goal to incorporate as a factor in decisions for property owners, planners, elected officials, and the HLC? As you may know, LEED 2009 now incorporates life-cycle assessments and may be able to provide to address or provide reference to this. I believe it is important to point out here that not only in the areas that are listed, but when assembled in a profile such as a life-cycle assessment, it becomes a great example of how buildings work well for the city and the people that best understand it should be leading the charge such as architects, interior designers, contractors, and consultants.

Goal 5.2 - Policy 5.2a

Action 2 (pg. 86) – In revising the SLC Design Guidelines, include a chapter just on Green Preservation Design.

Goal 5.3

Intro/Overview (pg. 87-88) – I believe that under economic development, we missed discussing important factors for how historic buildings provide affordable space for both residential and commercial uses. How could this be incorporated into this section at this point? Otherwise, it appears to me that we really missed the point that historic buildings provide a range of options for people, they are not just for the wealthy or found in gentrified districts.

West Liberty (pg. 119) - Disagree that the boundary should only be to 200 East; it should go to State Street in many places in order to not leave out whole blocks. Otherwise we are giving up entire blocks of a solid NR eligible district essentially as a buffer or boundary to the 'inner' neighborhood, and I don't believe this is good policy.

Westmoreland Place (pg. 120) - This small section is part of the highly vulnerable Wasatch Hollow neighborhood that is not listed on the National Register, is not a local district of any type, and has no design or compatible infill guidelines. Westmoreland is a highly significant historic area and without any of these tools, getting it listed should be a high priority.

Liberty Wells (pg. 122) - Add information to state when the recent survey was completed.

Missing Information

Where is East Liberty Park/9th and 9th on the priority lists for consideration of potential local historic districts or local conservation districts? This is an important inclusion for future consideration.

Where in the list of potential new financial incentives are: 1) a state tax credit for the rehabilitation of commercial buildings and 2) a city enacted tax freeze or abatement? Both of these options should be explored as new options for property owners by the city, SHPO, and UHF through coordination.

Corrections

pg.24 misspelling of parties in second para

pg.27 figure should not be just local historic districts since it has NR as well shown

pg.47 should say that the 'box' is on page 49 not the next page


pg.49 under Other Resources - should be Recent Past Preservation Network

pg.53 Policy 2.8a the boxes for Actions 1 and 2 are switched for how they are currently labeled

pg.54 Sugar House is two words I believe

Please contact me with any questions about these comments. Thank you for your great work to get it to this point and we look forward to our partnership in implementing the plan in the years to come.

Sincerely,



Kirk Huffaker
Executive Director

Exhibit 11C
Historic Landmark
Commission
April 1, 2009
Minutes

**SALT LAKE CITY HISTORIC LANDMARK COMMISSION
MINUTES OF THE MEETING
Room 315, 451 South State Street
April 1, 2009 at 5:45 p.m.**

This document along with the digital recording constitute the official minutes of the Historic Landmark Commission regular session meeting held on April 1, 2009.

If you are viewing a hard copy of the minutes and would like to view the attached materials and listen to audio excerpts of the record, please go to:

www.slcgov.com/boards/HLC/hlc-agen.htm

To download the FTR player and listen to audio excerpts from the record if you are already viewing this document on the worldwide web, click [here](#).

The regular meeting of the Historic Landmark Commission was held on April 1, 2009, at 5:46:53 PM in Room 315 of the City and County Building, located at 451 South State Street, Salt Lake City, Utah, 84111. Commissioners present for the meeting included: Warren Lloyd (Vice Chairperson), Arla Funk, Sheleigh Harding, Polly Hart, Anne Oliver, and Earle Bevins, III.

Planning staff present for the meeting were: Frank Gray, Community & Economic Development Director; Wilford Sommerkorn, Planning Director; Paul Nielson, Senior City Attorney; Joel Paterson, Planning Manager; Robin Zeigler, Senior Preservation Planner; Nick Norris, Senior Planner; and Andrea Curtis, Acting Historic Landmark Commission Secretary.

PLNPCM2009-00171 Citywide Historic Preservation Plan Adoption 7:22:33 PM

A request by the Planning Commission to consider recommendation of the Citywide Historic Preservation Plan to the Planning Commission and City Council. This is a city-wide project. (Staff: Robin Zeigler at 801-535-7758 or robin.zeigler@slcgov.com.)

Ms. Zeigler expressed enthusiasm at having the Preservation Plan to present to the Commission, recognizing the process has been lengthy but very valuable. She referred the Commissioners to the objectives, listed on the slideshow, which originated in the legislative action and from the Commissioners, namely to:

- Define a city-wide vision for historic preservation;
- Establish a set of historic preservation goals;
- Review and make recommendations on district boundaries and future surveys; and
- Set an implementation "Action Plan" with clear priorities.

Ms. Zeigler reviewed that the steps of the process which has included the Commission's Preservation Plan Subcommittee composed of Commissioners Oliver, Lloyd, and Hart and former Commissioner Hunter, as well as the public and stakeholders. She identified Clarion as the consultant firm working on the Plan, noting their process steps were determined from the

initial interviews conducted. Clarion first created a draft Vision and Goals Statement, which was discussed and fine-tuned by the Commission and the public through workshops and the public advisory committee. Ms. Zeigler noted that the Commission and the public have not only reviewed but shaped the Preservation Plan with comments solicited through workshops, online surveys, emails, direct mailings, public service announcements, working drafts posted to the website, etc. She remarked that during each step of the process the comments received have been fairly specific, indicating that Clarion has heard the stakeholders, understood their goals, and integrated them into the Plan. She expressed appreciation for the efforts of the Citizen Advisory Committee's invaluable input. She referred to the section of the staff report that includes the public comments, noting that all of them are addressed in some way in the Plan.

Ms. Zeigler stated that adoption process stage of the Plan is underway, with a final draft reviewed by the community advisory committee, stakeholders, and City Council staff before being revised by Clarion and forwarded to the Commission. She noted that a few additional changes to the Plan can be found on the errata sheet included in the staff report; hard copies were also provided to the Commissioners at the meeting. Ms. Zeigler stated that the request is for the Commission to approve recommending the Preservation Plan to the Planning Commission and City Council for adoption.

Ms. Zeigler introduced Matt Goebel from Clarion to provide an overview of the plan and discuss some of the changes and input. Mr. Goebel expressed appreciation for working with the Commission, Citizen Advisory Committee, and staff members on this exciting project, complimenting Robin Zeigler, Cheri Coffey, Joel Paterson, and Janice Lew on their work coordinating all the city's work on the project. He stated his intent to provide a quick review of the overall substance of the Plan and discuss recent changes to the February 2009 draft, the version widely distributed to stakeholders.

Mr. Goebel stated that the Plan was built by talking with the stakeholders about goals and objectives, defining the big picture vision and then developing goals and objectives with action items to achieve them. He remarked that this basic structure for the Plan has been consistent; what is new are the embellishments to the Plan, such as additional narratives to the objectives and goals to provide context regarding past efforts and public comments in order to make the Plan more accessible to the wider public. He added some clean up has been done to eliminate redundancies and that best practices examples have been added throughout the document with illustrations, text edits, sidebars, etc., noting examples of conservation districts, Chicago Historic Bungalow Initiative, preservation and light rail system integration, preserving buildings from the recent past, etc.

Mr. Goebel reviewed the five parts of the vision, namely:

- 1. Foster a Unified City Commitment to Preservation
- 2. Develop a Comprehensive Preservation Toolbox
- 3. Administer a Convenient and Consistent Historic Preservation Program
- 4. Improve Education and Outreach

- 5. Support a Sustainable City

Mr. Goebel observed that Theme 1 revisions included rephrasing Goals 1.1 and 1.2 to emphasize that the city should ensure consistency between preservation planning and other city plans and policies. He explained that comments regarding the original language identified that it elevated preservation planning above other city plans and goals, so that language has been modified throughout the Plan to reflect the need to include preservation planning when considering city plans and policies without implying that preservation should be primary. He noted that each Master Plan offers an opportunity to consider how preservation is addressed in each neighborhood and to ensure future land use maps and plans identify historic resources. Additional changes include new examples of preservation integrated with transit systems from Denver and Dallas. In this section, the errata for this section include updated maps, which Mr. Goebel is coordinating with Ms. Zeigler.

Mr. Goebel observed that Theme 2 emphasizes strengthening current preservation tools and adopting complementary tools. He recognized the Plan emphasizes using surveys to identify resources needing preservation and the importance of making decisions based on updated and current surveys, remarking that a list of criteria is included to assist in determining which surveys should be updated and referred to the Appendix, along with results of Clarion's field analysis. Mr. Goebel stated the Plan identifies the need to review the health and viability of existing historic districts and whether the underlying zoning supports preservation intents, particularly density and uses. He noted that updated surveys was a major focus of the Citizen Advisory Committee, which identified this as a priority, particularly in the Central City area which allows densities and uses that cannot be met without demolishing historic resources. He recognized that planning community boundaries and historic districts do not have good overlap.

Mr. Goebel also recognized that many communities expressed interest in additional tools to protect historic resources and community character. He stated that many citizens inquired whether historic preservation tools could be utilized to preserve community character by adopting infill standards or conservation district tools in areas that may not qualify for historic preservation status. He emphasized that neighborhoods such as Yalecrest asked for additional tools to protect their neighborhoods and control infill and demolitions.

Mr. Goebel summarized the major changes to the February 2009 draft as the change to Goal 2.7 statement to emphasize the need to coordinate preservation-related regulations with the Preservation Plan. The errata for this section includes additional clarification that the plan does not call for changing any National Register district boundaries, only local districts, and deletion of language requiring owner consent for designation of new landmark sites, as well as updated maps. Vice Chairperson Lloyd verified that the language regarding owner consent has not yet been made; Mr. Goebel concurred, clarifying that all the errata are not yet included in the draft.

Mr. Goebel noted that many of the comments received indicated the city's doing a great job with preservation but noted there are concerns that some applications are held to differing

standards and that the approval process is difficult for average persons wanting to make minor alterations to navigate. He stated that Theme 3 is the result of these concerns about consistent and convenient program administration. He noted that stakeholders are also concerned that the stake has regulations it cannot enforce. Mr. Goebel that there are no major changes in this section, although an additional action item to increase staff education has been added.

Mr. Goebel noted that although the Citizen Advisory Committee and the Historic Landmark Commission regularly deal with historic preservation, most of the general public is unaware of how historic preservation impacts life in Salt Lake City. Theme 4 focuses on resolving these concerns, noting that the website is weak, with information hard to find and difficult to interpret, and that there are numerous ways to help the public that the city is not utilizing. He remarked on increased public interest in reinstating the annual preservation awards program and increasing public visibility of historic preservation efforts. He stated that there are no major changes or errata for this section of the Plan.

Mr. Goebel noted that Themes 1-4 of the Plan focus on issues common to historic preservation plans throughout the nation, highlighting that Theme 5 sets the city apart by addressing linkages between historic preservation and sustainability, which is a major focus of the city's current leadership. He explained that this theme is broken into component themes based on work already completed by the city's sustainability office: energy, economic development, urban nature, transportation, and housing. He noted that policies which allow for the wider use of solar panels, wind turbines, and other energy efficient techniques and materials in historic districts provide opportunities to strengthen commitments to both preservation and sustainability. Mr. Goebel also recognized the important economic role of heritage tourism and downtown revitalization. He noted that the major change in this section is the deletion of references to the Utah Main Street program, replacing it with language identifying the need for a community revitalization programs for the downtown area. No errata were identified for this theme.

Mr. Goebel identified that the Implementation section at the end of the plan that discusses the variety of tools needed to implement the Preservation Plan, which is a long-term plan that will inform policy decisions, ordinance revisions, etc. for decades. He referred the Commissioners to the included implementation matrix that includes a prioritization and timing system indicating when action items should be implement; some items will be ongoing, some should occur within the first year, others extending for three to five years. He explained the priorities were assigned by the Citizen Advisory Committee with input from the Commission. He referenced the timeline that lists primary objectives, including the following:

- resurveying identified areas,
- establish an interagency coordination team,
- develop a preservation issues list for community master plans,
- assessing underlying zoning, which is considered by most to be the top priority,
- new Historic Landmark Commission member training materials,
- reestablish an architectural review committee [to provide voluntary guidance to public and applicants regarding projects that would be received favorably by the Commission],

- allowing broader use of solar panels, and
- allowing accessory dwelling units

Mr. Goebel noted that the errata for this section include changing implementation timeframes to a more realistic scale.

Mr. Goebel next referred the Commission to Appendix A, which identifies results of the field analysis done by Ron Slaughter. Mr. Goebel stated that current historic district boundaries were reviewed to determine whether the boundaries are considered stable or whether new development activity has compromised the character of the districts in some way. He remarked that the Central City district is considered compromised with a major commercial street, 400 South, bisecting the district. He stated that the Yalecrest district has generated a great deal of discussion; Mr. Slaughter identified during his 2007 survey the area as stable but the community has raised numerous concerns that has adjusted the district status in the table from stable to compromised. Mr. Goebel noted that there is extensive information in the report including potential areas for future recommendation as historic preservation districts.

Mr. Goebel noted that major changes in Appendix A include prioritization of surveys for the Avenues, Capitol Hill, and Yalecrest areas; updated information on surveys for South Temple, Capitol Hill, Gilmer Park, and Liberty Wells; correction of an area name in Table 2; and fine tuning of the Bryant description to note that modern buildings were present at the time of the historic designation. The errata for this section include changing the survey prioritization of Yalecrest and Gentile Core to high, editing the discussion of Central City to remove the suggestion it be delisted from the National Register and clarify any boundary realignments would be for the local district only, and clarifying that the Capitol Hill national district boundaries should remain intact.

Mr. Goebel summarized a memo from the Redevelopment Agency (RDA) to the Commission regarding the Preservation Plan, noting the copy in the packets was incomplete. [These items were addressed by DJ Baxter in the public comment portion of the meeting and are included there.] Mr. Goebel reviewed other public comments which were addressed in his review of Themes 1-5 and Appendix A of the plan.

Vice Chairperson Lloyd inquired if the comments from the Utah Heritage Foundation had been incorporated into the February 2009 draft; Mr. Goebel confirmed that they were. Vice Chairperson Lloyd thanked Mr. Goebel and Clarion for their work.

Public Comment 8:12:43 PM

Vice Chairperson Lloyd invited Esther Hunter to address the Commission.

Ms. Hunter commended Ms. Zeigler, Mr. Paterson, and the Commission on their work for the plan. She requested that the table of priorities be amended to include expansion of the University Historic District by five additional blocks, explaining this proposal was reviewed by the Historic Landmark Commission and sanctioned by the Planning Commission in 1991. She stated the request was supported by the City Council in 2006 when a funding was appropriated

for additional surveys, including the requested five blocks and the central core of what is referred to as the Bryant area. Ms. Hunter noted several ongoing surveys in the area that are not referenced in the Plan.

Ms. Hunter emphasized the importance of heritage tourism, expressing that its economic development contributions are significantly understated in the city. She also expressed concern that the University neighborhood is listed in the Preservation Plan as 'stable,' asserting that many previous surveys are outdated and do not provide important information.

Vice Chairperson Lloyd asked Ms. Hunter how the information regarding the University Historic District survey was overlooked. She responded that it was a combination of oversight and lack of clarity, noting it may have been addressed as the Bryant Area. Ms. Hunter stated that the City Council funded the survey in 2006. She clarified that one of the tables does indicate the survey is being conducted but it is omitted in the table which identifies survey priorities. Vice Chairperson Lloyd verified that the requested changes would primarily apply to noting in the chart in Appendix A the expansion. Ms. Hunter concurred, stating it should likely be included in the list of action items as well. She expressed that acting on the survey results could easily be overlooked if not included in the Preservation Plan, stating she was representing the East Central Community Council in presenting these concerns.

In response to an inquiry from Vice Chairperson Lloyd regarding her desire to place greater emphasis on the value of historic tourism, Ms. Hunter noted that this is an issue with significant potential impacts for the city but that people dwell on the negative aspects of window replacements that positive impacts of preservation are overshadowed.

Vice Chairperson Lloyd invited DJ Baxter to address the Commission. 8:20:11 PM

Mr. Baxter introduced himself as the Redevelopment Agency (RDA) Director and apologized for being unable to attend the full Commission meeting as he is involved in RDA budget hearings at the same hour. He thanked the Commission and the Planning staff for allowing the RDA the opportunity to review and comment on the Plan, recognizing the RDA's unique role in working closely with private developers while representing city interests and implementing master plans, sometimes even as a property owner. Mr. Baxter expressed appreciation for the quality of the Plan, expressing the content addresses a wide variety of challenges and issues. He commended Ms. Zeigler for her work and her efforts to involve the RDA.

Mr. Baxter stated that the RDA submitted comments several times through the process and referred the Commissioners to the written comments provided for this meeting. He expressed understanding of the qualitative contributions that historic preservations makes to communities. He expressed that the RDA serves as the city's primary tool for eliminating blight, affirming that neglected structures, historic or not, damage communities and delay the development and progress of neighborhoods. Mr. Baxter emphasized that the RDA strongly advocates for balancing new development that can rejuvenate and invigorate communities with preservation that infuses communities with uniqueness and a critical sense of place in such a way that allows the city to grow and evolve according to market demands and the vision

of residents and businesses. He identified RDA support and assistance with preservation on numerous projects throughout the city.

Mr. Baxter identified specific concerns with the proposed plan, citing language which prioritizes preservation over other goals [which Mr. Goebel addressed during his remarks]. Mr. Baxter requested that the Plan indicate that it will be compatible with the city's master plans and that preservation staff will collaborate with other city departments, rather than placing the burden on the city departments to come to Planning Division staff. He recognized the importance of renovating and preserving significant structures but expressed concern that the process sometimes serves to perpetuate the blight, disinvestment, and illicit activity that accompany severely dilapidated structures. He noted numerous cases in which long term neglect has made restoration economically infeasible. Mr. Baxter expressed concern with the Plan's intent to designating historic properties for protection from the recent past, citing the current 50 year standard as a way to mitigate the naturally subjective nature of determining significance. He requested that the 50 year standard – or another set number – be maintained.

Mr. Baxter noted that the creation of conservation districts, with an additional set of rules and processes, will likely hinder development and increase the problems associated with subjective interpretations. He stated that any self-designated and self-enforced neighborhood program can easily undermine the very sense of community it seeks to maintain and suggested that the desired community standards be adopted as part of the zoning code to maintain a single source of regulations and guidelines for properties.

Mr. Baxter reported that many developers have stated that they are willing to adhere to the city's regulations in the greatest of details, as long as they clearly know what is expected and then are allowed to proceed. He asserted that the greatest disincentive to reinvestment in Salt Lake City is the multiple layers of subjective review to which developers are subjected, which leads to uncertainty, unpredictability, and financial risk. He stressed that the zoning code rules need to be clear, predictable, and avoid multiple layers of subjective review. He expressed that the proposed Architectural Review Committee could be very helpful in providing proactive input on projects but could be disastrous if the committee's advice were not adopted by the Historic Landmark Commission. An architect or developer may proceed with a project based on the perception of good advice from the committee only to find the larger body disagrees. He suggested that the committee be empowered to make final decisions or provide that advice as a Commission to ensure consistency and predictability.

Mr. Baxter underscored the RDA's position that the Plan contains numerous positive elements, including the proposal to acquire historic properties with public money, which would address the problem of a community having the desire to maintain a structure without having the means or will to purchase it. He also lauded the suggestion to add historic designations to property titles, which would greatly enhance the predictability of property development from the outset. Mr. Baxter thanked the Commission again for allowing the RDA to participate so actively in the plan process and expressed enthusiasm at continuing to work with the Planning Division on refining and implementing the plan, reiterating the RDA goal of implementing the

city's master plans and the desire of the RDA to ensure their efforts are consistent with those plans.

Commissioner Oliver noted Mr. Baxter's concern that joint membership on the Historic Landmark Commission and a Redevelopment Agency board might violate city policy. She requested his suggestions for improving communication and resolving problems before they become a crisis. Mr. Baxter expressed this should be resolved at the staff level. He affirmed the importance of placing historic designations on property titles, which would allow developers and RDA staff involved in a project through a loan, purchase, or property development to immediately be aware of the additional regulations in play. He noted that for properties not currently located in historic districts, it is unclear whether the property may be deemed worthy of preservation or not. He cited the Regis Hotel as an example of a property which does not carry a historic designation but has incited disagreement even among elected officials to what degree, if any, it should be preserved or restored. He restated that anything that identifies such properties from the outset, either through an inventory or title search, will resolve many of the difficulties by immediately triggering discussions with preservation staff.

Commissioner Hart responded that, as a former member of the Redevelopment Advisory Committee (RAC) specifically recruited due to her background in historic preservation, it might be a good idea to have a position designated for a member of the preservation community. Vice Chairperson Lloyd concurred, noting that staff coordination is vital and expected but that the Commission is removed from the RDA goals and challenges, which may be a perception consistent with members of the RAC in regards to preservation issues.

Vice Chairperson Lloyd asked if the RDA is involved in advocacy for zoning ordinance changes. Mr. Baxter responded that the RDA does become involved as the variety of redevelopment projects and opportunities are affected. He noted that the RDA's stated intent to implement master plans conflicts with elements of the zoning code that do not mirror the master plan goals, so the RDA encourages zoning ordinance amendments that will ensure appropriate zoning that supports the master plan is in place. Mr. Baxter expressed that design guidelines also should be adopted as part of the master plan, articulated as clearly as possible in the zoning code to provide predictability for developers and the assurance that meeting those guidelines will result in expeditious approval of their projects, whatever the size. He noted that the RDA recently hosted the City Council and members of the administration on a field trip to demonstrate the benefits that come from a well-conceived and well-implemented set of design guidelines.

Vice Chairperson Lloyd noted that the RDA memorandum in the Commission packet is dated the end of February and that some updates to the Plan may have addressed some of the concerns Mr. Baxter raised and suggesting another round of review and feedback be coordinated with Ms. Zeigler. Mr. Baxter responded that he had not seen the errata nor the updated plan but would very much appreciate reviewing the changes and communicating with Ms. Zeigler.

Vice Chairperson Lloyd invited Cindy Cromer to address the Commission. 8:39:32 PM
Ms. Cromer identified three areas for her comments. She referenced the Peery Hotel as an example of her concerns about the RDA recommendations. She stated that the RDA may consider such properties blighted; she considers them opportunities to secure the best adaptive reuse. She expressed opposition to the RDA's request for economic hardship revisions, stating that larger developers should not have a different process than small ones. She emphasized the need to pay attention to buildings from the recent past to ensure they endure to the 50 year mark; she identified an arbitrary threshold as reckless. She expressed disappointment that more incentives for historic preservation, such as waiving acreage requirements for planned urban developments, noting that historic buildings are frequently located on oddly shaped or small parcels but most zones require large acreage to accommodate a planned urban development. She suggested that a well-developed variety of incentives would be very beneficial.

Ms. Cromer asserted that the negative language referring to the Bryant and Central City neighborhoods is extremely damaging, stressing that it will be taken out of context and used negatively by developers to justify demolition of more buildings. She requested that the language be amended to eliminate these negative references.

Executive Session 8:43:39 PM

Commissioner Hart identified an error on page 105 wherein the Highland Park District is listed as Salt Lake City Register and it is the National Register, not City Register.

Commissioner Oliver inquired as to what extent the Plan will continue to change, specifically whether future changes will constitute the errata only or will incorporate responses to additional comments. Ms. Zeigler confirmed there are changes in addition to the errata, as well as those raised in the meeting. She expressed belief that the RDA's comments have been addressed. Commissioner Oliver confirmed that the language regarding modern structures of the recent past will remain as written; Ms. Zeigler stated that would be up to the Commission.

Commissioner Bevins queried whether the Commission's role is now to make a recommendation to forward the Preservation Plan to the Planning Commission. Ms. Zeigler confirmed that is an option available. Commissioner Bevins stated that reading the Preservation Plan was an effective primer to the preservation process. He proposed that in addition the timeframes in the Plan, he would like to have an annual agenda item to revisit the Plan. He expressed that Commission has done its work and the Plan should now move forward in the adoption process.

Vice Chairperson Lloyd asked Ms. Zeigler about the University District and the validity of the changes proposed by Ms. Hunter. Ms. Zeigler affirmed those changes would be entirely valid. Commissioner Oliver asked about the unforeseen consequences of taking certain areas of certain districts off of the local register. Ms. Zeigler stated that she believes looking at those district boundaries would be valuable but that opinions could differ.

Vice Chairperson Lloyd concluded that the question at hand is moving the process forward by incorporating the errata into the draft and sending it to the Planning Commission or reviewing a final copy before taking that step. Commissioner Funk expressed that several of the statements made during the public comments were useful but that the Plan could be moved by giving staff the direction to include the changes in the final draft. Commissioner Hart agreed.

MOTION 8:48:43 PM

Commissioner Funk moved that in the case of PLNPCM2009-00171, the Citywide Historic Preservation Plan, the Historic Landmark Commission forward a positive recommendation to adopt the Plan with the inclusion of the following changes as discussed:

- **Status and recommendations with regards to the status of the University Neighborhood (including part of the Bryant area);**
- **Softening of language for the status of blight within Central City;**
- **Errata as provided;**
- **Correction on page 105 as identified; and**
- **Inclusion of preservation incentive recommendations as sidebar suggestions.**

Commissioner Hart seconded the motion.

All voted "Aye"; the motion carried.

8:53:18 PM

Mr. Nielson suggested that the Commission send a representative to the Planning Commission to provide background as needed. Vice Chairperson Lloyd concurred, inquiring as to a possible date. Mr. Paterson confirmed it has not yet been set. Commissioner Funk asked that a final copy of the Plan be provided to the Historic Landmark Commission members prior to the Planning Commission receiving it.

Vice Chairperson Lloyd noted that he failed to recognize Commissioner Funk who received the 2009 Lucy Beth Rampton Lifetime Achievement award; the Commission extended their congratulations and applauded her achievement.

Vice Chairperson Lloyd noted that this concluded the business of this meeting; the next meeting will be held on May 6, 2009.

Commissioner Hart made a motion to adjourn. 8:54:40 PM

Commissioner Oliver seconded the motion.

All voted "Aye". The meeting adjourned.



FRANK B. GRAY
DIRECTOR

SALT LAKE CITY CORPORATION

DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY & ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT
OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR

MARY DE LA MARE-SCHAEFER
DEPUTY DIRECTOR

ROBERT FARRINGTON, JR.
DEPUTY DIRECTOR

CITY COUNCIL TRANSMITTAL

SCANNED TO: *mary*
SCANNED BY: *arya*
DATE: *2/23/2010*
RALPH BECKER
MAYOR



[Signature]

David Everitt, Chief of Staff

Date Received: _____

Date Sent to City Council: 02/24/2010

TO: Salt Lake City Council
JT Martin, Chair

DATE: March 9, 2010

FROM: Frank Gray, Community & Economic
Development Department Director

RE: Designation of Historic Districts and Conservation Districts

STAFF CONTACTS: Pat Comarell, Assistant Planning Director
801-535-7660, pat.comarell@slcgov.com

DOCUMENT TYPE: Briefing

BUDGET IMPACT: None

Issue Origin:

In August 2009, the Council held a briefing regarding the basic preservation programs, priorities, and overview of the documents making their way to the Council for consideration and approval. The Council requested more information about the criteria for designating historic districts and more information about conservation districts.

Summary of Issues:

The City policy in the past has been that no new historic district would be considered unless staff resources increased to handle the increased workload. With the new preservation planner position in the FY 2010 budget, the Council is willing to consider a new policy indicating they are willing to receive recommendations for a new historic district. (The resolution which would establish such a policy is being submitted under a separate transmittal).

In recent meetings, the Historic Landmark Commission (HLC) has been discussing what criteria should be used to designate a new historic district. The Commission has developed a grid, which appears on the following pages.

- **The chart indicates the criteria.** The criteria are based partly on the zoning ordinance requirements for designation and other criteria which the HLC felt important to consider. The information in this chart comes from the reconnaissance level survey, intensive level surveys, or other historic documentation.
- **Presentations from community councils or area representatives.** The HLC has a second meeting in March (March 17th) for hearing from community or neighborhood representatives on why their area should be designated as an historic district.

Also, the Planning Staff indicated that as one looks at neighborhood preservation, there are numerous tools, three of which were infill ordinance, historic district, and conservation districts. A comparison of these tools follows below. **No one ordinance or tool (which includes RDA housing loans) can preserve neighborhoods by itself. It is the combination of tools which gives enough regulatory strength to address neighborhood issues.**

Tools Used to Protect Neighborhood Integrity: Historic District, Conservation Districts, & Compatible Infill Ordinance

There are multiple zoning tools used to protect neighborhoods. Which tool or tools makes the most sense depends on the goals the City has for its neighborhoods. Two tools currently available to the City to preserve neighborhoods are historic overlays and infill ordinance. A conservation district is a third tool the City may wish to consider.

The overall objective of these, used separately or together, is to preserve the essential qualities or overall character reflected in the ensemble of buildings comprising a neighborhood.

Historic Overlays

According to the National Park Service, “local legislation is one of the best ways to protect the historic character of buildings, streetscapes, neighborhoods, and special landmarks from inappropriate alterations, new construction, and other poorly conceived work, as well as outright demolition.” For more than 2,300 local historic districts throughout the country, this protection is accomplished through an historic overlay of either a single property or a collection of properties. The overlay provides for regulations in addition to those already provided by base zoning.

There are three basic components of an historic overlay: (1) standards for determination of designation, (2) the regulations used to guide change, and (3) the process for review. The regulations governing every district are a little different, but for the most part they all guide change by regulating new construction, demolition, building moves, and any exterior alteration.

What does it take to maintain and administer a district once established?

Historic overlays are stewarded by collaboration between property owners and the City. Property owners take on the responsibility of helping to educate new neighbors about the overlay and to apply for Certificates of Appropriateness any time they plan an exterior alteration. The City’s role is to provide information about the overlay, review applications, and enforce the ordinance.

Reviews vary dramatically depending on the complexity of the alteration planned. Simple projects such as a roof replacement may be reviewed quickly. Complicated or major alterations may require a site visit, historic and prior case research, written staff reports, review of building permit applications, and multiple meetings with an applicant. A few simple applications may be reviewed “over-the-counter,” however, the majority of applications require between one week and three months to process, depending on the complexity of the case, the timing of submission of the application, and how well the proposed work on the building, submitted with the application, meets the guidelines.

Although great effort is expended to educate new property owners and remind existing property owners about overlays, work still takes place without a Certificate of Appropriateness. In these cases, an enforcement officer might need to make multiple site visits and have multiple meetings with a property owner to ensure the work is done according to what was approved by the City.

What is the application process?

The application for a historic overlay begins with an application to the Planning Division for a map amendment. Application submittals include a National Register nomination and survey. If they have not already taken place, a series of public presentations should be given that explain the process and the responsibilities of the City and the property owner if the map amendment is adopted.

The map amendment process includes at least one public meeting, which may be a presentation at the appropriate Community Council meeting, or if multiple Community Council districts are affected, might be an “open house”. The first formal step in the process is a public hearing with the Historic Landmark Commission that considers the potential district against the standards of the ordinance. If they determine that the district meets the standards, they recommend designation to City Council.

The Planning Commission, which determines if designation is in conflict with any other plans for the City, holds a second public hearing. The Commission makes a recommendation to the City Council. The final public hearing is held by the City Council, which considers the recommendations and public comments, and adopts or denies the designation.

Conservation Overlay

Whereas the purpose of an **historic overlay** is to preserve *historic fabric* (including design, materials and integrity), a **conservation overlay** is used to preserve *community character* of a site or district. (The character may or may not have a connection to the area’s history.) This usually means that the two will differ in the standards for designation, the level of regulation and possibly the review process.

Conservation districts are often used when a neighborhood may not merit designation as an historic district, but the area still may need special land use standards and guidelines to ensure its distinctive character. Some cities use this as the criteria, others address only demolitions and new construction, and still in other cities, there is little distinction between historic and conservation districts. **Each city must develop a conservation district program which works best for them.**

Background on Conservation Districts

The publication “Protecting Older Neighborhoods Through Conservation District Programs” by Julia Miller has been previously distributed to the HLC Members. A few of the major thoughts from this publication are summarized below:

- Historic and conservation districts may differ is in the creation of design guidelines. For the historic overlay, design guidelines are usually based on the Secretary of Interior Standards and customized for a particular city. Conservation districts develop design guidelines for each district.
- The conservation districts guidelines may not meet the Secretary of Interior Standards, which may prevent a property owner from taking the tax credits for renovating historic resource.
- The differences between historic and conservation districts must be defined so that they are not used interchangeably, with the possible result of undermining the historic preservation program.
- Conservation overlays can have more public input where the community is charged with defining the characters to be preserved and helps to write the guidelines to regulate change.
- Conservation overlays may also differ in the review process. Some communities choose to allow all applications for alterations in a conservation district to be administratively reviewed, others allow some to be administratively reviewed and some have a group such as HLC review them.
- What is reviewed differs from community to community. Some look only at:
 - all external changes
 - substantial construction visible from a public way
 - mass and scale rather than architectural style
 - demolitions and new construction

Criteria for Conservation District Designation

The publication (mentioned above) also describes the criteria for designation by various cities, which are used when considering a proposed conservation district. Several are listed below:

- Initiated by residents within the neighborhoods, and a majority of property owners must support the designation.
- The area has a distinctive or cohesive character, but may fail to qualify for historic district designation (as outlined in the zoning ordinance)

- A “designation report” which describes the historic or neighborhood significance and the distinctive character with identifiable attributes embodied in architecture, use, urban design or history that makes it a unique and integral part of the city’s identity.
- “Some jurisdictions may insist on specific documentation regarding the area’s significance and the preparation of an architectural survey where designed-based protections are contemplated.”
- Preparation of a conservation plan and standards that will govern new projects in the area.

Demolition

Review of demolition may or may not be a component of a conservation district. If it is included, the “economic hardship” standard in the zoning ordinance may apply (which indicates that historic resources may be demolished if an economic hardship is shown to exist). (*Note:* a subcommittee of HLC has discussed possible changes to this criteria and their recommendation will be presented to the Commission at a future meeting.)

Demolition is reviewed based on standards of the ordinance, not the design guidelines, since demolition is a “yes” or “no” question as opposed to consideration of a degree of alteration. Standards of the ordinance are local law based on state enabling legislation, which provides the general criteria against which work can be measured.

The questions for a potential conservation district are (1) what standards will be used to determine whether a demolition should be approved? and (2) whether, if not allowed to be demolished, the property owner has a viable use for his/her land? Since a conservation district can be written in any manner the City wishes, the demolition standards can be as firm or as weak, as specific or as general, as the City determines to be appropriate.

Cost of Implementing Conservation Districts

Designation of a conservation district would require more time upfront since the City would need to work with the neighborhood to develop a completely new set of design guidelines. (In the case of historic overlays, the guidelines are the same for all districts and have short chapters with additional guidelines for each district.)

Each type of district requires a design review process. Conservation district may have fewer actions that would require review than an historic overlay; however, a true comparison would depend on the size of each district, the details of the conservation overlay, the design guidelines for each individual district, and the level of activity for each district.

Comparison of these tools: For a comparison of historic and conservation districts, see excerpt from the National Trust publication (on the following pages)

Infill Ordinance

The goal of the Compatible Infill Ordinance regulation is to ensure that existing development patterns are taken into consideration when constructing a new home or adding on to an existing home. For example, front yard setbacks for new development are calculated from the average of the front yard setbacks of the adjacent homes; additional building height may be obtained if it is consistent with the height of the surrounding structures; and accessory structures may be built as long as the size and location are compatible with the neighborhood.

In other words, the infill ordinance is a tool which focuses on building setbacks, height, exterior wall height, size, grade level, access to light, and lot coverage. This tool can be used, not to preserve historic resources, but to maintain some of the character and consistent patterns of the neighborhood.

Planning Staff Recommendation

No one ordinance is going to meet the expectations of Salt Lake City neighborhoods. In addition, there is a tendency in the City to go from one ordinance to another, thinking that the next will be the panacea for all the neighborhood woes.

The reality is that we need to develop all three of these tools (i.e., infill, conservation districts, and historic districts), along with zoning designations, for each to do their part in an overall approach to neighborhoods.

Recommendations:

- **Identify a new area as an historic district and pursue designation**
- **If the HLC wishes to pursue a conservation district aspect to the City's program, begin discussion on what should be in the conservation districts ordinance, e.g., the general purpose, criteria for designation, the review body and review process, conservation standards, and the appeal process. Once completed, pursue designation for a particular neighborhood. (See proposed approach below)**

Appendix 1
Background Materials & Minutes



Communication to Historic Landmark Commission

Planning Division

To: Historic Landmark Commission Members

From: Patricia Comarell, Assistant Planning Director

Date: January 6, 2010

Re: Criteria for Prioritizing Historic District Designation

At the November worksession which discussed designating historic districts, the chart prepared by Anne Oliver was distributed as a means by which to prioritize designation of districts. It was felt at the time, that the Commission did not have enough information evaluate the listed criteria, e.g., SLC Zoning criteria: Percentage of resources with significance. The staff was asked to fill in the blanks where possible.

There are two charts provided on the following pages. The **first chart** amends Commissioner Oliver's chart to include data on each district under each topic. The data was taken from National Register forms available for most areas. For those which are not on the National Register, we are asking for additional information from the consultants. Some spaces are blank as they necessitate the HLC making value judgments.

The **second chart** is Commissioner Oliver's original, which suggests ranking each criteria by district using a 1-5 priority system. The intent is for the HLC to discuss these criteria further to determine what area to pursue designation.

Other background information is attached:

- Staff Report from November which includes:
 - Criteria for Local Historic Designation in the Salt Lake City Ordinance
 - Preservation Plan Policies
 - Area analyses (taken from the Preservation Plan)
 - Summary of the Reconnaissance Level and Intensive Level Surveys by area
 - Dates of the Reconnaissance Level Surveys on file at the State Historic Preservation Office
- A map of the National and Local Register Districts
- A map of the Avenues COAs for last year
- A map of the Yalecrest Neighborhood building permits

PROPOSED CRITERIA FOR PRIORITIZING LOCAL HISTORIC DISTRICTS

| <i>How does the proposed district meet the following criteria? Scale = 1 (low) to 5 (high)</i> | <i>Bryant</i> | <i>Gilmer</i> | <i>Federal Heights</i> | <i>Wells</i> | <i>University Extension</i> | <i>Yalecrest</i> |
|--|---------------|---------------|----------------------------|---------------------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------|
| SLC Zoning criteria: Percentage of resources with significance | 73.5% | 88.1% | | 68.0% | Awaiting info from consultant | 91% |
| SLC Zoning criteria: Percentage of resources with integrity | | | | | | |
| SLC Zoning criteria: Percentage of resources meeting age requirement (Period of Significance) | 1870-1946 | 1909-1943 | | 1871-1957 | 1847-1946 | 1910- 1957 |
| Concentration of new types of resources not yet protected in SLC | | | | | | |
| Readiness for designation (listed on NRHP; RLS and ILS surveys complete?) | Nat'l Reg | Nat'l Reg | | Nom. to Nat'l Reg pending | Nat'l Reg | Nat'l Reg |
| Age of surveys done | RLS 1994 | 2006-07 | RLS in 1988 | RLS 2007 ILS 2009 | ILS 2009 | RLS 2005 |
| Level of endangerment through demolition, inappropriate alterations/additions or infill | | | | | | |
| Degree of public support | | | | | | |

PROPOSED CRITERIA FOR PRIORITIZING LOCAL HISTORIC DISTRICTS

| <i>How does the proposed district meet the following criteria? Scale = 1 (low) to 5 (high)</i> | <i>Bryant</i> | <i>Gilmer</i> | <i>Federal Heights</i> | <i>Wells</i> | <i>University Extension</i> | <i>Yalecrest</i> |
|--|---------------|---------------|----------------------------|--------------|---------------------------------|------------------|
| SLC Zoning criteria: Percentage of resources with significance | | | | | | |
| SLC Zoning criteria: Percentage of resources with integrity | | | | | | |
| SLC Zoning criteria: Percentage of resources meeting age requirement (Period of Significance) | | | | | | |
| Concentration of new types of resources not yet protected in SLC | | | | | | |
| Readiness for designation (listed on NRHP; RLS and ILS surveys complete?) | | | | | | |
| Age of survey done | | | | | | |
| Level of endangerment through demolition, inappropriate alterations/additions or infill | | | | | | |
| Degree of public support | | | | | | |
| <i>Subtotal</i> | | | | | | |
| <i>Total</i> | | | | | | |



Communication to Historic Landmark Commission

Planning Division

To: Historic Landmark Commission Members

From: Patricia Comarell, Assistant Planning Director

Date: November 2, 2009

Re: Criteria for Prioritizing Historic District Designation

As you are aware, the Mayor and Council added a preservation planner position in FY 2010 budget. This position is presently being advertised and selection of the planner will be done sometime in November.

The Planning Division Managers requested the Mayor and Council prioritize what they wanted this position to address. The managers also emphasized their concern that often when a planner is added, the expectation is that that person can do more than one person can do and the danger of raising expectations too high.

In several meetings in August and September this was discussed. HLC discussed their own priorities in their August and September meeting, which resulted in the attached letter which was sent to the City Council.

It was clear to staff in these meetings, that eventually the Council is going to ask staff, and in turn we are asking HLC, by what criteria does the City determine the priority of district designation? In discussing this with the HLC chair and vice chair, staff suggested that the Commission discuss this at the dinner meeting on November 4th. To assist you in your deliberations, staff has provided excerpts from the preservation plan and recommendations from surveys which have been conducted.

So far, the following districts have been mentioned either by City Council or HLC members:

- Yalecrest (Council and HLC)
- Gilmer (Council)
- Federal Heights (Council)
- Bryant (HLC)
- University Extension (HLC)
- Liberty Wells (HLC)

Criteria for Local Historic Designation in Salt Lake City

(Salt Lake Zoning Code, Section 21A.34.020(C) 2)

- Significance in local, regional, state, or national history, architecture, engineering or culture, associated with at least one of the following:
 - Events that have made significant contribution to the broad patterns of history, or
 - Lives of persons significant to the history of the City, region, state, or nation, or
 - The distinctive characteristics of a type, period or method of construction; or the work of a notable architect or master craftsman, or
 - Information important in the understanding of the prehistory or history of Salt Lake City.

 - Physical integrity in terms of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling and association as defined by the National ParkS for the National Register of Historic Places; and

 - The age of the site. Sites must be at least fifty (50) year old, or have achieved significance within the past fifty (50) years if the properties are of exceptional important
-

Preservation Plan Policies

Criteria

The Preservation Plan does not provide criteria for priority for designation, but did for surveys. Some seem relative to designation as well:

- Concentration of potential resources
- New types of resources not yet protected
- Possible endangerment of the resource/area (including encroachment from enw development);
- Presence of public support

Another criteria suggested by Planning Staff is the amount of work it would take to get the district ready for designation.

Area Analysis

The Preservation Plan also did an analysis of potential districts (pages 99-118). Below are the recommendation as they relate to the districts that have been under discussion by the Council and HLC:

- **Yalecrest**

While the Yalecrest Historic District generally continues to exhibit a good level of physical integrity relative to many other neighborhoods in the City, numerous comments received during this planning process expressed concern about teardowns and inappropriate infill. The Yalecrest neighborhood residents are committed to adopting strong local controls to prevent demolitions of historic resources and to ensure that additions and alterations are sensitive to the local historic character. Active discussions are underway at the time of this planning process to determine the most effective tool.

(**Staff Note:** The Yalecrest Neighborhood Reconnaissance Level Survey in 2005)

- **Gilmer**

The district has experienced some teardowns that have led to significant community discussion. This neighborhood might be a candidate for local district status. The **2008 survey** for this area recommended additional survey for approximately 50 properties; establishment of a local historic district; an update of the national nomination to expand the period of significance; and a verification of eligibility status for tax credit purposes.

- **Federal Heights**

This neighborhood exhibits a high degree of integrity and appears to be an excellent candidate for a future historic district on both the local and national levels. Staff notes that they have received several requests for local designation because of teardowns.

(**Staff Note:** A Reconnaissance Level Survey was conducted in 1988. The standards have changed somewhat since then and there may have been changes to the structures themselves. This survey needs to be updated, but could be done in-house with the new preservation planner position.)

- **Bryant**

While much remains intact, the district is becoming diminished by the loss of historic buildings. The area might be a candidate for a conservation district (p. 107)

Priority Local District for Resurvey. Field research as part of this planning effort identifies the following local districts as priority sites for resurvey and boundary evaluation work (p. 42)

- **University Extension**

[**Staff Note:** Although the plan does do a short analysis of the existing University District, it does not reference this extension (which was surveyed in 2008)]

- **Liberty Wells**

While the neighborhood merits the completion of a survey, it is not apparent whether it is worthy of district designation. A survey will determine whether it is district eligible, and on what level, or if individual buildings might be designated as Landmark Sites. Essentially, the district contains the same type and quality of building stock as that found in the surrounding neighborhoods and districts. A **2007 reconnaissance-level survey** in this area also recommended that an intensive-level survey be undertaken for all “A” and “B: properties, and this survey is now underway. [**Staff note:** Intensive Level Survey (ILS) were completed for this area in **2009**. A national register nomination is being prepared by the consultant.]

Summary of RLS Survey Recommendations, 2003-2009

RLS=Reconnaissance Level Survey, ILS=Intensive Level Survey

Avenues, Broschinsky, 2008

- Complete the RLS work for NRHP resources above current landmark boundary (north)
- Conduct a standard RLS for the resources currently marked in the SHPO database as a proposed “Avenues District Extension” (between NRHP north boundary and Ninth Avenue to Thirteenth Avenue, depending on street)
- Conduct Intensive Level Surveys (ILS) of selected/representative resources built between 1930 and 1965 to determine significance and most appropriate cut-off date for newly evaluated contributing resources from RLS surveys
- Amended NRHP nomination for the Avenues Historic District

Bryant

- Determine possible boundaries for the historic district. Because there is a noticeable difference in the architecture and neighborhoods between the northern and southern sections, as well as the western and eastern sections, the problem lies in where the bounds should be placed.
- Recommended Intensive Level Survey sites: 250 So 1000 East; 945 East 100 South; 871 East 200 South; 1072 East 200 South; 335 So 700 East; 234 South 900 East; 354 So 900 East; 955 East 100 So; 975 East 100 So; 847 East 200 So; 856 East 200 So; 976 East 200 so; 805 East 300 So; 718 East 300 So.

Capitol Hill RLS, 2006

- Survey and expand district boundaries to include the Kimball and DeSoto-Cortez neighborhoods
- ILS survey of Capitol Hill
- Implement action items within the Capitol Hill Community Master Plan

East Liberty Neighborhood, 2003

- ILS for all A rated properties not already studied
- NR for entire district
- Landmark for entire district
- Create public awareness and education programs: historic home tours, historic walking tours, publicize potential for tax credits, media exposure about designation

Gilmer Park, ILS and Design Guidelines, Blaes, Broschinsky and Lufkin, 2008

- Additional survey for approximately 50 properties
- Establish a local historic district
- Pay careful attention to compatible zoning ordinances
- Updated the NRHP nomination to expand the period of significance
- Verify eligibility status for tax credit purposes

Liberty Wells RLS, SWCA, 2007 - 2009

- ILS survey for all A and B rated properties (this project has begun)
- National Register nominations for individual properties and those found to be eligible during the ILS
- Propose listing of the entire area in the NR through a series of thematic nominations.

South Temple RLS, Lufkin, 2006

- Amend the NR nomination to change the period of significance to include the importance of modern construction in the area
- Amend the NR nomination to update the boundaries which presently run through the middle of buildings and properties, cut out four Haxton Place properties and overlap with adjacent districts
- ILS for all properties not already studied

Sugar House Business District, RLS, Blaes, Broschinsky and Lufkin, 2007

- ILS for all properties not already studied
- Establish a conservation district overlay zone which would share boundaries with the proposed Sugar House Business District
- Expand on the “Business District Design Guidelines Handbook” found in the Sugar House Master Plan using the survey information

University Expansion, ILS, Broschinsky, 2009

- Update the Reconnaissance Level Survey (SHPO Database) and NRHP Status
- Establish a local historic district

Yalecrest, National Register and ILS, Lufkin, 2007

- Establish a local historic district

Salt Lake City Reconnaissance Level Surveys on file at State Historic Preservation Office

(Many of these surveys were used to establish National Register Districts. The standards have changed over the years)

- 1300 East – UDOT 2006
- Avenues Historic District 2008 (1st-6th and Aves A – Virginia)
- Capitol Hill 2006
- Central City 1994
- City Creek/South Temple 2008 – Partial Survey
- East Liberty 2003 (9th S – 13th S & 7th E – 13th/11th E)
- Eastside 2000
- Salt Lake East Area 1986 (Michigan, Yale, Normandie Heights, Upper Yale, Allen Park, Westmorland Place, Westminster Ave.)
- SL East Central 1995
- Federal Heights 1988
- Highland Park 1995
- Liberty Wells 2007 & 2009
- South Temple 2000
- Sugar House 2000
- Sugar House 2004
- Sugar House Business District 2007
- Salt Lake West Side 1991
- Yalecrest 2005
- Southwestern Area 2005
- UTA Trax West 2005
- University Extension 2009

FRANK B. GRAY
DIRECTOR

SALT LAKE CITY CORPORATION


DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY & ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT
OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR

MARY DE LA MARE-SCHAEFER
DEPUTY DIRECTOR

ROBERT FARRINGTON, JR.
DEPUTY DIRECTOR

CITY COUNCIL TRANSMITTAL

SCANNED TO: *mege*
SCANNED BY: *Boye*
DATE: *2/23/2010*
RALPH BECKER
MAYOR



[Signature]

David Everitt, Chief of Staff

Date Received: _____

Date Sent to City Council: 02/24/2010

TO: Salt Lake City Council
JT Martin, Chair

DATE: March 9, 2010

FROM: Frank Gray, Community & Economic
Development Department Director

[Signature]

RE: Resolution amending the policy regarding designation of Historic Districts

STAFF CONTACTS: Pat Comarell, Assistant Planning Director
801-535-7660, pat.comarell@slcgov.com

DOCUMENT TYPE: Resolution

RECOMMENDATION: That the Council adopt the resolution regarding designation of historic districts.

BUDGET IMPACT: None – will be absorbed by new preservation planner position

Issue Origin:

The Council asked that a change of policy be considered. The existing informal policy was that no new historic districts be designated given the existing staff workload. With the addition of a new preservation planner position, the Council indicated they would consider a new policy. The resolution is attached for consideration.

RESOLUTION NO. _____ OF 2009

A resolution regarding the designation of additional historic districts.

WHEREAS, section 21A.34.020 of the *Salt Lake City Code* provides that the City Council may amend the zoning map to designate historic preservation zoning districts in areas of the City containing historical, architectural or cultural significance; and

WHEREAS, the City Council has previously designated certain areas as historic districts and supports designation of additional areas within the City as historic districts, where doing so will achieve the City's historic preservation goals.

NOW THEREFORE, be it resolved by the City Council of Salt Lake City:

SECTION 1. That the City Council hereby declares that it supports the designation of additional areas within the City as historic districts in accordance with section 21A.34.020 of the *Salt Lake City Code* in areas of the City where such designation will accomplish the City's historic preservation goals;

SECTION 2. The City Council further declares that designation of additional historic districts shall remain a high priority of the City Council, provided that the City's Planning Division maintains adequate staffing to accomplish the goals and purposes of historic preservation.

DATED this _____ day of _____, 2009.


Passed by the City Council of Salt Lake City, Utah, this _____ day of _____, 2009.

SALT LAKE CITY COUNCIL

By: _____
CHAIRPERSON

ATTEST AND COUNTERSIGN:

CITY RECORDER

| |
|---|
| <p>APPROVED AS TO FORM Salt Lake City Attorney's Office</p> <p>Date: <u>FEBRUARY 22, 2010</u></p> <p>By: <u></u> Paul C. Nielson, <i>Senior City Attorney</i></p> |
|---|

HB_ATTYY-#10923-v1-Resolution_re_historic_preservation.DOC