



Communication to Historic Landmark Commission

Planning Division

To: Historic Landmark Commission Members

From: Patricia Comarell, Assistant Planning Director

Date: January 6, 2010

Re: Criteria for Prioritizing Historic District Designation

At the November worksession which discussed designating historic districts, the chart prepared by Anne Oliver was distributed as a means by which to prioritize designation of districts. It was felt at the time, that the Commission did not have enough information evaluate the listed criteria, e.g., SLC Zoning criteria: Percentage of resources with significance. The staff was asked to fill in the blanks where possible.

There are two charts provided on the following pages. The **first chart** amends Commissioner Oliver's chart to include data on each district under each topic. The data was taken from National Register forms available for most areas. For those which are not on the National Register, we are asking for additional information from the consultants. Some spaces are blank as they necessitate the HLC making value judgments.

The **second chart** is Commissioner Oliver's original, which suggests ranking each criteria by district using a 1-5 priority system. The intent is for the HLC to discuss these criteria further to determine what area to pursue designation.

Other background information is attached:

- Staff Report from November which includes:
 - Criteria for Local Historic Designation in the Salt Lake City Ordinance
 - Preservation Plan Policies
 - Area analyses (taken from the Preservation Plan)
 - Summary of the Reconnaissance Level and Intensive Level Surveys by area
 - Dates of the Reconnaissance Level Surveys on file at the State Historic Preservation Office
- A map of the National and Local Register Districts
- A map of the Avenues COAs for last year
- A map of the Yalecrest Neighborhood building permits

PROPOSED CRITERIA FOR PRIORITIZING LOCAL HISTORIC DISTRICTS

<i>How does the proposed district meet the following criteria? Scale = 1 (low) to 5 (high)</i>	<i>Bryant</i>	<i>Gilmer</i>	<i>Federal Heights</i>	<i>Wells</i>	<i>University Extension</i>	<i>Yalecrest</i>
SLC Zoning criteria: Percentage of resources with significance	73.5%	88.1%		68.0%	Awaiting info from consultant	91%
SLC Zoning criteria: Percentage of resources with integrity						
SLC Zoning criteria: Percentage of resources meeting age requirement (Period of Significance)	1870-1946	1909-1943		1871-1957	Awaiting info from consultant	1910-1957
Concentration of new types of resources not yet protected in SLC						
Readiness for designation (listed on NRHP; RLS and ILS surveys complete?)	Nat'l Reg	Nat'l Reg		Nom. to Nat'l Reg pending	Nat'l Reg	Nat'l Reg
Age of surveys done	RLS 1994	2006-07	RLS in 1988	RLS 2007 ILS 2009	ILS 2009	RLS 2005
Level of endangerment through demolition, inappropriate alterations/additions or infill						
Degree of public support						

PROPOSED CRITERIA FOR PRIORITIZING LOCAL HISTORIC DISTRICTS

<i>How does the proposed district meet the following criteria? Scale = 1 (low) to 5 (high)</i>	<i>Bryant</i>	<i>Gilmer</i>	<i>Federal Heights</i>	<i>Wells</i>	<i>University Extension</i>	<i>Yalecrest</i>
SLC Zoning criteria: Percentage of resources with significance						
SLC Zoning criteria: Percentage of resources with integrity						
SLC Zoning criteria: Percentage of resources meeting age requirement (Period of Significance)						
Concentration of new types of resources not yet protected in SLC						
Readiness for designation (listed on NRHP; RLS and ILS surveys complete?)						
Age of survey done						
Level of endangerment through demolition, inappropriate alterations/additions or infill						
Degree of public support						
<i>Subtotal</i>						
<i>Total</i>						



Communication to Historic Landmark Commission

Planning Division

To: Historic Landmark Commission Members

From: Patricia Comarell, Assistant Planning Director

Date: November 2, 2009 *(Previously provided to the HLC)*

Re: Criteria for Prioritizing Historic District Designation

As you are aware, the Mayor and Council added a preservation planner position in FY 2010 budget. This position is presently being advertised and selection of the planner will be done sometime in November.

The Planning Division Managers requested the Mayor and Council prioritize what they wanted this position to address. The managers also emphasized their concern that often when a planner is added, the expectation is that that person can do more than one person can do and the danger of raising expectations too high.

In several meetings in August and September this was discussed. HLC discussed their own priorities in their August and September meeting, which resulted in the attached letter which was sent to the City Council.

It was clear to staff in these meetings, that eventually the Council is going to ask staff, and in turn we are asking HLC, by what criteria does the City determine the priority of district designation? In discussing this with the HLC chair and vice chair, staff suggested that the Commission discuss this at the dinner meeting on November 4th. To assist you in your deliberations, staff has provided excerpts from the preservation plan and recommendations from surveys which have been conducted.

So far, the following districts have been mentioned either by City Council or HLC members:

- Yalecrest (Council and HLC)
- Gilmer (Council)
- Federal Heights (Council)
- Bryant (HLC)
- University Extension (HLC)
- Liberty Wells (HLC)

Criteria for Local Historic Designation in Salt Lake City

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

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

Preservation Plan Policies

Criteria

The Preservation Plan does not provide criteria for priority for designation, but did for surveys. Some seem relative to designation as well:

- Concentration of potential resources
- New types of resources not yet protected
- Possible endangerment of the resource/area (including encroachment from enw development);
- Presence of public support

Another criteria suggested by Planning Staff is the amount of work it would take to get the district ready for designation.

Area Analysis

The Preservation Plan also did an analysis of potential districts (pages 99-118). Below are the recommendation from this section of town as they relate to the districts that have been under discussion by the Council and HLC:

- **Yalecrest**

While the Yalecrest Historic District generally continues to exhibit a good level of physical integrity relative to many other neighborhoods in the City, numerous comments received during this planning process expressed concern about teardowns and inappropriate infill. The Yalecrest neighborhood residents are committed to adopting strong local controls to prevent demolitions of historic resources and to ensure that additions and alterations are sensitive to the local historic character. Active discussions are underway at the time of this planning process to determine the most effective tool.

(**Staff Note:** The Yalecrest Neighborhood Reconnaissance Level Survey in 2005)

- **Gilmer**

The district has experienced some teardowns that have led to significant community discussion. This neighborhood might be a candidate for local district status. The **2008 survey** for this area recommended additional survey for approximately 50 properties; establishment of a local historic district; an update of the national nomination to expand the period of significance; and a verification of eligibility status for tax credit purposes.

- **Federal Heights**

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

(**Staff Note:** A Reconnaissance Level Survey was conducted in 1988. The standards have changed somewhat since then and there may have been changes to the structures themselves. This survey needs to be updated, but could be done in-house with the new preservation planner position.)

- **Bryant**

While much remains intact, the district is becoming diminished by the loss of historic buildings. The area might be a candidate for a conservation district (p. 107)

Priority Local District for Resurvey. Field research as part of this planning effort identifies the following local districts as priority sites for resurvey and boundary evaluation work (p. 42)

- **University Extension**

[**Staff Note:** Although the plan does do a short analysis of the existing University District, it does not reference this extension (which was surveyed in 2008)]

- **Liberty Wells**

While the neighborhood merits the completion of a survey, it is not apparent whether it is worthy of district designation. A survey will determine whether it is district eligible, and on what level, or if individual buildings might be designated as Landmark Sites. Essentially, the district contains the same type and quality of building stock as that found in the surrounding neighborhoods and districts. A **2007 reconnaissance-level survey** in this area also recommended that an intensive-level survey be undertaken for all “A” and “B” properties, and this survey is now underway. [**Staff note:** Intensive Level Survey (ILS) were completed for this area in **2009**. A national register nomination is being prepared by the consultant.]

Summary of RLS Survey Recommendations, 2003-2009

RLS=Reconnaissance Level Survey, ILS=Intensive Level Survey

Avenues, Broschinsky, 2008

- Complete the RLS work for NRHP resources above current landmark boundary (north)
- Conduct a standard RLS for the resources currently marked in the SHPO database as a proposed “Avenues District Extension” (between NRHP north boundary and Ninth Avenue to Thirteenth Avenue, depending on street)
- Conduct Intensive Level Surveys (ILS) of selected/representative resources built between 1930 and 1965 to determine significance and most appropriate cut-off date for newly evaluated contributing resources from RLS surveys
- Amended NRHP nomination for the Avenues Historic District

Capitol Hill RLS, 2006

- Survey and expand district boundaries to include the Kimball and DeSoto-Cortez neighborhoods
- ILS survey of Capitol Hill
- Implement action items within the Capitol Hill Community Master Plan

East Liberty Neighborhood, 2003

- ILS for all A rated properties not already studied
- NR for entire district
- Landmark for entire district
- Create public awareness and education programs: historic home tours, historic walking tours, publicize potential for tax credits, media exposure about designation

Gilmer Park, ILS and Design Guidelines, Blaes, Broschinsky and Lufkin, 2008

- Additional survey for approximately 50 properties
- Establish a local historic district
- Pay careful attention to compatible zoning ordinances
- Updated the NRHP nomination to expand the period of significance
- Verify eligibility status for tax credit purposes

Liberty Wells RLS, SWCA, 2007 - 2009

- ILS survey for all A and B rated properties (this project has begun)
- National Register nominations for individual properties and those found to be eligible during the ILS
- Propose listing of the entire area in the NR through a series of thematic nominations.

South Temple RLS, Lufkin, 2006

- Amend the NR nomination to change the period of significance to include the importance of modern construction in the area
- Amend the NR nomination to update the boundaries which presently run through the middle of buildings and properties, cut out four Haxton Place properties and overlap with adjacent districts
- ILS for all properties not already studied

Sugar House Business District, RLS, Blaes, Broschinsky and Lufkin, 2007

- ILS for all properties not already studied
- Establish a conservation district overlay zone which would share boundaries with the proposed Sugar House Business District
- Expand on the "Business District Design Guidelines Handbook" found in the Sugar House Master Plan using the survey information

University Expansion, ILS, Broschinsky, 2009

- Update the Reconnaissance Level Survey (SHPO Database) and NRHP Status
- Establish a local historic district

Yalecrest, National Register and ILS, Lufkin, 2007

- Establish a local historic district

Salt Lake City Reconnaissance Level Surveys on file at State Historic Preservation Office

(Many of these surveys were used to establish National Register Districts. The standards have changed over the years)

- 1300 East – UDOT 2006
- Avenues Historic District 2008 (1st-6th and Aves A – Virginia)
- Capitol Hill 2006
- Central City 1994
- City Creek/South Temple 2008 – Partial Survey
- East Liberty 2003 (9th S – 13th S & 7th E – 13th/11th E)
- Eastside 2000
- Salt Lake East Area 1986 (Michigan, Yale, Normandie Heights, Upper Yale, Allen Park, Westmorland Place, Westminster Ave.)
- SL East Central 1995
- Federal Heights 1988
- Highland Park 1995
- Liberty Wells 2007 & 2009
- South Temple 2000
- Sugar House 2000
- Sugar House 2004
- Sugar House Business District 2007
- Salt Lake West Side 1991
- Yalecrest 2005
- Southwestern Area 2005
- UTA Trax West 2005
- University Extension 2009