

**SALT LAKE CITY  
HISTORIC LANDMARK COMMISSION**

**REQUEST BY LIZA HART, ARCHITECT, REPRESENTING TRACEY BUSHMAN  
AND CHRISTIAN GURHOLT, TO CONSTRUCT A SINGLE-FAMILY DWELLING  
WITH A DETACHED CARPORT AT APPROXIMATELY 667 NO. WALL STREET,  
IN THE CAPITOL HILL HISTORIC DISTRICT  
CASE NO. 470-06-53 (TABLED JANUARY 3, 2007)  
WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 7, 2007**

**OVERVIEW**

This item was tabled from the January 3, 2007 Historic Landmark Commission meeting. The applicants, Tracey Bushman and Christian Gurholt, represented by Liza Hart, architect, presented their plans to construct a single-family residence with a detached carport at approximately 667 No. Wall Street. The subject property is located in a SR-1A, Special Development Pattern Residential zoning district. The Commissioners' concerns focused on the height and fenestration pattern of the proposed home, and grade changes to the subject property. The Commission requested that the applicant:

1. Provide additional information relating to site grading.
2. Address the Design Guidelines relating to building scale, form and details (Sections 11.10, 11.14, 11.21 and 11.23).
3. Consider an alternative design that would meet the height requirements of the zoning ordinance.

The architect has provided a response to the issues identified during the January 3, 2007 Historic Landmark Commission meeting as well as information she considers important to the Commission's discussion of the proposed project (Exhibit 1).

**BACKGROUND**

For determinations regarding certificates of appropriateness for new construction, the Historic Landmark Commission must consider the Zoning Ordinance criteria (Section 21A.34.020H) and the *Design Guidelines for Residential Historic Districts*. The staff report prepared for the January 3, 2007 meeting set forth findings of fact for each standard to serve as the basis for the Commission's decision (Exhibit 2).



## ANALYSIS

### DISCUSSION:

#### Site grading and topography

It is the high degree of physical diversity that distinguishes this part of the Capitol Hill Historic District. The area is characterized by a varying typography and one of the most uneven street patterns in the city. An irregular development pattern exists because of the angle of the streets and orientation of the buildings to the points of the compass. The narrow and steep streets of the area create odd shaped blocks and lot sizes, and the steep topography dictates that building sites be sloped.

The subject property is 3,003 square feet, and falls short of the minimum lot area of 5,000 square feet in the SR-1A zoning district. On August 15, 2005, the Board of Adjustment determined that the previous property owner sufficiently demonstrated that the subject property met the minimum lot size requirements in 1937 and recognized the parcel as a legal developable lot. At the time of its decision, staff indicated to the Board that the subject property may require a variance from the Board for setback reductions for any proposed construction due to the area of the lot. However, the issue of site grading was not a consideration.

During the lot legalization review process, staff documented that a small commercial structure was once located on the subject property. This structure was in place until the City ordered the previous owner of the property to repair or demolish the building. Because of the owner's decision to demolish the building, the lot has been vacant since 1988. A review of Salt Lake City Building Permit records does not specifically identify any site earth work for this property. According to the February 28, 2005 Board of Adjustment staff report, the lot has been the target of illegal dumping, gang activity and a general eyesore to the community. The

architect's submittal indicates that the current grade of the property corresponds with the existing sidewalk elevation, unlike the abutting property to the north that is several feet below the grade of the sidewalk (673 No. Wall Street).

Design Guidelines

The applicant has provided a response to the Commission's comments relating to consistency with the *Design Guidelines* that is attached to this staff report as Exhibit 1. Exhibit 3 includes photographs taken by staff of the evolution of residential structures in the area with a modern design aesthetic and information relating to when a residence was built.

Deleted: 4

Deleted: 4

Height

As stated during the January 2007 meeting, the home to the north is set at an elevation lower than the subject property and the sidewalk, which resulted in the construction of a retaining wall (Exhibit 3). In order to mitigate potential impacts to neighboring properties, the architect proposes to set the new residence several feet below the sidewalk grade. Thus, the height of the center section of the building, the tallest portion of the building, will be reduced to eighteen feet (18'). A height of nineteen feet (19') was originally presented.

**RECOMMENDATION**

Based upon the comments, analysis presented in the January 3, 2007 Historic Landmark Commission staff report attached as Exhibit 1, Planning Staff supported the proposed project because:

1. The proposed building is similar in terms of height, width, proportion of principal façade and scale with other buildings on the block and within the district. The proposed roof shape is not a typical roof form historically used for a single family home, but it is consistent with multi-family development in the area, and will be recognizable as a contemporary design element of the house. Given the eclectic architectural development of this neighborhood and the range of shapes found historically, the house form fits into the overall character of the neighborhood. The carport meets the intent of this standard as its height and width, proportions, and scale are subordinate to the primary structure.
2. The design of the proposed project is a contemporary design solution that draws upon basic characteristics of historic buildings, but reinforces a modern design aesthetic. The proposed house is visually compatible with the surrounding buildings and streetscape in terms of proportion of openings, rhythm of solids to voids in facades, rhythm of entrance porch and other projections and relationship of materials. The proposed "green" roofing material for the side wings, however, fails to convey the same visual appearance of those materials seen historically, and thus is less consistent with this standard. The carport complies with this standard

Deleted: ¶  
Staff made the following summary findings:¶  
<#>The proposed project fails to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment. Changing the grade adjacent to the building to allow development of a formerly below-grade area would drastically alter the historic relationship between the building and the site and diminish the historic integrity of the property and its context.¶  
The proposed addition fails to retain and preserve character-defining features of the property including the primary façade and series of spaces between the street and the building. The overall impact of the proposed addition on the property and streetscape will be substantial given the proposed changes to the site, the size of the new opening, and visibility of the proposed improvements from the public way.¶

as the construction materials are materials typically approved for accessory structures.

3. The proposed house meets the standards of the ordinance in terms of directional expression of the principal elevation, rhythm of spacing and structures on streets and walls of continuity. The orientation of the building is consistent with the typical alignment of the surrounding buildings on the block. The overall impact of the proposed accessory structure on the streetscape would be minimized, given that the proposed carport would be located behind the wall plane of the front facade toward the rear of the lot and the narrow side of the structure would face the Wall Street streetscape.

#### **Conditions of Approval**

1. Approval of the final details of the design including the fenestration pattern and roofing materials of the proposed project shall be delegated to the Planning Staff based upon direction given during the hearing from the Historic Landmark Commission.
2. The project must meet all other applicable City requirements, unless otherwise modified within the authority of the Historic Landmark Commission or Board of Adjustment.
3. The Historic Landmark Commission allows a modification to the maximum building height standard not to exceed eighteen feet at the center mass of the building.

If the Historic Landmark Commission decides to deny the request, reasonable justification and findings of fact for this case should be stated by the Commission.

Janice Lew  
Planning Division  
January 31, 2007

**Attachments:** Exhibit 1: Submittal  
Exhibit 2: January 3, 2007 Staff Report  
Exhibit 3: Photographs

**Exhibit 1  
Submittal**

**Exhibit 2**  
**January 3, 2007 Staff Report**

**Exhibit 3**  
**Photographs**

**Exhibit 4**  
**Site Information – Secondary Elevation**



**Exhibit 5**  
**Article: The Great American Garage**

**Exhibit 6**  
**February 7, 2006 Submittal**

