

SALT LAKE CITY
HISTORIC LANDMARK COMMISSION
Minutes of the Meeting
Room 326, 451 South State Street
December 15, 2011

This document along with the digital recording constitute the official minutes of the Historic Landmark Commission regular session meeting held on December 15, 2011.

Historic Landmark Commission Meetings are televised on SLCTV 17. Archived video of this meeting can be found at the following link under, "Historic Landmark Commission and RDA": http://www.slctv.com/vid_demand.htm,

A regular meeting of the Historic Landmark Commission was called to order on Thursday, December 15, 2011, 5:36:17 PM in Room 326 of the City and County Building, located at 451 South State Street, Salt Lake City, Utah,. Commissioners present for the meeting included, Chairperson Anne Oliver, Vice Chair Polly Hart, Dave Richards, Arla Funk, Earle Bevins III, and Stephen James. Commissioners Sheleigh Harding and Bill Davis were excused.

Planning staff present for the meeting included Cheri Coffey, Assistant Planning Director; Joel Paterson, Planning Manager, Janice Lew, Senior Planner, Carl Leith, Senior Planner and Michelle Moeller, Senior Secretary. City Attorney Paul Nielson was also present.

FIELD TRIP 5:36:24 PM

No field trip was held for this meeting

DINNER 5:36:40 PM

Dinner was served to the Commission and staff at 5:00 p.m. The Commission had no substantive business to discuss.

REPORT OF THE CHAIR OR VICE CHAIR 5:36:43 PM

Chairperson Oliver stated the design guideline Subcommittee met with staff and discussed the updates to the documents. She asked if the Subcommittee for the Westmoreland Place property had met.

Commissioner Hart stated the Subcommittee for the Westmoreland Place property met and felt they had made progress with the design.

Mr. Joel Paterson, Planning Manager stated Ms. Michaela Oktay, Principal Planner, was waiting for information from the Applicant and it was Staff's goal to have the case listed on the January agenda.

REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR 5:37:45 PM

Mr. Joel Paterson, Planning Manager, reported starting in January 2012, the Historic Landmark Commission would not meet twice a month. He stated the next meeting would be January 5, 2011.

APPROVAL OF December 1, 2011 MINUTES 5:38:48 PM

MOTION

Commissioner Bevins moved to approve the minutes of December 1, 2011. Commissioner Richards seconded the motion. Commissioners Hart, Richards, Bevins, Funk, and James voted Aye. The motion passed with a 5-0 vote Chairperson Oliver did not vote.

WORK SESSION 5:41:17 PM

Local Historic District Designation: The Planning Staff will discuss with the Commission proposed changes to the process and criteria for designating local historic districts and Landmark Sites.

Mr. Joel Paterson, Planning Manager, reviewed the proposed Zoning Ordinance Text Amendments to the Local Historic Districts/ Landmark Sites Designation Process addressing the following items:

A. Types of Designation:

1. Landmark Site
2. Historic District- geographic based
3. Historic District- thematic based (like historic churches, apartment buildings, etc.)

B. Process:

1. Petition Initiation: Petition can be initiated by:
 - a. Mayor
 - b. A majority of the City Council
 - c. A property owner (for Landmark Site)
 - d. 40% of owners of the property within the area proposed for designation (for a district)

Other groups may request that the Mayor or majority of the City Council initiate the petition.

2. Petition /Application were submitted to the Planning Director.
 - a. Before beginning a formal review process, the Planning Director will create a report including a determination of:
 - i. A cursory determination of whether the application generally meets the factors to consider for designation;
 - If a professional reconnaissance level survey has not been conducted, it must be done prior to formally processing the request.

- ii. Determine whether there are sufficient resources (funding) to adequately inform the owners of property subject to the proposed designation about the proposed regulations and benefits; and
 - iii. Determine whether there are sufficient staffing resources to process the petition in a timely manner.
 - b. The Planning Director will submit a report to the Mayor and City Council that includes a determination of whether the request appears to generally meet the criteria and whether current resources are sufficient to adequately process the request.
 - i. The Mayor will determine what level of priority it is for the Planning Division to process the request;
 - ii. If financial resources are needed, the City Council will determine whether they will allocate specific funding for the request.

Once the Mayor has approved the priority of the project and / or the City Council has allocated funding (if needed), the Planning Director would assign the project for analysis and processing.
- 3. Informing and Determining Support Level of owners of property subject to proposed designation.

After the initiation of the petition and prior to beginning a formal review / adoption process with the Historic Landmark Commission, the City shall conduct a formal means of:

- a. Informing property owners, subject to the proposed designation, about regulations and costs / benefits of a local historic district; and
 - b. Determining what the level of support is from owners of property that would be subject to the designation.
- 4. Public Hearings:
 - a. Historic Landmark Commission- makes recommendation based on review of criteria for the designation of new local historic districts and landmark sites;
 - b. Planning Commission- make recommendation based on review of criteria for Zoning Map Amendments; and
 - c. City Council- makes decision based on review of Historic Landmark Commission and Planning Commission recommendations and public comment.
- 5. Notice of Designation; if adopted:
 - a. All owners notified by US mail of all of the new regulations / guidelines; and
 - b. A notice of designation is recorded on the property deeds.
- C. Criteria for Designation:
 - 1. The City Council may designate a new Landmark Site or Local Historic District where;
 - a. 51% or more of owners of property subject to the proposed regulation are in support of the proposed regulation; or
 - b. Where there is less than 51% of owners of property subject to the proposed regulation in support, a 2/3 majority of members of the City Council is required for approval of the proposed regulation; and
 - c. The designation would protect the best examples of an element of the City's history, development patterns and architecture; and
 - d. The designation is generally consistent with adopted planning policies; and

- e. It would be in the overall public interest; and
 - f. There is a need for protection to avoid potential loss of important historic resources; and
 - g. The boundaries are appropriate.
2. Factors to Consider: In determining whether the designation criteria are met, the following criteria should be considered prior to taking action on the adoption of a new historic district:
- a. What is the level of Significance: Significance relates to important events, persons important in history; architecture; importance in the understanding history.
 - b. What is the level of Physical Integrity: Physical Integrity is the retention of physical characteristics that existed during the property's prehistoric or historic period. Integrity enables a property to illustrate the significant aspects of its past.
 - c. Whether the property(ies) would be eligible for listing on the National Register.
 - d. Whether the property(ies) are of such an age that it would allow insight into its (their) importance in the overall history of the community.
 - e. For local historic districts, whether it contains exceptional examples of elements of the City's history, development patterns or architecture not typically found in other areas of the City, region or State.
 - f. Whether at least 75% of the structures within the proposed boundaries are rated contributing by a professional reconnaissance level survey.
 - g. Whether the proposed boundaries of a district coincide with historic boundaries (roadways, canals, subdivision plats, etc),
 - h. Whether the proposed boundaries only contain non-contributing structures where necessary to meet appropriate boundaries.

D. Application Fee

Because historic preservation is deemed to be in the public interest, an application for designation as a Landmark Site or a local historic district does not require a fee.

COMMISSION COMMENTS 5:58:06 PM

Chairperson Oliver asked, regarding the factors to consider, were those the criteria the Commission and City Council would use in their deliberations.

Mr. Paterson stated that was correct.

Commissioner Richards asked if the proposed criteria would be added to the existing criteria.

Mr. Paterson stated yes it would.

Commissioner Funk asked what specific changes did the Legislature request to be made to the ordinance.

Mr. Paterson stated some of the concerns were that historic preservation represented a higher level of standards placed on property owners and the process should require some measure of public support to designate a new historic district. Mr. Paterson stated the level of support needed has not been defined. He stated the City was given information and suggestions for what should be included in the process. He stated there was concern that the City Council could initiate a petition and designate a new historic district where none of the property owners were in favor of one. Mr. Paterson stated the City Attorneys had advised the Staff that under State Law the City Council, for legislative matters, could not delegate their authority to property owners. He stated the issue was how to deal with the public support provision and where in the process it might take place. He stated the Attorneys were concerned that if a percentage of public support were required at the Council hearing, it would possibly be a delegation. Mr. Paterson gave the example of the State's annexation process which had a requirement that fifty percent of the property owners have to be in support. He gave an example where people could often request to be removed from the supporter list at the City Council public hearing and the percentage would then need to be recalculated. He stated that was not how the City wanted the proposed process to work. Mr. Paterson said the City wanted to have the public support process take place prior to first public hearing with the Historic Landmark Commission.

Commissioner Funk asked how much a reconnaissance level survey cost.

Mr. Paterson explained the survey process and fees stating it depended on the number of properties.

Commissioner Funk stated she was concerned with the statement that indicated a reconnaissance level survey of the area was required to move the process ahead. She asked who paid for the survey to be done and should the survey be required to get the process moving.

Commissioner Funk stated the funds needed to be available but was it possible to work it that way.

Chairperson Oliver stated in the past the City had always identified neighborhoods and funded the reconnaissance level surveys.

Mr. Paterson stated that was correct and grant money from the State Historic Preservation Office had been used for the surveys. He stated there were also other funding resources that had been used to fund surveys.

Chairperson Oliver stated the City had always been proactive in funding the surveys and keeping the surveys current.

Mr. Paterson stated the City, in the last 4-5 years, updated some of the outdated survey information and the Preservation Plan listed areas the City might consider for surveys. He stated Staff would like to get into the routine of updating the surveys every ten years or so.

Chairperson Oliver asked what the mindset of the City on doing surveys was. She asked since the possible survey areas were going to be broadening would the City take a back seat or continue to be proactive.

Mr. Paterson stated the City would continue to be proactive.

Commissioner Funk asked about the development patterns and/or architecture not typically found in other areas. She stated she was concerned because if other cities had a group of buildings similar to buildings in Salt Lake, that were asking for historical designation, would that prohibit the building from being considered.

Mr. Paterson stated no it would not be an issue and was not the intent of the City.

Commissioner Hart stated the document read those that were typically not found in the City.

Mr. Paterson stated Staff would adjust the wording.

Chairperson Oliver stated the word "exceptional", in E., was rather strong and should be changed to indicate that preservation included all types and not just the best of the best.

Commissioner Funk asked how votes would be calculated when two or more people owned the same property.

Mr. Paterson stated the language presented was not the final language that would be used and referred to the language in the Character Conservation District proposal that explained the voting process.

Commissioner Funk asked what would be done if someone wanted to designate a historic district in an area that was all ready a Character Conservation District.

Mr. Paterson stated it would be something that would need to be considered. He stated Character Conservation Districts were done as overlay districts and could be laid on each other but would be difficult to administer. He stated there would also be a cross purpose in types of regulations. Mr. Paterson stated the City would probably recommend, if an area were a character conservation district that wanted to become a historic district, removing the Character Conservation District.

Commissioner Funk stated that needed to be delineated in the proposal so they were not crossing over into patterns staff was not prepared to handle. She asked what happened if a Mayor that did not like Historic Districts was elected since the proposal indicated he was the only one who could make the determination.

Mr. Paterson explained there were checks and balances in place to help alleviate the possibilities of one person making all the decisions. The proposed ordinance also allows the City Council to initiate a petition to designate new local historic districts and landmark sites.

Commissioner Funk stated it seemed strange to her that the Historic Landmark Commission could not initiate a Historic District.

Mr. Paterson stated there was petition which affected the Planning Commission in a similar way and the City Administration's concern was that the Historic Landmark Commission could initiate a petition for a Historic Preservation topics and the Planning Commission could initiate petitions but if the Council or the Mayor are not in agreement with the petitions it put the Commission and Staff in an odd position. He stated under the proposed changes the Planning Commission or the Landmark Commission write a letter to request the initiation of a petition which would be forwarded to the Mayor for consideration.

Commissioner Funk stated she did not know if that it was a good idea.

Chairperson Oliver stated it went back to the fact that the Historic Landmark Commissions advocacy role was being removed. She stated because if the Historic Landmark Commission advocated for a Historic District then they have taken a side.

Commissioner Funk stated she felt the Commission had all ready picked a side by virtue of being here.

Commissioner Bevin asked if the proposed process would be more tedious than what was in place or would it just take longer.

Mr. Paterson stated the proposal should clarify and improve the process. He said right now the ordinance was not necessarily as clear as it could be and certainly had created confusion in the past. Mr. Paterson stated each application would be different and would determine the length of time needed.

Commissioner Bevins asked if Mr. Paterson thought the Westmoreland Place designation would have been as quick using the proposed procedure.

Mr. Paterson stated yes, pretty close.

Commissioner Richards stated he had a few questions on the Philosophy Statement signed off by the City Council that was included in the report. He referred to the section that read “apply standards in a reasonable manner taking into consideration economic and technical feasibility” was added to the statement. Commissioner Richards said there had been past discussions that indicated economics should not be involved, which he did not agree with so he liked the change. He stated the reasonableness in terms of economics needed to be addressed. Commissioner Richards stated the guidelines needed to reference the standards and with a statement that said adopted design guidelines are intended to help decision makers interpret the Historic Preservation overlay districts standards and provide the public with design advice. Commissioner Richards said it would be a great statement to have in the introduction of the new guidelines because it made reference to the standard and why the guidelines existed which was currently missing.

Chairperson Oliver asked why a majority of the City Council members was needed because the City Council members represented the different areas and the people in those areas. She stated if someone wanted to petition their Councilman, the Councilman could initiate a petition on their behalf.

Ms. Cheri Coffey, Assistant Planning Director, stated a City Council member could currently do that but in practice they did not. She stated a City Council member had to persuade a majority of their colleagues to agree to a petition before it could be initiated through the adoption of a legislative intent statement.

Chairperson Oliver asked if Ms. Coffey was saying the City Council members could initiate petitions if they wanted to but don't.

Ms. Coffey stated the way the ordinance was written the City Council could but she was not sure if there were bylaws or procedures that required the adoption of a legislative intent statement.

Chairperson Oliver asked if the proposal was contradictory. She asked if the proposal was saying the City Council could not petition for a Historic District singly, even though they did not typically do it, by law they could.

Ms. Coffey stated that was how the ordinance was currently written and a new ordinance was being written.

Chairperson Oliver stated, regarding the percentage of people that would need to vote, what if people don't reply to the petition, was a time limit given.

Mr. Paterson stated those questions would be address and the percentage would be based on the number of responses and the number of properties in the proposed district.

Chairperson Oliver stated it seemed unfair if people choose not to reply.

Commissioner Richards gave a scenario of how the percentage would be calculated and the lack of an answer would be considered a no.

Chairperson Oliver asked for clarification on criteria for designation, under F. there was a need for protection to avoid potential loss of important historical resources. She stated she found that a little problematic because she didn't think things needed to be in danger before some sort of district was discussed or considered.

Commissioner Funk asked if it was acceptable for an area, adjacent to a designated historic district, to piggy back onto the other district in order to qualify for designation. She gave the example of Bryant and University Neighborhood and asked if it was acceptable under the proposal.

Commissioner Funk stated the language needed to be changed to reflect the intention.

Mr. Paterson stated Staff's goal was to ensure there was sufficient density of contributing structures within the proposed boundaries of a historic district. He stated the boundaries could change or the City Council could decide to go ahead with the designation even though it didn't exactly meet the seventy five percent and the percentage may need to change as well.

Commissioner Funk stated to only recommend the percentage be seventy-five percent not dictate that it had to be seventy five percent.

Chairperson Oliver stated a petition had to meet all of the "criteria for designation" but not all of the "factors to consider" as those were softer.

Ms. Coffey stated when it came to the percentages the national districts were pretty big and it might be that a local one would take the best of the national district and designate it to meet the seventy five percent point.

PUBLIC COMMENTS 6:26:52 PM

No Public comment at this time.

PUBLIC HEARINGS 6:27:11 PM

PLNPCM2009-00628, Commercial Design Guidelines The Salt Lake City Planning Division has drafted a new section for the design guidelines use by the Historic Landmark Commission to make design review decisions for properties with local historic designation. This supplemental

information will provide guidance for commercial properties. The petition requires the Historic Landmark Commission to forward a recommendation to the City Council.

Chairperson Oliver stated at this time the Commission was not being asked to table the petition but was requested to forward the petition to the City Council with a favorable recommendation.

Ms. Janice Lew, Senior Planner reviewed the history of the petition as outlined in the Staff Report. She stated Staff was requesting feedback from the Commission and asking for them to consider forwarding a favorable recommendation to the City Council to adopt the design guidelines. Ms. Lew stated Staff would continue to make refinements to the guidelines based on the direction of the Commission.

A Commissioner asked if the Photography and diagrams were in the final state.

Staff answered the weather was currently not ideal for picture taking. Staff was looking for a photo or example of a Colonial structure and asked for suggestions.

A Commissioner made the following suggestions regarding items on P-3

- “Document lists design guidelines”, change the word lists to provides
- Second paragraph word “promotes”, should be “promote”.
- Under who should use the design guidelines second sentence, a commercial example should be used instead of a school building.

Staff stated this section had been considerably condensed with the thought that an introduction component would be included.

A Commissioner stated the change on 13.6 indicating departures maybe considered for base, middle, and top, which gave the Commission room to allow for different designs, was a great addition.

A Commissioner made a comment regarding comments listed in the Staff Report from Esther Hunter

- Referencing the district nominations which have so much information in them just so people know they exist.

Staff stated they would list them under additional resources. It was Staff’s goal to incorporate them into the guidelines in the future.

The Commissioners made the following suggestions for the New Construction Section

- Add something about shadow lines to help suggest the subtle things that could be done.

- The quality of construction on older buildings should be reflected although it did not have to be imitated.
 - Something to help people understand the minor details could be the deciding factors for proposed projects.
- Site design orientation (maybe better depicted in a diagram) did not speak to parking directly.
 - 7-11 building was a good example of a simple single story composition but it had a parking pattern that was directly in conflict with the historic fabric in which it sat.
 - If these types of photos are used a description of what worked and did not work needed to be included.

Staff indicated Parking was addressed in Section 13. Staff asked if cross-references were needed.

The Commissioners stated cross-references were needed in the site design information as parking was a large part of site design. It was suggested to acknowledge, upfront, the difficulty of incorporating modern parking requirements into a historic context when building a new building in a historic commercial district. It was part of the site design but parking structures would show up where it was economically feasible in the downtown core where site design moves are much more obvious than they are in some of the other historic districts. Plan diagrams could be used to depict the basic site plan principles that could help clarify the parking issues.

PUBLIC HEARING 6:45:31 PM

Chairperson Oliver opened the Public Hearing. Seeing there was no one present to speak on the issue the Public Hearing was closed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION 6:45:41 PM

The Commissioners discussed the photography in the New Construction section and whether it correctly depicted the guidelines it referenced such as 13.5 regarding the cornice. It was stated that there needed to be underlying logic, a pattern and rhythm and not a “zebra effect”. It was asked what the role of the imagery in the guidelines was and if the Commission wanted to lead with vision and inspiration in that context to reflect the goals of the Commission and City. It was said that the Subcommittee determined Staff would be able to choose from pictures not necessarily from Salt Lake City to better reflect the long term goals. The Commission would help to come up with pictures that better reflected the commercial properties. It was asked if pictures were not available would it be appropriate to have a drawing for the subject. The

Commissioners stated it would be appropriate but there should be pictures available that would properly reflect the subject matter.

- Need examples of new small scale commercial construction in a residential neighborhood
- Clarify captions to address parking or crop pictures to eliminate parking.

The Commissioners discussed the fact that they were being asked to forward an incomplete document to the City Council for approval. They stated they could not approve a document that they had not seen.

Staff explained the changes being made were adding in the photos and non-substantive changes but would follow the Commissions direction.

The Commissioners stated fundamental text changes needed to be made and reviewed. They stated the images were fundamental to the document and needed to be accurately captioned to reflect the intention and meaning of the document. They said the one thing that continued to be ignored was that the guidelines did not make reference to the standards which are City Code. The Commissioners discussed the standards and how they would be included in the document.

Staff asked if the Commissioners wanted the actual standards listed in the guidelines.

The Commissioners stated they would not oppose that as the standards are relatively short in length but there should at least be a reference that the guidelines are an interpretive guide for the standard but the standards are the law.

Staff explained that reference was on the first page of the introduction.

The Commissioners reviewed the reference and stated the language in the Philosophy Statement should be used as it encapsulated the role of the standards and the guidelines. The following suggestions were made:

- The standards referenced more
- Include the standards in the document or the location a copy of the standards could be acquired.

The Commission discussed the use of the standards, the process an application goes through, and whether or not the during the application process the standards are referenced. The

Commissions discussed other documents used by the City that were similar to the proposed guidelines and the information that was given to an individual for reference. They discussed the standards for new construction.

Staff explained New Construction was a separate section in the Historic Chapter of the Zoning Ordinance with specific standards for mass and scale, etc. that were applied. Staff explained the standards were included in the application process.

The Commission stated the document avoided the word “standard” and replaced everything with guidelines and yet the standards were the law. They asked if an individual would naturally come across the standards first and the guidelines second or if it was the other way around.

Staff explained it was the other way around as it seemed people were looking for some direction not necessarily the standards.

The Commissioners asked if there was a reason the standards could not be included in the guideline document.

Staff clarified that the Commission wanted the standards included stated the standards could be added as an appendix.

The Commission discussed the way the standards and guidelines were clearly shown in Staff Reports making the information accessible. They discussed the placement and reference of the standards in the guideline document. They discussed the possible topics that could be added to the New Construction section as follows:

- How to address in-fill and why
- A section on streets that outlined how building orientation effects the urbanization of a City.
- How to create a civic-minded City where people realize they contribute to a public realm.

The Commissioners discussed the suggestions for New Construction additions and decided the guidelines might be a place to start. The suggestion to address the streetscape, understanding the street as a whole and how it could be enhanced would be better addressed at the beginning of the guidelines. The Commissioners discussed the photographs in the New Construction section and agreed more photos in that section would help depict the different allowable types of new construction. They discussed the available space for photos and the suggested information in

Chapter 13 or if there should be another document to address those issues - "gallery of examples". They decided it would not be a good idea to have another document but try to fit the information into the guidelines. The Commissioners concluded that having many small photos with text and then at the end several large photos/figures of a successful building annotated with arrows indicating why the specific aspects of the building work in the particular area. They suggested having a subcommittee meeting to determine what the Commission's definition of successful was and asked Staff if that was an approach that would work.

Staff asked when the Subcommittee would like to meet.

The Commissioners stated they would need time to find building examples but a meeting could happen at any time necessary.

Staff stated the Commissioners could take adequate time to review the guidelines and a Subcommittee meeting could be held at a later date.

A Commissioner asked if utilities were addressed in the document, school building and Hospital expansions but all of those should be included. They said the Commission may not have jurisdiction over schools but a statement of what they expect could be made.

Staff explained the City did have some say in how utilities were handled. They said they were not sure if the Commercial Historic Guidelines were the place for that information but another document regarding guidelines for open space, multifamily housing and may be one for the institutional uses, utilities.

The Commissioners the following items stated and discussed:

- Fewer documents were better, the information could be added to the Commercial Guidelines and a decision as to whether it was appropriate needed to be made.
- The process schools took what they were evaluated under, and what could be said differently about those buildings to make them special.
- The aspects needed to address schools such as bus and auto pick up/drop off zones. The Commissioners agreed being proactive with the guidelines regarding schools by stating what the City would like to have considered would be a positive however, the Commercial Guidelines might not be the place and time for the topic to be addressed.

- How to address streets with sections in historical districts; these areas are referred to as Transit Oriented Districts and are included in the districts.

The Commissioners stated they approved the text and the overall question was if they were comfortable enough to give a positive recommendation to move forward. The Commissioners reiterated the importance of including the standards at the front of the guidelines. They discussed if they wanted to give the okay for Staff to approve the photos and captions or if the Subcommittee was needed. It was decided that the Subcommittee should assist in the selection of the photos and language for the captions and to approve the document with conditions.

Staff suggested holding off on the document until it reflects all of the comments that have been received and then bring the document back to the Commission for review.

MOTION 7:25:05 PM

Commissioner Funk moved in the case of PLNPCM2009-00628 the Historic Landmark Commission approve the text portion of the document with the addition of the appropriate rules and regulations at the beginning of the document and at the conclusion of the Subcommittee and Staff's approval of the photographs and or illustrations that favorable recommendation be forwarded to the City Council based on the analysis and findings in the Staff Report.

The Commissioners discussed how that would be different than tabling or continuing the issue and then forwarding the document once the revisions had been made.

Staff explained continuing the issue allowed the Public Hearing to remain open. Tabling closed the Public Hearing but allowed for more discussion on the subject.

The Commissioners and Staff discussed the need to hold a Public Hearing as there was no one present at the meeting. They discussed the need to notify the Public of the completed document for a Public Hearing.

Commissioner Funk withdrew the motion.

MOTION 7:28:50 PM

Commissioner Funk moved in the case of PLNPCM2009-00628 the Historic Landmark Commission approve the text portion of the document, give Staff the direction to continue to work with the Subcommittee on providing additional photos and/or illustrations, add ordinance language to the beginning of the document, bring the document back to the Commission for review and keep the Public Hearing open.

Chairperson Oliver stated in other words the case was being continued with those recommendations.

Ms. Coffey suggested saying the Historic Landmark Commission was supportive of the text in the document rather than approving the text because approval would be recommended at a later date.

Commissioner Funk agreed.

Commissioner Richards seconded the motion.

Commissioner Bevins asked if the Zoning Ordinance was to be at the beginning of the document or in the appendix.

Commissioner Funk stated she thought it should be at the beginning but as long as it was added she approved of an amendment to the motion.

Commissioner Hart stated the ordinance should be at the beginning.

The Commissioner discussed the location of the Zoning Ordinance standards in the guideline document and decided to amend the motion to state that the Zoning Ordinance be added to the document with the location to be determined at a later time.

Commissioner Funk and Commissioner Richards stated they accepted the amendment.

Commissioners Hart, Richards, Bevins, Funk, and James voted *Aye*. The motion passed with a 5-0 vote Chairperson Oliver did not vote

7:32:58 PM

PLNPCM2011-00471 Revisions to the Residential Design Guidelines for Historic Districts and Landmark Sites - A petition initiated by Mayor Ralph Becker to revise the Design Guidelines for Residential Historic Districts in Salt Lake City regulated by the H Historic Overlay Zone. The design guidelines have been used since 1999 providing advice to owners and applicants, and serving as review and decision-making criteria for the public, the Commission and Staff. They will be revised to reflect historic preservation design guidelines best practice in organization, clarity, and current issues.

Mr. Carl Leith, Senior Planner reviewed the updates to the document as outlined in the Staff Report. He stated the following were key points and updates to the document.

- The reorganization of the guidelines document into four distinct parts, to achieve greater clarity and coherence. These are:
 - I. Preservation in Salt Lake City, including
 1. Why Preserve Historic Buildings and Neighborhoods?
 2. The Preservation Program in Salt Lake City- Defining and Managing Historic Buildings and Districts
 3. The Design Guidelines- Why? What? How?
 4. Historic Context and Architectural Styles
 - II. Design Guidelines: Rehabilitation/General Issues/ New Construction
 - Ch.1-10 Rehabilitation
 - Ch. 11 General Issues
 - Ch. 12 New Construction
 - III. Design Guidelines: Historic Districts
 - IV. Appendices
- Complete revision of the previous introductory chapter to form three shorter chapters, linked to the previous Historic Context and Architectural Styles. Additional text to cover reference to the Commercial and the Sign Guidelines. Addition text in the Why Preserve Chapter. Minor edits elsewhere.
- Addition of a detailed Table of Contents Index, identifying the sections and topic through the document, to enhance usability and navigation.
- Some additional text to address advice on rooftop additions.
- Additional text to address a progression of spaces in Chapter 1.
- Edits to illustrations and captions in several parts of the document.
- Refinement of the Glossary of Terms section.
- Addition of a Historic Preservation Resources section.
- Additional advice notes on lead-based paint in Chapters 2 & 3.
- Additional energy efficiency note in Chapter 3.

Mr. Leith stated the Commission was being asked to review the draft of the Design Guidelines in detail, to close the Public Hearing and to consider approving the presented draft, with the revisions as the Commission might identify, for consideration by the City Council.

PUBLIC HEARING 7:54:16 PM

Chairperson Oliver opened the Public Hearing. Seeing there was no one present to speak on the issue the Public Hearing was closed.

COMMISSIONER COMMENTS/ EXECUTIVE SESSION 7:54:40 PM

The Commissioners stated the look and flow of the document was wonderful and made the document easy to follow and understand. It was asked if there was a map or other indication depicting where the districts were located.

Staff stated a complete map was in the works and would be added to the document.

A Commissioner stated it would help individuals understand where the rules were required. The Commissioners discussed the lack of photos in the New Construction section and asked if Staff was working on new photos. They stated the section addressing Additions was much improved and a recommendation for Chapter 8.11, regarding rooftop or attic additions, might be separated and addressed as two separate issues with language to describe what was not allowed and what was allowed for each issue.

Staff stated photos were being updated and would be added before the final draft was sent to the City Council. Staff stated they would make the suggested adjustments to Chapter 8.11.

The Commissioners discussed rooftop additions and how what makes them acceptable and not acceptable for historic districts. They stated that the standards should be added to the document in an appendix. The Commissioners discussed the language regarding accessory structures attached and detached garages should be cross referenced under additions because when a garage was attached to an existing structure it was considered an addition. The Commission and Staff discussed where it should be located in the document and where it should be cross referenced. It was decided that it would be listed as it was presented and cross referenced in the addition section.

The Commissioners asked if the Residential Design Guidelines could be given the same recommendation for final review as the Commercial Design Guidelines. They agree the text was moving along but photos and updates were still needed. They discussed the recommendation for the guidelines and what the review for the document should be. The Commissioners stated they would like to know if a quick start guide was still in the works for this process.

Staff stated they would come back with edits and additions for the Commission to review. Staff indicated the guide would be designed after the guidelines were completed.

The Commissioners asked for changes and corrections to be indicated on the next draft in order for them to track what has been done. The Commission and Staff discussed how the changes could be identified and what would be given to the Commissioners for future meetings. The Commissioners stated they did not need the entire document sent to them for each meeting however some individuals would like the complete set to address the layout of the document.

Staff explained the time constraints they are under and explained they would take the time to make changes and updates before returning to the Commission for approval.

The Commissioners stated that would be the appropriate thing to do. The Commissioners reviewed page 12 stating the following changes needed to be made:

- 12.6- change the existing language, expanding on what options were available for the one story element, porch, a stoop, etc.
- 12.9- Roof pitches should be 6/12 or greater does not make sense as it depends on the block face. The language was too restrictive and should be reconsidered.

MOTION 8:18:00 PM

Commissioner Hart moved in the case of PLNPCM2011-00471, Revisions to the Residential Design Guidelines for Historic Districts and Landmark Sites, that the Historic Landmark Commission continue the Public Hearing. Commissioner Richards seconded the motion

Commissioner James asked if more than one additional hearing was anticipated.

Commissioner Hart stated no, more than one was not necessary.

Commissioner Funk asked if Staff should be directed to make the suggested changes.

Commissioner Hart stated she would amend the motion to say based on the changes the Historic Landmark Commission recommended during the meeting.

Commissioner Richards seconded the amendment.

Commissioners Hart, Richards, James, Funk and Bevins voted Aye. The motion passed with a 5-0 vote Chairperson Oliver did not vote

The meeting stood adjourned at 8:20:18 PM



Michelle Moeller, Historic Landmark Commission Secretary