

SALT LAKE CITY
HISTORIC LANDMARK COMMISSION
Minutes of the Meeting
Held at 451 South State Street
May 17, 2006

A field trip preceded the meeting and was attended by Warren Lloyd, Scott Christensen, Dave Fitzsimmons, Paula Carl, Creed Haymond, Noreen Hammond Heid, Joel Paterson, Cheri Coffey, Elizabeth Giraud and Janice Lew.

Minutes of the field trip:

Case Number 020-06

Staff identified the proposal and the process.

Information discussed included where the parking will be located and that a similar structure (Carmax Restaurant) had been approved for this site several years ago but was never built.

Case Number 021-06

Staff identified the proposal.

Information discussed included the location of the garages and the slope of the driveway; the façade treatment of the First Avenue elevation and the relationship to the apartments to the east; types of architecture and heights of structures on B Street (both sides); and setbacks along B Street; .

Kate Little, property owner on B Street was present when the Commissioners walked the area. Staff helped her read the site plans and elevation drawings.

Case Number 019-06

Staff identified the proposal and the process. The Commissioners noted the painted brick and talked about the fact it is a non-contributing structure.

MINUTES OF THE MEETING

Present from the Historic Landmark Commission were: Scott Christensen, Warren Lloyd, David Fitzsimmons, Paula Carl, Noreen Hammond Heid and Creed Haymond.

Present from the Planning Staff were Alex Ikefuna, Planning Director; Cheri Coffey, Deputy Planning Director; Joel Paterson, Planning Programs Supervisor; Elizabeth Giraud, Senior Planner; Janice Lew, Principal Planner; Lex Traughber, Principal Planner and Louise Harris, Senior Secretary.

The meeting was called to order by Acting Chair, Scott Christensen at 4:10 p.m.

Mr. Christensen indicated that the field trip was well attended and they saw all the properties on the agenda except Case Number 006-06 which the Commission saw on a prior field trip.

Mr. Christensen asked that all cell phones or pagers be turned off. At this time he asked the audience if anyone wanted to address the Commission on matters not on the agenda.

Approval of Minutes of May 3, 2006

Ms. Hammond Heid moved to approve the minutes as corrected. Mr. Fitzsimmons seconded. Mr. Christensen had the following corrections to be made:

Page 7:

Paragraph 8:

Change those details to *it with one less stall.*

Paragraph 11:

Change they to *Commission* and the buildings to *contributing historic building*

Page 12

Paragraph 3:

Change who ever to *if a Commissioner* and insert *that this house is non-contributing* and add the word *that* in the last sentence.

Mr. Lloyd, Ms. Carl, Ms. Hammond Heid, Mr. Haymond and Mr. Fitzsimmons agreed on the corrections and voted “Aye”. There were none opposed. The motion passed.

Public Hearings

Case No. 019-06 at approximately 650 North 300 West, by Bruce Manka, represented by Allen Millo Associates, requesting design approval for alterations to the Marmalade Square Condominiums. The property is located in the Capitol Hill Historic District. (Staff, Janice Lew at 535-7625 or janice.lew@slcgov.com).

Ms. Lew presented the findings of fact and Staff recommendations as outlined in the Staff Report. The applicant, Bruce Manka, is requesting to make improvements to Marmalade Square, an existing multi-family property with 100 units built in 1960. The applicant is also requesting for Planned Development approval from the Planning Commission to the building setback requirements of the Zoning Ordinance. This would accommodate second-story balconies as well as patio covers on the rear of the buildings. The proposal includes upgrades to the exterior of the building, balcony additions, a new entry element and some interior improvements.

There are seven two-story buildings and an outdoor pool. Access is from 600 North with frontage on 300 West.

The buildings are currently constructed with T1-11 siding as an access to predominant CMU walls. The applicant proposes to use standard industrial elements for finishes on the alterations. The T1-11 siding would be replaced with galvanized corrugated metal siding and would be applied both vertically and horizontally. The new elements attached to the front facades of the buildings that identify access to stairways and attach to the existing metal balcony railings would be covered with a painted paneled sheet metal cladding. The proposal also includes second-story balconies that would have a corrugated metal covering as well as the roofs of the lower-level patios.

Staff finds the proposed exterior building improvements are generally consistent with the Design Guidelines; however, Staff considers the use of metal cladding and roofing materials inconsistent with the Design Guidelines and incompatible in Salt Lake City’s historic districts because of their texture, large modular pattern, and glossy finish. Historically, masonry, stucco and painted wood materials are the predominate materials.

There will be a new entry element on the 600 North side which includes the replacement of the existing sign with a four foot high concrete monument sign with more letters. The proposed sign compliments the design of the building in terms of material and style and is consistent with height and size standards of the Zoning Ordinance.

The plans also indicate a privacy wall along the west side of the property fronting 600 North Street. It extends north approximately 100 feet from the existing entrance pier. The proposed wall would be six feet in height and consist of twelve foot concrete masonry unit panels with a sandblasted finish and includes iron work in between the panels.

A new eight foot high wall, similar in design to the privacy wall will be on the west property line. Based upon the comments, analysis and findings of fact noted in the Planning Staff Report, Staff recommends approval of a modified request with the conditions as outlined in the Staff Report.

In addition Staff further recommends that the Historic Landmark Commission forward a positive recommendation to the Planning Commission to approve a Planned Development/Conditional Use that would modify the minimum yard standards (side and rear) to allow encroachments for unit balcony additions and roofs of the lower-level patios.

A copy of the Staff Report is filed with these minutes.

Mr. Christensen asked if anyone had questions for Staff.

Mr. Haymond asked about the 300 West elevation, and if it would change.

Ms. Lew indicated it would not change.

Mr. Fitzsimmons asked about the objection of the painted panels at the entrances if they were confined only to those places.

Ms. Lew indicated that it's the use of metal material.

Mr. Fitzsimmons then asked if there wasn't some precedence in using some metal on buildings of this configuration.

Ms. Lew indicated that there is not a precedence for using metal on residential buildings but because this area is right on the boundaries of this Historic District, there might be some industrial buildings across the street with the corrugated metal siding.

Mr. Christensen asked for more information relative to the modification request.

Ms. Lew indicated the modification would be in the areas where metal is proposed.

Mr. Christensen asked the Commission if they had any more questions for Staff.

There being none, Mr. Christensen invited the applicant to come forward, giving his name and address.

Mr. Ken Millo of Allen Millo Associates, his partner Bruce Allen and the client Bruce Manka came forward to represent the project. Mr. Millo indicated that they were looking for some help and solution to the project. They have been working on this project for four or five months. As presented in Ms. Lews' Staff Report the building was built in 1960, and that era is the trailing end of a very strong modern architectural movement. The use of new materials was a post-war trend. The problem is to make a modern building out of what has been done throughout the history of the building. T1-11 material is not a good material as it will not weather well and is of poor grade, but was an experimental material put on the building after it was built. Mr. Millo talked about the plans that were submitted with the Staff Report, showing metal buildings in places in town not just within the area of the subject property. He indicated that 300 West was a splitting point of the Capitol Hill Historic District on the east side and the industrial, refinery area on the west side. This property is centered within a block and hardly has any frontage, making it hard to be seen from the street. Mr. Millo was willing to make changes that would be more compatible if that is what the Commission desired.

Mr. Christensen asked if they had considered changing the flesh color paint back to the original red brick.

Mr. Millo indicated that they were looking into cleaning the brick.

Mr. Christensen asked Mr. Millo to clarify what will be achieved when the proposed modifications to the south entrance gate are made.

Mr. Millo indicated that because of the placement of this building in the middle of the block, it is difficult to find. They are hopeful an entry feature would help identify the entrance.

Ms. Carl asked if there were any plans to address the 300 West frontage.

Mr. Millo said that there just isn't any room to address that entrance.

Mr. Lloyd asked if 300 West was an "exit only" access.

Mr. Millo indicated that the entire complex is one-way traffic with 600 North the entrance and 300 West the exit.

Mr. Haymond asked about the landscaping on the proposed plans and if there would be more.

Mr. Allen indicated that there would be. There isn't a lot of room but they want to put in some trees to improve the site.

Mr. Fitzsimmons asked if the building is condominiums.

Mr. Millo indicated it was and they converted it from an apartment building in the early 1990s.

Mr. Christensen stated that the south entrance appears in two different designs and that it looks like the sections of wall are CMU and metal like wrought iron design.

Mr. Fitzsimmons asked if the south entrance features were sand blasted?

Mr. Allen indicated that some concrete-block walls at the end of the buildings were sand blasted.

Ms. Carl asked if the balcony panels are a metal mesh.

Mr. Allen said it was and they would like to leave them as they are.

Mr. Christensen asked if there were any more questions for the applicant. Seeing none, he then opened the discussion to the public.

Mr. Nephi Kemmeth Mueller of 328 West 600 North, came forward and indicated he has lived in the area since 1973. He stated the building looks like an apartment and will always look like apartments. There is poor parking and entrance and exit ways. He wanted to know about the safety of the units. He has been in the units and can smell if someone is smoking from the units above or below you. He indicated the stairs and risers do not meet code and that some are wood. The units do not have separate electric wiring, plumbing or mechanical. He said that the building has no historic look.

Mr. Christensen thanked Mr. Mueller for his concerns of safety; however, the Historic Landmark Commission has no authority on those types of items. His comments will be part of the minutes and noted for the contractor to be aware of.

Mr. Christensen then closed the public hearing.

Mr. Lloyd indicated the relevant issues are the interpretations of two of the four sections of design standards mentioned in the Staff Report:

21A.43.020 H

Materials

1. 11.16 Outlines specifically metal products being allowed for soffits and eaves only.

Architectural Character

2. 11.19 Contemporary interpretations of traditional details are encouraged.

He felt it falls with the category where it is an interpretations of details. He asked how the use of metal can be argued against but allowed on other projects.

Mr. Fitzsimmons indicated he was struggling with the same issue. If it is a non-contributing building, it certainly is not like the others within the neighborhood. The architectural design of the building, if it were in other areas, might be appropriate for its age. He questioned the recommendation in the staff report

Mr. Lloyd indicated it looks like a court yard housing type of architecture that is not readily usable from the street.

Ms. Carl indicated that the building is basically stylistic she doesn't have a problem with the metal.

Mr. Christensen indicated that this building looks like college campus style buildings that were built back in the same era.

Mr. Haymond asked the Commissioners if it is within their purview to make a decision on the corrugated metal being used on the building since it is inside a court yard and not facing a street.

Mr. Christensen said that it is a building that is within a historic district so it is within their purview the same as if the Commission were reviewing changes to the back side of any other historic structure.

Regarding Case Number 019-06 at 650 North 300 West, Mr. Fitzsimmons moved that the request for design approval for alterations to the Marmalade Square Condominiums be approved with the following conditions:

1. **Approval of the final details of the design of the proposed alterations, including materials, signage and site features shall be delegated to the Planning Staff.**
2. **Appropriate building materials shall be submitted to the Planning Staff prior to issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness. The use of metal cladding is okay except the use of corrugated metal on the balconies is inappropriate and not approved. The applicant shall work with Staff to find an alternate material.**
3. **The project must meet all other applicable City requirements, unless otherwise modified within the authority of the Planning Commission.**

Mr. Lloyd seconded. Ms. Hammond Heid asked if the motion was to disallow the use of the corrugated metal, but allow the use of other metal cladding.

Mr. Fitzsimmons indicated that is correct.

Mr. Lloyd, Ms. Carl, Mr. Fitzsimmons, Mr. Haymond voted "Aye". Ms. Hammond Heid was opposed. The motion passed.

Case No. 020-06 at approximately 479 S. 600 E. by Wayne Belka to construct a new commercial building to be used as a retail bakery and deli on vacant parcels in the Central City Historic District. (Staff-Elizabeth Giraud at 535-7128 or elizabeth.giraud@slcgov.com

Ms. Giraud indicated that this site is the former site of Bill and Nada's Café across from Trolley Square which was demolished in 2002. The new proposed building will be 4,144 square feet with a total height of 21 feet 8 inches and will front of both 500 South and 600 East. The main material will be a veneer with exterior insulating and finish systems on the upper third of the elevations. The proposal is to be a drive-through type restaurant/bakery and the restaurant will provide both indoor and outdoor seating.

The Planning Commission must review all new construction in a CS (Commercial Shopping) Zoning District as a planned development. The applicant must receive approval from the Planning Commission because of the subject property's location in the CS Zoning District.

The fenestration pattern of the proposed building on the south and west elevations consist of two bays of windows, divided in half that extend about two-thirds of the height of the brick wall. The drawings show half-rounded awnings shielding the windows, and also show a "blind" bay on the south elevation. Staff does not believe this meets the standards neither did the proposal as presented in having the major windows on the south and west elevations divided in half. There are also issues of the proposal of vertical side lights on either side of the entrance door and also on the south entrance where there is a single door. For the most part, Staff did find that the applicant did meet the standards in terms of the fenestration particularly with the corner angled door on the 600 East and 500 South sides.

There are some continuous setbacks with relation to the surrounding buildings within the block. The proposal does meet the standards of commercial buildings and the traditional streetscape within the Central City Historic District.

The applicant will have to combine the two parcels of land, and record a notice at the Salt Lake County Recorder's Office. In addition, the Historic Landmark Commission must consider the application within the context of the Design Guideline standards that apply to this proposal.

Staff recommends approval of the proposal, with the caveat that the issues described in the text regarding fenestration and entrance details be resolved, by this Commission's delegation to Staff for final approval. Approval should also be contingent upon approval as a Planned Development by the Planning Commission. All City requirements must be met prior to obtaining a building permit.

There is one standard the applicant must meet that is within the base zoning. It is a requirement of a six foot high solid fence. Staff proposes it be made out of masonry or wood and not vinyl.

A copy of the Staff Report is filed with these minutes.

Mr. Christensen asked if the Commission had any questions for Staff. Hearing none he invited the applicant to come forward.

Mr. Wayne Belka, 7343 Miline Lane, Cottonwood Heights, is the architect/planner acting as agent and owner for this project. This property was presented to the Commission about six years ago, 2000, to be developed before the Olympics in 2002. Because the economy failure, and events of September 11, the project has languished for the past six years. There were several people wanting to develop the lot but none could follow through for various reasons. This is the first solid offer and will be good for the inner-city traffic to purchase drive through food. The current CS Zone requires 30-foot setbacks on the front and rear yards leaving a very small developable area on the site. Parking will be screened behind the building. Traffic will enter from the 500 South side and exit onto 600 East. Outdoor seating will be on the south side.

Mr. Belka indicated that the Neighborhood Community Council is very much in favor of this development.

The booths will set up a rhythm of six foot centers and the windows will fall with that rhythm. The window sill heights are dictated by the booths in order to be a certain height and not low. The windows can be changed to have a transom look but bringing down the windows is a problem because of the booths. The entry of the building will lead to a more inviting atmosphere with more glass rather than less. With the front angle entry perhaps the windows could be left without the small side lights as that would still bring in a lot of lighting into the entry vestibule.

Mr. Haymond asked whether the window and door material, was aluminum.

Mr. Belka replied it will be an aluminum storefront.

Mr. Haymond asked that on the north side the huge brick wall be changed to have arches.

Mr. Belka agreed and indicated they could be on the back-side as well and an awning configuration on the drive-up.

Mr. Christensen asked if the Commission had any more questions for the applicant. Seeing none he closed the public hearings.

Mr. Lloyd indicated the building height is appropriate for that corner.

Regarding Case Number 020-06 at 479 South 600 West, Ms. Carl moved that the Commission accept Staff's recommendations and approve the project as presented and that the applicant supply further detail to Staff regarding the following items:

- **Fenestration patterns on the south elevation, including windows and entrances, and that window and door types be provided in a schedule to Staff for final approval.**
- **That a material board be submitted to Staff.**
- **That the Historic Landmark Commission delegate authority to Staff to administratively approve a wood or wrought iron fence around the parking lot.**

Also the Commission is to forward a favorable recommendation to the Planning Commission regarding the requested variations to the setback requirements.

Mr. Haymond seconded. Ms. Hammond Heid, Ms. Carl, Mr. Haymond, Mr. Fitzsimmons and Mr. Lloyd all voted "Aye". There were none opposed. Motion passed.

Case No. 006-06, at approximately 690 North West Capitol Street; Capitol Place Planned Development – Request for approval of new construction in the Capitol Hill Historic District consisting of nineteen new single-family residential dwelling units. The applicant is Cooper Roberts Simonsen Architects, representing the property owners, Jeremy Jones and Rob Reinhold. The subject property is zoned SR-1, Special Development Pattern Residential District. (Staff – Lex Traughber at 535-6184 or lex.traughber@slcgov.com)

The subject property is comprised of several vacant parcels, approximately 2.81 acres in size, located between Victory Road and West Capitol Street and is zoned SR-1 (Special Development Pattern Residential District). The proposed nineteen single-family residential units consist of six different housing designs. The homes would be positioned on either side of an extension to Darwin Street that would

connect to West Capitol Street, allowing circular traffic flow and a street pattern that is historically appropriate.

Prior to the applicant's submittal of the proposal to the Planning Division, a joint subcommittee meeting was held with members of the Historic Landmark Commission and the Planning Commission. The review process was discussed on various design items including building height, building materials, building siting, massing, scale, density, single-family versus multi-family development, and roadway design.

The proposal was then scheduled for an "Issues Only" Public Hearing at the April 5, 2006, Historic Landmark Commission meeting. The primary issues that were raised during this hearing were:

1. The height of the proposed dwelling units, particularly those that front West Capitol Street,
2. The proposed materials and design of the dwelling units; and
3. The width of the proposed garages.

Revised plans to address these issues are submitted along with a new site plan.

The items that fall under the purview of the Historic Landmark Commission include the Zoning Ordinance Standards for the H-Historic Preservation Overlay District for new construction, as well as compliance with the adopted Design Guidelines for Residential Historic Districts in Salt Lake City.

This is a three-step process and the first step in the process for Historic Landmark Commission is to look at the materials used for construction, massing, the height, the design of the residential units and the subdivision layout.

The second and third steps in the overall process require the consideration of the Planning Commission. Assuming that the applicant's proposal receives an approval from the Historic Landmark Commission, the applicant will be required to file applications for a Planned Development and a Subdivision for Planning Commission consideration.

This project falls under *Ordinance 91 of 2005 – Enacting Temporary Zoning Regulations for Compatible Residential Infill Development in Certain Geographic Areas of the City*. This Ordinance was adopted by the City Council on December 13, 2005, and will remain in effect for six months.

Section 21A.24.080(C) of the Zoning Ordinance addresses minimum lot size in the SR-1 Zone and states that the minimum lot area for single family development is 5,000 square feet. The proposed project has an overall lot area of 5,020 square feet per dwelling unit. This overall density meets the minimum lot area for a single-family detached dwelling.

Section 21A.24.080(F) of the Zoning Ordinance addresses maximum building coverage and states that the "surface coverage of all principal and accessory buildings shall not exceed forty percent of the lot area." The calculated footprint of the 19 units is 31,150 square feet, and the overall lot coverage based on the total acreage of 2.19 acres, is approximately 33%.

Section 21A.24.080(H) of the Zoning Ordinance addresses standards for attached garages, specifically the width of an attached garage, and reads, "The width of an attached garage facing the street may not exceed fifty percent (50%) of the width of the front façade of the house." All proposed units have garages that exceed this width limit. At the last hearing of April 5, 2006, it was noted that the garages would face Darwin Street and the internal street. Existing surrounding neighbors would not be affected by that particular design element.

The height ordinance limits maximum building height to twenty-three feet to the ridge of the roof, or the average height of other principal buildings on the block face. Height was discussed at length at the last meeting and the applicant had proposed at that time 28 to 30 feet in height. The applicant has revised the height and dropped it down to 23 feet in height to be more sensitive to the height issue especially to the homes that front on West Capitol Street.

The Commission is to review today the issues of building height, massing and scale, design of the proposed garages, building materials for the exterior of the units and subdivision proposal.

In addition, the applicant has varied the style of homes proposed for West Capitol Street by proposing two styles of B units and two styles of D units. The residential structures on the west side of West Capitol Street are typically located below the elevation of the existing street. The proposed residences built on the east side of West Capitol Street will be built above the street level. The retaining wall proposed as part of this project is not out of character on West Capitol Street as this feature is quite common up and down the street.

Planning Staff requests that the Historic Landmark Commission make a recommendation to the Planning Commission relating to whether the requested modifications will help ensure a compatible development in the Historic District.

Planning Staff notes that the lots proposed for this development are not out of character for this area; they are not unusually small. There are many lots in the 5,000 square foot range in this area. Certainly, there are some larger lots in the general vicinity; however, these are the exception rather than the rule. The Planning Commission will review the preliminary subdivision plat proposal in conjunction with the proposed Planned Development.

The proposed lot sizes, and therefore proposed density, are consistent with the zoning requirement for the SR-1 Zone.

Based on the submitted plans, the discussion, analysis and finding of fact in the Staff Report, Planning Staff recommends that the Historic Landmark Commission approve the design of the proposed Capitol Place Planned Development subject to the following conditions:

1. The proposed building heights shall conform to the plans submitted for each unit (A, B-1, B-2, C, D-1, and D-2).
- 2 Any substantial changes to the design or proposed building materials shall require reconsideration by the Historic Landmark Commission.

A copy of the Staff Report is included with these minutes.

Mr. Christensen asked the Commission if they had questions for Mr. Traughber.

Mr. Christensen asked about the architectural drawing AE201 as it looks like the overall height dropped was only one foot.

Mr. Traughber replied that the greatest level of reduction is with units that face West Capitol Street. The units on Darwin do not have an overall change. The Units B1 do not have any change. One B-1 unit will face West Capitol and it is at the north end of the project. With the B-2 units that face West Capitol Street, the roof style has changed and the initial height of 28 feet was dropped to 23 feet at the street front will rise to the east to 28 feet. The street front drop is due to the reconfiguration of the roof style

Ms. Carl asked about the maximum building coverage and whether it is calculated for each lot or for the entire project.

Mr. Traughber indicated it is the overall project. The calculations were derived by the footprint of all the units, added together and divided by the overall area of the developable land.

Mr. Traughber indicated that that is one of the reasons this project will go to the Planning Commission as a planned development. When the calculated lot coverage may not be met for each individual lot, the Planning Commission can approve or not approve it.

Mr. Haymond asked how much the units facing West Capitol Street have dropped.

Mr. Traughber referred Mr. Haymond to the table on page five of his Staff Report. The height of each of the unit styles, which relates to the site plan submitted for the type of unit that would be proposed to be built, is shown on a table in the Staff Report.

Mr. Haymond indicated it shows three units that have a height change D-1, D-2, and B-2.

Mr. Traughber indicated that is correct and then referred him to the site plan that shows (with the exception of one B-1 unit at the farthest end of the project), all the other heights of the D-1's, D-2 and B-2 have been dropped.

Mr. Haymond again asked if there were any units facing West Capitol Street that did not have a height drop.

Mr. Traughber said there is one unit at the far end of the project that was not dropped. He indicated he talked with the architect and he indicated that the B-1 unit was left as the old design just to vary the units on West Capitol Street.

Mr. Christensen then invited the applicant to come forward.

Jeremy Jones, the Developer and Owner, Casey McDonough, Jim Nelson and Allen Roberts, Architects all approached the table. They presented a slide presentation that identified the former and current proposed heights and examples of retaining walls in the neighborhood.

They indicated that on the south portion of the site, some units will have a larger setback and the building heights were changed. The previous plans indicated two sidewalks but now they only propose only one to be located on the upper portion of the retaining wall. The wall height was changed to 6 1/2 feet at the tallest portion. The curb was changed to a rolling curb like the one on West Capitol Street. The shed dormer on the B units dropped about 18 inches at the peak. The roof plane above grade stays to below 23 feet. The D units have been dropped about 18 inches as well.

After the slide presentation, questions were opened to the Commission and Mr. Christensen asked if the Commission was interested in seeing any of the slides again.

No one was interested.

Mr. Christensen asked about the change of the sidewalk configuration from an upper level that connected the houses to the sidewalk below.

Mr. Jones indicated that originally the sidewalk is now on the wall and accessed by stairs.

Mr. Fitzsimmons asked about the density.

Mr. Jones did not have an answer as he thought it was a Planning Commission issue. The SR-1 Zone allows a minimum of 5,000 square feet per lot for a single-family home. They are not changing the density but are planning some flexibility to make the site workable including providing open space for the City.

Mr. Christensen then opened the hearing to the public asking that they keep comments to three minutes or less. Many came and spoke about density, traffic, setbacks on the first five homes, and impacts to the stability of the existing homes and questioned the responsibility of maintenance. Many indicated they aren't against development but the homes are just too big and there are too many homes. There were also comments accusing the Planning Staff of being pro-development to increase the City's tax base.

Mr. Christensen explained to the audience the responsibility of the Historic Landmark Commission and the items within their purview.

Ms. Coffey indicated that the issues of density, number of houses, and setback requirements etc., will be proposed by the Planning Commission.

The following public spoke:

Mike Bennett	George Stentenburger	Karen Brisendine
David Mall	Stephen St. John	Katherine Gardner
Sandy Anderson	Mary Lamb	Lewis Downey
Marty Steinberg	Minta Brandon	

Ms. Coffey explained that the Planning Staff recommendations are based on professional analysis of whether a project meets the adopted criteria and they are not based on the economic benefits to the City that a development may provide.

Mr. Christensen then closed the public hearing.

Mr. Haymond asked about the retaining wall having different heights.

Mr. Christensen felt that the applicant should come back to the table and reopened the public hearing.

Mr. Jim Nelson a member of Cooper Roberts Simonsen Architects came forward and indicated that the height was eight feet but they choose to reduce the height to six feet at its maximum point.

Mr. Haymond then pointed to the architectural drawings and wanted to know what the strip of land was that runs across the property.

Mr. Nelson replied that it was a publicly owned piece of property controlled by the Public Utilities Department for access to a water line.

Mr. Haymond asked if it would be an extension to Clinton Avenue.

Mr. Nelson said that it would be green space. No structure can be built on the easement there as the 48 inch water line runs beneath it.

Mr. Christensen then closed the public hearing.

Mr. Fitzsimmons stated that he believed the questions then for the Commission are the height issues on West Capitol Street and whether there are too many houses proposed for the neighborhood. There are

seven bigger units with heights instead of five or six smaller ones and the rhythm, size and scale needed to be discussed.

Mr. Lloyd said that with the relationship and width of the principal elevations and compatibility of the structures there are seven houses with very different roof shapes. The variety of shapes would be a big change to the streetscape. In developing the site, it would have been more helpful if the applicant could have included the context rather than the elevation of the proposed so both sides of West Capitol Street could have been seen.

Ms. Carl said the proposal does not fit the pattern of the neighborhood as most of the homes in the neighborhood do not overwhelm the lot like the proposed homes do.

Ms. Hammond Heid read from the Staff Report "The purpose of the district is to maintain the unique character of older predominately low density neighborhoods that display a variety of yards, sizes and bulk characteristics." Even with the improvements that the developers have made since the last meeting the changes still do not follow with what the purpose indicates, as the homes are still very large and boxy.

Ms. Carl asked if the Commission is being asked to make a favorable recommendation to the Planning Commission on the Planned Development.

Mr. Christensen indicated that the Staff Report recommended approval and if changes were needed the Commission should probably vote against this and state major issues in a way that the architects would come back with substantial changes.

Mr. Ikefuna indicated that any issues that need to be considered should be noted and the Planning Commission can consider the changes.

Mr. Christensen indicated that if the applicant had substantial changes he would be invited to come back to the Historic Landmark Commission.

Mr. Lloyd indicated that if modest changes were being talked about and short of modifying everything, the rhythm of several of the homes might be looked at. There may need to be another opening in the streetscape to visually break up the row of houses and redistribute the houses so the pattern is not all the same.

Mr. Christensen then once again invited the applicant to come forward.

Mr. Jeremy Jones came to the table. He addressed several items that had been discussed including density, positioning, and setbacks. He indicated that the developers are trying to address the communities concerns as they started with 24 units but now are at 19 units.

Mr. Jim Nelson stated the project is right on the edge of Victory Road and the very edge of the Capitol Hill Historic District. The character of the development should be evaluated in the context of the entire Capitol Hill Historic District and not necessarily just West Capitol Street.

Mr. Jones once again explained that the different materials and overall look. They are open to design suggestions but they are trying to get some diversity by breaking up some of the styles of the homes.

Mr. Ikefuna indicated that the Historic Landmark Commission has a hard decision to make. Some of the Planning Commission issues like traffic will be addressed by the Division. The Planning Commission with a recommendation from the Transportation Division will also address things like the PUD and things of that nature.

All the Commissioners made final remarks that were very much alike in that the density and height were the most important issues.

Ms. Hammond Heid moved that in Case Number 006-06 at 690 North West Capitol Street, the Commission deny the application based on the two overriding concerns of:

- 1. The height of the houses are still too tall.**
- 2. Characteristics of the PUD are not compatible with the unique character of this historic district.**

Ms. Carl seconded. Mr. Lloyd, Mr. Haymond, Mr. Fitzsimmons, Ms. Carl and Ms. Hammond Heid all voted "Aye". There were none opposed. The motion passed.

Mr. Paterson called for a point of order and that the Staff Report has certain findings of fact. He stated that if voting against the application the Commission must explain why the findings are not approved.

Mr. Christensen indicated that the motion can be amended with the findings.

Ms. Giraud gave the pages where the specific information could be found that refers to the findings. Page 6 of the Staff Report on Scale and Form, Page 8 Composition of Principal Facades, Page 12 Relationship to Street, and Page 14 Subdivisions of Lots.

Mr. Ikefuna suggested that perhaps the Commission could table the petition and ask the developer to resign and come back to the Historic Landmark Commission.

Ms. Hammond Heid moved to amend her first motion: Case Number 006-06 at 690 North West Capitol Street that the Commission deny the application specifically because in the realm of Scale and Height the proposed Planned Development is incompatible in mass scale and height. Citing Design Guideline Standards 11.4, 11.5, and 11.7 as not met in the proposed design.

- 1. (11.4) To construct a new building to reinforce a sense of human scale and**
- 2. (11.5) To construct a new building to appear similar in scale to the scale that is established in the block and**
- 3. (11.7) To build to meet heights that appear similar to those found historically in the district.**

Ms. Carl seconded. Mr. Lloyd, Mr. Haymond, Mr. Fitzsimmons, Ms. Carl and Ms. Hammond Heid all voted "Aye". There were none opposed. The motion passed.

Mr. Christensen asked for a recess of 10 minutes. (7:35 p.m.)

Mr. Christensen reopened the meeting at 7:45 p.m.

Ms. Hammond Heid had to leave the meeting. There still being a quorum present, she was excused.

Case No. 021-06 at approximately 253 E. First Avenue, by John Collier, to construct three town homes as condominiums in the Avenues Historic District. (Staff-Elizabeth Giraud at 535-7128 or elizabeth.giraud@slcgov.com)

The property is located on the corner of B Street and First Avenue in the Avenues Historic District. The property is zoned RMF-35, and is not subject to the Compatible Infill Ordinance. The units would be two-

and-a-half stories in height with underground parking, accessed as separate garages from B Street. The applicants are proposing to install aluminum-clad wood windows and architectural shingles for the roof.

From the south and north, the proposed structure will be in keeping with the height of the surrounding structures. It will be higher than the U-shaped building to the east, but similar in scale and massing to that of the Villa Andrea Apartments.

The proposed new structure is similar in Height and Width, Proportion of Principal Facades, Roof Shape, and Scale to the surrounding structures and typical structures in this part of the Avenues Historic District.

Ms. Giraud stated that more detail is needed on the proposed window styles and types, as well as the proposed doors. The proposed building is similar to surrounding structures in terms of Proportion of Openings, Rhythm, of Solids to Voids in Facades, Rhythm of Entrance Porch and other Projections, and Relationship Materials.

The town homes will require subdivision approval.

Based upon the findings of fact in the Staff Report and the information supplied by the applicant, Staff recommends approval of the design and referral to the Planning Division Staff for refinement of details.

A copy of the Staff Report is included with these minutes.

Ms. Giraud indicated that a nearby neighbor had concerns in reference to the height and wanted the fenestration on the south elevation along First Avenue increased.

Mr. Christensen asked about the materials on the exterior as it looks like real sandstone. He also asked questions about the windows. Ms. Giraud deferred these questions to the applicant.

Mr. Christensen then invited the applicants to come forward.

Mr. John Collier, 1971 Broadmore St., Gary Andrews and Albert Visouidi of 1045 East Millbert Avenue came to the table. They indicated that they did not have much more to report and if the Commission had questions they would be glad to answer them.

Mr. Haymond asked why windows were not put on the south elevation.

Mr. Collier said that they could address the placement of windows on that elevation with Staff. They did not want all the walls to have windows, as placement of furniture sometimes prohibits that.

Mr. Christensen indicated that it seemed all the windows were being repeated in three's.

Mr. Collier indicated that was correct. The style ties in with the look of the front door.

Mr. Lloyd asked about the French door's size and scale.

Mr. Collier said that they are five foot doors with vertical windows above.

Mr. Collier said the bottom of the units will be real stone on the first two courses and smooth stucco above that.

Mr. Christensen asked about the ledges being stone.

Mr. Collier indicated they will be pre-cast concrete with a pigmentation to look like real stone.

Mr. Christensen asked about the roof line.

Mr. Andrews indicated that there will be rain gutter that goes around the roof to give a crown molding look and then another type of stucco. The brackets over the entrance will be plaster.

A lengthy discussion followed on the garages. It was indicated that the designers have worked with Engineering for the placement of the driveways in order for the driveways to slope to a small degree.

The south side of the structure will have plantings and will be made as pleasing as possible.

Kate Little, owner of the apartments at 68 "B" Street and home owner of 76 "B" street addressed the Commission regarding the details of the drawings. She questioned the accuracy of the elevation drawings. Ms. Little also noted concern about the mass and scale referenced to B Street by Ms. Giraud.

Mr. Christensen then closed the public hearings.

Mr. Christensen then asked about retaining walls at the driveways.

Mr. Lloyd asked if a guardrail would be required for the 30 inch retaining wall.

Mr. Fitzsimmons talked about the massiveness of the building. The slope of the street is 33 feet and the area that meets Ms. Little's is a nice match.

Ms. Carl moved that in Case Number 021-06 at 253 East First Avenue that the Commission accept the Staff Recommendations to approve the project for design only and that the applicant work with Staff on final design details, materials, and window configuration. The Commission further requests there applicant work with Staff to address the façade to have the same detail design that exits on "B" Street.

Mr. Haymond seconded. Mr. Fitzsimmons, Mr. Haymond, Ms. Carl and Mr. Lloyd voted "Aye". There were none opposed. Motion passed.

Case No. 014-04, at 242 W. 500 N., by the Salt Lake City Redevelopment Agency requesting a review of the findings of the Economic Review Panel related to the request for demolition of a building which is a contributing structure located in the Capitol Hill Historic District. In addition, this item includes the consideration of the demolition of the house at 515 N. Arctic Court, which the Historic Landmark Commission reviewed for demolition on August 4, 2004.
(Staff-Elizabeth Giraud at 535-7128 or elizabeth.giraud@slcgov.com)

Mr. Fitzsimmons indicated that he may have a conflict of interest since he works for Prescott, Muir Associates and HOWA is a client of Prescott, Muir and Associates. Since HOWA is the contractor for this project he felt the Commission should be aware of this information.

Ms. Carl asked if it were up to the Commission to make the decision.

Mr. Ikefuna said that a motion should be made by the Commission.

Mr. Christensen then called for a motion.

Mr. Lloyd moved that in Case Number 014-04 The Commissioners agreed that they believed Mr. Fitzsimmons can be fair and just in making decisions on this case and that he stay and be a part of the case.

It was seconded by Ms. Carl. Mr. Haymond, Ms. Carl and Mr. Lloyd voted "Aye". No one was opposed. The motion passed.

Ms. Giraud explained the history of the case stating that it started in August, 2004, when the Historic Landmark Commission reviewed a report from the Redevelopment Agency (RDA) requesting to demolish the five buildings on the commercial node between 500 and 600 North and 200 and 300 West. The buildings were approved for demolition except for one "The Store". She explained the process for approval of a demolition of this type with an Economic Hardship. She also indicated that the Economic Hardship Panel met Monday May 8, 2006, and the Commission will need to make a decision on the panel's determination of Economic Hardship as well as make a decision on whether to approve the demolition of the "Shotgun House."

Ms. Giraud asked Mr. Christensen to have the representatives of the Economic Hardship Panel come to the table.

Ms. Giraud talked about the "Shotgun House" being in the gray zone. It is located right behind "The Store" but on the same parcel. The two buildings were contributing but with different status as to whether they could be demolished. There was a one year clock to make a decision to find a buyer to purchase the "Shotgun House", but if not it would be demolished with "The Store".

Ms. Valda Tarbet and Rob Fetzer the panel members as well as Mack McDonald representing the Salt Lake City Redevelopment Agency (RDA) came forward. Mr. Darrin Liddell the other member of the panel was not able to attend this meeting.

Mr. Haymond indicated to the panel that the Commission would need more information before making the decision.

Ms. Tarbet explained that the panel looked at two uses for the project, one as an apartment building and one as a condominium. The RDA researched the financial liability of both options to determine if the return on the apartment or condominium options would equal the investment required.

Ms. Tarbet indicated the property would be incorporated into the development that is being proposed by HOWA for the Marmalade area.

Mr. Ikefuna indicated that the Economic Hardship issue is now ready for final decision. The zoning amendment that is required for this will be forwarded to the City Council.

Mr. Christensen thanked Mr. Ikefuna for explaining, as this has been a long process. This is the final step for the RDA to get approval for the demolition. The Commission while reviewing the case, could vote not to accept the findings of the Economic Hardship Panel.

Mr. Christensen then thanked the panel and asked if anyone else wanted to speak. Mr. Nephi Kenmethmueller came forward and expressed his thoughts on fixing the building. He thought it would be around \$800,000. He stated the building is very ugly and in extreme poor condition. The community all agreed to the fact that it needs to be demolished and the new construction would be ideal for the neighborhood.

Mr. Christensen closed the public hearing.

Mr. Christensen spoke of the several items mentioned tonight and suggested that someone needs to make a motion to accept the findings of the panel and approve demolition of both "The Store" and the "Shotgun House".

Mr. Lloyd moved that the Commission accept the findings of the Economic Hardship Panel relating to the demolition of the store and that the applicant has marketed the property in accordance with the zoning ordinance and the process outlined in the code. Therefore, demolition of both structures is allowed.

Ms. Carl seconded. Mr. Lloyd, Mr. Haymond and Ms Carl voted "Aye". Mr. Fitzsimmons abstained. Motion passed.

Other Business

Ms. Giraud talked about the Preserve America Initiative Program. The Certificate of Recognition will be presented to Rocky Fluhart, Chief Administrative Officer to the Mayor on Friday May 19, 2006, at 8:30 a.m. at the Downtown Marriott Hotel on West Temple, Salon 1F. She invited the Commission to attend.

Mr. Christensen invited the RDA members back up to the table and read a memo to Janice Lew on May 15, 2006, relative to the documentation package for the duplex at 748-750 North 300 West. Very good information was given under the direction of Ms. Lew and the subcommittee. Comments from the subcommittee were taken back to the RDA. Some questions were asked about the recommendations and now would be a good time to clarify them. The photographs were both black and white with some on a digital disk. One of the recommendations was to print all the photographs on good quality paper and in black and white. The images will last longer as digital data will not. Most companies that develop film don't put it in black and white developer. They develop any film in color developer. Mr. Christensen asked the RDA to always have the pictures developed at a place where they use a good black and white developer fluid. They will last approximately 300 years versus 30 years. He has knowledge of where that type of vendor is located.

Ms. Tarbet indicated that they have talked with the people they hired and it was indicated that the life of the photographs was 75 to 200 years if properly stored.

Mr. Christensen indicated he is a Certified Archivist and is looking for opportunities to make this documentation as good as can possibly be.

Ms. Tarbet indicated that if documentation is forwarded back to the RDA they will do their best to get true black and white processing done.

Mr. Christensen also indicated that another issue is the additional drawing on the duplexes roof and four framing system.

Mr. Christensen indicated that the letter from Ms. Brochinski, who completed the documentation stated she would charge an additional \$850 for that work.

Ms. Tarbet indicated she will withdraw the request.

Mr. Ikefuna indicated he had received an e/mail from Mr. Tuttle the architect for the project at 270 North Main Street the home of Mr. Rudy. He asked that Mr. Rudy work with Staff. Mr. Ikefuna met with Mr. & Mrs. Rudy and they went through some of the issues to understand what was needed for compliance. They took the drawings back to the architect and there is a new revised proposal. A subcommittee will need to be formed to look at the new drawings. Mr. Ikefuna asked for several Commissioners to volunteer to be on the subcommittee.

Mr. Fitzsimmons, Mr. Haymond and Ms. Carl each offered to sit in on the subcommittee. Mr. Ikefuna indicated a date and time will be scheduled.

The Planning Staff just completed work with the Avenues Community Council to draft their own new zoning district of SR-1A. This will be applicable only to a specific area and will replace the one adopted by City Council December 2005, relating to Compatible Residential Infill. There was an agreement between the Community Council and the Mayor after the Planning Commission approval for accessory structure height that is different from the Planning Commission recommendation. The petition was transmitted to the City Council. He asked the Historic Landmark Commission to draft a letter to the City Council in support of the proposed ordinance. He offered Staff assistance on writing the letter.

Mr. Paterson explained in more detail what Mr. Ikefuna had just stated.

Mr. Paterson then mentioned the case by Frank Bernard 415-417 North Center Street wanted to put a garage under his side of the duplex. Ms. Lew had mentioned that in the minutes of that meeting, it indicated the "the Commission granted conceptual approval subject to final details of the design of the garage door and other details to come back to the Commission for approval." He asked if the Commission wants this to come back or if they are comfortable with Staff approving the final details.

Mr. Christensen asked what the Commission wanted to do. There was much discussion. Mr. Christensen was concerned about the rock wall that is to be left in place. He thought that maybe it will be taken down and put in concrete. He said that if that were to happen then he would want it to come back to the Commission.

Mr. Fitzsimmons asked if something like that does happen could Staff have it brought back to the Commission.

Mr. Lloyd moved that in Case Number 032-05 that the Commission allow Staff to approve the plans but that any changes to the structural conditions as noted in the last presentation or major changes to their approved plan be forwarded to the Commission for review.

Mr. Fitzsimmons seconded. Ms. Carl, Mr. Haymond, Mr. Lloyd, and Mr. Fitzsimmons voted "Aye". There were none opposed. Motion passed.

Mr. Fitzsimmons moved to adjourn. The meeting closed at 9:37 p.m.

Louise Harris, Secretary

Scott Christensen, Acting Chair