

MEMORANDUM

451 South State Street, Room 406
Salt Lake City, Utah 84111
(801) 535-7757



Planning and Zoning Division
Department of Community Development

TO: Historic Landmark Commissioners
FROM: Cheri Coffey, Planning Staff
DATE: October 1, 2007
SUBJECT: Preservation Plan-Continued Discussion on Identification of Issues

On August 20 and August 23, 2007, the Historic Landmark Commission began a discussion relating to the City-wide Preservation Plan. On August 20, 2007 Mary De La Mare-Schaefer, Deputy Director of the Community Development Department, facilitated the meeting to identify issues the Commission would like addressed in the plan and discuss the Commission's role in the process. This discussion continued with the consultants on August 23, 2007. The Commission will meet again on Thursday October 11, 2007 to continue the discussion.

The purpose of the meeting on October 11th is to finalize the discussion begun on August 20th. Ms. De La Mare-Schaefer will facilitate the meeting. The finalized information will be forwarded to the consultants as they begin to draft the vision and goals portion of the plan. **The meeting will be held in Room 126 of the City & County Building and begin at 4:00 P.M.**

I have attached four documents relating to the discussion. I am hopeful that you will review the materials prior to the meeting on October 11th.

1. Notes from the August 20, 2007 meeting
2. Notes from the August 23, 2007 meeting
3. Document of bullet points produced from the discussion that occurred on August 20, 2007
4. Memorandum dated August 21, 2007 by Janice Lew outlining the identified issues and recommendations from the Legislative Intent project regarding preservation (2004).

If you have any questions, please contact me at 535-6188 or via e-mail at cheri.coffey@slcgov.com

Thank You.

SALT LAKE CITY HISTORIC LANDMARK COMMISSION WORK SESSION
MEETING NOTES
Room 126 of the City and County Building at 451 South State Street
August 20, 2007
11:30 a.m.

Commissioners present were Chairperson David Fitzsimmons, Vice Chairperson Noreen Heid, Commissioners Paula Carl, Creed Haymond, Esther Hunter, Warren Lloyd, and Commissioner Anne Oliver.

Staff present were: George Shaw, Planning Director, Cheri Coffey, Deputy Director; Joel Paterson, Planning Program Supervisor; Janice Lew, Principal Planner, Nick Norris, Principal Planner; Katie Weiler, Senior Secretary and Mary De La Mare-Schaefer, Deputy Director of the Community Development Department.

The Historic Landmark Commission met to discuss issues which they believed should be addressed in the Citywide Preservation Plan. The meeting was informal in nature: therefore Robert's Rules of Order were suspended to facilitate and promote free discussion.

Ms. Coffey introduced George Shaw to the Commission. Mr. Shaw asked each member of the Commission to introduce themselves and provide a brief description of their background in relation to historic preservation planning and the Historic Landmark Commission.

Topics to be Covered

The Historic Landmark Commission is to take a leadership role in overseeing the development of a City-wide Preservation Plan, the Commission came together for this meeting to discuss specific issues they believe should be addressed by Clarion Associates, LLC, the consultant hired to develop the Preservation Plan. Ms. De La Mare-Schaefer led the discussion by asking each Commissioner in turn to state issues they would like covered in the context of this meeting or in a follow up meeting. She created multiple charts with brief statements to reflect the issues/concerns raised by the Commission which included:

- Enforcement and inspections
- Frustration with the Economic Hardship process
- The need for additional tools when considering a possible reuse plan following demolition
- Zoning/Redevelopment/Preservation do not appear to have common goals:
Need flexibility for options (a past example where this was needed was in the Eric Saxey case)
- Need specifics:
Review time
- Need to know from the consultant what makes an effective plan
- Need to understand what other departments and Boards do:
Improve understanding and ongoing communication to reduce possible confrontation
- Evaluate how HLC is working:
Strengths and weaknesses
How we function as a board
- Preservation vs. compatible infill conflicts
Need clarity
Resolution of roles

- What happens at edges of Historic Districts (conflict of competing objectives)
- Integrating other initiatives:
i.e. energy, conservation districts, transit, housing, etc.
- 2003-2004 Legislative Action issues need to be reviewed in context of this plan

Ms. De La Mare-Schaefer created additional charts, subdividing the statements into categories. In follow up, Ms. Lew composed a memo listing these categories and correlating them with supporting guidelines which the Commission would take to the meeting with Clarion Associates, LLC, on August 23, 2007. As Ms. Lew's assignment was made within the context of the meeting, a copy of the memo is attached to these notes.

The Commissioners also listed how they perceive their role within the broader Salt Lake City government context. Ms. De La Mare-Schaeffer agreed to compile these statements into a memo, which was also attached to these notes.

As there was no remaining time to discuss the issues further, the Commissioners instructed Ms. De La Mare Schaeffer and Ms. Lew to provide a copy of their respective memos to Clarion Associates, LLC in the August 23, 2007 meeting with the recommendation that these items be addressed in the City-wide Presentation Plan. As further discussion was needed regarding the listed issues, the Commission also agreed to follow up in a meeting as a body to discuss the issues further.

**SALT LAKE CITY HISTORIC LANDMARK COMMISSION
PRESRVATION PLAN WORK SESSION
MEETING NOTES
ROOM 126 OF THE City and County Building at 451 South State Street
August 23, 2007
11:30 a.m.**

Attendees from the Commission: Chair David Fitzsimmons, Paula Carl, Creed Haymond, Esther Hunter, and Warren Lloyd.

Attendees from Staff: Cheri Coffey, Joel Paterson, and Janice Lew.

Attendees from consultant group: Amy Kacala, Clarion Associates; Matt Goebel, Clarion Associates and Ron Sladek Tatanka Historical Associates, Inc.

Ms. Coffey thanked the Commission for attending the special meeting and acknowledged that there had been numerous meetings over the recent past. She asked all of the meeting participants to introduce themselves and to give a brief background of their specialty or interest for the benefit of consultants.

Ms. Coffey stated that the Staff had met with the Historic Landmark Commission members on Monday August 20, 2007 and discussed two different topics: The landmark commission's role in the preservation plan project and what issues the Commission had that should be addressed in the preservation plan. Ms. Coffey noted that the document "*Notes from Landmarks Meeting Preservation Plan*" identifies the process and the role of the Commission in this project. The other memorandum with different colored type includes the issues raised at the brainstorming session on August 20, 2007. The blue color is the brainstorming and the red is the legislative intent. Ms. Coffey indicated that they would first review the process information relating to the Commission's role in the preservation plan process to ensure everyone is on board. She noted that the topic of the preservation plan would be a standing agenda item on the Commission's future agendas. She also stated that, in the future, there may be a need for additional meetings to focus on the plan. Ms. Coffey also asked for clarification on the idea of a mission statement for the preservation plan. She wondered whether the idea of a mission statement was similar to that of the Purpose of the Plan, which is typically found in master plans or if it related to the idea of the vision or goal statements.

Commissioner Hunter stated that she believed many of the Commissioners, for a long time, have looked to the preservation plan as an umbrella concept of what is or is not preserved. She noted that currently the City has local and national districts as well as Landmark Sites, but there are a lot of other things that relate

to the City's history and people often lose site of those things. Other features such as parks, landscaping, markers in sidewalks and neighborhoods are examples of other levels of preservation. There is a hierarchy umbrella that Monica Callahan talked about that is a more global perspective. The current form of preservation has been trying to inch its way forward house by house, building by building, district by district and it's difficult. In the past, the legislative body did not believe in doing anything additional relating to preservation. It has been just recently that funding was allocated for additional studies. This came about in response to an outcry by neighborhoods regarding what was happening in the neighborhoods due to infill development. Historic Preservation was the only tool the City had to address incompatible development. She stated that she is hoping that the preservation plan will include tools to address these types of things and not just focus on prioritizing new districts.

Ms. Coffey referenced the memorandum and noted that she thinks letter A in that memo addresses that issue. She noted that finding these other tools is a goal of the preservation plan process.

Ms. Hunter acknowledged that she had not read the whole memorandum.

Ms. Coffey read letter A from the memorandum. "To clarify the role of historic preservation planning in a city wide context in order to eliminate uncertainty and confusion of the purpose, meaning and context of preservation in Salt Lake City."

Ms. Hunter stated that she thought that statement was a little too limiting. She stated that the concern is that it focuses on definitions. When you mention historic preservation people automatically think historic districts. What is being asked is to look at something broader than historic districts. It is taking a step back and asking what do we actually value as our history and culture. She stated that's what she is hoping to clarify in a preservation plan. That could include districts, conservation districts and tools to encourage certain types of housing.

Chair Fitzsimmons stated that he thinks that the brief statement works fine. He stated that the mission statement is a guiding philosophical statement which is supposed to be brief and it is expanded on through the strategies that are put in the plan.

Commissioner Hunter stated that the Commission didn't totally finish the planning meeting and wondered if there is a plan to finish when more Commissioners are present.

Ms Coffey agreed that this needed to be clarified and that she was hoping it could be finalized in this meeting. She noted that the original intent of the

meeting on Monday and this meeting with the consultants was to identify the issues. The purpose of the project and role of the Commission came up as well so on Monday time was spent discussing the roles of the commission and the advisory committee, which the consultants would address. She stated that she was hoping to go down the list of issues relating to the purpose of the plan discussed on Monday and determine if the Commission believed those things were addressed to its satisfaction.

She noted that as discussed in the meeting on Monday, August 20, 2007, the Commissioners would take on the role of communication with the Community Councils and that Staff could also keep Community Council Chairs up to speed on the process through the forum of the Mayor's Monthly meeting. Staff is also willing to meet with those community councils who will want more information on the project.

Commissioner Hunter stated that one of the main things she remembered about the meeting on Monday was that there needed to be ongoing buy-in on the process, not just status updates. She stated she was concerned that there would be buy-in on various levels to ensure that the plan didn't become something that was not accepted.

Ms. Coffey noted that the staff and consultants had met with the Community Development Director and Deputy Director and discussed this issue. She stated that there are different phases to this project right now. Currently we are in the issue identification and information gathering phase. The second will consist of developing a vision and overall principals. Once we get to that stage in the process, we will work with the advisory committee to help the Consultants draft and support these guiding principals. We will bring these to the Historic Landmark Commission, Planning Commission and the City Council to make sure they agree and accept the vision and goals.

Mr. Goebel, project manager with Clarion Associates stated that there are some key milestone points to the process where they will have opportunities to check in with the Landmark Commission, the Planning Commission and the City Council. He noted that the key is to keep those groups informed but not overburden them with the entire planning process. He noted that they don't want the decision making groups to rethink everything that has been done by the advisory committee. The project contract goal is to have a full plan in place for the public adoption by about June or July 2008. There are several milestones that we have to get through first.

He noted that they are currently in phase I of information gathering and are trying to learn as much as they can as to what is working, what is not working and what the issues are which need to be addressed. He stated that the consultants will come back with a draft vision statement or plan that they think synthesizes all the

concerns and goals that they have heard. He stated that he thinks Commissioner Hunter has already started to articulate some ideas that need to be unfolded in that vision statement.

He stated that the consultants are going through a full interview process. They have met with some of the City Council members, some Planning Commissioners, architects, Economic Review Panel members and the Landmark Commission. They are going to fold all that input into the draft that they come back with along with some goals for implementation. They will ensure that there is a consensus on the vision statement and goals before they start drafting the plan. He noted that the work plan they submitted includes working mainly with the planning staff and advisory committee.

He noted that there are three Historic Landmark Commissioners on the Advisory Committee (Commissioners Oliver, Hunter and Lloyd) along with representatives of the State Preservation Office, Utah Heritage Foundation, and Downtown Alliance etc. He stated that the Advisory Committee has a broad stakeholder group for providing guidance to the plan. He noted that the consultants plan to do the bulk of their work with the Advisory Committee on an ongoing basis and hold periodic meetings with the full commission. He hoped that the full Historic Landmark Commission would be getting regular updates from those three Commissioners that serve on the advisory committee.

He stated that when the consultants come back with the goals and vision statement, they will have a lengthier meeting with the advisory committee but can provide updates to this Commission and perhaps with the Planning Commission and City Council as well. This process will be the same once the full draft of the plan is completed. The intent is to ensure the commission has full buy-in with this process. They want to make sure the Commission is supportive of this plan when it is ready to go to the adoption process, but it is understood that the Commission has a lot on its plate. That is why the advisory committee process was set up. They can be a little more actively involved in development of the plan and the liaisons to the Committee from the Commission will make sure the Commission's views are represented.

Commissioner Carl stated that she agreed with the process and assumed that was how it would work. If there is a specific crisis, then a Commission meeting could be arranged. She requested input on how the public input process would occur.

Mr. Goebel stated that they are receiving public input in various ways. He discussed the public workshop scheduled for that evening at the Central City Community Center. The purpose of the meeting is to inform the public about the purpose of the project, the City's objectives of the project and types of issues the

consultants will be looking at. After this introduction, they will break the participants into groups and let people tell them specific issues at different tables.

Ms. Kacala will be posting all materials, including minutes, on the City's website. They have bookmarks relating to the website and have sent out flyers to try and get as many people as possible to participate. Staff has mentioned that they can on a by- request basis, meet with community councils, present information to them and get feedback on the project. A crucial step for getting the public feedback is at the stage where the goals and policies are being discussed. The consultants want public feedback to know whether the draft goals are appropriate for the plan, and that the draft vision is on track. At that stage they could put together a briefing booklet with an interactive comment portion which could be used by the public to give us feedback. There will also be another open house for comments on the draft plan when the process gets to that stage.

Mr. Goebel stated that is what was anticipated for public outreach for this project. He added that they are happy to add more to that if the City thinks it is necessary. He emphasized that he believes the best way to maintain momentum is to work with the Advisory Committee, which is carefully established with a broad range of viewpoints and, keep them actively involved in the process. He stated they should be reminded that they need to serve as liaisons to their different groups. He noted that it's hard to conduct public workshops in every stage of the plan process.

Commissioner Hunter stated that she doesn't believe people respond well to workshops. She thought it would be interesting to see how many people come to the workshop that evening. She noted that she agrees to what the consultants are saying. She wanted to revisit the question regarding identifying an overarching statement.

Ms. Kacala stated that is the purpose of the vision statement. It is a broad overarching statement that identifies what preservation means for the City and how the city sees preservation fitting in with other programs, goals and activities. The goals and policies then direct how that overarching vision will be met.

Commissioner Hunter stated that's the part that will have to be right to begin with or the plan doesn't really flow.

Mr. Goebel stated that coming into this meeting the consultants had a narrower sense of what the City was hoping the plan would focus on. The consultants thought the City was looking for direction on ordinances and prioritizing surveys relating to historic preservation. They thought the City was looking for a city wide preservation philosophy, but they see those other things as equal. Based on the interviews and meetings they have held, there's clearly a focus on the articulation of the larger city preservation goals, thinking of preservation as a tool to protect

community character and establishing and maintaining strong neighborhoods. Clearly that idea of preservation in terms of building strong neighborhoods will be a focus in the vision statement

Commissioner Hunter noted that this City values economic development. The plan needs to address how preservation can play a strong role in economic development through tourism and other things. She wondered if part of the plan discussion would be one which focuses on what the City values.

Mr. Goebel stated that how preservation ties with economic development is a particular interest and expertise that Clarion brings to the table. Clarion has completed some state level studies for Colorado and Michigan on the economic benefits of historical preservation.

Mr. Goebel stated there are a variety of benefits ranging from cultural, aesthetic, environmental, and bottom line benefits and some people will focus on that. Clarion has a lot of experience in thinking through the different methodologies for demonstrating those benefits be it increased property values in historic districts, heritage tourism, or the spillover effects of all the revitalization and tax credit projects.

Chair Fitzsimmons noted that it is really critical to get leadership buy-in because they are so oriented to economic development that they need to understand that there is more to economic development than tearing down old buildings and building new ones. He stated that he thinks the leadership of the City is starting to realize the benefits of preservation and the Commission needs to reinforce it.

Commissioner Carl agreed and noted that the City leadership needs to have a long term view of what preservation can do.

Chair Fitzsimmons stated that he would like to focus on how the RDA fits into the process. The Commission has started having a dialogue with the leadership of the RDA. He would like to see that reinforced. They would like to have meetings with them earlier in the process to ensure that the RDA can be a positive force in preservation.

Ms. Kacala stated that after a day and a half of having interviews and discussions, it appears that what is desired in Salt Lake City is similar to what the National Trust has been pushing nationally. The City doesn't just want to focus on preserving static resources but it wants to look at what is that cutting edge way to do preservation. That means looking at all those relationships. It is looking at how preservation fits in with affordable housing, transit lines, the RDA, sustainability, etc... All of those concepts have come up in almost every interview the consultants have had. People have raised a handful of those

issues. Those things are going to be folded somehow into the vision and goals in this project.

Chair Fitzsimmons stated that at the last meeting they put together the list of issues and he believed it is a good list.

Chair Fitzsimmons also asked about the size of the advisory committee.

Ms. Coffey noted that there are 15 members including representatives from each of the seven council districts, three members from the Historic Landmark Commission a representative from AIA, UHF, SHPO, and a developer who wasn't at the meeting last night.

Commissioner Hunter noted that many of the Council members designated their best historian or preservation experts to represent their council district. She stated that she is still concerned that the Advisory Committee is missing the general public that isn't already working in preservation. She stated that the Committee is good and they had a very good discussion at their first meeting but she is still concerned that the views from the different communities are not represented. The communities differ on preservation. Some areas want development, especially on the west side.

Commissioner Carl wondered if there is an affordable housing advocate on the advisory committee. She wondered if Ben Logue fills the role of advocating for affordable housing.

Ms. Coffey noted who nominated the members of the Advisory Committee.

Commissioner Hunter stated that the Advisory Committee is a good group of people and they are very knowledgeable. She stated that the idea of going to the Community Councils and who would go there was important. The time it takes to work on this issue has been a lot in the last week but it won't always be so demanding. She asked how often the advisory committee will get together in the year.

Mr. Goebel stated that there are approximately 3-4 meetings planned: The one they just had, one on the goals and vision statement; one on the draft plan strategies and one at the end. It may be that there are more meetings that need to occur. It depends on how difficult it is to address the issues.

Commissioner Carl wondered if drafts of the plan could be emailed to the Committee or if they can receive updates periodically. She did not believe four meetings were adequate to meet the needs of the project.

Commissioner Hunter noted that conducting conference calls, which would not require travel but would allow for input, could be a way to increase the contact without having to change the budget. Conference calls or e-mails could be very effective in keeping in contact.

Ms. Coffey stated that it is important to distinguish the role of the Advisory Committee from that of the Commission and distinguishing the roles will also define how often the consultants meet with each group. There is also a need to determine what the role of the Landmark Commissioner's on the Advisory Committee is.

Commissioner Hunter stated that is why she believes the Commission needs to finish its work session that was started on Monday and is not complete.

Commissioner Carl stated that she believes the Advisory Committee is the liaison to the project.

Ms. Coffey stated that this is a good time for the Commission to talk about the issue.

Commissioner Lloyd asked if there is a type of forum that could be used as a clearinghouse of ideas for the project.

Ms Kacala stated that this would be in the form of a blog or message board and it would need to be set up through the City's website.

Ms Coffey requested clarification on whom and in what order the comments are taken during the various phases of the planning process. Knowing that there is an issues identification phase, a vision development phase and a draft document phase, she wondered when the Advisory Committee would comment and when the Commission would comment during these milestones of the project.

Commissioner Hunter stated that the Historic Landmark Commission has been asked to take the leadership role in the project. She stated that she believed when one is asked to take a leadership role, you would be involved early on, but this project has already begun. Usually the Commission would have discussed those issues before the RFP was written but those discussions did not take place with the Commission. They were had with the City Council, within the Planning Division, etc. At some point, the Commission was requested to be more involved in the process than what it had been so the Commission has had to play catch up. She stated that she believed the Commission is still trying to figure out what its role is in the project and how best to play that role.

Ms Coffey stated that staff wants to make sure that the Landmark Commission is ok with the product. The process has already been set up with the consultants

through their contract. It is great to give them feedback on ideas relating to the process.

Commissioner Hunter asked how you can ensure the final product is appropriate without being involved and have buy in of what the process is.

Ms. Coffey stated that she doesn't think that the Commission is just receiving a final product at the end. She stated that the idea is that the Advisory Committee is the representation of the community. Their input, along with the general public's input is synthesized by the Advisory Committee. They come up with recommendations that they submit to the Historic Landmark Commission. The Historic Landmark Commission reviews and comments on the ideas and then gives its recommendation to the Planning Commission and so forth.

Chair Fitzsimmons stated that it is important to ensure that the role of the Landmark members to the Advisory Committee is representative of the Commission. The Commission should receive regular, systematic, and thorough updates from the Commissioners who sit on the Advisory Committee.

Commissioner Lloyd stated that the Commissioners would like to do more than they may, in reality have time to do with all of the cases that they have to review. He stated that he has confidence that working with the consultants is the way to go, as the City is paying them to do what the Commission wished it had time to do. He stated that the Commission should figure out how it can reach out to the community. He stated that the Advisory Committee also needs to provide a link to the Community Councils.

Commissioner Carl stated that she believes the Commission ought to trust these consultants to know what they are doing. The Commission doesn't need to micromanage everything they do.

Commissioner Lloyd asked the consultants whether blogs are productive.

Ms. Kacala stated that the jury is still out as to whether blogs are productive. She noted that the basic work will be with the Advisory Committee. The consultants will check in with the Commission to make sure they are on the right course.

Commissioner Hunter stated that she trusts the consultants and the staff. The issue is that there is not a lot of talk time to share broad brush issues and philosophies. That is something that should happen (value clarification within the commission or with the RDA, etc). She noted that the Commission is so busy with case load it is not able to discuss the other functions. The blog or other idea may be a way to maximize communication. The Commission needs to have tools to address these other things. If the Commission only looks at more

districts, it will just have more case load in the end and never be able to address these other issues. The preservation plan process was to address a lot of issues.

Ms. Kacala stated that it appears there are two tiers of work: One is for the Commission to determine, as a group, what it has in mind of what needs to be addressed in the project itself. The conversation which began on Monday might just be a conversation where the Commission can call a special meeting to figure out what as a group it wants to address. It may not impact the plan relating to the stages and the touchstones. That catch up piece seems to be something internal with the Commission.

Commissioner Hunter stated that it is internal but also they want to relay the information to the consultants. She noted that it would have been great to have the consultants listen in on Monday's meeting.

Ms. Kacala stated that this is the very beginning of the process and they are just in the gathering stages of collecting information and issues. It is a good time to have this conversation. If the Commission wants to meet and decide what they want out of the plan, it can be incorporated into the process. The next step of this process is going to be late October or early November. By that time the consultants will probably have a clearer direction from the Commission as to what the Commission wants to be addressed in this project

Commissioner Carl stated that the whole process is new to her and she suspects that is true for others on the Commission. She asked what successes the consultants have had in other places... She wondered whether the other preservation plans they have participated in have achieved a lot of public buy-in and if the consultants were comfortable with the interface that they are getting from the public.

Mr. Goebel stated that they just won a national APA planning award for the Cheyenne, Wyoming plan in a large part because of the effective outreach program that they had.

Ms Kacala stated that was a multi-tiered project that lasted over two years. The process they are suggesting for this project is the same process. The general outreach and staging of this process is the same as if they were developing a comprehensive plan for a community. In each case there needs to be public input and support and check in to make sure the project is on the right course.

Mr. Goebel stated that the really sophisticated public outreach strategies take a lot of resources that are not available for this project. They have done what they think is a very effective strategy based on the resources that are allocated.

Commissioner Haymond stated that he was anxious for input from the consultants as to what the consultants expect from the Commission.

Ms. Kacala stated that the consultants will tell the Commission what they have heard and let them know if there is contention regarding an issue. They will bounce that feedback off of the Commission and will want to hear its response. The consultants are looking for more targeted guidance and direction from the Commission at key stages of the process. That will be at each major stage of the process: such as when visions, goals, policies are defined; when strategies to implement the plan are developed and once on the draft plan is created.

Mr. Goebel gave a specific example of how the process would work stating that they are here to gather information and hear issues. They may come back with a goal statement that says there is a need to prioritize specific areas for future surveys for historic districts. They would spend time to hash out the language with the staff and Advisory Committee to make sure that they have the idea and concepts down. While they are here they could meet with the Historic Landmark Commission to let them know where they are with the goal statements based on the discussions they have had with the Advisory Committee and staff. Staff will play a key role in all of this. Once that stage is over, they would go back and draft strategies for implementing the goals. These strategies would be more specific and they would make recommendations, such as the Rose Park or Fairpark Neighborhood needs to be the priority for surveys in the near future.

Ms Coffey noted that the check in with the Commission would include receiving the Commission's comments. Mr. Goebel agreed. They want to make sure the Commission is comfortable with these statements.

Commissioner Hunter inquired as to receiving notes from the Advisory Committee meeting.

Ms. Kacala stated that they would be made available and posted on the website.

Commissioner Carl asked whether the consultants would be involved in getting recommendations turned into codified documents that the City Council could approve.

Ms. Coffey noted that the City Council will be the final approval authority of the plan.

Ms. Kacala wondered if the Commission would be making a recommendation to the City Council regarding the goal and objective stage, to ensure the Council's support at that stage as well.

Ms. Coffey noted that will occur.

Mr. Lloyd asked for clarification as to whether there would be multiple points during the process where the Commission would be asked to make motions recommending the City Council approve the work to date.

Ms. Coffey stated that the main stage to get buy-in from everyone is the vision statement phase. The consultants would work very closely with the Advisory Committee to review the drafts of the plan and the final draft will go through the full public adoption process.

Mr. Goebel agreed that there will still be a full public adoption process once the final draft plan is in place.

Ms. Kacala inquired as to how many of the commissioners had filled out the surveys. She encouraged the commissioners to fill them out and send them in. The consultants had received approximately 40 completed surveys to date.

Mr. Goebel noted that the Commission may want to set up a list serve to communicate amongst itself on commission matters.

Commissioner Lloyd asked whether there were legal issues relating to the Commission communicating electronically and not in a public forum. Ms. Coffey noted that she would ask the Attorney's Office if this type of communication is restricted.

Commissioner Carl asked whether the consultants were getting what they need from the Commission.

Mr. Goebel stated that he knew the discussion would involve the roles of the Advisory Committee and Commission. He stated that he would also like to get substantive issues as well.

Chair Fitzsimmons requested more input on the makeup of the Advisory Committee. He noted there are a few owners of a lot of property downtown and wondered if some of them could be on the committee.

Ms. Coffey stated that there was a representative from the Downtown Alliance on the Advisory Committee and that the stakeholders group had included a representative from Zions Securities. She had tried but was not able to get a stakeholder representative from the Boyer Company.

Commissioner Carl wondered if it was too late to add an affordable housing advocate because she believed that that piece was missing. She nominated Claudia O'Grady.

Mr. Goebel stated that he was concerned that the Committee may get too big and it would not be productive.

Ms. Coffey asked whether Ben Logue could also fill the role of an affordable housing advocate on the Committee since he was already a member.

Commissioner Carl stated that a big concern of hers is the affordability of housing in Salt Lake City. She stated that the lack of affordable housing is becoming a problem and historic preservation gentrifies neighborhoods and decreases the affordability for residents.

Chair Fitzsimmons stated that the letter signed by Ocktai Parviz included in the Legislative Intent included a discussion of the process and the areas in the process that need to be fixed. He encouraged the consultants to review that letter and other similar documents to obtain information on what needs to be addressed in the process.

Mr. Goebel discussed how the open house would proceed. He stated they would try and focus discussion on three topics: priorities for designation (surveys); how well things are being protected (how well do the regulations work); and how well is preservation planning being integrated in other City tools (such as TOD, housing), etc.

Ms. Coffey clarified what the colored type represented in the memorandum document written by Janice Lew

Commissioner Lloyd asked the consultants what they thought of Salt Lake City's Preservation Program.

Mr. Goebel responded that from a regulatory point of view, Salt Lake City is in good shape. He noted that the regulations are stronger than other communities of this size. He identified problem areas including that the demolition standards have been criticized and the design guidelines don't address commercial development. He also noted that there is criticism of how the Commission reviews the applications. Some people are frustrated by perceived inconsistency and others think that each decision made on a case by case decision is a good thing.

Commissioner Carl asked whether this project will help ensure that all boards, commissions and departments of the City work towards the same goal.

Mr. Goebel stated that the consultants can give examples of best practices from around the country of how to address that and in what cities it works.

Mr. Sladek noted that Salt Lake City has a magnificent collection of historic architecture. He is concerned with how outdated the surveys are and that decisions are being made based on that data. Without good, reliable information is it hard to make good decisions. He stated that the districts are massive and it is a challenge to finance those surveys but it is an absolute necessity to ensure that the surveys are current. He noted that he will look at the existing districts and come back and look at other areas where new districts may be appropriate. He also noted that he will look at individual sites for possible study.

Chair Fitzsimmons stated that he would like Mr. Sladek to look at the edges of the districts and how to deal with the character changes to the district caused by infrastructure changes and with the attrition along the edges. He also would like the consultants to review preservation and the new infill housing. He would like direction because even though the Commission justifies its decisions on a case by case basis, it is often criticized as not being consistent.

Notes from the Historic Landmarks Meeting re: Preservation Plan August 20, 2007

How does the HLC want to lead out on the Preservation Plan?

HLC:

Put Preservation Plan on as a standing agenda item for each meeting

Need additional meetings(s) to focus on the plan

Create a mission statement for the Preservation Plan

Need to have HLC members meet with their respective Community Councils to keep them informed on the plan – to build consensus with the community

The Advisory Committee:

HLC members on the Advisory Committee will keep the Board informed

The Advisory Committee has good preservation expertise – but does not represent the public at large (“regular” neighbors)

City Council:

There are concerns that people are hurrying to get plans submitted before they can be curtailed by the Preservation Plan.

Information needs to be shared regarding RDA issues, and issues raised by the consultant (Monica)

There is a need to communicate with the City Council during the planning process – ideas such as a joint study session, or “talk time” with the City Council so that they know the issues and how the plan is proceeding. The HLC need the buy in from the City Council.

Staff:

HLC needs to hear staff issues and perspectives.

The work done today needs to be plugged into the proposed goals for Thursday's discussion with the consultants.

HLC needs time with the staff and the consultant regarding the Preservation Plan.

Staff could help HLC create a traveling roadshow regarding the Preservation Plan that could circulate to the Community Councils.

Update HLC on past work (i.e. legislative action from 2003, info from consultant – Monica, etc.)

Consultant:

Work with the HLC to define the roles with all the groups involved in the Preservation Plan.

Public:

HLC needs to discuss engaging the public.

MEMORANDUM

451 South State Street, Room 406
Salt Lake City, Utah 84111
(801) 535-7757



Planning and Zoning Division
Department of Community Development

TO: Historic Landmark Commission

FROM: Janice Lew, Principal Planner

DATE: August 21, 2007

SUBJECT: Refining Elements of the Scope of Work

A scope of work and issues gathering session as held by the Historic Landmark Commission on August 20, 2007. The Commission was asked to review the goals and objectives of the Preservation Plan as stated in the RFP and identify key issues and key factors that should be addressed through the planning process. Several themes arose that embody the Commission's input and include the bulleted items below. The Commission's key issues are listed in **blue**. Staff was then asked to incorporate the recommendations of the Legislative Response of 2004. These recommendations are listed in **red**.

Statement of Goals and Objectives:

A. To clarify the role of historic preservation planning in a city-wide context, in order to eliminate uncertainty and confusion of the purpose, meaning and context of historic preservation in Salt Lake City.

- **Vision and Values for the City: what makes the city liveable**
- **Vision Statement – What is our big picture in all of this: Commission, Community**
- **Conflicts with goals within the City**

Need value clarification from the city as to the drivers for Preservation Plan

- what are we trying to preserve
- what have we lost

System analysis: Assess how HLC functions – strengths and weaknesses

Clarify the role of preservation in broader community planning

Assessment of HLC

- dual role of Commission has at times become problematic (regulatory and advocates)
- status of Architectural Committee
- number of commission members and balanced membership
- staffing

B. To constructively identify and resolve conflicts between historic preservation and other land-use tools such as zoning and master plans, and to ensure consistency between various City policies.

- **Resolution between neighborhoods and historic districts (definition) and dealing with issue of redevelopment**
- **Driving Values: economic development value clarification; incentives, economic hardship, tourism**

Conflicting goals

Clarity to what is expected in regards to preservation and compatible in-fill

Economic hardship frustrations – additional tools

- what we are trying to preserve
- reuse plan
- need flexibility for options

Integration with walkable communities

Sustainable development

Energy conservation in conjunction with preservation – LEED standards

Integration of committees, boards and divisions – less confrontational

Advocacy/ombudsperson – to help address interdisciplinary and interdepartmental issues

Revisit master plan policies to eliminate conflicting expectations

Re-assessing the approach of master plans from community-based to community wide

Assessment of demolition ordinance

- lack of flexibility in the review of demolition applications
- lack of political avenue to formally engage elected City officials in preventing demolition because of the current appeals process (LUAB)
- issues with Economic Review Panel

Evaluate opportunities for regulatory improvements to create a more appropriate balance between historic preservation and economic development.

C. To guide decision-making for all City departments.

Enforcement issues

RDA not onboard

D. To strengthen the legal basis of historic preservation

What is “legal” – what is “fair” under the law

Precedent vs. compatibility with surroundings

E. To comprehensively address issues relating to zoning, development patterns of residential, commercial and institutional uses, and design affecting the City’s historic resources, including current zoning in existing historic districts.

Neighborhood context for preservation

Need good commercial guidelines

Residential guidelines do not address building type changes for change of use

Great text in plans that needs to be utilized – synthesized down and summarized too much

Tools for reuse and rehabilitation (incentives)

Lack of compatibility between underlying zoning and historic resources

F. To encourage economic development through historic preservation

Economic use flexibility
Goal of heritage tourism

Preservation has not been used to its full potential nor has it been accorded sufficient attention compared to other land use issues
Explore was to be flexible to get economic use out of historic structures

G. To prioritize additional survey efforts.

Outdated historic resource surveys create a lack of predictability and problematic projects.

H. To prioritize designation of future historic districts.

I. To make recommendations on revisions to the boundaries of existing districts.

Conservation districts – what happens at edges of districts

Commitment to fund and formally adopt survey work

J. To identify areas of historic districts in need of extra assistance and attention.

Incentives for preservation

K. To identify public, private, and non-profit sector roles and responsibilities.

L. To identify and build support for additional incentives to encourage historic preservation in the community.

- **Education / community buy in / consensus building**

M. To establish a work plan addressing priorities and implementation strategies to make best use of staffing and financial resources.

- **Literature review for best practices – internal and external**
-what makes an effective plan
- **Work program for plan to ensure the work done here is institutionalized**
-constant orientation to Commission members
-structure/staffing (implementation)

N. To identify an approach to historic preservation for buildings of the recent past.