


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...

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.

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.

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.

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 Salt Lake City zoning ordinance does not include specific standards for consideration of adopting general plans or master plans. 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.

Options

Deny. The HLC may recommend denial of this plan. If denied, the Planning Division will explore, in consultation with the Historic Landmark Commission, other means of providing guidance for preservation of the City's historic sites.

Approve. The HLC may recommend approval of this plan to the Planning Commission and City Council. If approved, the plan will be presented to the Planning Commission who will decide whether or not to approve recommendation to the City Council.

Table Decision. The HLC may table acting on this plan and request additional information or research.

ATTACHMENT A
Draft Preservation Plan

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,

boards, and commissions should collaborate with preservation program staff.” Again, we worry that this approach places historic preservation above all other city goals and objectives, rather than on equal footing. The Plan should indicate that it will be compatible with the City’s master plans and preservation staff will collaborate with other City Departments to further the Plan’s objectives. While this is clearly an issue of semantics, the Plan implies it should supersede all other City plans and policies, and we believe other City plans and policies should carry equal, and in some cases, greater weight.

Demolition: Our views on demolition were provided during earlier discussions on the Economic Hardship Process. While some of our concerns with that process were addressed, we remain concerned that the proposed Economic Hardship process does not adequately balance the desire to preserve a particular structure with the legitimate community and property owner needs that may favor demolition. While we understand and share the desire to renovate and preserve structures that contribute significantly to the historic character of an area, we worry that a process that disproportionately favors preservation will sometimes serve to perpetuate blight, disinvestment, and illicit activity that often accompany severely dilapidated structures and negatively impact the surrounding properties.

There are references to demolition throughout the document that call for changes due to public discontent with current policies. The statement, “Current demolition provisions of the preservation ordinance, including the economic hardship process, are seen as convoluted and ineffectual (Page 6, 46, 54),” was used several times to justify the Plan’s proposals, without identifying who sees the process this way. The process may be convoluted, but a property owner’s successful use of a fair and equitable process to demolish a dilapidated structure on his or her property is not necessarily ineffectual. A process that always prevents demolition is not a fair process. Processes established by this Plan should address the needs of all Salt Lake City residents, not solely the goals of the preservation community. The goal of the process should be to strike an objective and fair balance among the community’s interest in preserving the structure, the community benefits that could come from removing the structure, and the interests of the property owner, not just to prevent demolition in all cases.

Preserving New Buildings: The RDA staff is concerned that the Plan calls for protecting historic properties from the recent past (Page 43). By nature, the process of designating historically significant structures will always carry an element of subjectivity. The current standard of fifty years, which we understand is nationally accepted, provides a quantitative criterion for eligibility. Furthermore, as the Plan notes, it provides for a sufficient passage of time that a building can be more fairly evaluated for its contribution to the architectural landscape and its representation of a particular style or era. We worry that the designation process only becomes more subjective if any structure can be declared historic from the time it receives its Certificate of Occupancy. This potential seems particularly clear when the Plan uses the Salt Lake City Public Safety Building as an example of a significant modern resource worthy of preservation, which is not a universal view. Ideally, there should be a designated period of time that must elapse before a building is reviewed to determine its historic value to the entire community.

Committee Membership: While increased coordination between the Historic Landmark Commission (HLC) and the Redevelopment Agency may be beneficial, having an HLC member serve on the Redevelopment Advisory Committee (RAC) and vice versa (Page 23) would not conform to the City’s policy requiring that members serve on no more than one Board/Committee/Commission at a time. Furthermore, the interests of the RDA and HLC do not

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.

Transit-Oriented Development: The RDA recognizes that transit and transit-oriented development (TOD) may impact preservation districts or activities. While transit, TOD, and preservation can collaboratively address the needs of the citizenry; where transit and TOD conflict with preservation, the broad needs of the community and the substantial and lasting benefits that come from successful TOD projects should be fairly balanced with preservation in adjudicating such conflicts.

Capitol Hill Historic District and Capitol Hill Extension: It appears that the recommendations on the Capitol Hill (Page 102) and Capitol Hill Extension (Page 109) districts are not consistent. The areas to which the recommendations refer overlap, but they describe the overlapping area differently. Additionally, the Capitol Hill Extension section indicates that the district includes Pugsley Street, which it does not.

There were several policies included in the Plan that the RDA staff feels are important new additions to the way preservation is addressed in the City. These policy proposals include:

Develop Property Acquisition Process: The RDA thinks that preservation should be driven by private and public investment in historically significant properties, rather than imposing unreasonable financial requirements on property owners. The Plan's call for a property acquisition process is welcomed and overdue. In addition to calling for a plan once the property is acquired, the Plan should reference the need for the City to annually allocate acquisition funds and delineate how properties will be selected.

Historic Designation on Property Titles: The RDA staff agrees that property titles should include historic designations. If legislation is passed that will allow the designation on the title, it is important that there be a process to remove the designation if future surveys determine the property is no longer historically significant.

Thank you for allowing the RDA staff to review the draft Plan. We hope our suggestions will benefit the final product. Please contact Matt Dahl at 535-7239 if you would like to discuss any of these comments or suggestions.

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 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.

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 or 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 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 weeks 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 Washch 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 Sladek 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, 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.

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 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.



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.

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.

Goal 5.4 - Policy 5.4a

Action 1 (pg. 89) – Since the 'Pioneer Communities' has gone away, I would highly recommend using another term such as *Community Revitalization Program* or *Downtown Main Street Program* here.

Goal 5.7 - Policy 5.7c

Action 1 (pg. 95) – In supporting appropriate residential additions, this is where we could further explore the proposed Safe Harbor Rule by UHF as well as greater distribution of the UHF Celebrating Compatible Design book.

Goal 5.8 - Policy 5.8

Action 2 (pg. 96) - The community design center ASSIST, Inc. could be a resource for outreach and support to elderly, handicap, and low-moderate income residents.

Exchange Place Recommendation (pg. 107) – The reference to the 'Wells Fargo Building' should be changed to the 1955 International Style Ken Garff Building (historic First Security Bank Building).

General comment on local vs. national historic districts – For the city's management of local districts, I think it's important to keep the local historic district boundaries manageable. But I disagree with some of the statements in the draft plan that the National Register boundaries should be seriously considered because they allow the one economic tool we have to still work in areas that have very few other tools but have the qualifications to be NR eligible.

General comment for national historic districts – Where the draft plan mentions a local option, it should clearly be stated that a 'local' conservation district is recommended.'

Central City (pg. 109) – I believe that the Central City HD deserves a closer look for boundary realignment for a Central City North and South district, but not outright disbanding. This may include new boundaries that make each area stretch further east and west, rather than straight up 600 East.

Gilmer Park Recommendation (pg. 112) - Recommend rewording to omit the first sentence as the teardowns that have happened in this neighborhood. Though limited to the eye, these few teardowns have created tremendous discussion and a vocal uprising about next steps.

Capitol Hill Extension, Northwest Recommendation (pg. 115) – I strongly believe it is the wrong message to send that the city should redraw NR boundaries as NR listing is positive for most neighborhoods. For the Capitol Hill Extension, if the recommendation is to consider a local conservation district instead of a local historic district, then it should also state how it could work better or differently such as to encourage compatible infill housing in this area.

Yalecrest (pg. 116) – Recommend adding content reflecting how the non-historic development has created neighborhood strife and significant concern about the future of neighborhood. Therefore local historic districts for significant areas and/or conservation districts should be explored further.

Gentile Core (pg. 119) – I believe that this should be a priority area to state in the recommendation due to the overall development pressure and sensitivity in this area.

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



Salt Lake City Historic Preservation Plan



March 2009

A citywide plan to guide future historic preservation efforts in Salt Lake City.

Table of Contents

| | |
|--|-----------|
| Introduction | 1 |
| Historic Preservation in Salt Lake City: A Background | 2 |
| Objectives of this Plan | 4 |
| Planning and Outreach | 4 |
| Historic Resource Inventories and Surveys | 5 |
| Regulations and Incentives | 5 |
| The Planning Process | 6 |
| Plan Overview | 7 |
| A Vision for Historic Preservation in Salt Lake City | 9 |
| Theme 1: Foster a Unified City Commitment to Preservation. | 9 |
| Theme 2: Develop a Comprehensive Preservation Toolbox. | 10 |
| Theme 3: Administer a Convenient and Consistent Historic Preservation Program. | 10 |
| Theme 4: Improve Education and Outreach. | 11 |
| Theme 5: Support a Sustainable City. | 11 |
| Turning a Vision into Actions | 12 |
| Foster a Unified City Commitment to Preservation | 13 |
| Citywide Planning | 14 |
| Overview | 14 |
| Goals, Policies, and Actions | 16 |
| Interdepartmental Coordination | 17 |
| Overview | 17 |
| Goals, Policies, and Actions | 22 |
| A Shared Understanding of Preservation’s Benefits | 26 |
| Overview | 26 |
| Goals, Policies, and Actions | 26 |
| Develop a Comprehensive Preservation Toolbox | 28 |
| Historic Resource Surveys | 29 |
| Overview | 29 |
| Goals, Policies, and Actions | 32 |
| Historic Designation (Districts and Landmark Sites) | 34 |
| Overview | 34 |
| Land Use and Design Regulations | 43 |
| Overview | 43 |
| Goals, Policies, and Actions | 45 |
| Administer a Convenient and Consistent Historic Preservation Program | 53 |
| Historic Landmark Commission | 53 |
| Overview | 53 |
| Goals, Policies, and Actions | 55 |
| Program Administration | 56 |
| Overview | 56 |
| Goals, Policies, and Actions | 60 |

| | |
|--|-----------|
| Improve Education and Outreach | 63 |
| Overview | 63 |
| Goals, Policies, and Actions..... | 66 |
| Support a Sustainable City | 71 |
| Energy..... | 72 |
| Overview | 72 |
| Goals, Policies, and Actions..... | 75 |
| Economic Development..... | 77 |
| Overview | 77 |
| Goals, Policies, And Actions..... | 79 |
| Urban Nature | 80 |
| Overview | 80 |
| Goals, Policies, and Action | 80 |
| Transportation..... | 83 |
| Overview | 83 |
| Goals, Policies, and Actions..... | 83 |
| Housing..... | 84 |
| Overview | 84 |
| Goals, Policies, and Actions..... | 85 |
| Implementation Action Plan..... | 88 |
| How Will The Plan Be Implemented?..... | 88 |
| Policy Decisions | 88 |
| Regulatory Improvements | 88 |
| Coordination and Partnerships | 88 |
| Pursuing Funding Mechanisms | 89 |
| Education and Outreach..... | 89 |
| Implementation Action Plan | 89 |
| Appendix A: Historic Districts and Sites Field Analysis | 94 |
| Overview | 94 |
| Project Background..... | 96 |
| Local Districts | 96 |
| South Temple | 96 |
| The Avenues..... | 97 |
| Exchange Place..... | 98 |
| Capitol Hill | 99 |
| Central City | 100 |
| University | 100 |
| National Districts..... | 101 |
| The Avenues Extension | 101 |
| City Creek Canyon..... | 101 |
| Westside Warehouse..... | 102 |
| Gilmer Park | 103 |
| Bennion-Douglas..... | 103 |
| Bryant | 104 |
| Highland Park | 105 |
| Northwest..... | 105 |
| Capitol Hill Extension..... | 106 |

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

Introduction

Though a relatively young city, Salt Lake has been identifying and protecting its historic resources much longer than most communities in the West. Salt Lake adopted its first local preservation 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’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 ordinance itself, which has gone through numerous revisions and updates since its original adoption.

The residents and officials of Salt Lake 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 continues to grow in size and in geographic reach, the city’s older neighborhoods face increasing pressures for redevelopment and infill, presenting both challenges and opportunities. Many stakeholders have questioned the role that the historic preservation plan should play in a modern, growing city that 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 that historic preservation plays throughout all of Salt Lake. 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 preservation 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, 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 landmarks. The size of the preservation program and number of designated properties means that city preservation staff review a high volume of 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: Romanesque Revival 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 project 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, was 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 that city’s patchwork quilt of master plans do 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 landmarks. 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 district overlay ordinance and the residential district design guidelines, which apply only to locally designated landmarks 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 preservation ordinance, including the economic hardship process, are seen as convoluted and ineffectual. 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 preservation 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.

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



Final workshop.



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

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 is 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 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



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 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.

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 applicable property owner's participation with the historic preservation program.

6.0 ARCHITECTURAL DETAILS

Policy:
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 several roles in defining the character of a historic structure: they add visual interest, define certain building styles and types, and often show superior craftsmanship and architectural design. Features such as window hoods, brackets and columns addbe materials and finishes often associated with particular styles and therefore their preservation is important.

Treatment of Architectural Features

Preserving original architectural details is critical to the integrity of the building and its context. Where replacement is required, one should improve only those portions that are deteriorated beyond repair. 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 critical to the integrity of a building and its context.



Replaces such as window hoods, brackets and columns are often painted with particular style and therefore their preservation is important.

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. Preservation 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 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 advance 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 I.

The topics covered in this chapter include:

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

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 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 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 1: EXAMPLES OF PLANNING GEOGRAPHIES COVERED IN CITY PLANS

| Citywide | Planning Subarea | 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 AREA



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 subareas. 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 1 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 are intended to strategically 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 is 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 district. Plan updates should identify and address inconsistencies in both the future land use map and also the text, since 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 1: 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 be able 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 1: DEPARTMENT ACTIVITY OVERLAPS WITH HISTORIC DISTRICTS


| Historic District | Planning Communities | Other Geographies |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------|
| Local 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 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 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 points in the housing stock to meet a variety of needs, including those of families, the elderly, and singles. 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 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 the green 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 between preservation and transit can use 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: JOINT LEADERSHIP REPRESENTATION WITH RDA

Establish a joint membership requirement to ensure at least one member of the Commission sits on the RDA's Redevelopment Advisory Committee, and vice versa. This will create a venue for consistent coordination of decision-making for these two entities.

ACTION 3: 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



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.

tourism to the city, and opportunities for partnerships between Economic Development and Historic Preservation.

ACTION 4: COORDINATE WITH TRANSPORTATION PLANNING

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

ACTION 5: COORDINATE WITH CITY SUSTAINABILITY EFFORTS

Assign a preservation 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 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.

I. 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 station area planning 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 preservation 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 preservation 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.

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 Eard 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 other city economic development efforts 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 district overlay ordinance and the residential district design guidelines); and a dedicated preservation 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.

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 and makes basic notes on the architecture and apparent integrity of a property.



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.



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 preservation 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. Fold re-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 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
- Public Works Buildings TR



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

- 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.)

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)
- Westside Warehouse (1982)
- Gilmer Park (1996)

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>

- 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 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 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

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

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


The majority of sites listed individually on the Salt Lake 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.

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)




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.

- University (1991)

The following goals, policies, and actions establish a long-term 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 historic district boundaries as necessary to reflect current conditions.

ACTION 1: EVALUATE POSSIBLE 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 Districts for Resurvey

Field research as part of this planning effort identifies the following 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 box on the following page 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, with property owner consent.

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 FROM 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 district overlay ordinance and the residential district design guidelines, which apply only to locally designated landmarks 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 that highlights the date range and key characteristics of each. They also

6.0 ARCHITECTURAL DETAILS

Policy:
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 several roles in defining the character of a historic structure: they add visual interest, define certain building styles and types, and often showcase superior craftsmanship and architectural design. Features such as window hoods, brackets and columns exhibit materials and finishes often associated with particular styles and therefore their preservation is important.

Treatment of Architectural Features

Preserving original architectural details is critical to the integrity of the building, and its context. Where replacement is required, one should remove only those portions that are deteriorated beyond repair. 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 critical to the integrity of a building and its context.



Elements such as window hoods, brackets and columns are often associated with particular styles and therefore their preservation is important.

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

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 1: 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 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. A preliminary assessment of this issue indicates that the Central City and University Districts are two priority areas to be examined in this regard.

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



New house under construction.

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: ESTABLISH 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.



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.



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 preservation 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 that have already been identified by staff review:

- 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 Salt Lake City context.

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

ACTION 1: CREATE INTERIM PROTECTION MEASURES

Revise the ordinance to allow an option for the Historic Landmark Commission to designate a property of notable significance to the city and/or a contributing structure in a local historic district to provide the city with a grace period during which economically viable alternatives to demolition of the site can be explored. In the case of residential properties converting to non-residential uses, any interim protection measure should consider the provision already in place via the Housing Advisory and Appeals Board to ensure any new measures are compatible with existing rules and procedures.

ACTION 2: IDENTIFY AND ADDRESS DEFICIENCIES

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 and complete to appropriately 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 meet long-term housing needs.

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 program responsibilities. The first half of this chapter discusses the Historic Landmark Commission, and the staff is discussed in the following section on program administration.

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.

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 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 have reviewed an average of 250 applications each year. This relatively heavy caseload should

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.

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 were practicing professionals experienced in renovation work 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 how the regulations are understood and applied as Commissioners come and go.



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 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 capacity building, 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 (forum, 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 1: ESTABLISH ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW COMMITTEE

Revise the Historic District 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 subcommittee would meet on an as-needed basis, and applicants would be notified that the opinions of the subcommittee 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 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 preservation 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.) Preservation 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;
- Historic Landmark Commission meeting attendance and preparation;
- 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;
- Coordinate 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 within a local district wishing 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 time delays and confusion. This is in part due to a historic preservation 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, whereas 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 property application assistance and review responsibilities, 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 program review volume, education and outreach, and other plan implementation tasks.

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

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 preservation staff to meet expected work volume.

ACTION 1: TRACK TARGET STAFFING LEVELS

Use the workload tracking system to track committed hours of work for preservation 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 preservation ordinance and related programs.

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, is 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 expansions are conducted in accordance with agreed upon specifications and to identify unpermitted renovation activities. These may be specially trained housing and zoning officers or additional preservation 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 preservation 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 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 1: 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 1: 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 their daily procedures to ensure the technology is appropriately used to make the process more transparent, well-informed, and user-friendly.

ACTION 1: 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, 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 offers 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 help advocate and 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 on 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 preservation staff to conduct

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. Preservation 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 advocating 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 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.



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

direct 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 way information about the city's preservation program is shared. 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 their 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.

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 clearly express program requirements and benefits 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 facilitate property owners finding 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. If materials have been developed locally, the city, UHF, and SHPO should coordinate so that each has the product of the other so that materials can be distributed when needed and overlaps avoided.

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 State Historic Preservation Office and Utah Heritage Foundation to ensure a comprehensive program of education and outreach is offered in the city, 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 preservation 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 education, outreach, or awareness-raising 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 council, 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 outreach 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 1: 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 1: 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 landmarking decisions.

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

ACTION 1: 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 city history as a means of outreach and also to provide benefit to school programs.

ACTION 1: 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 for the city 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 preservation 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.

In aligning its current thinking and policy choices regarding sustainability, the city has developed the following thematic framework:

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 help 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. 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 may come from numerous countries around the world, meaning that significant energy is involved simply in bringing the materials to the site. It can take a new, earth-friendly, energy-efficient building 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

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 the city'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 organization'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>.

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 educate generally about 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 find out 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.

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 preservation 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 fields.



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

ACTION 2: UPDATE DESIGN GUIDELINES ON A REGULAR BASIS

On a regular basis, the preservation 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. Budget 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

Working with preservation partners, such as the UHF, 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 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 1: 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.



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

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 city attractions and the downtown. The next step should be to identify measures that could be taken to expand the geographical and resource 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 – 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 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 1: 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 preservation 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 1: 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 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 preservation 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.

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



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



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

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 public safety, water conservation, invasive species, and pest management needs of the community.

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 inform 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.

ACTION 3: CONDUCT TRAINING ON DESIGN GUIDELINES

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

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

ACTION 1: PRESERVE PARKS LISTED AND LANDMARK SITES

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.

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 preservation 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 sidewalk repairs.

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 inventories resources easy and convenient.

ACTION 2: DETERMINE APPROPRIATE PRESERVATION MEASURES FOR HISTORIC LANDSCAPE FEATURES

Eliminate or streamline negotiations on preservation of historic landmark 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 preservation 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 1: 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, preservation 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 work to 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.

ACTION 1: 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.



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 1: REPRESENT PRESERVATION PRIORITIES IN THE TRANSIT PLANNING PROCESS

Ensure consistent participation by preservation staff in the transit planning and policy-setting process. In particular, ensure that preservation staff (or 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, 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 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.



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.

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.

As an example of such policies, UHF has developed a proposed “safe harbor” policy for additions that would allow administrative approval of additions that are considered to have minor impact, based on defined criteria (e.g., the addition does not exceed the existing roof ridge height, the addition does not exceed a total length of 20 feet extending out from the original building footprint). 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.

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 community programs to assist elderly or handicap 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 it is found that there is need and support for such programs from elderly, handicap, or low-income residents. Programs will likely include public/private or public/non-profit partnerships, as well as direct collaboration with the Housing and Neighborhood Development Division. Develop standards designed to uphold the material requirements of the historic preservation 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 preservation 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 annual funding allocations made by the City Council to support different planning and preservation staff activities will directly impact the successful implementation of this plan.

REGULATORY IMPROVEMENTS

Regulatory improvements to the (H) Historic District ordinance, creation of new tools like conservation districts, and improvements and additional design guidelines for historic areas will be a critical component 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 in the city.

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 historic preservation staff of the Planning and Zoning Division of the city will work to coordinate with other departments, particularly the Economic Development, Housing, and Public Services departments, 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 preservation staff and other departments where mutual opportunities or overlaps exist.

EDUCATION AND OUTREACH

Education and outreach is 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:

Timing: The matrix expresses the relative priority of the action within the timing section of the matrix. These columns categorize each action by timing for implementation – ongoing, within the first year after the plan is adopted, in the 1-3 year timeframe, and 3-5 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 | 1-3 yrs | 3-5 yrs | |
| Theme 1: Foster a Unified City Commitment to Preservation | | | | | | |
| 1.1a.1 | Master Plan Assessment | ✓ | | | | City Staff |
| 1.1a.2 | Develop Preservation Issues List for Community Master Plans | | ✓ | | | HLC, City 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.1 | City Coordination Committee | | ✓ | | | City Staff |
| 1.2b.2 | Joint Leadership Representation with RDA | ✓ | | | | HLC, RDA |
| 1.2b.3 | Coordinate with Economic Development | ✓ | | | | City Staff |
| 1.2b.4 | Coordinate with Transportation Planning | ✓ | | | | City Staff |
| 1.2b.5 | Coordinate with City Sustainability Efforts | ✓ | | | | City Staff |
| 1.2c.1 | Annual Action Plan for Implementation | ✓ | | | | HLC, City Staff |
| 1.2c.2 | Periodic Implementation Progress Reports | ✓ | | | | City Staff |
| 1.3a.1 | Outreach to City Leaders and Other Departments | | ✓ | | | HLC, City Staff |
| 1.3a.2 | Weave Education into all Preservation Planning Functions | | | ✓ | | City Staff |
| 1.3b.1 | Assign Staff Planning Teams to the Community | | ✓ | | | City Staff |
| 1.3b.2 | Develop Property Acquisition Process | | | ✓ | | City Officials, City Staff |
| 1.3b.3 | Planning for City-Owned Properties | | | ✓ | | City Officials, City Staff |
| 1.3c.1 | Study Economic Benefits of Historic Preservation | | | | ✓ | City Officials, City Staff |
| 1.3c.2 | Understand Mutual Interests | ✓ | | | | City Officials, HLC, RDA, City Staff |
| Theme 2: Develop a Comprehensive Preservation Toolbox | | | | | | |
| 2.1a.1 | Establish Survey Criteria | | ✓ | | | City Staff, HLC |
| 2.1a.2 | Identify Areas Where New Surveys Are Needed | ✓ | | | | HLC, City Staff |
| 2.1b.1 | Establish Age Threshold for Existing Surveys | | | ✓ | | HLC, City Staff |
| 2.1b.2 | Identify Areas Where Resurveys Are Needed | | ✓ | | | HLC, City Staff |
| 2.1c.1 | Identify Short- and Long-Term Survey Funding Priorities | | | ✓ | | HLC, City Staff |
| 2.2a.1 | Establish A Consistent Format for New Surveys | | | ✓ | | HLC, City Staff, SHPO |
| 2.2b.1 | Support Archive Development | ✓ | | | | HLC, City Staff, SHPO |
| 2.2b.2 | Promote Electronic Archive Use | ✓ | | | | HLC, City Staff, SHPO, UHF |
| 2.3a.1 | Track Development Activity Near District Boundaries | ✓ | | | | City Staff |
| 2.3b.1 | Evaluate Possible District Boundary Changes | | | ✓ | | HLC, City Staff |
| 2.3b.2 | Refine Local District Boundaries | | | ✓ | | City Officials, HLC, City Staff |
| 2.4a.1 | Identify National Districts Appropriate for Local Listing | | | ✓ | | HLC, City Staff, SHPO |
| 2.4a.2 | Identify Other Candidate Areas for Local Designation | | | ✓ | | HLC, City Staff, SHPO |
| 2.4a.3 | Prepare Local District and Multiple-Property Nominations | | | ✓ | | HLC, City Staff, SHPO |

| Action Ref # | Implementation Action | Timing | | | | Responsible Parties |
|--|---|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------------------------------|
| | | Ongoing | 0-12 mo | 1-3 yrs | 3-5 yrs | |
| 2.5a.1 | Identify Landmark Site Candidates | ✓ | | | | HLC, City Staff, SHPO, UHF |
| 2.5a.2 | Nominate Additional Landmark Sites | | | | ✓ | City Officials, HLC, City Staff |
| 2.5a.3 | Evaluate Designation Status of Existing Landmark Sites | | | ✓ | | City Staff, HLC |
| 2.5b.1 | Pursue Local Listing of City Properties | | ✓ | | | City Staff, HLC |
| 2.5b.2 | Update City Property Acquisition Process | | ✓ | | | City Officials, HLC, City Staff |
| 2.6a.1 | Encourage National Register Nominations for Properties Identified Through Survey Work | ✓ | | | | City Staff, SHPO, UHF |
| 2.7a.1 | Assess Underlying Zoning | | ✓ | | | City Staff |
| 2.7a.2 | Pursue Zoning Map Amendments | | ✓ | | | City Officials, HLC, City Staff |
| 2.7b.1 | Assess Building Code Barriers and Conflicts | | ✓ | | | City Staff |
| 2.7b.2 | Develop Smart Code for Adaptive Reuse | | | ✓ | | City Staff, City Officials |
| 2.8a.1 | Establish a Conservation Overlay District | | | ✓ | | City Officials, HLC, City Staff |
| 2.8a.2 | Develop TDR Programs | | | | ✓ | City Officials, HLC, City Staff |
| 2.8a.3 | Explore Other Tools and Incentives | ✓ | | | | City Officials, HLC, City Staff |
| 2.8b.1 | Educate About Existing Incentives | ✓ | | | | City Staff, SHPO, UHF |
| 2.8b.2 | Improve Preservation Program Incentives to Property Owners | ✓ | | | | City Staff, RDA |
| 2.9a.1 | Make Targeted Ordinance Revisions | | ✓ | | | City Officials, HLC, City Staff |
| 2.9a.2 | Examine Best Practices and Lessons Learned | ✓ | | | | City Staff |
| 2.9b.1 | Create Interim Protection Measures | | ✓ | | | City Officials, HLC, City Staff |
| 2.9b.2 | Identify and Address Deficiencies | | ✓ | | | City Staff |
| 2.10a.1 | Update and Clarify New Construction Requirements | | ✓ | | | City Officials, HLC, City Staff |
| 2.10a.2 | Align Design Guidelines | ✓ | | | | City Officials, HLC, City Staff |
| 2.10b.1 | Encourage the Retention of Historic Signs | ✓ | | | | City Officials, HLC, City Staff |
| 2.10c.1 | Develop Design Guidelines for New Signs | | | ✓ | | City Officials, HLC, City Staff |
| 2.10d.1 | Create Multi-Family Design Guidelines | | | ✓ | | City Officials, HLC, City Staff |
| 2.10e.1 | Develop Non-Residential Design Guidelines | | | ✓ | | City Officials, HLC, City Staff |
| Theme 3: Administer a Convenient and Consistent Historic Preservation Program | | | | | | |
| 3.1a.1 | Annual Commissioner Retreats | ✓ | | | | City Officials, HLC, City Staff |
| 3.1a.2 | Facilitate Additional Training | ✓ | | | | City Officials, HLC, City Staff |
| 3.1a.3 | New HLC Member Training Materials | | ✓ | | | City Staff |
| 3.1a.4 | HLC Mentoring Program | ✓ | | | | HLC, City Staff |
| 3.1b.1 | Revise Ordinance Description of HLC Role | | ✓ | | | City Officials, HLC, City Staff |
| 3.1c.1 | Establish Architectural Review Committee | | ✓ | | | City Officials, HLC |
| 3.2a.1 | Develop a Staff Workload Tracking System | ✓ | | | | City Staff |
| 3.2b.1 | Track Target Staffing Levels | ✓ | | | | City Staff |
| 3.2b.2 | Maintain Adequate Staffing Levels | ✓ | | | | City Officials, City Staff |
| 3.2b.3 | Provide Education for Staff | ✓ | | | | City Officials, City Staff |
| 3.3a.1 | Create User Handbook for Historic Preservation Projects | | | ✓ | | City Staff |
| 3.4a.1 | Create New Preservation Enforcement Position | | | | ✓ | City Officials, City Staff |
| 3.4a.2 | Develop System for New Construction Project | | | ✓ | | City Staff |

| Action Ref # | Implementation Action | Timing | | | | Responsible Parties |
|--|---|---------|---------|---------|---------|--|
| | | Ongoing | 0-12 mo | 1-3 yrs | 3-5 yrs | |
| | Review | | | | | |
| 3.5a.1 | Add GIS Capacity | | | ✓ | | City Officials, City Staff |
| 3.5b.1 | GIS Education and Outreach | | | | ✓ | City Staff |
| 3.5c.1 | Track Properties by Parcel | ✓ | | | ✓ | City Staff, SHPO |
| Theme 4: Improve Education and Outreach | | | | | | |
| 4.1a.1 | Annual Property Owner Newsletter | ✓ | | | | City Staff, Community Councils |
| 4.1a.2 | Convey Historic Status as Part of the Sale Process | | | | ✓ | City Officials, City Staff, SHPO |
| 4.1a.3 | Lobby for State Requirements for Historic Designation on Property Titles | | | | ✓ | SHPO, UHF |
| 4.1b.1 | Develop Property Maintenance Handouts | | | ✓ | | City Staff, SHPO, UHF |
| 4.2a.1 | Periodic Education and Outreach Materials with Preservation Partners | ✓ | | | | City Staff, SHPO, UHF |
| 4.2b.1 | Create Education and Outreach Guide | | | ✓ | | City Staff, SHPO, UHF |
| 4.2c.1 | Expand Website Content | | ✓ | | | City Staff |
| 4.2c.2 | Gather Relevant "Best Practice" Highlights | ✓ | | | | City Staff |
| 4.2d.1 | Highlight Community Best Practices | ✓ | | | | City Staff |
| 4.2e.1 | Project Financing Workshops | ✓ | | | | City Staff, SHPO |
| 4.3a.1 | Reinstate Awards Program | | ✓ | | | City Officials, HLC, City Staff |
| 4.3b.1 | Pursue Broader Recognition of Salt Lake City Preservation Activities | ✓ | | | | City Officials, HLC, City Staff |
| 4.3c.1 | Increase the Number of Historic Signs and Markers | | | ✓ | | City Staff |
| 4.3e.1 | Attend Community Events and Fairs | ✓ | | | | City Staff |
| 4.3e.1 | Work with School District Officials to Integrate City History into School Curricula | | | ✓ | | City Staff, School District Administrators |
| 4.4a.1 | Create a Financing and Incentives Brochure | | | ✓ | | City Staff, SHPO |
| 4.4a.2 | Offer Periodic Tax-Credit Workshops | ✓ | | | | City Staff, SHPO |
| 4.4b.1 | Help Expand UHF Loan Pool | ✓ | | | | City Officials, HLC, City Staff, UHF |
| 4.4c.1 | Promote Preservation Easements | ✓ | | | | City Staff, SHPO, UHF |
| 4.4d.1 | Modify Review Procedures | | ✓ | | | City Officials, HLC, City Staff |
| Theme 5: Support a Sustainable City | | | | | | |
| 5.1a.1 | Preservation/Sustainability Education Series | | | ✓ | | City Staff |
| 5.1b.1 | Create Educational Materials for Owners of Historic Properties | | | | ✓ | City Staff |
| 5.2a.1 | Research New Green Building Materials, Technologies, and Practices | ✓ | | | | City Staff |
| 5.2a.2 | Update Design Guideline on a Regular Basis | ✓ | | | | HLC, City Staff |
| 5.2a.3 | Appoint A Staff Green Building Liaison | | ✓ | | | City Staff |
| 5.2a.4 | Support Contractor Workshops | | | | ✓ | City Staff, SHPO, UHF |
| 5.2b.1 | Enable Broader Use of Solar Collectors | | ✓ | | | City Officials, City Staff |
| 5.2c.1 | Support Architectural Salvage Programs | | | | ✓ | City Officials, Chamber of Commerce, RDA |

| Action Ref # | Implementation Action | Timing | | | | Responsible Parties |
|--------------|---|---------|---------|---------|---------|---|
| | | Ongoing | 0-12 mo | 1-3 yrs | 3-5 yrs | |
| 5.3a.1 | Develop Heritage Tourism Strategy | | | | ✓ | Chamber of Commerce, Salt Lake City Visitor Bureau, Utah Tourism Council, City Staff, UHF, SHPO |
| 5.3b.1 | Pursue Grants to Support Heritage Tourism | | | ✓ | | City Staff |
| 5.4a.1 | Develop Pioneer Communities Program | | | | ✓ | Chamber of Commerce, City Staff, UHF, SHPO |
| 5.5a.1 | Survey the City's Historic Landscapes | | | ✓ | | City Staff, SHPO |
| 5.5a.2 | Create Historic Landscape Design Guidelines | | | | ✓ | City Officials, HLC, City Staff |
| 5.5a.3 | Conduct Training on Design Guidelines | | | | ✓ | City Staff |
| 5.5b.1 | Preserve Parks Listed and Landmark Sites | | ✓ | | | City Staff |
| 5.5b.2 | Identify and Pursue Listing For Additional Historic Parks and Historic Landscapes | | | | ✓ | City Staff, SHPO |
| 5.5b.3 | Develop Informational Packet for All Historic Parks in the City | | | ✓ | | City Staff, UHF |
| 5.5c.1 | Inventory Historic Details to Be Preserved | | | ✓ | | City Staff |
| 5.5c.2 | Determine Appropriate Preservation Measures for Historic Landscape Features | | | | ✓ | HLC, City Staff |
| 5.5c.3 | Public Services Department Coordination | ✓ | | | | HLC, City Staff |
| 5.5d.1 | Develop Educational Materials for the Owners of Private Historic Landscapes | | | | ✓ | City Staff |
| 5.6a.1 | Develop Historic Design Guidelines that Enhance the Pedestrian Environment | | | | ✓ | City Officials, HLC, City Staff |
| 5.6a.2 | Represent Preservation Priorities in the Transit Planning Process | ✓ | | | | City Officials, City Staff |
| 5.7a.1 | Ensure Compatible Zoning | | ✓ | | | City Officials, City Staff |
| 5.7b.1 | Identify and Remove Obstacles and Incentives for Demolition | | ✓ | | | City Officials, HLC, RDA, City Staff |
| 5.7b.2 | Educate Staff on Code Changes and Available Assistance | | | ✓ | | City Staff |
| 5.7c.1 | Support Appropriate Residential Additions | | ✓ | | | City Officials, HLC, City Staff |
| 5.7d.1 | Allow Accessory Dwelling Units in Historic Districts | | ✓ | | | City Officials, HLC, City Staff |
| 5.7e.1 | Affordable Housing Best Practice | | | ✓ | | City Staff |
| 5.7e.2 | Program Development | | | ✓ | | City Staff |
| 5.8a.1 | Create Targeted Maintenance Assistance Programs | | | ✓ | | City Staff |
| 5.8a.2 | Coordinate Outreach to Property Owners | ✓ | | | | City Staff |
| 5.8a.3 | Pursue and Create Funding Support | ✓ | | | | 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 | | | | |
| 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 | Stable | | | |
| National Districts | | | | |
| The Avenues Extension | Stable | | | |
| City Creek Canyon | Stable | | | |
| Westside Warehouse | Stable | | | |
| Gilmer Park | Stable | ✓ | Consider local district nomination | Moderate |
| Bennion-Douglas | Stable | | | |
| 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 | |

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 District | ✓ | | Moderate |
| Gentile Core | ✓ | Inventory for structures; thematic nomination candidate | Low |
| 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 | | | Low |
| Rose Park Neighborhood | ✓ | Reconnaissance level only | Low |

| Area | Survey Recommended? | Explanation | Priority Level |
|---------------------------------|---------------------|---|----------------|
| 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 landmarking 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 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 Avenue 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 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 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.

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 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 Pl. 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 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 individually landmarked. 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.

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 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.

UNIVERSITY

The University 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 modern high-rise apartment buildings of no particular note other than that they are out of character with the rest of the district. 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 District exhibits a good level of integrity and is in no need of changes other than ongoing protection.

NATIONAL DISTRICTS

THE AVENUES EXTENSION

The Avenues Extension was established in 1980 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 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 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.

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 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

No changes or recommendations are made regarding the district. 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 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.



Gilmer Park

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 District is essentially an eastward extension of the Central City 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.

BRYANT

The Bryant District is, like Bennion-Douglas, an eastward extension of the Central City 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 occurs. 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 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 quickly becoming so diminished by the loss of historic buildings that it may soon no longer merit its historic district status. The area might be a candidate for a conservation district.

HIGHLAND PARK

The Highland Park District was established in 1998 when it was listed in the Salt Lake City 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 only question raised is why the district did not 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 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 landmarked in the near future.

NORTHWEST

The Northwest 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 highway, 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 N. 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 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 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. Rather than local historic district designation, a conservation district designation may be the most effective tool in an area like this to define parameters for appropriate infill development.

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 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.



Yalecrest

RECOMMENDATION

While the Yalecrest 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. 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 EXTENSION DISTRICT

This residential neighborhood extends about five blocks north of the Avenues 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 Extension District. 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 (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 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 buildings 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 landmark downtown buildings 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 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 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 landmarked. 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

This neighborhood appears to be a good candidate for a survey project. Its historic building stock is largely intact, with modern intrusions that are most significant in its northwest industrial corner. Any survey completed there should also consider including the several blocks to the west that are located between 500 East and 700 East to determine if they are related to the neighborhood and its development. It appears that the neighborhood might be eligible for historic district status, but this needs to be determined through the completion of a survey.

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 landmarked. 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 N. Temple Street to Interstate 80, and from Interstate 15 to 1000 West. An active rail corridor that runs along S. 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 lightrail 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 landmarks 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 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 landmarked 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 District, these involve perimeters (and interior areas) that have experienced attrition of historic resources. Others, such as the Northwest District, include numerous non-historic resources such as commercial and industrial-warehouse buildings that should not be part of the district. The Central City 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 district 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 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.

| 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 |
| Government Funding | | | | |
| Pioneer Communities Program | Governor's Office of Economic Development | Cities and towns. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Building rehabilitation; Streetscape and public improvement planning and design; Marketing and promotion planning and implementation; Business development planning and implementation; and Organizational development. | State |

| Name | Offered By | Available To | Description | Scale |
|--|---|---|--|---|
| Community Development Block Grants (CDBG) | Federal Government | Eligible communities across the US. ² 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 |
| 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. | State |
| Certified Local | Utah State | CLG cities, towns, and | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conducting architectural and | State |

² 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 |
|-------------------------|---------------------------|--------------|--|-------|
| Government (CLG) Grants | Historical Society (SHPO) | counties. | archaeological surveys <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. | |

| Name | Offered By | Available To | Description | Scale |
|---|--|--|---|----------------------------------|
| 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 |