

**SALT LAKE CITY
HISTORIC LANDMARK COMMISSION
Minutes of the Meeting
Held at 451 South State Street, Room 126
October 4, 2006**

A field trip preceded the meeting and was attended by Commission Members:
Pete Ashdown, David Fitzsimmons, Noreen Hammond-Heid and Esther Hunter

MINUTES FOR THE FIELD TRIP (3:00 P.M.)

A quorum was not present, therefore minutes were not taken.

Historic Landmark Commission Members present at the meeting were:

Paula Carl; David Fitzsimmons, Noreen Hammond-Heid; Warren Lloyd; Creed Haymond,
Esther Hunter and Pete Ashdown (Vice Chair)

Planning Staff present:

Alex Ikefuna, Planning Director, Cheri Coffey, Deputy Planning Director, Joel Paterson,
Planning Programs Supervisor, Nick Briton, Principal Planner and Louise Harris, Secretary.

Commissioner Pete Ashdown, Vice Chair called the meeting to order at 4:30 p.m.

Commissioner Ashdown indicated he had to leave at 5:00 p.m. and wanted to change the order of the agenda. Ms. Coffey, Deputy Planning Director indicated that as Acting Chair he has the prerogative to make that change. Commissioner Ashdown then opened the elections for a new chair. Commissioner Carl nominated Commissioner Fitzsimmons. It was seconded by Commissioner Haymond and all voted "Aye". The nomination passed and Commissioner Fitzsimmons accepted. Commissioner Ashdown nominated Commissioner Hammond-Heid as Vice Chair. It was seconded by Commissioner Haymond. All voted "Aye". The nomination passed and Commissioner Hammond-Heid accepted.

Commissioner Ashdown then left the meeting at 4:35 p.m.

Commissioner Fitzsimmons then continued the meeting as the new Chair. He invited anyone from the audience to come forward if they had comments not related to any of the cases on the agenda for today. Seeing none, he continued to the next item on the agenda.

Report by the Planning Director

Mr. Ikefuna did not have anything to report at this time.

Approval of the Minutes

Commissioner Chair Fitzsimmons asked for corrections or additions to the minutes of September 6, 2006 meeting.

Commissioner Hunter indicated that page 10 of the minutes, second paragraph should read that "the flower pots **and posts that the containers sit on at Liberty Park**". Commissioner Fitzsimmons indicated that on page 2 under Public Hearings it read that he had been recused from hearing the case #470-06-33 at 256 South 700 East, 262-264 South 700 East and 268 South 700 East but it did not show he had returned. It should read "**he returned to the**

meeting at the end of case #470-06-33". Commissioner Fitzsimmons also indicated that page 10, first paragraph, should read "**that the ground was already vacant** was very dishonest".

Commissioner Hammond-Heid moved to accept the minutes as corrected. Commissioner Hunter seconded. All voted "Aye". The motion passed.

PUBLIC HEARING

(This item was heard at 4:37)

Case No. 470-06-34 at approximately 715 North West Capitol Street by Wayne Harrier to construct a single-family house in the Capitol Hill Historic District (Staff - Elizabeth Giraud at 535-7128 or elizabeth.giraud@slcgov.com)

In the absence of Elizabeth Giraud, this case was presented by Joel Paterson. Mr. Paterson presented the Findings of Fact and Staff recommendations regarding this property. The property is zoned RMF-35, the purpose of which is to provide an environment suitable for a variety of moderate density housing types, including multi-family dwellings.

This property is a vacant lot at the northern end of West Capitol Street and the applicant, Wayne Harrier, is proposing to build a single-family house. The property has steep topography and is an unusual property line along the street. The current plans note a 4-foot side yard on the south property line. Because this is a single family home and not a multi-family development, the Zoning Administrator has determined that the 10-foot landscape buffer is not needed. The Board of Adjustment denied the applicant's request to reduce the front yard setback from the required 20-feet to a front yard setback between 13 feet to 18 feet 8 inches.

The square footage of the house will be 5,100 square feet on three levels with a footprint of 2,910 square feet on the main level. On the street, the house appears as a single story, 14 to 18 feet high. Because of the steep grade at the rear, the house is 36 feet at its highest point. The applicant is proposing to use Dryvit stucco on most of the wall elevations and a cultured stone veneer surrounding the garage doors and a wainscot on the north side of the garage. The garage will have a double door. The applicant will be required to meet all setback requirements prior to the issuance of a building permit.

The projection of the garage, its prominence in the façade of the house, and the wide, double garage doors, are unusual and out of keeping with the residential architecture found in the Capitol Hill Historic District. The vertical orientation of the windows is in keeping with the historic pattern of fenestration of residential architecture in the area. Staff finds that the relationship of the windows to the size of the walls, and the replacement within the walls to be aligned with the ratio seen in the Capitol Hill residential architecture.

The prominence of the garage and the double-car door is out of keeping with the character of the historic development found in Capitol Hill, but is a reality of developing in this part of the district. Staff finds that the use of rough wood for posts has no precedent in the district, and recommends that the Historic Landmark Commission deny the use of this material. It is also recommended that the Historic Landmark Commission direct the property owner to work with Staff to create a more appropriate and detailed material for the posts.

The windows in the east and front elevations are a typical dimension for the height and width but historically the window would be a double hung or single hung window. The Staff recommends that the windows be changed to match an historic window pattern.

Based upon the comments, analysis and Findings of Fact noted, 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 conditions listed as:

1. 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 Planning Staff recommends that the applicant present windows other than single pane on all elevations.
2. That the applicant use simple wood trim as lintels and for the porch posts, and that the posts incorporate more detail than shown on the submitted plans.
3. That the applicant revises the size of the decks so that they do not encroach into the rear and side yards.
4. 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.

There being no questions for staff, Commissioner Fitzsimmons invited the applicant to come forward and introduce himself and give his address.

Mr. Wayne Harrier of 672 North Columbus Street came forward and indicated that he did not have much more to add but that he had been working on this project for the past 11 months and is trying to build a quality home that is in keeping with the standards of the district. He is willing to make the suggested changes and comply with the Historical Landmark Ordinances.

Commissioner Haymond asked Mr. Harrier if he had thought about changing the look of the front of the garage by adding an arbor. He suggested some type of design that would make it look more pleasing since the garage stands out further than the house.

Mr. Harrier then introduced his engineer Mr. Larry Christiansen.

Commissioner Haymond asked if the applicant had thought about putting in an arbor along the walkway leading to the front door.

Mr. Christiansen asked if this was a covered walkway that would run along the north side of the garage.

Commissioner Haymond asked what restraints they would have.

Mr. Christiansen indicated that an arbor would be considered part of the structure and would be required to meet the front yard setback.

Ms. Coffey indicated that they would need to check the Zoning Ordinances to see how much he could encroach with an arbor on a front yard setback.

Mr. Paterson read a provision from Chapter 21A.36 of the Zoning Ordinance which allows encroachments into required yards. Arbors and trellises are not to exceed 12 feet in height or 120 square feet in size in a residential district. This requirement shall also apply to non-residential structures unless otherwise authorized. This applies to front and corner side yards, rear and side yards.

Ms. Coffey indicated it might be more of a decorative feature that vegetation could grow on and perhaps could possibly encroach two feet into the required yard. She suggested that the Commissioners might state in their motion that some sort of design feature be added to minimize the design feature of the garage or entrance way. The applicant should work with the planner, Elizabeth Giraud, on that design.

Mr. Christiansen referred to the 2003 International Building Code (IBC) referencing height to width limitations of shear panels on each side of the garage. Given the slope of the terrain on the west side and the fact that it slopes so rapidly, they are forced to put the garage where it is in order for the driveway to have a minimal slope.

Commissioner Lloyd asked about using two garage doors instead of one.

Commissioner Haymond asked about having the garage opening on the north face. The garage would be wider at that direction. Also divided single garage doors could be used without encroaching in the side yard.

Mr. Christiansen indicated that the garage would be wider overall if two single doors were used. Given the setbacks it would encroach into the front yard setback.

Mr. Paterson indicated that the rear yard on the drawings was not accurate. The rear yard setback is based on the percentage of the lot depth. That is 20 percent of the lot depth no greater than 25 feet.

Mr. Christiansen indicated he would be modifying the back deck to make it conform to whatever they end up doing in regard to the entry.

Mr. Paterson explained that Mr. Christiansen had gone to the Board of Adjustment to get a variance for the front yard setback but was denied.

Mr. Christiansen explained that front doors are the focal points of a house. Carriage style doors on the garage would be something they may be able to consider.

Commissioner Fitzsimmons asked if Mr. Christiansen would be willing to work with Staff.

Mr. Christiansen replied that he would.

Commissioner Hunter asked Mr. Christiansen if he had considered having just a one car garage.

Mr. Christiansen indicated that one car garage would make the home harder to sell.

Ms. Coffey indicated that the ordinance requires two off-street parking spaces for a single family home.

Commissioner Carl indicated that a 16 foot wide door with nice fenestration and more texture would look nice. She also indicated that the applicant should work with Staff to find another type of door.

Commissioner Fitzsimmons then opened the public hearing.

Mr. Peter von Sivers, Chair of Capitol Hill Community Council came forward. He indicated he could not say anything about this case because he had not received information until today. He received an e/mail of the agenda. Mr. von Sivers called Ms. Giraud but he did not get a response because she is out of town. He then called his City Councilman, Eric Jergensen about the matter. After that, Mr. von Sivers received phone calls from several people in the Planning and Zoning office but still was not able to get details. He then indicated he wanted to explain to the Historic Landmark Commission that the Zoning Ordinance, Chapter 21A.10.030 explains that public hearing notices must be sent by first class mail and received 14 calendar days in advance of each public hearing. He further indicated that he has requested the applicant present the case to the Community Council on October 18, 2006.

Commissioner Fitzsimmons asked Mr. Paterson if he would like to respond to Mr. von Sivers.

Mr. Paterson indicated that Mr. von Sivers was correct when talking about the Zoning Ordinances on public hearing procedures. The City has been using a "Listserve" for notices to the Community Councils. This is an e/mail notice. The notices are sent out 14 days prior to a meeting. A hard copy was not sent to Mr. von Sivers. Mr. Paterson also mentioned a section in the City Ordinance that deals with Community Council provisions. Failure to give notice under these provisions does not affect any validity of any act or decisions of the Commission. He stated that the division does its best to notify the Community Councils and Mr. von Sivers did receive an e/mail notice of this meeting.

Commissioner Fitzsimmons thanked Mr. Paterson and asked if there were any further remarks.

Mr. Paterson remarked that demolition action of historic structures is the only thing that must go to the Community Councils before the Historic Landmark Commission hears the case. New construction is not required to go to the Community Councils.

Commissioner Fitzsimmons then invited Mr. Paul Evans to come forward.

Mr. Evans of 2546 N. Wilshire Circle explained that he lived south of the proposed property. It is currently a twin family dwelling. He and his wife had purchased the property at retirement about 12 years ago. He is very supportive of the new construction and despite the fact that it will impact the street parking of his tenants; in the long run it will benefit the street and his property. He had hoped that he could get a sufficient side yard between the two properties. Mr. Evans has a 10 foot side yard on the north property line. Mr. Evans went to the Board of Adjustment meeting hoping to get a 10 foot setback in order to have 20 feet between the two properties. Since the property slope is very steep it will be difficult to have a functional yard in the back of his home.

Commissioner Fitzsimmons asked if anyone else wanted to speak. Seeing none, he closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Hunter asked Staff for a definition of what was planned in the area where this home will be built.

Mr. Paterson explained that the land across the street is mostly vacant property and just south of this proposal there is a 19 lot planned development that was presented to the Historic Landmark Commission earlier this summer. To the north is another single family home and not visible from the streetscape. Mr. Paterson passed around a picture for Staff and the Commission to see. It showed other garages in the same area of the Capitol Hill Historic District that have been approved by the Historic Landmark Commission.

Commissioner Fitzsimmons then re-opened the public hearing so Mr. Christiansen could address the photograph. He indicated that Ms. Elizabeth Giraud had given him the photograph and it does show some garages with carriage doors. He is willing to work with the planner in any way he can.

Commissioner Hunter asked about this case going to a sub-committee.

Mr. Ikefuna replied that perhaps rather than a sub-committee this case might be tabled to give the applicant an opportunity to work with the planner, make changes and then come back to the Historic Landmark Commission at a later date for approval.

Commissioner Lloyd moved to continue this case. He requested the applicant work with staff to explore alternative front elevations that could possibly include single doors like carriage type door, door placement and other elements like a trellis. The applicant should also work with staff regarding window proportions and materials and all conditions listed in the Staff Report. This is to be completed and brought back to the next meeting in November.

Commissioner Haymond seconded. Commissioners Hunter, Lloyd and Haymond voted "Aye". Commissioners Carl and Hammond-Heid voted "No". Motion passed.

(This case was heard at 5:28)

Case No. 470-06-42 at approximately 464 South 600 East by Craig Ames, Architect to design a multi-tenant retail building in the Central City Historic District. (Staff - Elizabeth Giraud at 535-7128 or elizabeth.giraud@slcgov.com)

In the absence of Elizabeth Giraud, this case was presented by Joel Paterson. This is a proposal for a new commercial building on the southeast corner of the 600 East and 600 South block containing Smiths Marketplace. The subject property is zoned CS, Commercial Shopping, the purpose of which is to *"Provide an environment for efficient and attractive shopping center development at a community level scale."*

The Planning Commission approved the subject pad site on June 11, 2003.

The subject building will have 5,198 square feet and house three retail tenants. The height of the main structure, when viewed from the east, would be 20'-8" high; to the top of the parapet walls would be 31 feet high. The proposed materials are Atlas brick and Exterior Insulated Finish System (EIFS) in the parapet walls. The roofline of the overall building is flat. It is punctuated with three, gabled parapets on the east elevation, and one broad parapet on the south and the north elevations.

Large signage panels are proposed for the east, south and north elevations. The CS Zoning District allows signage up to one square foot per linear foot of building frontage. Signage is

reviewed as a separate permit, and will be submitted at a later date. The square footage of the proposed signage on the east, south and north elevations is 288 square feet. The entrance doorway and windows are not centered under the gabled end. Staff recommends that it be modified to be centered. The proposed signage exceeds the sign ordinance requirements and Staff recommends that when they come in for the sign permit that the signs are scaled back to meet code.

The north wall that fronts the parking lot does not have windows. Staff recommends that the applicant work with Staff on the windows. The south wall does have windows but the signage block exceeds the Zoning Ordinance allowed and would have to be reduced to be consistent with the Zoning Ordinance. The west wall fronts the loading dock of Smiths Marketplace.

Staff recommends that the Historic Landmark Commission approve the proposed plan, with final review to be delegated to the Planning Division Staff based on conditions stated in the report.

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

Commissioner Fitzsimmons asked if there were any questions for Staff. Hearing none he invited the applicant to come forward.

Mr. Craig Ames, Architect noted that all of the recommendations requested have already been submitted to Elizabeth Giraud with a new set of plans. The Commissioners did not receive the new plans and were interested in seeing them. He indicated that the north wall without windows is about 8-10 feet below grade and cannot be seen from the parking lot. He also spoke of walking from the public way to the building as recommended by Staff. The grade wraps down around the corner to the west at about 6 to 7 percent grade. A public walkway needs to have 2 percent ADA cross-slope and Mr. Ames indicated it could be done. He will check with their engineer.

Commissioner Hunter asked Mr. Ames if he thought about tying into a look of the Trolley Square buildings. Mr. Ames replied that he thought they were tying into the look of Smith's Marketplace which was designed to tie into Trolley Square. Commissioner Hunter was concerned that construction traffic might damage the island at 600 East. Mr. Ames indicated they would not be disturbed. They have already been working with the Transportation Division and a driveway exit to 600 East has been installed with a "right out only" egress. The island will stay as it is.

Commissioner Fitzsimmons opened the Public Hearing. Seeing no one in the public wishing to comment on the project, he closed the public hearing and asked for a motion from the Commissioners.

Commissioner Carl moved to accept staff's recommendation and approve the project, with the corrections just reviewed in the updated plans, and the applicant continue to work with staff on the design details. Commissioner Hammond-Heid seconded all voted "Aye". The motion passed.

(This case was heard at 5:46)

Case 470-06-37 and 470-06-36 at 175 South Main Street. A request by Vectra Management Group, represented by Cooper Roberts Simonsen Associates to designate the Walker Bank Building on the Salt Lake City Register of Cultural Resources in order to place a roof sign on top of the building.

1. Case No. 470-06-37 (Petition No. 400-06-20), requesting the Historic Landmark Commission transmit a favorable recommendation to the Planning Commission to place the Walker Bank Building on the Salt Lake City Register of Cultural Resources as a Landmark Site. (Staff – Janice Lew 535-7625 or Janice.lew@slcgov.com)
2. Case No. 470-06-36 requesting the Historic Landmark Commission transmit a favorable recommendation to the Board of Adjustment to allow the placement of a roof-top sign in the previous radio tower configuration which would include the attachment of neon letters on three sides. (Staff – Janice Lew at 535-7625 or Janice.lew@slcgov.com)

In the absence of Janice Lew, Ms. Coffey presented the case. Ms. Coffey indicated that the Commission will need to make a decision on two issues for this project. The petitioner wants to install a roof sign on top of the Walker Bank Building. This is only possible if it is a Landmark Site. The Board of Adjustment can allow a sign that might not otherwise be approved if the Historic Landmark Commission gives a positive recommendation. The building is currently in the process of being nominated to the National Register and the applicant has applied to obtain tax credits. The building meets the City requirements for a Landmark Site based on the historic merit of the property. The City Council has the final say on whether it is designated as a Landmark Site. The Historic Landmark Commission is to forward a positive recommendation to the Planning Commission regarding the designation. The Historic Landmark Commission would then forward a positive recommendation to the Board of Adjustment for the signage with the condition that any further signage on that building be in the form of a comprehensive signage package. The applicant wants the signage issue to be resolved before the designation issue is completed.

Commissioner Fitzsimmons asked if two separate motions were needed.

Ms. Coffey indicated yes, and that the request will go to the Board of Adjustment first. If the Board of Adjustment does not approve the sign then the proposed designation of a Landmark Site will not go to the Planning Commission.

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

Commissioner Fitzsimmons invited the applicant to come forward.

Wally Cooper, Architect, and Susie Petheram both of Cooper Roberts Simonsen Associates came forward. Mr. Cooper indicated that he had a power point presentation on the history of the sign. The owner is interested in placing this building on the City Register only if they can get approval of the signage. They want the tax credits through the Department of Interior. Placing the building on the National Register basically meets the owner's desire to preserve the building consistent with the Secretary of Interior standards. To place the building on the City Register without the sign provides no benefit to the owner. But it is beneficial to the City to have it on the City register. It would make it more difficult to demolish the building.

Susan Petheram, planner with Cooper Roberts Simonsen then made a presentation. Construction of the building began in 1911 and was completed in 1912. It was at one time the tallest buildings on Main Street. The owner would like to get back the earlier sign configurations. The name was changed to Walker Center in 1983 when the bank was sold to First Interstate Bank. The first sign lasted about 20 years and read "Walker Bank". About 1935,

the sign changed in size and had two rows that read "Walker Bank". The third change is the one the owners are interested in bringing back. A radio station, KDYL, was housed in the building next to the bank. When the radio station moved out they left the tower with the transmitters and the owners of the bank changed the configuration of the sign. They moved the letters that spelled "Walker" on all four sides and the letters spelling "Bank" on the perimeter of all three sides. At this time the sign was used as a weather beacon illuminating color on all sides. When blue flashed it was cloudy, solid blue meant sunny skies and red flashing meant rain but solid red meant snow. This was seen all over the valley. This is the character they wish to restore.

Mr. Cooper came back and talked about the signs of long ago. He explained how the City's sign ordinance changed completely all the signs of downtown. He would like to see that changed again and bring back the signs to bring more excitement to our town.

Commissioner Fitzsimmons opened the public hearing and asked if anyone had comments. Hearing none, he closed the public hearing and called for a motion.

Commissioner Hunter moved to send a favorable recommendation to the Board of Adjustment regarding the allowing of a roof sign on top of the building as shown in the drawings. It was seconded by Commission Lloyd. All voted "Aye". Motion passed.

Commissioner Hunter then moved to send a favorable recommendation to the Planning Commission to designate the building as a Landmark Site. It was seconded by Commission Haymond. All voted "Aye". The motion passed.

Ms. Coffey indicated that the Historic Landmark Commission could modify the sign ordinance provisions. Profile and blade signs are not readily allowed in the City, but in a Historic District these types of signs may be approved by the Board of Adjustment with a favorable Historic Landmark Commission recommendation.

At this time Commission Carl excused herself and left the meeting.

(This case was heard at 6:09)

Case 470-06-48 at approximately 136 East Third Avenue, by Michael Ryon to construct a 22 feet four inch high garage with approximately 816 square feet of space in the Avenues Historic District (Staff - Nick Britton, 535-7932 or nick.britton@slcgov.com)

Mr. Britton gave his analysis, Findings of Fact and Staff recommendation as outlined in the Staff Report. This garage will be a three-car garage located in the rear yard. It will be 17 feet to the midpoint. It is 22'-4" to the ridge of the roof and has two floors. The first level is for vehicle storage and the second floor is a hobby shop which was approved September 11, 2006 at a Public Hearing by the Board of Adjustment. The structure meets all underlying zoning codes in terms of lot coverage height and bulk for an RMF-35 Moderate Density Multi-Family Residential District. This home has been converted from a multi-family dwelling back to a single family dwelling. The proposed garage will have a gabled roof. The proposed wall material is hardboard lap siding. The vehicular access would be through three individual garage doors on the west elevation. The doors would be square and made of wood. The west elevation would

contain three dormers with wood windows. Access to the second floor would be via a wooden stairway.

Staff finds the structure would have a negligible impact on the streetscape because it is located behind the house and would not be seen from the street.

Staff recommends that the Historic Landmark Commission approve the proposed garage with the following conditions:

1. The proposed garage must meet all other City requirements and regulations.

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

Commissioner Fitzsimmons asked if there were questions from the Commissioners for Staff.

Commissioner Lloyd asked about the upper floor being called a studio loft.

Mr. Britton indicated the space will be a hobby shop and has been approved as a special exception.

Commissioner Fitzsimmons asked if there were other questions. He then invited the applicant to come forward and give his name.

Mr. Michael Ryon, 136 East Third Avenue came forward. He bought the home two years ago when he retired. He indicated that this is the only single family, owner occupied, home between "A" Street and Canyon Road. The home was bought with the idea to convert it back to a single family dwelling and now several neighbors are following suit.

Mr. Ryon indicated parking is a problem. Third Avenue is a one-way street and the parking is only allowed on one side. Parking is heavily enforced by the Parking Division, day-time, seven days a week. Parking on the driveway is impossible because it is a shared driveway with the neighbor. The back of the lot is 5 feet lower than the street level. The shop will be used for Mrs. Ryon's quilting and Mr. Ryon will do photography and stain glass.

Commissioner Fitzsimmons opened the public hearing.

Mr. Steven McCowin came forward and indicated he was suing the City over a garage at 446 Douglas Street. He has no reason to oppose this garage but he indicated that there may have been neighbors at this meeting if they had been told what the garage was going to be. Mr. McCowin referred to the Staff Report indicating a three car garage with hobby shop. He also indicated that the plans showed a bathroom. The public notice only indicated construction of a garage. This meant that the substance of the building had not been disclosed to the neighborhood. He indicated that he is not a neighbor and does not oppose the garage but he is concerned about the practice of not giving adequate notice, which is the essence of his lawsuit.

Mr. Britton addressed the issue of the bathroom in the hobby shop. When this case went to the Board of Adjustment, notices were mailed out to the surrounding neighbors. The Board of Adjustment approved the "hobby shop" with a bathroom that included a toilet and a sink.

Seeing on others wishing to speak Commissioner Fitzsimmons closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Hammond-Heid asked if this was approved by the Board of Adjustment, why did it come before the Historic Landmark Commission.

Ms. Coffey replied that the "hobby shop" use was approved by the Board of Adjustment, not the design. The design of the new garage must come before this Commission for approval.

Commissioner Lloyd asked about parking being increased and the gravel thirty feet between the house and garage.

Ms. Coffey replied that parking areas must be hard-surfaced. There will be three off-street parking spaces. Entrance to the garage will be from the west and the driveway will have to be paved. Parking on the gravel is not allowed.

Commissioner Hunter raised the concern that as she read the Historic Overlay Ordinance she believed the intent was to promote a similar scale, mass and design in keeping with the particular building or development pattern of the block-face rather than any approval previously given in the particular Historic District.

Commissioner Lloyd talked about the garage being compatible with the Design Guideline. He indicated that architecturally the roof lines were different and wondered if the garage roof line was taller than the home. He also indicated that his concern was that this exception not becoming the rule.

Mr. Britton indicated that if the garage and house were on the same level the garage would be taller; but because this property slopes to the rear of the property both structures are the same height.

Commissioner Hunter then read the Avenues Guidelines on secondary structures. She read about *access by an alley if one existed. Garages and driveways should not dominate the streetscape and therefore should be detached from the main house located at the rear, if possible. Historically garages and carriage houses in the Avenues should be covered with a gable or hipped roof.* Commissioner Hunter indicated that she challenges the idea that some rear garages have been approved without looking at the area and how the proposal relates to the Design Guidelines. She believes several garages in the Avenues have been approved without following the Sub-guidelines of the Design Guidelines.

Commissioner Lloyd asked if this garage were approved could a limit be placed to assure that the height of the garage stay lower than the existing house.

Ms. Coffey indicated that a condition of approval might be that the garage has to be at the same level or lower than the main structure.

Commissioner Fitzsimmons indicated that the floor level of the garage is five feet lower than the floor level of the house which makes the roofs equal height.

Mr. Ryon returned to the table. The garage is 22'-4" to the ridge of the roof. The front of the house, at the peak of the roof is 21 feet from grade. The back of the house with the slope slopping down from grade to peak is 23 feet. If the garage were next to the back of the house it would be exactly the same height, maybe even a foot less. The front of the house might be a foot higher. But from the back of the house it appears the garage is three feet lower than the back peak of the house.

Commissioner Lloyd moved to approve the garage based on the Findings of Fact in the Staff Report. The applicant is to verify with the Planning Staff that the finished ridge elevation of the garage be three feet below the elevation of the house and that the proposed garage meets all other City requirements and regulations. Commissioner Haymond seconded. Commissioners Haymond, Lloyd and Hammond-Heid voted "Aye". Commissioner Hunter voted "NO". Motion passed.

OTHER BUSINESS

Commissioner Hunter indicated that she and Commissioner Christensen had had a conversation referencing some of the opportunities they have as Commissioners based on the Historic Overlay Ordinance beyond the cases that come to the Commission including but not limited to training, outreach, preservation concern such as enforcement, etc. She feels that the meetings are busy and time is not allowed. She asked the fellow commissioners if they might be interested in adding time on the agenda to discuss some of these types of topics since with everyone's busy schedules, extra meetings to handle such things might be difficult to schedule.

Commissioner Hunter mentioned that Council member Jill Remington Love is trying to get funding to have the Gilmore area studied as a possible local historic district. The University Area is looking to expand down to 1000 East to match the University boundary. These are just a few things she would like to see placed on the agenda. She felt it is not beneficial to have it at the end of the agenda as it is late and everyone is tired. She thought maybe they could be placed at the beginning before the Public Hearings.

Ms. Coffey thought it would be fine but one problem she sees is if you scheduled it for 4:00 and there are public hearings without time slots, the public is kept waiting. It would have to be set at a time that the public was not kept waiting.

Commissioner Fitzsimmons indicated that these are public meetings.

Ms. Coffey replied they are and anyone is welcome to attend.

Further discussion took place among the Commissioners and Staff regarding where it would be placed on the agenda and how much time would be needed. It was also discussed if they could meet with the inspectors and go over enforcement issues such as electrical, plumbing, or framing items.

Ms. Coffey indicated that they could invite the building official to come and talk with the Commissioners. A motion was not needed on the matter. She also asked if the Commissioners had an idea what to name it.

Commissioner Lloyd asked for 15 minutes before the start of the public hearing.

Ms. Coffey suggested that in November the commission could prioritize items to be discussed.

Commissioner Hunter indicated it would be a time to set their goals and discuss what exactly they want to talk about.

Commissioner Fitzsimmons indicated that we should not forget Commissioner Vicki Mickelsen. *She loved older homes and especially historic houses. This enthusiasm has guided our steps as tourists (never met a castle she didn't like) and our choice of residence (beautiful Victorian on the National Register). Her community service including the establishment of the University Historic District in 1991 and six years as a member of the Historic Landmark Commission.* (Taken from her obituary September 26, 2006)

The Commission expressed gratitude to Commissioner Christensen for stepping up and filling in as Chair of this Commission during Commissioner Mickelsen's illness.

There being no further business to come before the Commission, Commissioner Fitzsimmons called for a motion to adjourn. Commissioner Hunter moved to adjourn at 6:50 p.m.

Louise Harris, Secretary

David Fitzsimmons, Chair