

**SALT LAKE CITY
HISTORIC LANDMARK COMMISSION
Minutes of the Meeting
Room 315, 451 South State Street
July 2, 2008**

The regular meeting of the Historic Landmark Commission was held on July 2, 2008, at 5:52 p.m. in Room 315 of the City and County Building, located at 451 South State Street, Salt Lake City, Utah, 84111. Commissioners present for the meeting included Paula Carl, Sheleigh Harding, Polly Hart, Creed Haymond, Warren Lloyd, and Anne Oliver. Commissioners Earle Bevins, III, David Fitzsimmons, Arla Funk and Jessica Norie were excused from the meeting.

Planning staff present for the meeting were: Janice Lew, Principal Planner and ex officio for the Historic Landmark Commission; Paul Nielson, Senior City Attorney; Lynn Pace, Deputy City Attorney; Robin Zeigler, Senior Preservation Planner and Cecily Zuck, Historic Landmark Commission Secretary.

A field trip was held prior to the meeting at 4:00 p.m. The field trip was attended by Commissioners Hart and Lloyd. A quorum was not present and therefore, minutes were not taken during the field trip. The Commission, however, did not revisit the site for City Creek Center and the ZCMI façade, instead opting to revisit the site for the agenda's second item.

DINNER AND WORK SESSION

(This item occurred at 5:15 p.m., prior to the regular meeting.)

Robin Zeigler noted that the next meeting for the Preservation Plan would be held on July 14, 2008, at 5:00 p.m. She stated that Ron Sladek would be present to confer with the Community Action Council and other advisory members to consider which individual properties throughout Salt Lake City should be surveyed for the plan.

Ms. Zeigler noted there was also a Preservation Plan workshop tentatively scheduled for mid-September and she would inform the Commission of the final details as they became available.

At the last meeting of the Community Advisory Committee (CAC), Acting Chairperson Lloyd stated, they had reviewed maps and historic markers identifying some areas of interest throughout the City. He noted that it was remarkable how many sites the group identified in just preliminarily examining the maps together.

Acting Chairperson Lloyd stated that at the July 14th meeting with the CAC they would also discuss what methods and means were available to educate the public about the Preservation Plan process and by which to receive ample public comment.

Ms. Lew inquired if the Commission could help to prioritize issues for further exploration by staff which had been discussed at the retreat, particularly noting education, and a possible solar panel symposium for the Commission as well as community members.

Commissioner Haymond noted that he saw historic district enforcement and education of the community as a high priority and volunteered to be part of a committee to explore those issues.

Commissioner Harding noted that she felt it was important for the Commissioners who were not familiar with particular architectural styles to receive more education and that it could be a topic for an upcoming work session.

Ms. Lew noted that both issues could be addressed.

Ms. Lew stated that Nole Walkingshaw would be reviewing the Accela program and would discuss how the interface would assist public officials at a future work session.

Commissioner Oliver noted she would like to know how the Accela program implementation would assist and educate the public.

Acting Chairperson Lloyd noted that he would like to see a symposium on solar panels in the near future, but would also like to address other advancements in building materials and discuss how the Commission should address such materials.

Commissioner Oliver noted that she would also like to see more information from material manufacturers, particularly regarding new vinyl window profiles, which she had heard could now be molded to include more architectural detail and variety.

Ms. Zeigler stated that they could look into providing more information for the Commission regarding material manufacturers and available options.

Ms. Lew noted that an educational brochure on ownership in local historic districts was being developed by staff.

As there were no other issues raised regarding the retreat, Ms. Zeigler moved on to another item for discussion. She noted that the Liberty Park Tennis Bubble case appealed to the Land Use Appeals Board (LUAB) had been heard on June 30th, 2008 and the LUAB decision had been to remand the case back to the Historic Landmark Commission. She stated that they would not need to reconsider the entire case, but were asked to affirm findings for their decision as there was no discussion of findings in the original motion on record.

Commissioner Harding inquired if this meant they would need to affirm every finding listed in the staff report.

Mr. Pace noted that the Commission would not need to affirm every finding in the staff report, but should discuss the applicable standards which had been identified for recommending approval in the original staff report.

Commissioner Oliver inquired when the case would be heard.

Ms. Zeigler noted that the agendas for August and September were already quite full and it was not likely that the case would be heard by the Commission before October.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

(This item was heard at 5:53 p.m.)

Commissioner Hart made a motion to approve the minutes with noted changes. Commissioner Haymond seconded. Commissioners Harding, Haymond, Hart and Oliver voted "Aye". Commissioner Carl abstained from the vote. The motion carried by majority.

REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR

(This item was heard at 5:56 p.m.)

Ms. Lew noted that staff had no issues to report.

COMMENTS TO THE COMMISSION

(This item was heard at 5:56 p.m.)

Acting Chairperson Lloyd opened the floor to public comments at this time, but seeing no one with comments for the Commission, he moved on to the next item on the agenda.

NEW BUSINESS

Petition 470-08-17 City Creek Reserve, Inc. Major Alteration - A request by City Creek Reserve, Inc., owner, for a major alteration to the historic ZCMI façade to be relocated at approximately 15 South Main Street. The proposed project includes the reconstruction of the façade and its attachment to a new building. The property is zoned D-1 Central Business District. The Landmark Site is located in City Council District 4, represented by Council Member Luke Garrott. *(This item was heard at 5:57 p.m.)*

Acting Chairperson Lloyd recognized Robin Zeigler as staff representative.

Ms. Zeigler reviewed the proposal noting that the changes incorporated into the façade design since the last hearing before the Commission on the matter included:

- ★ Removing the proposed loggia and placing the façade almost flush with the new building
- ★ Incorporating a different treatment of the spandrel glass in the façade openings
- ★ Display windows would all be moved to the first floor, no display windows would be located on the upper floors

Ms. Zeigler noted that the applicant sought conceptual approval of the item and the relegation of final design detail approval to staff or the Commission at a later date.

Seeing no comments or questions for staff from the Commission, Acting Chairperson Lloyd invited the applicant forward to speak at 5:58 p.m.

Bill Williams, with CCRI, gave the Commission a presentation regarding proposed changes for the ZCMI façade. He reviewed historic photos of the façade, showcasing particular elements which comprised the current incarnation of the cast-iron façade, which had been reconstructed for the previous ZCMI department store in 1972.

Mr. Williams noted that the current proposal would move all of the show windows to the first floor and then eliminate the loggia and turn that space into an entryway and show windows. The façade would sit slightly behind the new building face so that the separate elements could move independently of one another in the event of an earthquake, he noted.

Mr. Williams stated that the spandrel glass proposed for the façade openings would have some depth and noted he would provide a sample for the Commission to examine.

He reviewed entrances and exits on the front façade of the store as well as proposed signage. He noted that there was a canopy on the front of the façade which extended out into the sidewalk about 8-10' and would be about 28' in length. He noted that the signage for the canopy would include pin letters centered on top of the canopy. He noted that the canopy would be solid and incorporate a separate drainage system away from the façade so there would be no drip edge.

Mr. Williams noted that the floors of the new building would not meet the historic façade, but instead, the show windows would be built slightly above the first floor of the store to match the façade openings to create the illusion that the store was on the same level.

Commissioner Haymond inquired what the canopy would be comprised of.

Mr. Williams noted that it would be comprised of painted metal.

Commissioner Haymond acknowledged that Mr. Williams had stated the canopy would not be connected to the new structure, but inquired if it would appear to be connected.

Mr. Williams noted that it would look as though it were connected and would only be 6-7" off of the historic façade and would be sealed at the top and bottom so that it would not be immediately apparent that the two elements were not connected.

Commissioner Hart inquired if the Commission might see the example of spandrel glass Mr. Williams had mentioned.

Mr. Williams presented the sample to the Commission, noting that the glass was comprised of four levels to provide depth and the third level could be a design of the applicant's choosing and the fourth level would include a paint color of the customer's choosing.

Commissioner Carl inquired where the glass would be placed in relationship to the façade.

Mr. Williams noted that the glass would be placed a few inches behind the façade.

Commissioner Oliver requested that Mr. Williams discuss how the proposed night lighting system would assist in focusing on the architecture instead of on the façade openings.

Mr. Williams apologized for not mentioning this change to the proposal. He noted that the previous schemes included using light-emitting diodes (LEDs) to reflect light off of the windows, and the new proposal was to use these lights to focus on the architecture instead. He stated that they had contracted with a lighting designer to assist them in that endeavor.

Acting Chairperson Lloyd noted that in the Architectural Review Committee meeting, it had been very helpful to see an architectural rendering which displayed a slight reflection on the façade openings from surrounding activity.

Mr. Williams noted that different degrees of reflectivity could be achieved, depending on what type of glass was used in the first pane of the spandrel treatment. He noted that use of a low-iron glass in the first pane created a see through appearance. He noted that it would be attractive to have a reflective quality to the glass and they could work towards that end.

Mr. Williams noted that it would also be helpful for CCRI to receive approval or thoughts from the Commission on signage and canopy location.

Commissioner Oliver noted that they were requesting location approval and not final material approval.

Mr. Williams noted that this was correct and that if the Commission felt that the general placement and size of the signage was correct for the building, the applicants could work with staff on the exact details.

Ms. Lew stated that she did not believe staff had been given the opportunity to review proposed signage in accordance with the sign ordinance.

Ms. Zeigler agreed that staff had not analyzed the proposed dimensions and specifics of the signs and sign ordinance; when she had received the drawings they were conceptual and staff had been told that the signage had not been approved by Macy's yet.

Acting Chairperson Lloyd inquired if it would be appropriate for the Commission to comment on the general location of the signage and defer details and ordinance review to the staff.

Ms. Zeigler noted that she felt it was appropriate for the Commission to include this as part of approval of the conceptual plan if they felt inclined to do so.

Acting Chairperson Lloyd opened the floor to public comment at 6:14 p.m.

Cindy Cromer, 816 East 100 South, stated that she felt her concerns regarding this entry to the City Creek development had been addressed through the subcommittee, and was pleased with the movement of the display windows. She stated that she felt that this proposal was more in kind with the historic images of the structure, with similar windows all being on the same level.

Kirk Huffaker was present on behalf of the Utah Heritage Foundation. He noted that he would like to commend the Commission for helping the applicant to come back with an improved design for the façade. He commended the amended proposal for lighting, noting that it would help to better highlight the historic architecture of the façade, and was similar to the way in which local historic buildings had been lighted in the past.

Acting Chairperson Lloyd closed the public comment portion of the item at 6:17 p.m. and moved the Commission into Executive Session.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Commissioner Hart noted that she felt the current proposed division of the windows to be a more aesthetically pleasing interpretation.

Commissioner Carl inquired if the glass on the main floor was repeated or was two different types of bifurcated glass and if this presentation affected the layout of the interior.

Mr. Williams noted that there was only one type of glass on the first level, but the floor had been set back to incorporate show windows which would appear to be full height in regards to the ZCMI façade. Mr. Williams noted that the glass would be vision glass from top to bottom on the first level, above and below the center rail.

Acting Chairperson Lloyd noted that the entire first floor would then be vision glass, and the reflective glass would begin on the second floor.

Mr. Williams noted that there would be spandrel glass on the edges of the building at the main level, as that was where seismic bracing and the continuation of exit stairs would be housed.

Acting Chairperson Lloyd inquired if the Commission had any concerns regarding the proposed canopy.

Commissioner Haymond noted that he was satisfied with both the canopy and proposed signage, and was comfortable in referring any design details to staff.

Commissioner Oliver noted that she was also satisfied with the canopy and signage proposals, noting she felt they were simple and unobtrusive and did not imitate anything on the historic facade.

Acting Chairperson Lloyd inquired if the Commission would look for items to be delegated to staff on final approval or would like to see the details before them at a later date.

Commissioner Oliver stated she felt comfortable in delegating design detail approval to staff, noting that if staff found that a detail required review by the Commission it could be brought back.

Mr. Pace noted that the decision should address the signage, canopy and lighting as well as the overall use of the façade.

Acting Chairperson Lloyd noted that the motion might need to clarify who the Commission was allowing approval of final design decisions but it was in the Commissions purview to relegate final approval of details to staff.

Ms. Zeigler noted that the Commission could approve the conceptual design, with general locations for signage. She noted that lighting should probably still be looked at, by staff or the Commission, as there was no definitive location or proposed size for the lighting given to the Commission. Ms. Zeigler noted that the proposal could return to the Commission or the final approval could be delegated to staff.

Commissioner Oliver made a motion to approve a Certificate of Appropriateness for the general design of petition 470-08-17, including signage and canopy placement, and that the applicant come back to staff or the Commission for approval of final design details such as the signage design and materials, awning design and dimensions, glass material and design, location and design of display windows and doors and lighting design and location.

There was no discussion of the motion.

Commissioner Haymond seconded the motion. All voted "Aye". The motion carried unanimously.

Petition 470-06-56 Everest Builders LLC. New Construction - A request by Everest Builders LLC, represented by Eric Saxey, for New Construction located at approximately 256, 262 and 268 South 700 East and 673 and 695 East 300 South Street in the Central City Historic District. The proposed project involves construction of 13 condominiums. The property is zoned RMF-45, Moderate/High Density Multi Family Residential in the Central City Historic District. The property is located in City Council District 4, represented by Council Member Luke Garrott.
(*This item was heard at 6:28 p.m.*)

Acting Chairperson Lloyd recognized Robin Zeigler as staff representative.

Ms. Zeigler noted that the item had gone before the Planning Commission and the site plan before the Historic Landmark Commission was the plan approved by the Planning Commission at their last meeting. Ms. Zeigler reviewed issues which had been of concern to the Historic Landmark Commission previously, and if they had been resolved, including;

- Parking on Markea; removed since the petition last appeared before the Commission.
- Discussion that the design should not include a garage facing 300 South; reviewed by the Architectural Review Committee, and applicant changed design to be less obtrusive by recessing the doors and creating an awning over the garage.
- Concern regarding the design of the submerged courts; the applicant had recently significantly diminished the size of the courts.
- Presence of a second additional parallel sidewalk; the applicant removed the sidewalk
- There had been a question regarding the rhythm of solids to voids; the applicant increased the amount of brick on the façade.
- Question regarding the symmetry of the design when compared to other historic buildings in the neighborhood; the applicant made some other proposed changes to the façade.

- Question regarding lack of well defined entrances; the Architectural Review Committee felt that the issue had been resolved through the design of the entrance staircases.

Ms. Zeigler noted that the project met portions of the zoning ordinance but did not substantially meet the ordinance. She stated that staff felt it was in many ways a successful contemporary interpretation of a historic apartment building, but there was still several ways in which the design did not meet the standards or design guidelines. Ms. Zeigler reviewed these issues for the Commission, including:

- Standard 1: Staff had concern with the width of the building fronting 300 South. She noted that the unit facing 300 South was 60 feet wide, about three times as wide as other buildings on Markea Avenue and 300 South. She stated that staff recommended the size of the building on 300 South be reduced in size to remain more in place with the width of existing single family and multi-family historic buildings in the area.
- Design Guideline 11.6: She noted that the design did not include a one story element such as a porch. Ms. Zeigler stated that a design element around the entrances such as a projecting vestibule or portico could help to better define the entrances and fulfill the directive of the design guidelines.
- Standard 2, composition of principal façades: Ms. Zeigler stated that the proposed design of windows and walls did not match the rhythm seen in the symmetrical designs of multi-family buildings in the surrounding area. She noted that this was particularly true on elevations for 300 South and Markea Avenue.
- Design Guideline 11.22: Windows and doors for the project were not framed in a way in keeping with the character of historic residential buildings and were not proportional with historic windows on surrounding buildings as recommended by the guidelines.
- Section 13.25: main entrances were not well defined, as they were located to the side of the recessed entrances and not visible from the street.
- Standard 3: The design did not meet the criteria of directional expression of principal facades. She noted that the largely blank wall on Markea Avenue and the garage on 300 South created more of a secondary façade than a primary façade. She noted that staff recommended additional windows facing Markea Avenue, and for Unit 1 to be decreased in size so that the garage might be entered from the rear like other units, creating a second entrance to the complex and relieving some vehicular pressure on Markea Avenue.
- Design Guideline 12.8: Front courts did not meet the guidelines, which did not allow for inorganic surface materials in front yards. She noted that a large front patio such as the submerged court was not a design feature of buildings in the district and staff recommended that the court be lowered in size to a sidewalk around the building rather than a patio.

Ms. Zeigler noted that in light of these design issues, staff recommended that the applicant submit a new design which considered symmetry to each bay, attention to the rhythm of solids to voids in nearby historic structures and a one story element to help define main entrances. She noted that more information was needed from the applicant regarding the design of railings, windows, doors, garage doors and any other ornamental elements. She noted that the Commission could approve the design conceptually but require the applicant to come back with revised designs.

Ms. Zeigler stated that other staff recommendations included the addition of a date stone to the foundation, also to decrease unit one in size to allow for a rear loading garage and that the design should include more symmetry for each module, paying attention to the rhythm of solids to voids in nearby historic structures and include a one story element which might also help to define the main entrances. She noted that staff also asked the applicant to come back to the Commission or staff with detailed information on materials for design features.

Commissioner Oliver noted that Ms. Zeigler had referred to a unit one, but there was no unit one marked on the site drawings.

Ms. Zeigler noted that unit one would be the unit on the corner of 300 South and 700 East. She noted that the side would be along 300 South and the front would face 700 East. She noted that it was the largest unit in the proposed project.

Commissioner Harding inquired if the solid to void ratio issues and rhythm and spacing issues could be explained.

Ms. Zeigler noted that if a person were to look at the historic buildings in the area and visually draw a line vertically dividing the buildings, every time an opening occurred, it created a rhythm of solid to void. She noted that on the applicant's design, the placement of openings was not as symmetrical as seen on historic buildings in the area.

Commissioner Harding inquired why this had not disturbed staff enough to recommend that the item not be approved.

Ms. Zeigler noted that if the applicant was willing to make the suggested changes, they should be addressed, as the proposal did not meet those standards.

Acting Chairperson Lloyd noted on the 300 South elevation staff recommended that the building be reduced in size and inquired if a step back could accomplish the same goal.

Ms. Zeigler noted that the recommendation for the reduced size was not to create a view into the complex or a secondary entrance, but rather, to move the garage from 300 South to the back of the building. She noted that it would still be visible from 300 South, but would not be a prominent feature on 300 South. She noted that lessening the square footage of the unit would also lessen the width of the building to be more in keeping with other buildings on the block face.

Acting Chairperson Lloyd noted that in looking at the drawings it seemed that there was a recessed area over the garage and inquired what that area was.

Ms. Zeigler noted that the applicant had recessed the garage and the applicant could provide further details on the design elements of the project.

Commissioner Oliver inquired if the Commission was considering anything regarding building C, the original four-plex.

Ms. Zeigler noted that there had been no exterior alterations suggested for the building, and while the applicants might have some exterior changes they wished to make, they had not yet submitted anything to staff.

Seeing no further questions for staff, Acting Chairperson Lloyd invited the applicant forward at 6:39 p.m.

Eric Saxey, the applicant, noted that he thought all issues had been addressed through the Architectural Review Committee meetings. Mr. Saxey stated that the patio area or submerged court was part of a common area he thought the Architectural Review Committee had approved of.

Acting Chairperson Lloyd inquired what the elevation of the submerged court would be in relationship to the sidewalk.

Mr. Saxey noted that it would be at the same elevation as the sidewalk, so it would not be submerged.

Commissioner Carl inquired what the material for the patio area would be.

Mr. Saxey stated it would be concrete and gravel for drainage surrounding the concrete pad. He inquired if this were an issue for the Historic Landmarks Commission or the Planning Commission.

Commissioner Hart noted that the issue could be both, dealing with zoning, which had been approved by the Planning Commission, or dealing with design specifics, which was the purview of the Historic Landmark Commission.

Commissioner Carl noted she would not want to see the patios become a dead space area.

Commissioner Oliver inquired if there were any elevation change involved in the transition between the building, the patio and the sidewalk.

Mr. Saxey noted that there was a slight elevation change as a transition to the second story entry was needed. He stated, therefore, that the patio would include a couple of stairs leading to a landing and connect to the staircase.

Lisa Arnett, the project architect, reviewed the site plans for the Commission, noting the patio would be a walkout from the ground level.

Acting Chairperson Lloyd stated that the ground floor would be level with the sidewalk in this case.

Mr. Saxey noted this was correct.

Mr. Saxey reviewed several examples of regional architecture and felt that the design reflected the elements present in local historic buildings.

Acting Chairperson Lloyd inquired if there were any wall or fence planned for the front patios or common area.

Mr. Saxey noted there was currently no plan to install a wall or fence.

Commissioner Oliver inquired if Mr. Saxey had ever considered the entrance being on the ground floor rather than the second floor of living space.

Mr. Saxey noted he had explored the possibility and while he would not be able to change the stairs to enter at ground level, he would be willing to change elements of the entryway to incorporate a one story element as desired by the design guidelines.

Commissioner Oliver inquired if the inability to change the stairway was due to a grade change between the sidewalk and the ground floor of the building.

Acting Chairperson Lloyd inquired if the architect would be able to discuss these elements.

Commissioner Carl inquired if this would be a change the applicant was willing to make.

Mr. Saxey noted he would be.

Commissioner Carl noted that the project would achieve more of a traditional entryway in this manner and less of a cavern-like front entryway.

Acting Chairperson Lloyd inquired if the architect would be able to discuss these elements.

Mr. Saxey noted the architect could come forward and speak about the architectural elements, however; he wanted to first discuss the garage on 300 South with the Commission. Mr. Saxey stated that the original site plan approved for the economic hardship included that garage facing 300 South. He stated that he felt the Commission's request would change the site plan, which he felt had already been determined by the Planning Commission approval. He stated he had believed that in the original Architectural Review Committee meeting, staff had noted the size of unit one was fine due to its ability to block the view of the backs of other garages in the area. Mr. Saxey noted he felt the placement of the garage had been preliminarily approved, as long as they made the attempt to lessen the perceived impact.

Commissioner Oliver inquired if the applicant could move the garage to the north arm of the building rather than the current placement on the south side. He reviewed the site plan for the Commission noting where the sewer and storm drain lines needed to go through the area and stated that there was not enough room to place the garage to the side, and that a rear loading garage would not work for the development either. He noted his concern that all of these issues were new and had not been addressed in the Architectural Review Committee.

Ms. Lew stated that the Architectural Review Committee was a body formed from the Commission to provide advice to applicants in the development of project design elements, but in no way were their findings binding or official as far as the Historic Landmark Commission was concerned.

Mr. Muir noted he felt the difference between the review by the Architectural Review Committee and in standing before the Historic Landmark Commission was that there were issues which had never been addressed with the applicant previously in any subcommittee or otherwise. He noted that there had been discussion regarding placement and treatment of the garage facing 300 South, however, the addition of the date stone was new, as was the additional windows on Markea Avenue and a 1-3' concrete border surrounding the building in lieu of the patios.

Mr. Muir reviewed a layout displaying building materials for the development. He noted they would use low-e glass for the windows which would be a natural finished aluminum, a darker gray would be used for the railings and awnings, red brick for the exterior and they would also raise the foundation to create a kind of wainscoting banding at the base of the buildings.

Mr. Muir noted there would in fact be some symmetry, as the area with the entrances and bay windows would consistently be in the center of the buildings. He displayed a board for the Commission with pictures of structures in the area which displayed considerable asymmetry. He noted that typically with single family structures in the area, there was a dominant bay window on one side of the entry and upper floor windows which were more a function of the layout of rooms rather than purely neo-classical architecture. He noted that he felt that the design in its current incarnation better lent character to the design rather than perfect symmetry on each façade. Mr. Muir stated that they had tried to achieve this as well with the patios, giving more of a sense of claim to the area between the front sidewalk and the front façade and a more psychological barrier between the front entrance and the street. Mr. Muir noted that Mr. Saxey was open to moving the front door and they could create more definition architecturally around that opening with a canopy. He noted that they would appreciate a list from the Commission of the issues which should be addressed.

Acting Chairperson Lloyd noted there was often great difficulty in creating transition zones in modern architecture between a front entrance and yard. He inquired if some type of low wall, fence or other type of screen would assist in achieving ownership of the front yard.

Mr. Muir noted that if Mr. Saxey was open to it, every little gesture they could make on the exterior of the development would help to define that as a semi-private zone. He noted that he felt there were considerable examples of stoops and porches in the area. Mr. Muir noted that by eliminating the berm and sunken patio and starting over, they could venture back into creating an outdoor space with a small wall.

Mr. Muir stated that there was little precedence for townhouses in the area, but even so, townhomes with separate entrances for each unit would add more property owners with an interest in staking claim to the neighborhood than an apartment complex with a single entrance and fluctuating occupancy.

Acting Chairperson Lloyd noted one of the staff comments in the report indicated that the proportion of the 300 South elevation was 60' (sixty feet) and larger than the average frontage in the area. He noted that there were other buildings in the area which were larger, particularly on corner lots and the proposal was also located on a corner lot. He inquired if all the façades along the streetscape were considered or only those on corner lots.

Mr. Muir stated that he and the applicant might need to take the overall average into consideration and that there was certainly a difference in size when turning the corner onto 300 South and Markea Avenue. Mr. Muir reviewed the elevations for the Commission and discussed how they might change it to rectify that issue of massing. He noted they could also add more windows to bedrooms on the Markea Avenue façade.

Commissioner Oliver noted her concern that the tall, sweeping entrance was more typical of a fire escape than the broad steps and stoops which were defining characteristics in the area. She inquired if the applicant was open to the possibility of a first floor entry to the project.

Mr. Muir noted it could be done, but they could also break down the perception of having to climb two flights to get to the second story entrance by installing a porch and a stoop, and the other strategy would be to do just that, have some type of architectural element outside of the building to help reach out and stake claim to the neighborhood.

Commissioner Oliver stated that a traditional stoop would be more of a wide broad platform for sitting, and the proposed stairway was less inviting.

Mr. Muir noted that a wider stair would be possible if they created a landing and service two tenants from that entryway. He noted that if they put the stairs on the plane of the building it would probably leave eight stairs on the exterior and that could be broken up depending on how close the stairs were placed to the existing sidewalk.

Acting Chairperson Lloyd inquired how wide the stairs were at this point.

Mr. Muir noted that they were currently proposed at 4' in width, but could be widened to 6' if a landing were incorporated into the design.

Acting Chairperson Lloyd opened the floor to public comment at 7:16 p.m.

Acting Chairperson Lloyd noted that a number of additional comments had been received by Ms. Zeigler over the phone on July 2, 2008. He summarized those comments for the Commission:

- Mark Rex, 744 East 300 South, noted that it was a bad idea for the look and crime potential of the neighborhood to have garages facing 300 South. He noted that he wanted to maintain the residential character of the neighborhood.
- Marguerite Heath, 715 East 300 South, stated that she was in opposition to the project.
- Maha Barani, 744 East 300 South, noted that a garage facing 300 South would set a bad precedent for redevelopment on the opposite side of the street. She also did not like the idea of a garage in the historically intact area of the neighborhood.

Acting Chairperson Lloyd invited the first present speaker forward at 7:19 p.m.

Kathy Scott, 941 East 500 South, noted that she was a Planning Commission member and that the vote on the Eric Saxey case had not been unanimous. She noted that she still had a few concerns regarding the development including the garage facing 300 South. She noted that Commissioner Robert Forbis had attempted to think of a number of ways to relocate the garage off of 300 South. She noted that there were also concerns about the setback, scale of the building and the orientation.

Mrs. Scott stated that the building would be oriented to Markea Avenue, which would not necessarily be the most logical orientation. She noted that 700 East or 300 South would be more logical orientations as that was where the majority of activity occurred. Mrs. Scott noted that she understood this orientation was due to the required setbacks for the project, but was troubling, nonetheless. She stated that the impact and the obtrusiveness of the buildings on Markea Avenue had been discussed by the Planning Commission. She stated that there was a minimum setback with neighbors on Markea Avenue, and it was important to consider the project's compatibility with neighboring properties. She noted that she felt it was very important to incorporate some type of design element on the 300 South side of the development, as Mr. Muir had previously discussed, as it was such a large frontage on a large corner and looking on the back of a building at that corner would not be compatible with the character of the neighborhood.

Mrs. Scott stated that the scale of building one on 700 East was significantly larger than other buildings in the neighborhood and architectural detail which would break up the length of the building would be very important. She noted that the Planning Commission had been confident that the Historic Landmark Commission (HLC) would address these issues.

Acting Chairperson Lloyd stated that the site plan indicated that the two buildings directly west of the proposed structure on Markea Avenue were actually closer to the street than the proposal itself.

Mrs. Scott noted that this elevation would be the front of the development, and she had thought that the proposed patios went further into the setback than the adjacent residences.

Commissioner Haymond stated that building one, which would face 700 East, was considerably large, but inquired if Mrs. Scott thought it was larger than the apartment buildings across the street from the proposal.

Mrs. Scott noted that she felt the proposal would be larger, but couldn't say for certain.

Cindy Cromer, 816 East 100 South, noted there was a handwritten survey she had conducted for the Planning Commission meeting which had been included in the HLC staff report. She noted that there was not a single building in the survey which included twenty block faces that incorporated a front facing garage, unless counting a fire station and oil service center. She noted that there were no garages on the front of buildings, which was extraordinary considering the variety of structures in the

Central City Historic District. Ms. Cromer noted she felt that the 300 South Street frontage was an extraordinarily important aspect for the Central City Historic District as that frontage contained an abundance of contributing historic structures.

Ms. Cromer noted her concern that there were no design guidelines for multiple unit structures in historic districts. She felt that issues in the combined subcommittee meeting between the Planning Commission and HLC became muddled and design issues were not clearly communicated to the applicant. She noted that she felt that the item would need to be continued for the sake of defensible findings and fairness to all, even though she was not interested in prolonging the project.

Kirk Huffaker, on behalf of the Utah Heritage Foundation, noted that there were two points of interest to him in the staff report; incorporation of one story elements on the 700 East façade and a potential move of the proposed garage on 300 South. He stated that he was not prepared to discuss the idea of symmetry in the building. He noted that there were buildings in the district with quantitative elements that he could think of, but that required more research and noted that he could make no determination as to how the design complied with what the district really provided. He noted that he felt the design had some great architectural merit on its own, but didn't know that the Commission had everything it needed to move forward with a decision in relationship to the historic district.

Acting Chairperson Lloyd invited the applicant forward to respond at 7:37 p.m.

Mr. Muir, speaking as a Planning Commissioner himself, noted that Ms. Scott was not delegated as a representative for the Planning Commission and therefore gave her own opinion on the matter. Mr. Muir noted that they had not surveyed buildings in the surrounding area, but if the HLC felt it was important, they could do a survey of those structures.

Mr. Muir noted that the two remaining buildings on Markea Avenue did actually encroach further into the required setback than the proposal. He noted that the applicant had felt it to be important to include private gestures such as a porch and or stoop and felt that the proposal should address those issues.

Mr. Saxey reviewed photographs he had taken of existing garages in the Central City area and wanted to review them for the Commission. He noted that many of these garages were multi-family residential structures, and several of the garages fronted 500 and 600 East streets. He noted that they would be willing to do what was suggested by the Commission or subcommittee. He noted that he had been to the Community Councils; both Central City and East Central Community Councils both gave unanimous support to the project.

Acting Chairperson Lloyd closed the public comment portion of the item and brought the Commission to executive session at 7:42.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Commissioner Harding stated that she had been on the Architectural Review Committee regarding the issue and an impasse had been reached regarding the solid to void ratio and the rhythm and spacing of the proposal, and while there was consensus that issues were being addressed and had improved, it did not appear that they were fully resolved. She noted that there were so many issues with core elements of the proposal; she did not feel they could approve it even conceptually.

Commissioner Carl noted that she felt the Commission had a responsibility to give the applicant fairly specific instructions as to what would be requested of them regarding a redesign of the structure.

Commissioner Harding stated that looking at the proposal, she saw serious violations of Design Guidelines 11.10 and 11.14, and that she did not feel it could be approved.

Acting Chairperson Lloyd requested clarification from Commissioner Harding regarding the second meeting of the Architectural Review Committee, which was a joint meeting with the Planning Commission. He inquired if there were changes between the first and second meeting.

Commissioner Harding noted that there had been significant changes and it seemed that the Commissioners from the HLC on the Architectural Review Committee stepped back because they could not represent the entire Commission, however they had noted that there were issues regarding the stairways and solid to void ratios.

Commissioner Oliver stated that there were other issues she would like to see addressed including; a presentation of the west elevation of building B and what it might look like in relationship to Markea Avenue; a redesign of the north and south elevations of building A; redesign of the entrance stairs to give it a more welcoming entrance feel and a wider stoop, which would help to break up that long wall. She noted she would like to see some very creative thought regarding the treatment and placement of the garage.

Commissioner Haymond noted that the garage on 300 South was not appropriate at all. He stated that he was also not satisfied with the giant staircase, and inquired if the first floor could be lowered under grade slightly to shorten that flight of stairs.

Acting Chairperson Lloyd noted it appeared the Commission generally had three issues and stated that the Commission should summarize those issues independently in how they do or do not meet the guidelines, and if they did not, what specific ways the applicant could accommodate the requirements to park on site.

Stairways and approach

- Commissioners Carl, Harding, Oliver and Haymond all took issue with the length of the stair
- Commissioner Carl stated that there seemed to be a consensus that the Commission would like to see the front entrance brought closer to the front of the building and closer to grade.
- Acting Chairperson Lloyd wondered if just bringing the door flush with the face of the building might accomplish anything and noted that a three-dimensional model of the project might help the Commission visualize the proposed changes.
- Commissioner Haymond noted that he would like to see the stairs widened in the front of the project and lowering the entrance a few feet would decrease the overall number of stairs and corridor-like effect.
- Acting Chairperson Lloyd noted that the stairway might transition into the patio and the patio might include a low wall to act as a buffer
- Commissioner Hart stated that she would like to see the stairwell end in a doorway to prevent dead space. Commissioner Oliver noted that this could be accomplished with a secondary foyer door flush with the face of the building.
- Commissioner Haymond stated that the applicant could also use a different material at the top of the landing to make the entrance way stand out.

Windows

- Commissioner Oliver noted that windows on the 300 South elevation should be more compatible with residential units in the neighborhood, which might include a more regular rhythm and scale of the windows consistent with other structures.

- Commissioner Haymond noted that he felt a regular rhythm needed to be repeated on the north end of building A on 700 East as well.

Garages

- Acting Chairperson Lloyd noted that the applicant might consider raised exposed parking under the floor level, or a pass drive through under the ground level. He noted that oftentimes, these floor plans were all above grade or partially above grade.
- Acting Chairperson Lloyd stated that there probably needed to be a drive approach off 300 South.
- Commissioner Carl noted that she would rather see a garage door than a large hole in the wall.
- Commissioner Oliver stated that she would like to see the applicant prove that the garage could absolutely not be placed on a face of the project away from the street front.

Acting Chairperson Lloyd inquired of staff if this was sufficient detail for the applicant.

Ms. Lew noted that if the Commission were to table the item, they should provide specific reasons for continuation of the issue.

Commissioner Haymond noted that he felt the changes to be too major to grant concept approval.

Mr. Muir asked if he could approach counsel.

Acting Chairperson Lloyd allowed this.

Mr. Muir inquired if rejection of the proposal would require a complete refilling by his client.

Mr. Nielson noted that if the Commission was not pleased with particular elements of the proposal, they should ask if the applicant would be willing to change those elements. He stated that if not, it would be appropriate to have a determination or a decision on the application.

Mr. Muir noted that they were not necessarily looking for concept approval and thought they would be satisfied with a tabling of the issue to give them time to be able to improve the project.

Mr. Nielson stated that he would want confirmation that the applicant was in agreement with the Commission tabling the item to address additional issues.

Mr. Saxey noted that he would prefer to table the item and come back at a later date.

Mr. Nielson noted that the applicant could then amend the petition to try and address concerns.

Acting Chairperson Lloyd stated that he understood there was a rather full agenda for next month, and didn't want to prolong the process unnecessarily, therefore, maybe one more Architectural Review Committee meeting would be in order.

Mr. Nielson noted that the Commission would want to fulfill noticing requirements by tabling the item to a fixed date for continuation. He noted that the comments of the Architectural Review Committee were not binding, but were advisory, and sometimes that might lead to a situation where an applicant might feel that they had addressed all issues only to find that not everything had been addressed. Mr. Nielson stated that as long as the applicant was willing to address the issues raised by the Commission and to return to the Commission at a date certain, he would request that those issues be clearly expressed to the applicant.

Mr. Saxey stated that he was open to resolving these issues as quickly as possible.

Commissioner Oliver noted that it might seem like a lot of issues, they were primarily major design tweaks and that the proposal was actually pretty close to what the Commission was looking for.

Commissioner Carl inquired if September would be the first available time that the item could come back to the Commission for review.

Ms. Lew deferred to Ms. Zeigler to explain when she would need the revised site plan and other information in order to generate a staff report.

Ms. Zeigler noted that the August agenda had been designed with a placeholder for this issue assuming that it might come back to the Commission. Ms. Zeigler stated that if the item were sent to an expanded Architectural Review Committee meeting, the item might not be heard until September, due to the time involved in instituting changes and creating new site plans.

Acting Chairperson Lloyd noted that the soonest the item would be heard again would be on August 6, 2008. He stated that if there was a possibility to review the item again before the Architectural Review Committee, it would need to be reviewed in that intervening time.

Ms. Zeigler noted that she felt it would need to be reviewed within the next few days to give the applicant time to apply changes and submit them to her.

Commissioner Hart stated that she felt enough direction had been given so that another Architectural Review Committee meeting might not be necessary.

Commissioner Haymond noted that the Commission seemed to agree on the discussed changes.

Commissioner Carl inquired if they could ask the applicant if they felt they had received enough information in order to proceed with a redesign of the item.

Commissioner Oliver made a motion to table petition 470-06-56 in order to provide further guidance to the applicant on issues that the Commission would like to see addressed prior to making a final decision, issues including the following; give greater attention to the design of the east and west elevations of building B; the north and south elevations of building A; on the south elevation of building A, provide some creative thought about removing the garage to a different location, and having that façade relate to the homes on 300 South rather than relating to itself on 700 East; on the east elevation of building A, address the issue of long narrow stairways leading to the unit entrances, reducing the visual effect of the stairways by possibly moving the foyer door to the façade of the building and creating a true entry as historically seen in the Central City Historic District and reducing the number of stairs leading up to the entrance; addressing the issue of solids to voids and rhythm of the façades, particularly on 700 East, making these façades more regular and reducing expansive glass which was contrary to Design Guidelines 11.10 and 11.14.

Commissioner Carl seconded the motion.

DISCUSSION OF THE MOTION

Mr. Nielson noted that the motion might be amended to mention a certain date for the applicant, allowing him to be able to revise his plans, and that the items set forth in the motion were requests and not suggestions.

Commissioner Oliver made an amendment to the motion stating to the applicant that the items referred to in the motion were requests and not suggestions, with the petition to be presented again at the August 6, 2008, Historic Landmark Commission Meeting.

The amendment was seconded by Commissioner Haymond. All voted "Aye" on the amended motion, the motion carried unanimously.

OTHER BUSINESS

There was no further business.

The meeting adjourned at 8:27 p.m.

Cecily Zuck, Historic Landmark Commission Secretary