

**SALT LAKE CITY  
HISTORIC LANDMARK COMMISSION  
Minutes of the Meeting  
Held at 451 South State Street, Room 126  
February 7, 2007**

A field trip preceded the meeting and was attended by Commission Members David Fitzsimmons, Pete Ashdown, Paula Carl, Scott Christensen, and Warren Lloyd, as well as Planning Staff members Cheri Coffey, Deputy Director; Joel Paterson, Planning Program Supervisor; and Janice Lew, Principal Planner; and Michael Maloy, Principal Planner. A quorum was not present: therefore minutes were not taken of the field trip.

Present from the Historic Landmark Commission were Chairperson Fitzsimmons, Commissioner Ashdown, Commissioner Carl, Commissioner Christensen, Commissioner Hunter, and Commissioner Lloyd. Commissioner Carl left the meeting at 7:21 P.M.

Present from the Planning Staff were Cheri Coffey, Deputy Planning Director; Joel Paterson, Planning Program Supervisor; Janice Lew, Principal Planner; Michael Maloy, Principal Planner, and Louise Harris, Senior Secretary. Chairperson Fitzsimmons called the meeting to order at 4:08 P.M.

Chairperson Fitzsimmons announced that each item would be reviewed in the same order as listed on the agenda. Chairperson Fitzsimmons asked that all cellular telephones and pagers be turned off so there will be no disruption during the meeting.

An agenda was mailed to pertinent people and was posted in the appropriate locations in the building, in accordance with the open meeting law. A roll is being kept with the minutes of all who attended the Historic Landmark Commission meeting. The minutes are presented in agenda order, not necessarily as items were presented at the Historic Landmark Commission meeting. Electronic recordings of the meeting will be retained in the Commission office for a period of one year, after which they may be erased.

Chairperson Fitzsimmons inquired if all Commissioners had the opportunity to visit sites that would be the subject of discussion at this meeting. With the exception of Commissioner Hunter, the Commissioners indicated they had visited the sites.

**WORK SESSION (4:08 P.M.)**

Chairperson Fitzsimmons opened the Work Session portion of the meeting. In a discussion led by Ms. Coffey, the Commission agreed to address future work topics in the following order: RDA, inspection issues, sustainability, State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) and the Utah Heritage Foundation.

Joint Meeting with the Redevelopment Agency (RDA): The Commissioners expressed the desire to meet jointly with the RDA to improve the working relationship between the two agencies and to clarify roles. An additional purpose of meeting together would be to educate the RDA regarding the importance of preservation and the Historic Landmark

Commission official policy. Ms. Coffey suggested that the Commission could research past problems and present them with solutions. An additional topic for discussion would be the official preservation policy of the City.

Enforcement issues: The Commission wants to discuss options to educate building inspectors and provide the tools for inspectors to enforce stipulations found in the motions. The Commission will also need to decide if it would be advantageous to hire an inspector whose primary function would be to determine if structures comply with the guidelines, motions, and stipulations set forth by the Historic Landmark Commission. The Commission will also need to determine if the Building Services Division or the Planning Division will oversee the inspector.

Sustainability: Commissioners expressed an interest in discussing the mandate for LEEDS certification as well as evaluating and creating a list of acceptable products for use.

SHPO and the Utah Heritage Foundation: The Commission expressed the desire to meet jointly with SHPO and the Utah Heritage Foundation to discuss some of the projects they are working on and to learn more about the tax and other benefits of home ownership in a historic district.

#### COMMENTS TO THE COMMISSION (4:23 P.M.)

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, he closed the meeting to public comments and the Commission proceeded with the agenda.

#### APPROVAL OF MINUTES (4:24 P.M.)

Commissioner Hunter stated that the January 3, 2007 minutes should be changed to read that the article in the Salt Lake Tribune was in regards to the Park City historic district which is in danger of removal from the National Historic Register. Commissioner Christensen moved that the minutes for the Historic Landmark Commission public hearing on January 3, 2007, be approved with the noted correction. Commissioner Ashdown seconded the motion. The motion was accepted unanimously.

Commissioner Ashdown moved that the notes of the Historic Landmark Commission Retreat on January 17, 2007, be approved. Commissioner Carl seconded the motion. Commissioner Lloyd was absent from the Retreat, therefore he abstained. The minutes were accepted unanimously.

#### UNFINISHED BUSINESS (4:27 P.M.)

Case No. 470-06-53, at approximately 667 North Wall Street, a request by Tracey Bushman and Christian Gurholt, represented by Liza Hart, architect, to construct a single-family residence with a detached carport. The property is located in the Capitol Hill Historic District. This item was tabled at the

January 3, 2007, meeting. (Staff Janice Lew at 535-7625 or janice.lew@slcgov.com) Ms. Lew presented the petition by outlining the major issues of the case, the findings of fact, and the staff's recommendation, a copy of which was filed with the minutes.

Introducing the proposal, she stated that the item had been tabled at the January 3, 2007, meeting. At that time, the Commissioners' concerns focused on the fenestration and grade change to the subject property. The Commission requested that the applicant provide additional information relating to site grading, that the applicant address design guidelines in relation to building scale, form, and details along with other specific sections noted. The Commission instructed the applicant to consider an alternative design that would meet the height requirements of the Zoning Ordinance.

The applicant has provided a response to the Commission's comments relating to consistency with the Design Guidelines that is attached to the 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.

As stated during the January, 2007, meeting, the abutting 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. Supporting photos demonstrating the evolution of home construction in the area are included with the staff report under 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, will be reduced to eighteen feet (18'). A height of nineteen feet (19') was originally presented.

Based upon the comments, analysis presented in the January 3, 2007, Historic Landmark Commission staff report, Staff recommends approval of the design including the fenestration pattern and roofing materials of the proposed project. Final approval shall be delegated to the Planning Staff based upon direction given during the hearing from the Historic Landmark Commission. The project must meet all other applicable City requirements, unless otherwise modified within the authority of the Historic Landmark Commission or Board of Adjustment. Staff recommends the Historic Landmark Commission allow 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.

The Chair called the Petitioner to answer questions from the Commission. Ms. Hart explained that the application was modified to reflect the following changes: The lot grade will be lowered two feet and one foot will be subtracted from the building wall height, which will result in an overall diminished height of two feet. Average building height is twenty feet, so this brings the property well within the twenty-three feet. The

windows have been shortened in response to the Historic Landmark Commission comments during the public hearing in January 2007.

Ms. Hart argued that changes have been made to height and the grade and do comply with the Design Guidelines and read her written comments (exhibit 1 of the Staff Report) to the Committee. She stated that the proposed structure was designed to allow diversity and a new structure cannot mimic a prior period of design history.

#### PUBLIC COMMENT (4:55 P.M.)

Chairperson Fitzsimmons opened the public comment portion of the meeting.

Christine Contestalele, abutting property owner, read a written statement opposing the architectural style stating that it does not fit in the neighborhood.

Minta Brandon, Trustee for the Community Council, opposed the design of the home stating that she worried any allowed new structures on Wall Street would be precedence setting and change the nature of the Marmalade district dramatically.

Evan Caplis, neighbor, is opposed to the style of the house. He wants homes that imitate or incorporate similar styles to blend with the neighborhood. He stated that he would be able to see the roof of the proposed structure from his house. While in support of a green roof, he opposes the use of gravel.

Stacey Waddoups, abutting neighbor to the north, is opposed to the project, stating that it doesn't fit into the neighborhood and that the height of the structure is a problem even with a reduction in grade and wall height.

Helen Draper, neighbor, stated opposition to the proposed project design. She expressed the opinion that a modern looking house would not fit in the neighborhood.

Matt Finlinson, neighbor, was in opposition to the project. He stated that the design did not fit with the neighborhood.

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION (5:25 P.M.)

Commissioner Carl argued that Ms. Hart has satisfied the requirements of the ordinance and followed the instructions given to her at the January, 2007, meeting.

Commissioner Lloyd argued that the lot is non-conforming and it is highly unlikely that a traditional house could be built there. Unless a flat roofed structure is built, the lot is not buildable.

Commissioner Christensen stated that he disagreed with the staff report recommendation. Whereas other neighborhoods in the district do have a variety of home styles, Wall Street is traditionally more historic. He stated that he believes it is possible to meet the roof height with a traditional roof pattern and to get a second story living space. The proposed structure is attractive, but Wall Street is historically intact

and the proposed design does not meet the compatibility requirement of the ordinance. Specifically, the building meets a lot of the standards, but under his interpretation, it fails to meet the following standards in the Design Guidelines for Residential Historic District:

#### Standards for New Construction

11.10 Use a ratio of wall-to-window (solid to void) that is similar to that found on historic structures in the district. Large surfaces of glass are inappropriate in residential structures. Divide large glass surfaces into smaller windows.

11.14 Keep the proportions of window and door openings similar to those of historic buildings in the area. This is an important design standard because these details strongly influence the compatibility of a building within its context. Large expanses of glass, either vertical or horizontal, are generally inappropriate on new buildings in the historic districts.

11.17 Use building components that are similar in size and shape to those found historically along the street. These include windows, doors, and porches.

11.21 Windows with vertical emphasis are encouraged. A general rule is that the height of the window should be twice the dimension of the width in most residential contexts. See also the discussions of the character of the relevant historic district and architectural styles.

11.22 Frame windows and doors in materials that appear similar in scale, proportion and character to those used traditionally in the neighborhood. Double-hung windows with traditional depth and trim are preferred in most districts. (See also the rehabilitation section on windows as well as the discussions of specific historic districts and relevant architectural styles.)

Commissioner Ashdown stated that it is frustrating that the guidelines for new construction are not as strict as that for existing construction. He expressed the hope that if the project goes to the Land Use Appeals Board, the community would be in attendance to let their views be known.

Chairperson Fitzsimmons reminded the Commission that the proposed project needs to be consistent with the neighborhood and whoever presents a motion should be very specific in those areas of agreement or disagreement with the staff recommendation.

Commissioner Hunter stated that the project is not characteristic of the block and the area.

MOTION (5:41 P.M.)

**Commissioner Christensen moved that in case 470-06-53, the Historic Landmark Commission deny approval of this project, stating that the roof is not a typical roof form used for single family homes, and that the Commission finds, in opposition to the staff findings, that the proposed building is not visually compatible with surrounding buildings; specifically, in its context on Wall Street**

**and in the immediate neighborhood. The proposed design is not compatible with the following standards for new construction in the Design Guidelines for Residential Historic Districts: 11.10, 11.14, 11.17, 11.21, and 11.22. The Commission acknowledges that Wall Street is a block face of historic buildings that do not have any other buildings that the proposed design would successfully reference.**

**Seconded by Commissioner Hunter. Commissioners Ashdown, Christensen and Hunter voted aye; Commissioners Carl and Lloyd voted nay. The motion passed 3 to 2.**

## PUBLIC HEARINGS

Case No. 470-06-52, at approximately 317 North 'N' Street, a request by Wellington Webb to construct an approximately forty foot (40') tall amateur radio facility on the subject property. The property is located in the Avenues Historic District. (Staff – Janice Lew at 535-7625 or [janice.lew@slcgov.com](mailto:janice.lew@slcgov.com))

*(This item was heard at 5:44 P.M.)*

Ms. Lew explained the application and staff findings:

According to the historic site form completed in 1979, this one-story brick bungalow was built in 1919, probably from a pattern book design by Raymond Cole. The applicant proposes to place a freestanding forty-foot (40') amateur radio tower in the rear yard of the subject property in order to send and receive long-distance radio transmissions. The self-supporting galvanized steel triangular structure with tubular legs and angle cross bracing would be placed on an eight by eight-foot (8'x8') concrete pad.

Section 21A.40.090 of the Zoning Ordinance provides general regulations, applicable to all zoning districts, for accessory uses, buildings and structures. The proposed accessory structure complies with the antenna regulations of the ordinance. As per this section, specific standards must be met for the requested amateur radio facility. Any antenna having a combined surface area greater than ten (10) square feet or having any single dimension exceeding twelve feet (12') that is capable of transmitting as well as receiving signals and is licensed by the Federal Communications Commission as an amateur radio facility shall be permitted as an accessory use, but must meet the following regulations:

1. Number Limited: *No more than one such antenna or antenna support structure with a surface area greater than ten (10) square feet or any single dimension exceeding twelve feet (12') may be located on any lot.*
2. Height Limited: *No such antenna and its support structure shall, if ground mounted, exceed seventy-five feet (75') in height or, if attached to a building pursuant to subsection D3 of this section, the height therein specified.*

Design Guidelines for Residential Historic Districts in Salt Lake City, Design Standards for Additions,

8.1: Design an addition to a historic structure such that it will not destroy or obscure historically important architectural features. For example, loss or alteration of architectural details, cornices and eavelines should be avoided.

12.4: Minimize the visual impacts of mechanical equipment as seen from the public way. Screen mechanical equipment from view. Screen ground mounted units with fences, stone walls or hedges. Where rooftop units are visible, provide screening with materials that are compatible with those of the building itself. Do not locate window air conditioning units in the primary façade. Use low-profile units on rooftops so they will not be visible from the street or alley. Also, minimize the visual impact of utility connections and service boxes. Use smaller satellite dishes and mount them low to the ground away from front yards, significant building facades or highly visible roof planes when feasible. Use muted colors on telecommunications and mechanical equipment that will minimize their appearance by blending with their background.

Staff is concerned about minimizing any potential negative visual impacts of the proposed antenna on the property and historic area. The Commission may wish to consider to what extent it is appropriate to restrict the height of the facility, determine other less visible locations and appropriate screening as viewed from the street.

The subject property is next to the eastern boundary of the historic district. The City Cemetery located to the east of the property is thus outside the historic district boundary. The surrounding buildings are a mix of one and two-story buildings exhibiting a typical range of styles, forms and materials. The four Victorian style homes adjacent to the subject property to the south range in height from one to one-and-one-half stories. A one-and-one-half story brick Victorian cottage is located to the west. To the north of the subject property, is a one story brick Bungalow with a hip roof.

Based upon the analysis and findings of fact noted above, Planning Staff recommends the Historic Landmark Commission approve the request subject to approval of final details on the design of the proposed project, including location, size, color and screening shall be delegated to Planning Staff based upon direction given during the hearing from the Historic Landmark Commission. The proposed amateur radio facility shall be located to the rear of the existing principal building on the subject property to minimize its visibility from the street. The final landscape plan including specific details for effectively screening the equipment shall be approved by the Planning Staff. This approval is for design only. The project must meet all other applicable city codes and ordinances prior to issuance of a building permit.

## PETITIONER COMMENTS

The Chair called the Petitioner to answer questions from the Commission. The petitioner, Wellington Webb explained that he is an amateur ham radio operator and desires to install the antennae so that he can pursue his hobby. He disputed claims that prolonged exposure to radio wires cause cancer and that the structure would be unstable and a danger to the community. In response to questions by the Commission, he explained the antenna height was in compliance with west coast laws. He informed the commission that one hundred twenty feet (120') tall radios work the best, but he is requesting a forty-foot tower to minimize the impact on the neighborhood. Mr. Webb stated that other alternatives, including a long wire antenna mounted in a tree, do not provide a clear radio signal. He confirmed that if he were to move from the home, he would first remove the radio tower. There are safety guards which can be permanently installed on the tower to prevent unauthorized access to the tower. An eighteen-foot by eight-inch (18'x8") "H" sits horizontally at the top of the tower.

## PUBLIC COMMENT (6:20 P.M.)

Chairperson Fitzsimmons opened the public comment portion of the meeting.

David Keith, whose back yard abuts the petitioner's lot, stated that he is opposed to the proposed tower for aesthetic purposes, fear of health risks and decrease of neighboring property values.

Gernot Laicher, neighbor directly south of the subject property, objected to the height of the tower: and on a small lot, a decrease in property values. He speculated that stray radio signals could possibly turn on his lights or impact someone's pacemaker. He further questioned the integrity of the tower construction.

Russell Banz, neighbor to the north, objects to the aesthetics of the proposed project. He stated concern that noise from the power pole would increase with the antennae and that the tower, once the tower was approved, it would not be completed.

Louis Downing, is not from the neighborhood, but is a former amateur radio operator. He offered the opinion that the applicant needs to consider other less intrusive and physically visible options. In regards to the RF exposure issues, he stated that the amateur radio association has guidelines to help radio operators use the equipment safely.

## EXECUTIVE SESSION (6:45 P.M.)

Seeing that no other members of the public wished to address the Commission regarding this matter, Chairperson Fitzsimmons closed the public comment portion of the meeting and proceeded to the executive session. Chairperson Ashdown presented a motion to the Commission.



MOTION (6:45 P.M.)

**In regards to Petition No. 470-06-52, Commissioner Ashdown moved to deny the applicant the ability to construct the antennae based on Design Guidelines for Residential Historic Districts in Salt Lake City, General Design Standards, Section 8.1 and 12.4. The Zoning Ordinance section 21A.34.020 and G.2. The Commission finds that the accessory structure does obscure the defining characteristics of the property; and the height maximizes the impact from the public way. Antenna regulatory issues are created by the Federal Government, but the site does fall within a historic district; and therefore, the design and placement of antennas are under the jurisdiction of the Historic Landmark Commission.**

**Commissioner Christensen seconded the motion. Commissioner Carl encouraged the applicant to consult with an expert to help him find another way to support a ham radio while being less intrusive. All voted in favor of the motion to deny. Motion passed.**

Commissioner Fitzsimmons called a break (6:49 P.M.)

Case No. 470-07-01, at approximately 815 South 600 East, a request by Chelli Lundberg, Advantage Window & Door, to legalize windows replaced without a building permit and to approve replacement of other remaining original windows on the apartment building. The property is located in the Central City Historic District. (Staff – Michael Maloy at 535-7118 or michael.maloy@slcgov.com)

*(This item was heard at 6:56 P.M.)*

Mr. Maloy briefly described the proposal. According to a historic survey conducted by the Utah State Historic Preservation Office in 1989, the subject property is described as a “masonry...multiple dwelling brick block” structure in “good” condition without any alterations to the original building. The multi-family rectangular building was originally constructed in 1950. Although the building was deemed “ineligible” for historic preservation purposes at the time of the 1989 survey, the structure is now 56 years old and as such has been categorized as a “contributing structure” within the Central City historic district as per Salt Lake City Code 21.34A.020.B.2.

The structure is comprised of two stories above grade with a basement. Each level within the building contains two apartments, for a total of six units. The multi-family dwelling is characterized by a low pitch hip roof, brick façade, metal awnings along the front and a series of fixed and casement windows of varying sizes on all sides of the building. The original windows were manufactured using rolled steel for the window frame, rail, stile and muntins. Single-pane glass was then installed using a glazing compound, thereby creating true divided lights within each window. Most window openings utilize a combination of fixed and casement windows, which pivot vertically outward.

The building exterior has not been significantly altered throughout its history. According to Salt Lake City building permit records, previous owners of the building were issued two separate plumbing permits; one in 1958 and again in 1975. The current owner purchased the property in approximately March of 2002. Prior to the applicant's recent efforts to replace the original rolled steel window frames and muntins with vinyl window frames; all 36 of the original windows were intact. The applicant replaced 19 of 36 original windows when a City building inspector noticed the work, informed the applicant regarding the need to obtain a permit and issued a stop work order for the project on November 7, 2006. Subsequently, the applicant submitted a petition to the Historic Landmark Commission (HLC) for Minor Construction/Alteration to legalize the replacement windows already installed and permit the replacement of all remaining original windows.

The applicant is asking to legalize replacement of all windows. Staff suggests legalizing the windows which have been replaced and to allow replacement of the remaining windows, but require the original pattern to be mimicked.

Mr. Maloy stated that prior to the partial replacement of windows, all windows were the original 1950s windows. The replacement was halted while the front elevation still contained the original windows. He explained that replacement of the window using identical materials, style and function was not practical. A compromise to replace the front windows could involve partial retention and repair or replacement of the original window with a grid style window that would mimic the original. He noted that mimicking the windows would not allow true divided light and that much of the apartment building is seen from the public way.

The Chair called the Petitioner to answer questions from the Commission. James Straiter, owner of Advantage Windows & Door, explained that the salesman who sold and installed the replacement windows was inexperienced and did not realize that the property was in a historic district. His company is now petitioning the Historic Landmark Commission to legalize the work already conducted and approval for replacement of the remaining windows.

He further stated that they were faced with the problem of replicating the steel casement windows because the grids are not available unless the grid is external. Wooden casement windows with true dividing light would not be an identical replication and cost approximately \$340.00 per window or \$10,000 to complete the project. Milgard makes an external grid that goes over the existing window in a colonial style. When seen from the road it is indistinguishable from a true grid. The windows would have a true divided light look from the street. It sits against the exterior of the glass, raised about one half inch, but from the curb it is indistinguishable from a true divided light or an external grid. Vinyl windows do have a lifetime warranty and the petitioner expects the windows to be durable and last approximately thirty or forty years.

#### PUBLIC COMMENT (7:15 P.M.)

Seeing that there were not any members of the public who wished to speak to this issue, Chairperson Fitzsimmons opened the executive session portion of the hearing.

## EXECUTIVE SESSION (7:19 P.M.)

Mr. Maloy stated that the only photo of the building available was a black and white document of the street façade from the 1979 survey. Commissioner Hunter asked if all construction of this nature required a permit and if the replacement of existing windows with vinyl was routinely allowed in the historic district. Staff confirmed that permits were required for the work conducted at the subject site and that it was not typical to grant an exception to allow vinyl windows in the historic area.

After confirming with the Chair that a quorum was still present if she excused herself, Commissioner Carl left the meeting at 7:21 P.M.

The Commissioners generally commented that the style of this building is so simple in structure that the grid in the front elevation second floor window is one of the few defining characteristics of the building; therefore, it was generally agreed that the window must be repaired rather than replaced and the other windows on the front elevation should be constructed with an external grid as proposed by the applicant, which match the configuration to preserve the character of the principle façade.

As structures from this time period now fall under the auspices of the Historic Landmark Commission, the Commissioners expressed the desire for guidelines to address the structures from this era: specifically, regarding the principle façade.

## MOTION (7:26 P.M.)

**In regards to Case No. 470-07-01 Commissioner Ashdown moved to allow the installation of vinyl windows based on the character of this building being a square box apartment building and not depending heavily upon the design of the windows to define its character, but the applicant must retain and repair the front second story center window and that the front windows which are visible from the street are installed with an external grid to mimic the original steel windows.**

**Commissioner Lloyd seconded the motion.**

**Commissioners Ashdown, Christensen and Lloyd voted aye, Commissioner Hunter voted nay. The motion carried.**

## REPORT FROM THE PLANNING DIRECTOR (7:26 P.M.)

Chairperson Fitzsimmons noted that the Planning Director was not present. He opened the meeting to discuss other business.

## OTHER BUSINESS (7:27 P.M.)

Ms. Coffey reminded the Commission that the Preservation Presentation by Monica Callahan would take place on February 21, 2007. Commissioner Lloyd indicated he would not be present at the meeting.

The New Hope Center is a Landmark in the Northwest Community. Staff is putting together a memorandum to present to the City Council requesting funds for a feasibility study for adaptive reuse of the structure.

Ms. Coffey invited the Commission to attend the upcoming Economic Hardship Panel meeting regarding 256 South 700 East scheduled for March 13 2007. The project will return to the Historic Landmark Commission in April 2007, so that the Commission can review the Panel's findings.

The Salt Lake Sustainable Building Conference is on February 21, 2007. There will be a discussion on green preservation and Federal tax credits. Experts from the preservation field will be present. Commissioners Fitzsimmons and Hunter expressed interest in attending.

The Utah Heritage Foundation Conference will be in April 2007. Ms. Coffey will provide specifics when more information becomes available. Commissioner Hunter expressed interest in attending.

Mr. Paterson provided a brief summary of the Capitol View Planned Development which appeared before the Historic Landmark Commission in 2006. A seventeen-lot subdivision facing West Capitol Street is being reviewed as a Planned Development. Therefore, the Planning Commission will also hold a public hearing. The Historic Landmark Commission denied the request based on the failure of the project to meet the following Design Guideline Standards:

- 11.4 Construct a new building to reinforce a sense of human scale;
- 11.5 Construct a new building to appear similar in scale to the scale that is established in the block, and;
- 11.7 Built to heights that appear similar to those found historically in the district.

The newly designed project was reviewed at a joint subcommittee meeting on January 31, 2007. A full copy of the notes of that meeting are included with these minutes. Noting that the project did not provide sidewalks or access to West Capitol Street, the Subcommittee recommended that the developer incorporate stairways or walkways that lead from West Capitol Street to provide better pedestrian access.

Commissioner Christensen, who participated in the subcommittee, briefly described the redesign:

- A seventeen-unit subdivision condominium.
- The proposed structures are of Craftsman or Prairie style design with the porch details changed enough to essentially reflect different structures.
- In the retooled plans, the structures have changed orientation so that some of the structures look out over West Capitol Street, but they no longer front that street. Essentially the back of the homes face the street.

Ms. Coffey provided an update on Requests for Proposals (RFP) of various studies. The Committee has met on the Liberty Wells and Avenues surveys, made recommendations, and process is now proceeding. They have not yet met on the Gilmer Park and Sugar House business district survey proposals. No RFP has been submitted on the University Extension Part.

There being no further business, Commissioner Hunter moved to adjourn the meeting at 7:39 P.M.

---

Dave Fitzsimmons, Chairperson

---

Louise Harris, Recording Secretary

---

Kathryn Weiler, Historic Landmark Commission Secretary (Transcriber)