

Attachment B

Minutes of the Historic Landmark Commission Meeting – 3/17/10

**SALT LAKE CITY
HISTORIC LANDMARK COMMISSION
Minutes of the Meeting
Room 315, 451 South State Street
March 17, 2010**

This document along with the digital recording constitute the official minutes of the Historic Landmark Commission regular session meeting held on March 17, 2010.

To download the FTR player and listen to audio excerpts from the record, click [here](#).

A regular meeting of the Historic Landmark Commission was held on March 17, 2010 at [5:54:10 PM](#) in Room 315 of the City and County Building, located at 451 South State Street, Salt Lake City, Utah, 84111. Commissioners present for the meeting included: Earle Bevins III, Bill Davis, Arla Funk, Sheleigh Harding, Polly Hart, Creed Haymond, Warren Lloyd, Chairperson; Anne Oliver, Vice Chairperson and Dave Richards. Commissioner Thomas Carter was excused from the meeting.

Planning staff present for the meeting were: Pat Comarell, Assistant Planning Director, Angela Hasenberg, Historic Landmark Commission Secretary, Carl Leith, Senior Planner, Janice Lew, Senior Planner, Paul Nielson, City Attorney and Joel Paterson, Planning Manager.

A field trip was held prior to the meeting at 4:00 p.m. The field trip was attended by Commissioners Bevins, Funk, Harding, Hart, Haymond and Chairperson Lloyd. A quorum was present. Field trip notes are included with the record of the minutes in the Planning Division Office.

DINNER AND WORK SESSION

There was no discussion of Commission matters during dinner.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM JANUARY 6, 2010

There were no minutes available to approve.

REPORT OF THE CHAIR AND VICE CHAIR [5:55:48 PM](#)

Chairperson Lloyd noted that he had nothing to report and gave the floor over to the Vice Chairperson to present background information regarding the evening's discussion of local historic districts.

Vice Chairperson Oliver stated that the Mayor and City Council both had a deeply rooted commitment to historic preservation. She noted that both entities had funded the creation of a City-wide Historic Preservation Plan which was in the final stages of being adopted. Vice Chairperson Oliver noted that the Citywide Preservation Plan had come with a great number of recommendations, one being the designation of several new local historic districts to protect valued City neighborhoods.

Vice Chairperson Oliver noted that the Landmark Commission had looked at several neighborhoods throughout the City and had prioritized them based upon the numerous factors which might affect the successful creation and management of new districts. She stated that there were several factors that might make it more pressing to designate one district before another, such as the physical threat of demolition as well as the architectural integrity and the presence of resources not yet protected at the local level.

Chairperson Lloyd indicated the second document left at the front door had been provided for citizens to give feedback to the Commission regarding their concerns about these proposed designations. He noted that there were eight neighborhoods in the City which had requested information or actions regarding local historic designation. He noted that the Commission would address these neighborhoods alphabetically with the exception of the Bryant neighborhood, as it was adjacent to the University Extension area and the Commission felt it made more sense to deal with the two areas as one.

Commissioner Funk noted that the Commission should open the floor to comments not pertaining to the discussion regarding local district designations.

COMMENTS TO THE COMMISSION [6:04:11 PM](#)

Chairperson Lloyd noted that there was no one present to speak to another item. He therefore closed the item and moved on to the public discussion.

PUBLIC DISCUSSION [6:04:34 PM](#)

The Salt Lake City Historic Landmark Commission will accept public input and consider an advisory vote regarding designation of a historic district and/or conservation district to the Planning Commission and City Council.
(Staff contact: Pat Comarell, (801) 535-7660 or email pat.comarell@slcgov.com.)

1. Federal Heights Neighborhood

Gene Fitzgerald, representing the Federal Heights Neighborhood Association, noted that the Federal Heights Neighborhood was situated between Virginia Street and the University of Utah, the Foothills to the East and 100 South/Federal Heights Drive to the North and consisted of approximately 500 homes. Mr. Fitzgerald stated that through their meetings and newsletter, there had been no consensus from the neighborhood regarding local designation. He noted that there had been positive and negative comments regarding the issue and they were having a meeting on April 1, 2010 to discuss the issue further. He noted that they would request more information from the City regarding what it would mean to be designated as a local historic district.

Commissioner Funk inquired if the Neighborhood Association would prefer a staff or Commission member present to discuss parameters for local historic district designation.

Mr. Fitzgerald noted that was an excellent idea.

Commissioner Funk inquired if Kirk Huffaker with the Utah Heritage Foundation would be available to attend that meeting.

Mr. Huffaker noted he would give Mr. Fitzgerald his contact information.

Chairperson Lloyd noted that the City did have a Preservation in Brief document outlining local historic preservation processes and benefits and that there were two City planners dedicated to preservation issues that might also be able to attend.

2. Forest Dale Neighborhood [6:11:19 PM](#)

Chairperson Lloyd noted that there was no one present to speak as a representative from the Forest Dale Neighborhood.

3. Gilmer Park Neighborhood [6:11:32 PM](#)

Susan Webster, longtime resident, noted that she was involved with the Gilmer Park Neighborhood Association and that the Association had established a mission for the neighborhood a couple of years ago. She stated that this mission included developing a stronger sense of community and to preserve the history of their area. She noted that there were approximately 244 homes in the neighborhood and that they were bordered by 900 South and Harvard Avenue and 1100 East and 1300 East. She noted that a matter of recent concern for the neighborhood had been the teardown and oversized rebuild of a home located at 1215 Yale Avenue.

Ms. Webster gave a projector photo presentation of homes in the area, reviewing several architectural styles present within the Gilmer Park Neighborhood.

Ms. Webster stated that they had not surveyed the neighbors regarding their opinion, but would like to understand more about the process in order to make the most conscientious decision for the neighborhood.

Vice Chairperson Oliver inquired if Ms. Webster felt the neighborhood was under development pressure.

Ms. Webster noted that in the past seven years there had been three teardowns she was aware of. She stated that she did not see any imminent danger, however, imagined more teardowns were possible.

Vice Chairperson Oliver inquired if Ms. Webster felt the Gilmer Park Neighborhood required more education on the issue of preservation tools.

Ms. Webster noted that she felt it absolutely was necessary.

Chairperson Lloyd noted that the most current survey for the neighborhood was a reconnaissance level survey from 2006-2007. He inquired if there had been discussion at the time about local historic district designation.

Ms. Webster noted that the survey information had not been evaluated as they felt they had been looking for tools to prevent demolition but not for local historic district designation.

Commissioner Funk noted that she felt staff would be happy to meet with the Gilmer Park Neighborhood Association and provide more information regarding preservation resources.

4. University Extension [6:26:06 PM](#)

Esther Hunter, Vice Chairperson of the East Central Community Council and Land Use Chair, noted that she was excited to be present at a time when additional preservation for their neighborhood might be put in place. She noted that there already was an existing University Historic District, however, an effort had been underway for nineteen years to accomplish expansion of the current University District boundaries. Ms. Hunter noted that in 1991, many dedicated people worked to establish the University District and that the Planning Commission at the time had also requested that staff work to include five additional blocks west to 1000 East in the District. She noted that the request had grown to include seven additional blocks, nine blocks in total, due to the additional survey work which had been done. Ms. Hunter noted that there had been great development pressure in the outlying areas of both the University and Central City Districts and that reconnaissance surveys indicated the area had been part of Brigham Young's Plat of Zion.

Ms. Hunter noted that it was part of the history of the University of Utah as well, intricately linked to the growth of that institution. She stated that the area met criteria for resident history as there was a history of prominent residents who contributed to the growth and development of Salt Lake City within the neighborhood. She stated that their analysis also clearly denoted the varying range of architectural styles and significant structures representing three distinct periods of growth present in the area. Ms. Hunter noted that there had been a reconnaissance level survey in 1995 as well as an intensive level survey in 1998 which recognized 35 significant buildings including Barber Place. She stated that this was an extension which would not require the creation of new criteria.

Ms. Hunter stated that the area had definitely been under attack through demolition, but primarily had been affected by the patchwork quilt of zoning districts within the area that had created a veritable donut hole between historic districts which developers had honed in upon and this had placed several valuable historic resources at risk. Ms. Hunter reviewed examples of teardowns and rebuilds in the area illustrating this dilemma for the Commission.

Ms. Hunter noted that the East Central Community Council had reviewed the issue with the neighborhood, even receiving a vote ninety-five percent in favor of approving the University Expansion. She noted that the primary concerns of those who had voted against the expansion had to do with the City's standards regarding the replacement of windows, the allowed placement of garages as well as limited inclusion of additional parking on a property. Ms. Hunter stated that the East Central Community Council would revisit the issue again at a meeting later in the year.

Vice Chairperson Oliver inquired if there had been a sense of a broader level of support from the neighborhood at large, not just in meetings of the East Central Community Council.

Ms. Hunter noted that she felt there was a great deal of support from the local community at large, not including developers in the area.

Commissioner Davis inquired how many people had been in attendance when the vote in question was taken.

Ms. Hunter noted that 72 people had been present at that meeting and that all 2000 residents in the affected area had been notified.

Chairperson Lloyd inquired if Ms. Hunter had a concern about the interim period between the present and a possible designation.

Ms. Hunter noted that she was and that by having the intensive level survey from 2006 on file, less research would be required by staff to get the nomination under way.

Chairperson Lloyd inquired if Ms. Hunter had requested a moratorium on demolition for the time being.

Ms. Hunter noted that she had not as she was not aware of any imminent demolitions in the area, but the East Central Community Council was more than ready to move forward otherwise.

Commissioner Richards inquired what had been considered significant about the east side of 900 East.

Ms. Hunter noted that there were some buildings on the east side of the street they had considered worth protecting.

5. Bryant Neighborhood [6:47:03 PM](#)

Ms. Hunter noted that the Bryant Neighborhood was also in great need of historic preservation. She stated that this neighborhood was representative of the working class citizens of Salt Lake City who built the railroad and continued expansion of the City westward. She noted that the area was currently highly exposed to development risks.

Ms. Hunter stated that there had not been an intensive level survey of the area, but that a walk-up study might also exist somewhere in City archives.

Commissioner Funk inquired what the level of public support would be for creating a historic district in the Bryant neighborhood.

Ms. Hunter noted that she did not know at present. She stated that several citizens from the neighborhood had been involved in meetings regarding the University Expansion in 2006, but that the area had not been included in the survey. She noted that the reconnaissance level survey of the neighborhood in 1994 was the only resource she was certain existed as part of the National Eastside Survey.

Vice Chairperson Oliver inquired if the East Central Community Council would be open to setting the boundaries for the district as such to include only one side of a street, such as 900 East.

Ms. Hunter noted that this would be wonderful if the Commission would be willing to investigate the structures not included in the original surveys.

6. Wells Neighborhood [6:54:21 PM](#)

DeWitt Smith noted that the Liberty-Wells Community Council was not ready to present to the Commission, but they were present to take any questions as well as copious notes. Mr. Smith noted that more education for the neighborhood regarding this opportunity was needed.

Commissioner Funk nominated Assistant Planning Director Pat Comarell and Kirk Huffaker from the Utah Heritage Foundation once again to help educate the neighborhood. She inquired if Mr. Smith was aware of the level of interest in the community.

Mr. Smith noted that the survey had indicated a number of prominent resources worthy of a preservation effort and that those property owners had been interested in a much stronger designation for the area. He stated that they were also interested in the infill ordinances as there were several structures in the area which desperately needed attention, most likely in demolition and rebuilding.

7. Westmoreland Place [6:56:54 PM](#)

Jean Zancanella, representative for the Westmoreland Place Neighborhood, reviewed the history of the neighborhood. Ms. Zancanella noted that there were 51 homes located within the current boundaries of the neighborhood. She stated that the landscaping was unique as many of the trees were Elms said to have survived Dutch Elm Disease outbreaks in the past. Ms. Zancanella reviewed the varied architectural styles present as well as listing prominent residents who occupied the neighborhood in the past. She noted that in 1995, the Utah Heritage Foundation had sponsored a Westmoreland Place bungalow tour. Ms. Zancanella noted that the neighborhood was an early example of the promotion of a sustainable lifestyle, which many people were today yearning to return to. She stated that they had recently polled 82 percent of the neighborhood. She stated that of those responses, 50 percent were in favor of the district nomination and the remainder stated that

they were in favor of preservation but would like more information before making a decision. She noted that this seemed to be a recurring theme and had taken information from Mr. Huffaker and would seek assistance from the Planning Division.

Vice Chairperson Oliver thanked Ms. Zancanella for her presentation. She inquired if the neighborhood had an association or other way to communicate regularly.

Ms. Zancanella noted that advocates had been building contact lists and meeting on a regular basis. She stated that they were planning a meeting soon to try and educate the neighborhood and relieve some of the misconceptions about local historic district designation which seemed to exist.

Chairperson Lloyd inquired of Ms. Comarell what the status of survey work for the neighborhood was.

Ms. Comarell noted that there was no formal intensive level survey. She noted that there was a University of Utah study and this information could be used to apply for a grant to create a proper nomination for the National Register.

8. Yalecrest Neighborhood [7:15:00 PM](#)

Lisette Gibson, Chair of the Yalecrest Neighborhood Council; George Kilner, Vice Chair of the Yalecrest Neighborhood Council and Jon Dewey, past chair of the Council, were all present to speak on behalf of the Yalecrest Neighborhood Council.

Ms. Gibson stated that the Yalecrest area was significant both architecturally and historically. She noted that the area had a remarkably high degree of architectural consistency and the area had been platted from the 1910s through the 1940s. Ms. Gibson noted that the boundaries were Sunnyside Avenue to 1300 South and 1300 East to 1900 East, comprising around 1400 homes.

Mr. Kilner reviewed a photo slideshow of historically significant homes and examples of architectural styles present in the Yalecrest area. He noted that the Council felt they met all of the criteria for designation especially as in the 2005 survey, 91 percent of the houses had been deemed contributing to the historic character of the neighborhood, the highest such percentage in Salt Lake City. Mr. Kilner noted that the neighborhood had been listed on the National Register in 2007.

Mr. Dewey noted that there had been 22 teardowns in the last 12 years and six in the last 15 months, with four others planned for the near future. He stated that it was obvious to them a pattern of development was building momentum in the area. He noted that this pattern showed that the infill ordinance was insufficient as a preservation tool in their neighborhood and they needed more.

Mr. Kilner stated that it had been a challenge to spread the word in such a large area. He noted that they had placed the item on the agenda for the last six meetings of their neighborhood council and that they had received a number of questions from residents, however, in their meetings; the idea had so far been well received. He noted that many residents had stated that the compatible infill ordinance did not do enough to preserve the neighborhood.

Commissioner Richards inquired if a poll of the neighborhood had been conducted to indicate the level of support for a local district designation.

Mr. Kilner noted that there had been around 50 people at each meeting and that the agendas for their meetings were distributed to about 700 people who knew where to send comments on any issue they might be concerned about. He noted that they hadn't heard anything but support.

Public Hearing Portion [7:38:29 PM](#)

Chairperson Lloyd noted that the Commission had received several cards from those wishing to speak to the proposed nominations and opened the floor to comments.

Kirk Huffaker, with the Utah Heritage Foundation, complimented the various neighborhoods on their presentations for the Commission. He stated that he would be happy to meet with any of the neighborhood councils to provide more information regarding preservation in Salt Lake City. He stated that the Utah Heritage Foundation was very much in favor of the Commission prioritizing the list of possible designations and believed that the criteria the Commission should focus upon included the following:

1. The percentage of resources that were contributing within the district which could benefit from the range of services provided by City Planning tools;
2. The ability of the Commission to recognize a diversity of architectural styles within the City which might not be recognized by local districts or other planning tools thus far;
3. The degree of immediate need;
4. The ability to match the correct tool for preservation with the base zoning and what the Commission is actually trying to preserve.

Mr. Huffaker noted that UHF believed some neighborhoods had made an effort to demonstrate the value of preservation and how to take immediate action. He noted that he had given preservation education tutorials before the Douglas Neighborhood Council, the Bryant Neighborhood, the Yalecrest Neighborhood Council and Westmoreland Place.

Comments from the Bryant Neighborhood

Cindy Cromer, 816 East 100 South, prepared written comments, read into the record by Commissioner Harding:

Four of my buildings are in City Historic Districts, the remaining ones are not, although they are all in a national register district known as the Bryant Neighborhood. The construction dates for the unprotected ones range from 1878 to 1910. Each one deserves protection from demolition. Realistically, I cannot expect all of them to get in the lifeboat presented by the City register status. I understand the reasons, which are numerous. My best hope is for my residents on the west side of 1000 East, between 200 and 300 South, it's an extraordinary house. A South Temple Mansion that wandered away from South Temple to be across the street from the private tennis club on 1000 East that Wallace Stegner described. It is located on an amazing block, 10 acres with two intact interior block streets and a perimeter of contributory structures with very few intrusions into the late nineteenth and early twentieth century character of the block. I have every reason to believe that the University Historic District would expand to include my house when I purchased it late in 1992. There was an expectation that the University District would expand to the west; if the district boundary got as far as 1000 East, then it would be obvious that the protection should include the block containing my house which compares favorably with any 10 acre block in any existing historic district in the City. So, I am calling your attention to the block between 1000 East and 900 East, 200 South and 300 South, including the interior streets of Iowa and Pennsylvania. I would like to have all of my buildings in the lifeboat provided by the City Register status. I recognize however, that the strongest case I can make is for this block.

Comments from the Forest Dale Neighborhood

Susie Petheram spoke for the Forest Dale Neighborhood. She noted that the neighborhood did not have a formal community council or neighborhood association; however, there had been great support within the neighborhood for their National District Nomination. She noted that she felt the City should be proactive in protecting the Forest Dale Neighborhood as it was most likely under threat from transportation, particularly the expansion of I-80 which prompted the national nomination after several properties were demolished to accommodate the expansion. Ms. Petheram stated that there was a general feeling that transportation interests would continue to be the biggest threat to the area and that the City should work to ensure that an area's base zoning matched the desired preservation objective.

Comments from the Westmoreland Place Neighborhood

Kenton Peters spoke for Westmoreland Place. He noted he recognized the value and need for historic preservation, yet was torn as an architect, feeling that taste and aesthetics could not be legislated. Mr. Peters stated that neighborhoods evolved and wondered how preservation would allow and encourage the evolution of technologies. He stated that he felt there needed to be a mechanism by which preservation could be accommodated on an individual basis.

Matt Durham spoke for Westmoreland Place. Mr. Durham noted that they purchased their home in part because of the unique character of the neighborhood. He stated that when discussion in the neighborhood began regarding whether the residents should do something to preserve the character of the area, they decided to explore preservation options. Mr. Durham stated that he had heard no one say they were opposed to historic preservation in the neighborhood and that they were all concerned that there were homes that were dear to them and that they were unwilling to lose if they had any say.

Comments from the Yalecrest Neighborhood

Kirk Anderson spoke for the Yalecrest Neighborhood. He read, "Architecture has been described as a conversation across generations." Mr. Anderson noted that it felt like this in the Yalecrest neighborhood. He stated that recently he had become concerned about the neighborhood's future, especially when a house was torn down or dramatically altered by a cost-effective, easy to maintain structure out of place in the style and scale of the neighborhood. He noted that the trend seemed to be accelerating and it was hard to describe the sense of frustration and loss he experienced each time he saw this. Mr. Anderson noted he was convinced that historic preservation was not only a proper role for local government, but an obligation of local government to protect the history and character of neighborhoods for future generations.

Cindy Norton, 1750 Herbert Avenue, spoke for the Yalecrest Neighborhood. She noted that many families she worked with as an elementary teacher had lived there for generations. She stated that she took her students on a walking tour to learn about the unique architectural styles near the school. Ms. Norton noted that she felt the Yalecrest Neighborhood was a special area of the city deserving local historic district protections.

Lynn Pershing, 1715 Laird Avenue, spoke for the Yalecrest Neighborhood. She noted that after consideration of many City and suburban neighborhoods, she chose the Yalecrest Neighborhood for its tree-lined streets and ambience of Tudor architecture. Ms. Pershing stated that since moving there, she had witnessed the destruction of character filled homes to build new homes with three to four times the square footage of the original structure as well as large multi-story additions on existing homes often inconsistent with existing architecture. She noted that she was not against remodeling or updating homes, however, she considered such remodeling of homes in the Yalecrest

neighborhood to be inappropriate. Ms. Pershing noted her support of a local historic district nomination.

Boyd Anderson, 1759 Hubbard Avenue, stated that he had concerns regarding further restrictions to property rights, unintended consequences of designation as well as concerns regarding how the ordinance seemed to apply arbitrary and capricious standards. Mr. Anderson stated that he would much rather see children playing in front of a newly remodeled home with architecture he may not love than no one playing in front of an old home with great architecture. Mr. Anderson noted that he felt it offensive that he would need to request permission to build a shed or replace the roof on his home.

David Gibson, architect, spoke for the Yalecrest Neighborhood. He noted that demolition in the neighborhood was a clear and present danger, occurring at an accelerated rate. Mr. Gibson stated that it concerned him that currently any home in the Yalecrest Neighborhood could be demolished without cause.

Sally Patrick, 1413 Laird Circle, noted that her property abutted a very large garage which had resulted in the loss of sunlight on the west side of her lot and a porch overlooking her back porch. She stated that she had chosen not to expand her home a number of years to help maintain the character of the area.

Tony Hoagland, 1784 Michigan Avenue, noted that he had grown up in the Yalecrest Neighborhood and that there had been some remodeling projects in the area that had been executed in a way which respected the character of the area. He stated that he would like to preserve the homes in the neighborhood and was proud to be a resident. Mr. Hoagland noted he would like to see demolitions end and the construction of larger homes to stop as well. He stated that he would also like to see, however, people allowed to modify their homes to make them suit their lifestyles while respecting the character of the neighborhood.

Adam Ford, attorney for residents in the area, noted that he had grown up in the Yalecrest Neighborhood. He stated that his clients felt the Moratorium instituted by the City Council was overbroad, illegal, unconstitutional and could prove very expensive to the City. He stated that there had to be a showing of compelling, countervailing public interest in order for a moratorium such as the one put forth by the City Council to come into play. Mr. Ford read the opinions of the Property Rights Ombudsman for the State, numbers 28 and 33 respectively. He noted that opinion 28 indicated that a moratorium could not be initiated if there were current ordinances which could remedy the problem. Mr. Ford noted he felt there were sufficient tools already in place by the City. He stated that the Moratorium could be considered a taking by the City. He also noted that the government had to have a compelling reason without a less restrictive method of accomplishing the goal in order to put something like a moratorium in place.

Annie Payne, noted her support of the Yalecrest Historic District Nomination. She stated that she felt the neighborhood was in danger from developers who felt they could profit through redevelopment in the area.

Cindy Korowski, 1770 Hubbard Avenue, stated she had been attracted to the older homes in the neighborhood when they purchased their home. Ms. Korowski noted her concern that there was a great deal of misinformation regarding the proposed designation and she felt that the designation was very much needed to preserve the ambience of the neighborhood.

Lisette Gibson, resident of Hubbard Avenue, noted that she had personally seen six teardowns from her property and lived four houses away from the famed Garage Mahal. She stated that the compatible infill ordinance only went so far and therefore other protections needed to be put into

place. Ms. Gibson noted that with 91 percent of the homes considered contributory, people understood the value of the character of the neighborhood and it was necessary to preserve it.

Heather Lloyd, noted that she had moved to the Yalecrest Neighborhood with her husband after they discovered their love for the character of the homes along Michigan Avenue. She stated that not designating the area could result in losing a great deal of that character and noted that the 1700 block of Michigan had endured three demolitions with two more slated for the future. Ms. Lloyd noted that she worried about retaining the historic community and hoped that her children would be as moved by its beauty as she and her husband had been ten years ago.

Jeff Justice, 1600 Yale Avenue, noted he had lived in the area since 1993 and felt fortunate to live there. He stated he felt a historic district designation would force people into a corner and work inside the constraints of the current overlay. Mr. Justice noted that many of the homes shown in the slideshow were constructed prior to the creation of the infill ordinance. He stated that many of those homes were the reason the overlay was created to begin with.

Ken Dayton, 1576 Yale Avenue, stated that he had been involved with the historic tour which had taken place in the neighborhood. He noted that he had plans one day to increase the size of his home and while he felt he could do so and maintain the integrity of the neighborhood, he was concerned that the designation would severely limit this ability.

Scott Parkinson noted that he had been attracted to the character of the Yalecrest Neighborhood in 1981 but had stayed due to the character of his neighbors. Mr. Parkinson noted his concern that designation would limit the ability of young families to live in the neighborhood due to the escalated price or the inability to create a space suitable for a growing family. Mr. Parkinson stated that he was concerned about the small sample in the room which did not allow for proper comment on the issue.

Comment from the Commission [8:28:42 PM](#)

Vice Chairperson Oliver noted her desire to explain the local historic district designation process to the audience. She stated that before a local district was designated, design guidelines for that particular neighborhood would be written. She noted that these guidelines would take a look at Yalecrest and its needs in particular, the point being not to stop change or freeze the neighborhood in time, but to manage change in a controlled, predictable manner.

Comments from the Westmoreland Neighborhood (continued) [8:29:51 PM](#)

Lindsey Keller, an area resident, noted that when they moved to the Westmoreland Neighborhood they were initially attracted to everything others were mentioning, the aesthetics of the neighborhood and close knit relationships those aesthetics seemed to promote. She stated that she would wish to keep those things, even in light of the detractions such as smaller garages and bathrooms.

Comments from the Yalecrest Neighborhood (continued) [8:31:32 PM](#)

Bob Plumb, an area resident, noted he felt the homes in the area were too small to retain growing families and that there were homes that had been expanded and done tastefully. He stated that realistically, families needed more room. He also noted he felt the survey to be inconsistent as there was no clear reasoning to him as to why certain structures were considered contributory while others were not.

Jon Dewey, former chair of the Yalecrest Neighborhood Council, read a letter written by a third grader at Bonneville Elementary:

Dear Editor,

I'm a third grade student in Mrs. Norton's class at Bonneville Elementary. I think the old homes in Salt Lake City neighborhoods should not become big, new fancy houses. If the old homes get rebuilt into new homes there are no more old homes to enjoy. If there are a lot of new homes in the neighborhood, it will just be an ordinary neighborhood, not unique, just normal. If new tall homes are for big parties and more stuff, then people shouldn't be wasting their money on buying more things to put in the house. The old houses are small and cost less, but the new houses are gigantic and take up a lot of room. If you tear down an old house, you have to pay for that and then when it gets rebuilt you have to pay more money for it again. It costs a lot of money. If you tear down the old homes, there wouldn't be any more old history in the neighborhood and I like history. Can you put this in the newspaper?

Sue Ulbrich, 1775 Yalecrest Avenue, noted her concern regarding social responsibility in the neighborhood. She stated that in being a good neighbor it was responsible to think beyond oneself and that the neighborhood had lost sight of this. Ms. Ulbrich noted that she felt the neighborhood needed protection from this attitude.

George Kilner, Vice Chairperson of the Yalecrest Community Council, stated that he wanted to clarify that this was the beginning of the process; that the Commission was not considering the actual designation at this time. Mr. Kilner noted that he realized the Commission would continue to work with the community to educate them, gather input and then take the next step.

Cathy Kilner, 1000 Military Drive, noted her belief that the current trend of demolition and rebuilding was changing the character of the neighborhood. She stated that she loved the neighborhood and that she wanted to see it preserved for generations to come.

Barbara Madsen noted that she was both in favor and against the proposition of preserving the neighborhood. She stated that she was for preservation of the beauty and charm of the neighborhood, but felt that the moratorium was overbroad. Ms. Madsen stated that she did not agree with the findings of the survey regarding particular homes. Ms. Madsen noted that she felt the true issue was addressing compatible infill in the neighborhood.

Chairperson Lloyd noted that there were no other cards received for comment. Seeing no one else wishing to speak to the item, Chairperson Lloyd closed the Public Hearing portion of the meeting.

Executive Session [8:45:28 PM](#)

Chairperson Lloyd noted that they would spend some time deliberating as a Commission, but wished to inform the audience that the Landmark Commission did not designate local historic districts, but would provide recommendations for prioritization to the City Council.

Chairperson Lloyd reviewed the designation process, stating that any proposed designation would be reviewed by the Mayor, the City Council and the Planning Director, and the Commission existed as an advisory board in the matter.

Chairperson Lloyd called for a recess at this time. [8:47:53 PM](#)

The meeting reconvened at [9:02:03 PM](#)

The Commission debated whether or not to use the matrix provided by staff to review and prioritize the districts.

Commissioner Funk suggested breaking the districts into two groups and then comparing them to the matrix; those districts that seemed ready to move forward and those that had requested more time and education.

Commissioner Davis concurred and identified University Extension, Westmoreland and Yalecrest neighborhoods as being ready to move forward now.

Commission Discussion – Federal Heights

Chairperson Lloyd noted that of the remaining districts, Federal Heights was the first neighborhood listed and inquired if the Commission would recommend any tools for Federal Heights in moving forward.

Commissioner Haymond noted it seemed they needed further information.

Commissioner Davis concurred and noted they needed education for the community.

Ms. Comarell noted that staff had the capability further down the road of doing a reconnaissance level survey in house and in this manner, Federal Heights historic information could be updated.

Commissioner Funk noted that many of the factors for Federal Heights were unknown or very limited. She indicated that she did not know what economic factors meant unless it was a way to address diversity within the historic districts.

Ms. Comarell noted that this dilemma had been addressed during a training session for Commissioners Davis and Carter, wherein Commissioner Carter noted that the true way to resolve this issue was to survey more properties in economically depressed areas, not during the designation stage.

Vice Chairperson Oliver noted that she considered there was a great deal of information yet needed for Federal Heights.

The Commission concurred that the priority for pursuing local historic district designation in the Federal Heights neighborhood was low at this point in time, but noted that education could be made available as well as outreach to the community.

Commission Discussion – Forest Dale

Commissioner Davis noted that there had only been one comment for Forest Dale and that they had not had a public meeting scheduled to discuss the matter with their community.

Commissioner Bevins noted that there were a number of factors for which the Forest Dale neighborhood received marks for higher prioritization, but there was little information regarding public support.

Vice Chairperson Oliver concurred with Commissioner Bevins and stated it seemed they were trying to organize themselves in order to discern the level of public support, but the criteria listed by staff seemed to lend credence to higher prioritization as well. She noted that the Forest Dale Neighborhood had a mid-level risk of endangerment and their readiness for designation was high as they had just completed a survey recently.

The Commission concurred that the priority for pursuing local historic district designation in the Forest Dale neighborhood was low as the public opinion was largely unknown, further education could be provided, but most elements were in place should the neighborhood ever decide to move forward in pursuing some type of protection from the City.

Commissioner Funk noted disagreement with assigning rankings to the districts.

Chairperson Lloyd noted that they could go through the list for internal organization, but still provide some sort of direction for the neighborhood councils to return to their local communities with.

Commission Discussion – Gilmer Park

Commissioner Richards noted that Gilmer Park did not seem ready, as they were requesting more information and education at this point.

Ms. Comarell noted that staff research revealed that Yalecrest would be a very large district and that some of the districts such as Westmoreland and Gilmer Park were much smaller; they would not require the resources that Yalecrest would to implement and therefore more than one district could be pursued if the Commission felt the need was pressing. Ms. Comarell stated that if the Commission could state for each district why they felt the area was or was not ready to move forward, where the priorities of the Commission lay, it would be helpful to everyone involved.

Chairperson Lloyd noted that while the level of public support for a designation in Gilmer Park was relatively unknown, Gilmer Park had relatively recent survey information, their National Register Nomination had been completed and a high percentage of significant resources were present.

Commissioner Davis noted that he had gleaned from the information available that Gilmer Park was vulnerable but not a high endangerment risk in comparison to areas such as Yalecrest where several demolitions had occurred and more were pending.

The Commission concurred that the prioritization for designation of a local historic district for Gilmer Park was lower; education could be provided and the Commission would like to discern the level of present public support for a designation.

Commission Discussion – Wells

Vice Chairperson Oliver noted that everything was in place to pursue a district designation, however, the level of public support again was unknown, there was some level of vulnerability but not real endangerment at this time.

The Commission concurred that the prioritization for designation of a local historic district for Wells was lower; education could be provided and the Commission would like to discern the level of present public support for a designation.

Commission Discussion – University Extension

Commissioner Richards noted that this extension was overdue. He stated that the boundaries were not clear and would need to be defined.

Ms. Comarell noted that public support was clearly present. She stated that the Commission could advertise the Extension with proposed extended boundaries and hold a public hearing to decide what it felt would be appropriate.

The Commission concurred that the prioritization for designation of the University Historic District Extension was higher; staff should pursue moving forward with this designation.

Commission Discussion – Westmoreland and Yalecrest

Commissioner Davis noted that he felt the University Expansion, Westmoreland and Yalecrest to be the three areas which seemed most ready to move forward and all three were in need of City protection.

Motion [9:52:26 PM](#)

Commissioner Funk made a motion to move the University Expansion forward, and that Westmoreland and Yalecrest be moved forward to determine if they wish to become designated local historic districts and to move that process forward if they so desire. Commissioner Haymond seconded the motion.

Discussion of the Motion [9:52:43 PM](#)

Vice Chairperson Oliver stated that they had not discussed the Bryant neighborhood and should do so.

Commissioner Richards concurred.

Vice Chairperson Oliver noted that they should also provide any suggestions to Yalecrest and Westmoreland that they felt were appropriate.

Commissioner Davis noted that it seemed, particularly from comments received from the public this evening, there needed to be more public education for Westmoreland and Yalecrest.

Ms. Comarell noted that the Yalecrest neighborhood had planned a meeting for early April to discuss the issue, at which point, more education could be provided. She stated that there

would be at least seven meetings between now and designation where a public input platform would be provided. She noted that once the Commission took action, staff would need to communicate the decision to the Council and see if they may move forward.

All voted “Aye”. The motion carries unanimously.

Commission Discussion – Bryant

Vice Chairperson Oliver noted it seemed from that evening’s public comment the Bryant neighborhood required further study before moving forward with a designation. She stated that the area might better be served by an examination of the zoning and possible amendments. Vice Chairperson Oliver stated that very little was known about the area and the survey was moderately old. She did note that the area was seriously endangered, but there was no cohesive public voice.

Commissioner Funk inquired if it would be appropriate to request Esther Hunter to return and address the Commission regarding whether or not rezoning might help alleviate some of the issues facing the Bryant neighborhood.

Chairperson Lloyd invited Ms. Hunter forward to respond. [10:01:32 PM](#)

Ms. Hunter noted that advocates for the area had been trying to address the zoning problems present for the last ten years and hadn’t made any headway. She stated that they had discussed density bonuses and other incentives for protecting some structures, but felt they were in danger.

Chairperson Lloyd inquired how density bonuses might work.

Ms. Hunter stated she would defer to Cindy Cromer regarding that issue.

Chairperson Lloyd noted that they could require higher density in certain areas to inhibit growth in others.

Ms. Hunter stated that there were two or three blocks of structures which could be considered significant and in the meantime maybe something could be put in place to protect that area.

Chairperson Lloyd stated they might consult with the Planning Department to try and address those issues in some way.

Ms. Comarell noted that the Planning Division had made a commitment to address the empty medical buildings inhabiting the Bryant Neighborhood. She stated that a tool needed to be put into place, but it might not be the transfer of development rights.

Vice Chairperson Oliver noted that the Commission might request a new survey of the Bryant area at the RLS (Reconnaissance Level Survey) or ILS (Intensive Level Survey) level. She stated that this might be possible to do in house as it was a small area. Vice Chairperson Oliver stated that it was a complicated area in great danger and warranted further study.

Ms. Comarell noted that it might be best for the Commission to discuss their priorities in context of all the requests they made within the past year.

Commissioner Funk inquired if the Commission would again discuss Bryant at their April 7th 2010 Meeting.

The Commission concurred.

Other Business [10:08:25 PM](#)

There was no further business.

Vice Chairperson Oliver made a motion to adjourn. Commissioners Davis, Haymond and Richards all offered a second. The meeting adjourned at [10:08:38 PM](#)

Cecily Zuck, Senior Secretary
Transcribing for Angela Hasenberg, Secretary of Record