

**SALT LAKE CITY
HISTORIC LANDMARK COMMISSION
Minutes of the Meeting
Held at 451 South State Street, Room 126
April 18, 2007**

A field trip preceded the meeting and was attended by Commission Members Pete Ashdown, Paula Carl, David Fitzsimmons, Noreen Heid, Warren Lloyd, Jessica Norie, and Anne Oliver. Planning Staff present were Cheri Coffey, and Janice Lew. A quorum was present, therefore, minutes were taken of the field trip.

MINUTES OF THE FIELD TRIP

The Commission toured the University Pharmacy. Staff described the project in general. Staff clarified that the procedure was followed relating to the procedures for demolition of a non-contributing structure, but the Planning Director has the discretion as to whether to send the issue to the Historic Landmark Commission. Citizens requested that the case be heard as a public hearing, so the Planning Director elected to send the case before the Historic Landmark Commission for consideration.

The Commission toured 360 First Avenue. Staff described the project and clarified that they were not certain where the property line was located. Staff identified changes that were visible from First Avenue. There are four units in structure. Staff also clarified the proposed height of the carport and explained the necessity of the height. The elevation drawing indicates there is no slope on grade. However, the site plan shows a four foot grade change which would mean one side would be higher.

MINUTES OF THE MEETING

The Historic Landmark Commission and staff assembled for the meeting. Present from the Historic Landmark Commission were Chairperson Fitzsimmons, Commissioner Ashdown, Commissioner Carl, Vice Chair Heid, Commissioner Hunter, Commissioner Lloyd, Commissioner Norie, and Commissioner Oliver.

Present from the Planning Staff were George Shaw, Planning Director; Cheri Coffey, Deputy Planning Director; Janice Lew, Principle Planner; Casey Stewart, Principle Planner; and Kathryn Weiler, Senior Secretary.

Chairperson Fitzsimmons called the meeting of the Historic Landmark Commission to order at 4:01 P.M.

COMMENTS TO THE COMMISSION

Chairperson Fitzsimmons stated comments would be taken on any issues affecting the historic districts and historic preservation in Salt Lake City. As there were no remarks from the public, he proceeded with the next item on the agenda.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

(Commissioner Hunter joined the meeting at 4:10 p.m.)

Commissioner Ashdown moved that the minutes for the April 4, 2007 Historic Landmark Commission meeting be approved.

Commissioner Norie seconded the motion.
All voted aye; the vote was unanimous.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

Case No. 470-07-06, at approximately 360 East First Avenue, a request by Larry Campbell to alter an existing multifamily residential building, replace an existing rear addition with a new addition as well as construct a detached six-car carport. The property is located in the Avenues Historic District.

(This item was heard at 4:03 p.m.)

Ms. Lew explained the application by outlining the history and major issues of the case which are extensively outlined in the Staff Report. A complete copy of the Staff Report is filed with the minutes.

Ms. Lew explained that there are three parts to the request:

- 1) Remodeling of the east side of the building that includes new wall openings and window replacements;
- 2) Replacement of the earlier additions to the rear of the building with a new addition; and
- 3) Construction of a six-car detached carport.

The applicant proposes to alter the fenestration pattern on the east elevation of the building by cutting new entrances and window openings. A new north facing entrance and an upper level balcony that would match the existing balcony on this façade are proposed.

A two-story hipped roof addition above a stucco finished foundation wall would replace the older additions toward the rear of the building. The primary wall material for the new construction is Hardiplank siding. The wall plane of the south elevation is broken by projecting balconies. The proposed roofing material will match the existing asphalt shingle roofing material. Wood windows are also proposed.

The applicant proposes to construct an approximately twenty by fifty-three foot (20' x 53') detached carport that will cover six parking stalls at the rear of the building on the east side of the property. The shed roof profile is covered with architectural grade

asphalt shingles and rises approximately nineteen feet to the top of a parapet. The proposed design includes decorative corner wood brackets attached to the top of wood square columns. The bays of the carport addition would face west, towards the side of the property. On the east and south elevation there would be a fire rated wall with Hardiplank siding. Access to the parking area would be from an east-west alley that runs between D and E Streets.

Staff recommended approval of the project with the following conditions:

- 1) Approval of final details of the design to be delegated to Staff.
- 2) As detailed in the Staff Report, the applicant would maintain portions of the later additions at the rear of the structure, particularly the west wall.
- 3) The project must meet all applicable City Ordinances unless modified by the Landmark Commission.

Ms. Lew explained that that the applicant proposes to demolish the stone foundation on the east wall. Staff recommends that the west wall should not undergo complete demolition and that the applicant retain the west wall as part of the exterior wall.

Ms. Lew stated that the design of the carport which has a steeply pitched roof with a parapet above is unusual for this neighborhood.

The applicant was invited to come to the table and address the Commission. David Henshaw and Larry Campbell approached the table. Mr. Henshaw didn't receive the staff report and requested a list of conditions so that he could respond to them. Ms. Lew provided a copy for his use. He stated that the proposed project design was inspired by some of the carriage house designs in the Avenues and also in response to the Zoning Ordinance which dictated the slope of the roof to prevent water drainage onto the abutting property. There is a fire parapet wall above the roof line, which dictated the high back wall. The shingle roof needed a 4:12 pitch roof which is the lowest pitch that the design could employ with the use of architectural shingles. The back side is a tall wall that abuts a brick walled parking terrace on the adjacent property.

The applicant did not wish to retain the west wall of the previous addition, but plans to construct the new addition as an inline addition as it imposes some requirements which are not beneficial. By offsetting rooflines and the use of trim bands, he could denote where the original structure ends without losing eighteen inches of the addition width.

The applicant stated that the existing addition was in poor condition and needed to be replaced to maintain the integrity of a new addition. He further stated that reclaiming the stone foundation would be a waste as the stone is not readily visible. It does not and will not be visible from the street. The existing stone foundation wall is six feet deep. The new foundation wall would be nine feet deep, therefore the existing wall only extends two thirds of the proposed new wall which would undermine the stone. As the existing foundation is not reinforced, the stone could eventually crack or slough off. The

applicant stated that there was no guarantee that he could preserve the stone foundation.

The Commission discussed the burden placed on the applicant of preserving a wall which is not visible from the street and would have to function as part of the structure vs. the duty of the Historic Landmark Commission to preserve historical material.

Mr. Henshaw read the Staff Report and did not make further comment regarding the Staff recommendations.

In response to a question posed by the Chair, Mr. Henshaw agreed that he would be doing foundation work on the north exposure of the building where the stone work was visible. However, if the Historic Landmark Commission instructed the applicant to denote the original construction, in the back corner, he would do that with either some trim detail or stepping in the foundation with a line which would denote the old from the new.

A single entry type wood door is proposed where an existing window is located. It would be seen from the front. It would be a white door painted to match the existing door on the house. All of the other doors and windows will not be changed.

Commissioner Lloyd stated that the elevation on the carport illustrates the parking area while the site plan shows approximately three feet of grade change across the parking structure. He expressed concern because the drawing shows the elevation on one end will be three feet taller and the drawing does not demonstrate any accommodation for stepping onto the carport structure.

The applicant responded that the final details have not been designed yet. One option would be to stair-step it down or build the structure on a parallel rake to match the slope on the parking lot. He noted that if the Commission made a recommendation, he would follow it.

In response to questions from Commissioner Heid, Mr. Henshaw stated that there was not a right-of-way issue with the alleyway and that the carport plans already received Development Review Team (DRT) approval. The property line is accurately shown based on a survey and DRT determined that the carport could be placed to within three feet of the first stall. The building to the west has a staircase and landing which was not indicated on the drawings, but it does line up, coming right to the edge of the asphalt.

Commissioner Oliver confirmed with the applicant that there was a rear mechanical access on the back and French doors which were added later and do not appear historic. No other original exterior doors, which are now interior doors, remain in the structure.

Commissioner Lloyd stated that the drawings of the addition show that the fascia would match the existing, which provided an attractive profile. Mr. Henshaw confirmed that the additional fascia would match the original.

Seeing that the Commission had no further comments, the Chair opened the meeting for public comment.

Public Comment

Seeing as no members of the public expressed the desire to speak, Chairperson Fitzsimmons closed the public comment portion of the meeting and moved to Executive Session.

Executive Session

Commissioner Ashdown stated that he did not object to the demolition of the rock foundation on the back because it would be burdensome to the owner and it would stick out like a veneer. Commissioner Oliver agreed and said it would be hard to read the building for historic purposes in the future.

Commissioner Lloyd stated that the detailing on the carport was not completely resolved. He stated that a sloping roof was not a good idea.

Commissioner Oliver stated that she was not supportive of the conversion of the window to a door because it makes the structure look like a multi-family structure. She stated the door should look more like a secondary door to a single family house. This could be accomplished by having a door with more wood and less glass.

Motion

Commissioner Lloyd made a motion in regards to Case No. 470-07-06, that the Historic Landmark Commission accepts the Staff recommendation to approve the addition to the structure and carport with the following conditions:

- 1) Staff reconfirm that the roof height of the carport is in conformance with the Zoning Restrictions.**
- 2) The applicant is to consider a stepped structure to minimize carport wall height and to accommodate the grade change.**
- 3) The applicant is to consider a plan to reuse existing materials, specifically the stone foundations.**
- 4) The applicant is to consider alternatives to the secondary door to reduce the appearance as a multi-family structure.**
- 5) Final approval of the design and materials is delegated to staff.**

Seconded by Commissioner Oliver, who stated that though she was not in favor of the conversion of doors to windows, she understood the need.

All voted aye; the motion passed unanimously

Case No. 470-07-11 and 470-06-55, at approximately 1320-1328 East 200 South, a request by Richard Rasmuson, represented by Brent Davis, Architect. The Historic

Landmark Commission will make a determination of whether the building located at 1328 East 200 South is a "contributing" or "non-contributing" structure in the University Historic District for demolition purposes. The Commission will also review the post demolition reuse plan to alter the University Pharmacy building and construct an addition on the east side of the building. The proposed addition would replace the existing building located at 1328 East 200 South which is under consideration for demolition (470-07-11).

(This item was heard at 4:42 p.m.)

Commissioner Hunter stated that her daughter was an employee of the University Pharmacy approximately five years ago, and though she did not believe her connection with the Pharmacy to be a conflict of interest, she asked the opinion of the Commission. The Commissioners agreed that Commissioner Hunter's past connection with the University Pharmacy did not represent a conflict of interest.

Ms. Lew presented the case by outlining the history and major issues which are extensively outlined in the memorandum dated April 12, 2007 and the Staff Report. The Memorandum is an explanation of the process that took place, the criteria used by the Planning Division to arrive at the determination that the structure on the property was non-contributing. A complete copy of both documents is filed with the minutes.

To keep the cases clear, Ms. Lew presented to the Commission the case for demolition and the reuse plan separately. She explained that the Commission is being asked to confirm Staff's determination that the structure is non-contributing and then to consider the reuse plan, which must be approved prior to any demolition permit is issued.

The non-contributing determination was made in conjunction with the application for demolition and proposal to construct an addition to the building to the west, the University Pharmacy. As set forth in subsection 21A.34.020F of the Zoning Ordinance, a request for demolition of a non-contributing building is not required to be heard before the Historic Landmark Commission. The request may be administratively approved provided the Commission Members and the property owners within 85 feet of the subject property are notified, and given a period of two weeks to respond if opposed to the demolition. Notices of the demolition request were mailed on March 13, 2007. The Planning Director has referred this demolition application to the Commission since public input objecting to the request was received.

In the context of the University Historic District commercial area, the wood-frame building that appeared in the 1936 tax photograph could be considered part of the broader pattern of development, as it would meet the age requirement and was constructed within the historic period. However, major alterations compromised the building's physical integrity in terms of design, materials, workmanship and feeling. The building no longer illustrates, through distinctive characteristics, the identity associated with its historic significance. These alterations are not reversible without complete replacement of building fabric. Thus, it is the Planning Division's determination that the building meets the definition of a non-contributing structure as defined by the Zoning Ordinance.

Commissioner Hunter stated that in 1980, when many buildings were surveyed, this structure received the status of non-contributing because it was then less than fifty years old. If those same buildings were now surveyed, they might receive a different status. She expressed concern that the surveys might be too out of date to be heavily weighed when considering the status of a property.

Ms. Lew stated that Staff did reevaluate the building. As part of the reference materials used to determine status, the Planning Division used the 1993 University Historic District Survey Map which listed the property as out of period.

Commissioner Hunter asked if the Ordinance was laid out so that the property typically received a determination of status prior to presenting a reuse plan to the Historic Landmark Commission; which seemed to grant permission for demolition before considering a reuse plan.

Ms. Coffey stated that the demolition permit cannot be issued until a reuse plan is approved. She stated that the minimum reuse plan would require plans for landscaping. The applicant exceeded the minimum and has provided a reuse plan with an addition to the building on the west.

The applicant, Brent Davis, representing Babcock Design Group and Tiffany Hansen, secretary with University Pharmacy Incorporated, were invited to approach the table to discuss their project and answer questions that the Commission might have.

Mr. Davis reconfirmed that the reuse plan was submitted with the application for demolition. Ms. Hansen stated that the original plan was to save the building, but it became obvious that the building was an unsafe structure and the plan would allow them to fix the building.

Seeing that the Commission had no further questions for the applicant, the chair opened the public comment portion of the hearing.

Public Comment

Cindy Cromer, 816 East 100 South, stated that she was in favor of the demolition, but objected to the Zoning Ordinance which governed the process. She believes that the 85 foot notification radius was inadequate in industrial or business areas and where there is contiguous ownership or land banking.

Mr. Shaw stated that the 85 foot notification radius seemed inadequate. Planning Staff has been reviewing the distance as written in the Ordinance and are considering an amendment to the Zoning Ordinance to broaden the notification radius, making it more in line with other applications and other boards.

In response to a question from the Commission, Ms. Coffey confirmed that the Historic Landmark Commission maintained an electronic mailing list for interested parties.

Seeing that no further members of the public expressed the desire to speak, the Chair moved to the Executive Session portion of the meeting.

Executive Session

A motion was immediately introduced.

Motion

In regards to Case No. 470-07-11, Commissioner Heid moved that the Historic Landmark Commission accept the findings of fact as presented in the Staff Report and determine that the subject property is a non-contributing building.

Seconded by Commissioner Ashdown.

All voted aye; the vote was unanimous.

Case No. 470-07-11

The Commission heard the case in two parts. The following is the second portion of the hearing.

Ms. Lew explained the post demolition reuse plan to alter the University Pharmacy building and construct an addition on the east side of the building. The proposed addition would replace the existing building located at 1328 East 200 South. The project is outlined in detail in the Staff Report, which is filed with these minutes.

Ms. Lew stated that the applicant proposes to raze the existing frame building located at 1328 East 200 South Street and construct an addition to the University Pharmacy building. This is a one-story, approximately 1,872 square foot addition with a maximum height of approximately seventeen feet (17') from finished grade and includes façade improvements to the pharmacy building. The flat roof form of the existing building would be replicated on the addition and a stair-step effect created. The materials for the exterior of the project include Exterior Insulation and Finish System (EIFS) for the main portion of the building, brick as a secondary material, and brushed aluminum fins and cornice details. The plans show storefront type windows on the principal façade with a centrally located double door. The existing roof sign will be retained. Any other additional signage will be handled under a separate application.

Seeing as the Commission had no questions for Staff, the applicant was invited to approach the table to present the project and to address from the Commission.

Mr. Davis stated that he believed the project would constitute an improvement to the neighborhood. The proposed building would be one level. The current structure is approximately eighteen inches above the University Pharmacy.

In response to questions by the Commission, the applicant stated that the windows on the front would remain storefront windows. The sign will remain atop the building as it is an identifying feature of the block. However, the sign might be enhanced with new neon lights.

The applicant also stated that the proposed structure would front closer to the sidewalk than the existing building. The applicant stated that the roof portion of the existing building comes out to the property line as allowed by Ordinance. The new addition will be flush with the adjacent building.

Mr. Davis informed the Commission that the only projection into the right-of way will be a portion of the cornice that is projecting from the existing University Pharmacy Building.

In response to a question from the Commission, the applicant stated that the existing brick façade has been painted over several times and will not be reused on the façade of the structure. Complimentary cornices and brushed aluminum would use a color palate which will coordinate with the other structures on the block face. Possible materials for the façade of the proposed structure would include new brick on the lower portion of the window sill. If the existing brick is in good condition and compatible with the theme of the structure, the applicant might use it elsewhere in the structure of the addition.

Seeing as there were no further questions from the Commission, Chairperson Fitzsimmons opened the hearing for Public Comment.

Public Comment

Seeing as there we no members of the public who expressed the desire to speak, Commissioner Fitzsimmons closed the Public Comment Session and moved to Executive Session.

Executive Session

Commissioner Hunter stated for the record that the University Survey was done in 1991 and in the application for the National Register in 1993. It specifically shows a photo of this block and block face, and while the specific building is not noted as contributory, the street face is.

Some of the details in the Historic Landmark Commission Design guidelines vs. the actual core guidelines are a little different. She asked if the focus of the Historic Landmark Commission should be to preserve some buildings or to also look at things like walls and alleys of historical significance which is listed in a portion of the adopted design guidelines.

She further stated that she did not have a concern regarding the demolition and reuse plan of this building, but does have a concern about the apparent disconnect between the study information and guidelines used by the Historic Landmark Commission. She stated that the need should be addressed in the new preservation plan before some of the buildings of historical significance in this area are gone.

Motion

In regards to Case No. 470-06-55, Commissioner Carl moved that the Historic Landmark Commission accept the Staff recommendation and approve the reuse plan for the structure at the 1328 East 200 South location. The approval of final details will be delegated to Staff conditioned upon the project meeting City requirements.

Seconded by Commissioner Norie

Commissioners Ashdown, Carl, Heid, Lloyd, Norie, and Oliver voted aye; Commissioner Hunter voted nay. The motion passed.

REPORT FROM THE PLANNING DIRECTOR

Ms. Coffey introduced Casey Stewart who is a new planner to the Planning Division. She also distributed various handouts, which are filed with these minutes.

OTHER BUSINESS

Chairperson Fitzsimmons announced that the Architectural Committee met on April 3, 2007, to review and give architectural advice relating to the case. The case will come before the Historic Landmark Commission on May 2, 2007, for consideration by the Commission.

In response to a question from Commissioner Ashdown, Ms. Coffey stated that decisions by the Historic Landmark Commission can be appealed to the Land Use Appeals Board.

There being no further business, Commissioner Ashdown moved to adjourn the meeting at 5:19 P.M.

Dave Fitzsimmons, Chairperson

Kathryn Weiler, HLC Secretary