

**SALT LAKE CITY  
HISTORIC LANDMARK COMMISSION  
Minutes of the Meeting  
Held at 451 South State Street, Room 315  
July 5, 2006**

A field trip preceded the meeting and was attended by Commission Members: Paula Carl, Scott Christensen, Acting Chairperson, David Fitzsimmons, Noreen Hammond-Heid, Creed Haymond and Warren Lloyd. Planning Staff present were Cheri Coffey, Deputy Planning Director; Joel Paterson, Planning Programs Supervisor; Elizabeth Giraud, Senior Planner and Janice Lew, Principal Planner.

**MINUTES FOR THE FIELD TRIP (3:00 p.m.)**

**Case No. 470-06-18 at 270 North Main Street**

Staff described the proposal and gave directions on specific items the Commission needs to decide including:

- Consideration of materials for retaining wall
- How the change in landscaping would relate to neighbors to the south's sloped front yard on the adjacent projects to the south.

**Case No. 470-06-26 at 670 East Fourth Avenue**

Staff described the proposal and gave direction on specific items the Commission needs to decide including fenestration, height and wall height. The Commission discussed whether they can address Contemporary style. It should be a design of times and not create a false sense of history. They discussed the size of lot and options.

**Case No. 470-06-17 at 53 South 600 East**

Staff described the proposal and discussed a possible timeframe that the bay window was constructed. Staff identified other issues that have to be resolved, (i.e. parking.)

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING (4:08 p.m.)**

Historic Landmark Commission Members present at the meeting were Scott Christensen; Acting Chair, Paula Carl, David Fitzsimmons, Noreen Hammond-Heid, Warren Lloyd and Creed Haymond.

Planning Staff present were: Alexander Ikefuna, Planning Director; Cheri Coffey, Deputy Planning Director; Joel Paterson, Planning Programs Supervisor; Elizabeth Giraud, Senior Planner; Janice Lew, Principal Planner; and Louise Harris, Secretary.

Chairperson Christensen called the meeting to order.

**Comments to the Commission**

No one from the public had comments to make to the Commission.

**Report by the Planning Director**

Mr. Ikefuna discussed his memorandum to the Commission referencing the "Proposed Administrative Policy for Solar Panel Installation on Residential Structures." This is an Executive Order by Mayor Anderson to develop and implement policies that promote economically and environmentally sustainable practices on energy saving matters.

Mr. Ikefuna asked the Commission to support this Order and adopt as part of the Commissioners policies. Commissioner Lloyd has been appointed to the Sustainability Committee put together by Mayor Anderson. He will represent the Commissioners on that Committee. Commissioner Lloyd will report to the Historic Landmark Commission with information on the issues discussed at those meetings.

**Commissioner Fitzsimmons moved that the Historic Landmark Commission endorse the Administrative Policy for Solar Panel Installation, pages 1 through 4, with the amendments discussed on Page 3, items 4 and 6 changed to read:**

4. *Solar panels should be located on the rear or sides of a pitched roof. Locating solar panels on a front pitched roof of the primary façade is inappropriate.*
6. *Solar panels should be installed in a location on the roof so as to be not readily visible from public streets.*

Commissioner Lloyd seconded and all voted "Aye". The motion passed.

Mr. Ikefuna then talked about a second memorandum that was also in the Commissioner's packets from Elizabeth Giraud, Senior Planner, on the "Scope of Work for Certified Local Government Grant." He explained that these Grants are pass-through monies from the National Park Service, and are awarded to "certified" communities in Utah. This year Salt Lake City received \$10,000 of which \$9,100 will be used to hire a consultant to prepare intensive-level site forms and a nomination to list the Yalecrest neighborhood on the National Register of Historic Places.

**Commissioner Hammond-Heid moved that the Historic Landmark Commission support the Scope of Work of the Certified Local Government Grant from the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO). It was seconded by Commissioner Fitzsimmons. All voted "Aye"; the motion passed.**

#### **Approval of the Minutes of June 7, 2006**

**Commissioner Fitzsimmons moved to approve the minutes of June 7, 2006. Commissioner Carl seconded. Commissioners Carl, Hammond-Heid, Haymond, and Fitzsimmons voted "Aye"; Commissioner Lloyd abstained, the motion passed.**

#### **PUBLIC HEARING**

Case No. 470-06-18 at approximately 270 N. Main Street by Robert Rudy, represented by Eric Tuttle, architect, requesting approval to make alterations to the existing house. The property is located in the Capitol Hill Historic District in an R-2 Zoning District. (Staff, Janice Lew at 535-7625 or [janice.lew@slcgov.com](mailto:janice.lew@slcgov.com))

(This item was heard at 4:32 p.m.)

Ms. Lew presented the findings of fact and Staff recommendations as outlined in the Staff Report.

Ms. Lew indicated that on May 3, 2006, the Commission had made a determination on this property and found that it was contributing and a local example of post-World War II era architecture.

More recent alterations to the building include changes to the north window opening on the west which is the primary façade. However, there is no record of this change going through the City's review process and an appropriate landing was never constructed for the doors. A Certificate of Appropriateness was issued in December 2005, for a garage at the rear of the lot and to enclose the covered patio on the north side of the building. However, construction of this work is not yet underway.

The proposed scope of work includes the following:

- Porch additions to the north and south sides of the building.
- Alteration to the porch element on the primary façade of the building that includes two options for the Commission's consideration.
- A foundation level addition.
- Site improvements to address the steep slope of the hillside along the Main Street frontage.

Two design options have been presented for the Commission's consideration affecting the porch element at the front of the house.

- Option 1 – The front porch would be expanded across the full width of the house and connect to the proposed side decks. The applicant proposes to over-build the eaves to cover the space. Metal wrought iron posts and railings are proposed.
- Option 2 – The covered front porch would be expanded to extend halfway across the front of the house and provide a landing for the existing French doors.

All proposed work must comply with height, yard and bulk requirements of the R-2 Zoning District and the Compatible Residential Infill Development Ordinance. The proposed plan appears to meet the zoning requirements for building height, lot coverage, and interior side yard. The front yard setback must be verified.

Most of the proposed work allows the house to continue to appear as a post-World War II dwelling, and the effect on the character-defining elements of the house is minimized. The proposed improvements are generally compatible with the historic building primarily because of their location and meet the intent of this standard.

Planning Staff supports Porch Option 2 for the replacement porch and entry elements and recommends the Historic Landmark Commission approve a modified request, subject to the following conditions:

1. Approval of the final details of the design of the proposed alterations shall be delegated to the Planning Staff based upon direction given during the hearing from the Historic Landmark Commission.
2. The applicant must verify that the front yard setback meets the City requirements.

3. The project must meet all other applicable City requirements, unless otherwise modified within the authority of the Historic Landmark Commission.

A copy of the staff report is filed with these minutes.

Commissioner Haymond asked Ms. Lew what the dry block wall was made of.

Ms. Lew indicated it would be better explained from the architect or designer.

Commissioner Christensen invited the architect to come forward.

Preston Dean, Designer, 1648 East 3300 South, came forward as the architect Mr. Tuttle had left the meeting. Mr. Dean indicated the dry stack block wall had not been designed but some sort of CMU product will be used and will meet code to insure that it is structurally sound. The owners are open to any ideas and are looking for other examples within the area.

Commissioner Fitzsimmons asked if Option 2 and Option 1 were equally acceptable to the applicant. Staff recommends Options 2 and he asked if that would be acceptable to the home owner.

Mr. Dean indicated the two options that are shown would both accommodate the French doors that are there. The applicant prefers Option 1 but if Option 1 wasn't acceptable to the Commissioners, the owners would be open to other ideas such as not having the porch on the other side but still having the deck to get to the side porch.

Commissioner Lloyd indicated that if they construct Option 2 and stop the deck extension it doesn't appear the south covered porch would have access and therefore would not be used.

Mr. Dean agreed and said perhaps they would use the front door and have steps to the deck from the back.

Commissioner Haymond asked Staff about Option 1 not being as compatible as Option 2.

Staff indicated that it significantly alters the front façade of this building and its character defining features. The owners are proposing to over-build the eaves and that changes the eave line to a greater extent than Option 2 would as well as change the appearance of the small porch that was originally there. Option 1 extends across the entire front of the home. Option 2 only covers half of the house and is not a perfect solution. Staff also mentioned that they are looking for consistency with the Design Guidelines.

Commissioner Fitzsimmons indicated that both options change the roof line, add a porch and expose the basement on the principal façade. He questioned if doing half instead of the whole porch would be different in terms of the ordinance. The roof line covers part of the porch but would look appropriate.

Staff indicated that the Commission does allow changes to porches when they don't know what the original looked like.

Mr. Dean indicated the steps at the front door will be removed and replaced with a deck structure without any damage to the foundation wall.

Commissioner Carl asked how they would get to the front of the house from the street.

Mr. Dean indicated the stairs that are currently there will go to the upper deck on the north. The lower deck would only be accessible from the basement.

Seeing no one else requesting to address the Commission, Commissioner Christensen closed the public hearing and the Historic Landmark Commission discussed the proposal.

Commissioner Lloyd indicated that the character defining feature of the porch is the nature of the fine cantilever porch that comes out over the entry door. The house is below the horizon line and makes for an interesting view. Adding the porches on the north and south are very nice features on this symmetrical house.

Commissioner Fitzsimmons thought the change of the roof line altered the defining character of the house rather than the porch. The porch would read from the bottom of the hill as if there is a level line and the odd angle of the change on the roof line would be more significant.

Commissioner Haymond could not understand how the roof-line could be seen from the street. It would look like a large eave.

Commissioner Lloyd indicated that the most prominent feature of the house is the projecting roof covering the porch.

The Commissioners further discussed the eaves and suggested perhaps this should go back to the Sub-committee but the Commissioners then said that decision would require coming back to the full Commission again and would cause delay for the owners. The Commission decided they could put conditions on the final approval instead.

The designer was asked to return for clarification of the porch overhang and how it would be supported.

Mr. Dean said the wrought iron support shown in the elevation on Option 1 is four columns and would support the edge of the porch. A larger porch had been previously presented but with the new change of the porch it is now only extending three feet more and the deck eight feet more. If there needs to be other ways to support the porch overhang maybe a design cantilever would be possible.

Commissioner Lloyd indicated that the porch overhang in the front of the house not supported by columns is the only significant feature of a home from the post war era. To eliminate the design of that feature would be obscuring the historic nature of the home.

**Commissioner Fitzsimmons moved that in Case No. 470-06-18 the Commission approves the design of either Option 1 or Option 2 with the following conditions:**

- **The roof line not be amended or changed; the low slope pitch and the additional soffit is not part of the approval.**

- **The applicant must verify the front yard setback meets the City requirements.**
- **The project must meet all other applicable City requirements, unless otherwise modified within the authority of the Historic Landmark Commission.**
- **The approval of the retaining wall is delegated to Staff unless Staff requires it to be approved by the full Commission.**

**Commissioner Haymond seconded.**

**Discussion**

**Mr. Dean asked about the roof overhang. He indicated the Rudy's concern was water coming in where the door is. It is a problem now because there is no landing and because the way the doors are designed. They are proposing a three foot over hang.**

**Commissioner Fitzsimmons indicated he did not understand how that would protect the door unless it is the full depth of the soffitt because there is an over hang now.**

**Mr. Dean indicated he was talking about the area by the French doors.**

**Commissioner Fitzsimmons indicated he did not want to change his motion.**

**Commission Christensen indicated there was a motion on the floor and called for a vote. All voted "Aye" the motion passed.**

Case No. 470-06-26 at approximately 670 E. Fourth Avenue by Mark Wisniewski, represented by Solim Gasparik, architect, requesting approval to construct a single-family dwelling. The property is located in the Avenues Historic District in an SR-1 Zoning District. (Staff, Janice Lew at 535-7625 or [janice.lew@slcgov.com](mailto:janice.lew@slcgov.com))

(This case was heard at 5:13 p.m.)

Ms. Lew presented the findings of fact and Staff recommendations as outlined in the Staff Report.

This property is located in an SR-1A zoning, Special Development Pattern Residential, the purpose of which is "to maintain the unique character of older, predominantly single-family neighborhoods that display a variety of yard, lot sizes and bulk characteristics." The application was submitted before the SR-1 zoning was changed to SR-1A in May 2006. Planning Staff has determined that the SR-1A requirements are not applicable to this case because the application was received before the change. The home will have 1,900 square feet of living space, three bedrooms and three full baths and an approximately 420 square foot detached two-car garage at the southeast corner of the property.

The applicant proposes the following materials for the building:

- EIFS with integral color on the main level.
- Hardiplank siding on the upper level and garage.
- Harditrim fascia and raking molding.
- An exposed metal stack chimney with an EIFS base.

- Wood and aluminum window systems.
- Wood garage door.

In the SR-1 zone the minimum building height is 23 feet. The proposed primary structure ranges in height from 28 feet at the ridge in the front of the house to 30 feet at the rear. The maximum exterior wall height is sixteen feet for exterior walls placed at the building setback established by the minimum required yard. The minimum depth of the front yard for all principal buildings is equal to the average of the front yards of existing buildings within the block face.

Within the Avenues District, a range of architectural styles exists. Depending on the style, some are simple rectangles, with details applied; others are more complex. Asymmetrical forms composed of several subordinate masses are also found. To the west, is a one-and-a-half-story gable roofed Victorian Eclectic Cottage that measures 28 feet in height. To the east, the closest structure to the subject property is a garage. The building associated with the garage (187 K Street) is a one-story brick bungalow with a hip roof that measures 24 feet in height.

The applicant is requesting relief for the maximum exterior wall height of sixteen feet (16') and proposing a wall height of approximately nineteen feet (19 ') from grade.

The proposed building is compatible in height, width and scale with other buildings on the block and within the historic district.

The garage, as traditionally built in the past, is a separate structure at the rear of the lot; this pattern should be maintained. The overall impact of the proposed accessory structure on the streetscape would not be substantial, given that the proposed accessory structure would be located toward the rear of the lot. The proposed project meets the intent of this standard.

Planning Staff recommends the Historic Landmark Commission approve the application requesting approval to construct a single-family dwelling with a detached garage subject to the following conditions:

- Approval of the final details of the design including the fenestration pattern of the proposed project shall be delegated to the Planning Staff based upon direction given during the hearing from the Historic Landmark Commission.
- The project must meet all other applicable City requirements, unless otherwise modified within the authority of the Historic Landmark Commission. The applicant must verify the surface coverage of all principal and accessory buildings meets the City standards.
- The Historic Landmark Commission allows a modification to the maximum building height standard not to exceed thirty feet at the rear of the building.
- The Historic Landmark Commission allows a modification to the maximum exterior wall height standard not to exceed nineteen feet at the setback line.

A copy of the staff report is filed with these minutes.

There was a discussion about the garage in the rear of the property. Commissioner Christensen thought there needs to be more concern about saving these types of structures instead of demolition.

Commissioner Christensen invited Solim Gasparik, Architect, 328 West Broadway Suite 7, and Mark Wisniewski, property owner to come forward. Mr. Wisniewski indicated that Dorothy and Lynn Goodfellow owned the home next door. He moved there at the age of 6 and he died at age 96 just two years ago. There had been two garages there but one is now gone. One had a large hole in the roof and was very hazardous. Mr. Goodfellow had told Mr. Wisniewski about the garage being there all those years. The LDS Church Archives had sealed the files on the garage so he couldn't get a real history of the garage.

Mr. Gasparik discussed how he is working with the historic guidelines to make the home an interesting house. The building is only a little over 900 square feet on the first level and trying to figure out the right type of approach to the design has been a challenge. The small mass on the west elevation they would like to either use a different color, or if budget would allow, they would like to install a wood panel. They probably would use a base texture EIFS color that would wrap the house and be seen on all four elevations. While using a different type of EIFS where the front is seen that would have a smoother trowel finish with an integral color.

Mr. Gasparik explained when trying to design the garage for a two-car garage they thought maybe they could cantilevering out the second story. The east side would be a translucent glass and they would open up the stairway so the whole circulation of the house could be open to the street. It would give the house more character.

Commissioner Lloyd asked about the hardiplank and how it would be handled with the detail and trim out on the windows.

Mr. Gasparik indicated the window jams would come out and have flashing for water proofing with the hardiplank becoming the casing.

The second story porch on the south elevation will have a Juliette style balcony with sliding doors to let in the breeze.

Seeing no one else requesting to address the Commission, Commissioner Christensen closed the public hearing and the Historic Landmark Commission discussed the proposal.

Commissioner Fitzsimmons indicated the scale, massing of the house, the pitched roof, the use of the hardiplank and stucco, respond to a challenging site quite nicely. The Avenues are architectural noisy and this house is peaceful and calm, interesting to look at and does its own thing.

Commissioner Christensen indicated that the applicant and his architect are very correct in that the Historic Guidelines for our Historic Districts encourage new buildings within these districts to give some evidence that they are a product of their own era and not an exact replica of the past.



Commissioner Lloyd indicated that the Historic Landmark Commission is expected to approve something that is five (5) feet taller than what the base zoning would allow. It is important that the Commission allow the additional height for the second story to function adequately. If the owner were to lower the ceiling height or make a change in the roof pitch it would detract from the purity of the look in the home.

Commissioner Fitzsimmons further noted that he liked the idea of a lot of texture being built in the different building materials and the windows set back. This is something that is not seen a lot of in the suburbs and will allow this to be a very interesting building.

**Commissioner Lloyd moved in Case No. 470-06-26 that design approval be given to construct a single-family dwelling with the detached garage subject to the following conditions:**

- **Approval of the final details of the design including the fenestration pattern of the proposed project is delegated to the Planning Staff based upon the direction given during the hearing from the Historic Landmark Commission.**
- **The project must meet all other applicable City requirements, unless otherwise modified within the authority of the Historic Landmark Commission. The applicant must verify the surface coverage of all principal and accessory buildings meets the City standards.**
- **The Historic Landmark Commission allows a modification to the maximum building height standard not to exceed thirty feet at the rear of the building.**
- **The Historic Landmark Commission allows a modification to the maximum exterior wall height standard not to exceed nineteen feet at the setback line.**
- **The additional five (5) feet of height be approved based upon its appropriateness and compatibility with adjacent properties along the block face.**

**Commissioner Haymond seconded the motion, all voted “Aye”, the motion passed.**

Case No. 470-06-17 at approximately 53 S. 600 E. by Dennis & Rosa Runnoe, are requesting approval to remove the rear addition and a bay window. The property is located in the Central City Historic District. The property is zoned Residential-Office. (Staff Elizabeth Giraud at 535-7128 or [elizabethgiraud@slcgov.com](mailto:elizabethgiraud@slcgov.com))

(This item was heard at 5:49 p.m.)

Ms. Giraud presented the findings of fact and Staff recommendations as outlined in the Staff Report.

This home was built in 1898 and designed by a prominent Utah Architect, Walter E. Ware for Alfred J. and Grace Bettles. The home was renovated in 1979. The 1911 Sanborn map shows a two story, frame addition at the rear. The one-story bay window, proposed for demolition is located on the south side of the structure, toward the rear of the house.

The owners would like to turn the home into office space and the proposal would create sufficient parking for office use which is allowed in the RO Zoning District. In order to function as office space, the property would need six parking stalls. In order to meet the parking requirements and provide disability access to the building, the owners are proposing to remove the rear, frame addition, or ell leaving the brick portion of the house. They are proposing to install two windows on the second floor, and one window on the first.

The frame ell is a character-defining feature, as is the small bay window. Staff is opposed to removing the small bay window because of the potential problems of matching new masonry with the existing.

The addition and the bay window have acquired historic significance in their own right. This case differs from others in that no addition is proposed.

The bay window has also acquired historic significance, and is in keeping with the character of the house. It is a feature that conveys the Victorian use of asymmetrical forms, and helps identify the house as consistent with late-nineteenth-century design.

The applicant does not meet the standard for the removal of either the rear appendage or the bay window.

Staff recommends approval of the removal of the ell, with the provisions that wood doors and windows are used. Staff recommends denial of the removal of the bay window, for the reason that it will create a noticeable alteration in the brick wall to the detriment of the architectural integrity of the house. The approval of the ell is for design purposes only; the proposal, including the expanded parking area at the rear, must meet all other building and zoning codes.

A copy of the staff report is filed with these minutes.

There was discussion from Commissioner Fitzsimmons on the removal of the large bay window as well as the small bay window. Ms. Giraud explained it was easier and less noticeable to go from frame to brick than brick to brick when changes are made.

Commissioner Lloyd asked if Ms. Giraud meant it would be difficult to achieve the look if the second bay were removed from the south elevation as shown on the original drawing.

Ms. Giraud indicated it would be because it always would be noticeable that a change had occurred.

Commissioner Christensen invited the applicant to come forward. Dennis and Rosa Runnoe are the homeowners and applicants.

Commissioner Christensen asked about the condition of the brick wall if the ell were removed.

Ms. Runnoe indicated that she had a contractor and he felt there would not be a problem getting the brick to look like the original. In 1988, she and her husband bought the home and renovated it for them to raise their children. They lived there for 15 years but the

noise from the public parking lot next door (north), made it difficult to sleep so they moved. The home has been vacant for three years.

Commissioner Fitzsimmons asked about whether the brick on the back wall were still there and whether it could be restored to the original condition.

Ms. Runnoe indicated she thought it could. The home is not in good shape right now. The windows sag and the foundation is sinking. The brick does not match as it has been painted over in the years past. She would like to spend a lot of money and time and preserve it as closely to the original as possible. She thinks they can match the brick. The garage is made of the same brick.

Commissioner Fitzsimmons asked about the cleaning of the brick noting that sandblasting is not acceptable.

Ms. Runnoe indicated her contractor will use some type of a chemical that is appropriate for cleaning the brick.

Commissioner Fitzsimmons asked if they were keeping the garage.

Ms. Runnoe indicated they are and that it will be used for the tenants to park in or used for storage. She will put on a new roof and maybe a new door in the same style.

Commissioner Haymond asked how many tenant spaces there will be.

Ms. Runnoe did not have an exact idea but said the entire structure will be used for one tenant who may have several employees. No new construction will be done to the inside of the building.

Commissioner Christensen asked if there were additional openings on the rear elevation that have been covered up with the old addition.

Mr. Runnoe indicated the door on the rear elevation and the window on the southeast elevation exist and some additional brick work has been done. The window on the left was a door that has been opened.

Commissioner Christensen asked if new garage doors were put on, would that come to this Commission.

Ms. Giraud indicated that it could come to this Commission but she would not administratively approve two steel doors should they be suggested to replace the old ones. There are other types that are workable and more sensitive like a roll-up style that looks like Craftsman doors.

Commissioner Haymond thought the bay window in the back should be taken off and the wall restored as much as possible because the foundation has settled.

Seeing no one else wanting to address the Commission, the meeting was closed to public comment and the Historic Landmark Commission discussed the proposal.

Commissioner Lloyd asked about fencing on the north side.

Ms. Giraud indicated that there was none and that still would not keep the noise out.

**Commissioner Fitzsimmons moved that in Case No. 470-06-17 that the Commission approve to remove all of the ell, with the provision that wood doors and windows are used and to encourage the owner to keep the newer bay window on the south elevation of the building if, there is a way to preserve it. If not, Staff should recommend administratively a way to remove it. To have expanded parking in the rear, meet all building and zoning codes and also, to approve the change of use for the building.**

**Discussion**

Commissioner Fitzsimmons asked if that was enough direction for the ell. Ms. Giraud indicated that it would be better to recommend approval or not.

**Commissioner Fitzsimmons then amended the motion to recommend approval to remove the bay window on the south elevation because it is unsound and incompatible with the style of the home and detracts from the original design of the home.**

**The motion as amended was seconded by Commissioner Hammond-Heid. All voted "Aye". The amended motion passed.**

**UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

None

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 6:35 p.m.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Louise Harris, Secretary

\_\_\_\_\_  
Scott Christensen, Acting Chairperson