

**SALT LAKE CITY
HISTORIC LANDMARK COMMISSION
Minutes of the Meeting
Room 315, 451 South State Street
June 4, 2008**

The regular meeting of the Historic Landmark Commission was held on June 4, 2008, at 5:50 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 Earle Bevins, III, David Fitzsimmons, Arla Funk, Polly Hart, Creed Haymond, Warren Lloyd, and Anne Oliver. Commissioners Paula Carl, Sheleigh Harding 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; Ray Milliner, Principal Planner; Joel Paterson, Interim Assistant Director for Planning; and Cecily Zuck, Historic Landmark Commission Secretary. Lynn Pace, Deputy Attorney for Salt Lake City was also present.

A field trip was held prior to the meeting at 4:00 p.m. The field trip was attended by Commissioners Bevins, Fitzsimmons, Funk, Hart, Haymond, Lloyd and Oliver. A quorum was present; therefore minutes were taken during the field trip and were as follows:

FIELD TRIP NOTES

(This item occurred at 4:00 p.m., prior to the regular meeting)

381 East Eleventh Avenue; Keyser House: The Commission took a tour of the property. The Commission inquired if this was the property that was reviewed in the past for a request to de-list the property as a Landmark Site. Staff noted that it was.

104 North 'F' Street; Carl Jones Legalization: The Commissioner noted the visibility of three sides of the building from the street.

840 East Sixth Avenue; Campbell House Legalization: Staff described the project. The Commission inquired about the age and significance of the rear addition and the nature of the permits issued for the work. Staff noted that the alteration was not considered architecturally significant. Staff also noted that earlier additions were often poorly constructed and the Commission had allowed such changes in the past.

30 North 'S' Street; Kimble Shaw Major Alteration: Staff described the project. The Commissioner reviewed the condition of the windows, the construction of the front stable entrance, and the location of the garage with respect to adjacent properties. The Commission also discussed the removal of existing driveways.

445 East 300 South; Peter Pan Apartments: A question was raised regarding the nature of the nomination with respect to the multiple properties listing (Historic Resources of Salt Lake City Urban Apartments).

115 South 300 East; Piccardy Apartments: A question was raised as to whether or not Ben Lowe was involved with the property.

The Commission elected not to visit the City Creek property since the historic ZCMI façade is no longer in place.

DINNER AND WORK SESSION

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

Bee Luftkin and Dina Blaes were present to review the Sugar House Design Guidelines for the Commission. Ms. Luftkin reviewed the results of the Reconnaissance Level Survey of the Sugar House Business District, noting that there were only three significant properties already listed on the National Historic Register and 27 structures which could be considered contributing. She noted that based upon this analysis, the volume of historic properties were not enough to meet the criteria to create a national historic district.

Ms. Luftkin noted that she and her colleagues were recommending the City investigate the initiation of a Historic Zoning Overlay District for the area, with four categories of buildings adhering to different criteria for alterations or new construction.

Ms. Blaes reviewed the evaluation criteria which the consultants used in order to determine which structures would be eligible. She noted the four categories of structures they had identified:

Significant: Structures built prior to 1962 – historic on their own merit.

Notable: Structures built prior to 1962 – major alterations done before 1962, maintain most of historical integrity.

Associated: Structures built before 1962 – major alterations done after 1962.

Non- Historic: Structures built after 1962.

Ms. Blaes stated that the recommended Sugar House Business District Design Guidelines were based upon the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation. She stated that while the Planning Commission was the body with authority for approval in this zoning district, small changes to the Ordinance could ensure that the Planning Commission work together with the Historic Landmark Commission when review of a historically significant property came about.

Ms. Blaes noted that the consultants welcomed questions from the Commission.

Commissioner Oliver inquired if the Planning Commission was prepared to grapple with the greater level of scrutiny involved with the Historic District Guidelines.

Mr. Paterson noted that training could occur, or the creation of an Overlay District could possibly widen the purview of the Historic Landmark Commission in this area with changes to the ordinance, as mentioned by Ms. Blaes. He also stated that there could be the creation of a joint committee to address such issues when they arise.

Commissioner Fitzsimmons inquired if the Planning Commission had seen the results of the survey yet.

Ms. Blaes stated that they had not, but did note that the survey was to next be presented to the Sugar House Community Council later that evening.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

(This item was heard at 5:51 p.m.)

Commissioner Hart made a motion to approve the minutes as written. Vice Chairperson Lloyd seconded the motion. All voted "Aye". The motion carried unanimously.

REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR

(This item was heard at 5:52 p.m.)

Mr. Paterson welcomed new Commissioner Earle Bevins, III to his first meeting and thanked him for his willingness to serve.

He noted that he had no further issues to discuss with the Commission at that time.

COMMENTS TO THE COMMISSION

(This item was heard at 5:49 p.m.)

Chairperson Fitzsimmons opened the floor to comments from the public at this time.

Cindy Cromer, 816 East 100 South, noted that she had found an article on details of new construction which she felt would be of interest to the Commission and had identified comments for individual Commissioners. She noted she would distribute copies of that article to them later.

Ms. Cromer stated that Mayor Becker had gained a reprieve from demolition, and the Salt Lake Tribune had since published an editorial in favor of reuse of the North Dock at the Intermodal Hub. She stated that the University of Utah had also published a small area study of the Intermodal Hub and its immediate historic vicinity, and urged the Commission to read it and promote the plan to other City agencies.

Mr. Paterson noted that in addition to the University of Utah study, the Redevelopment Agency had initiated a study of the Intermodal Hub area in partnership with IBI (consulting firm), and the area was also under review by the City Council.

Noting no further comments, Chairperson Fitzsimmons closed the Comments portion of the meeting at 5:55 p.m. and moved on to new business for the Commission.

NEW BUSINESS

Petition 470-08-23 Malcolm & Elizabeth Keyser House – A request by Larry Perkins, property owner, soliciting comments from the Historic Landmark Commission to list the house located at 381 East Eleventh Avenue on the National Register of Historic Places. The property is zoned SR-1A; Special Development Pattern Residential District, and is located in City Council District Three represented by Council member Eric Jergensen. (Staff contact: Janice Lew, 535-7625 or janice.lew@slcgov.com.)

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

Chairperson Fitzsimmons recognized the representative for the nomination at this time.

Korral Broschinsky, the consultant for the individual listing nomination was present to speak to the item. Ms. Broschinsky gave a slide presentation of the home and its history. Ms. Broschinsky noted that the home was a two-story Prairie School style home; designed by Salt Lake City Architects Pope & Burton and constructed by John Tims & Son. Ms. Broschinsky noted that the first owner of the property was Malcolm Keyser who founded the Keyser Fireproof Storage Company in 1910, and noted that there were several fireproof elements in the home as well.

Ms. Broschinsky stated that in 1943, the home was sold to Dr. Lindon Snow and his wife Glade. She noted that they lived in the home until their deaths in 1993 and 1977, respectively. Ms. Broschinsky noted that this was the period during which most of the non-historic renovations had taken place. She stated that the Snows had turned the back part of the home into an upscale suburban ranch house with a pool and glass wing as well as a garden room. She noted that they would have elaborate theme parties at their home.

Ms. Broschinsky stated that the basement was one of the few spaces in the home that had never been altered and was interesting for its resemblance of west side warehouses in Salt Lake, with large concrete columns and a sliding metal door for fire-proofing, just in case something spontaneously combusted.

Ms. Broschinsky noted that the current owners had gone to a great deal of effort to restore the property to as close to the original condition of the Prairie style home as was possible.

Vice Chairperson Lloyd noted that the property had been listed on the Salt Lake City register in 1978, however, not on the national register and inquired why this was.

Ms. Broschinsky noted that the home had been through several modifications prior to 1978 which were contemporary, not historic, and therefore had not been recommended at that time for the national register.

Chairperson Fitzsimmons stated that the Commission was pleased to see the improvements to the home.

Commissioner Haymond noted he would be glad to recommend the property if an interior tour were given to the Commission.

Commissioner Hart seconded Commissioner Haymond's suggestion.

Commissioner Hart made a motion to send a favorable recommendation to the State Historic Preservation Officer regarding the Keyser House National Historic Nomination. Vice Chairperson Lloyd seconded the motion. All voted "Aye". The motion carried unanimously.

Chairperson Fitzsimmons, as a point of order, noted that they had not opened the floor to public comment.

Mr. Paterson stated that it was not necessary to open the floor to the public; however, the Commission could do so if they wished to.

Chairperson Fitzsimmons offered the floor to any interested parties from the public, but seeing no comments, closed the hearing item at 6:10 p.m.

Petition 470-08-24 Peter Pan Apartments – A request by Oban Properties, LLC, property owner, soliciting comments from the Historic Landmark Commission to list the apartments located at 445 East 300 South on the National Register of Historic Places. The property is zoned R-MU; Residential Mixed Use, and is located in City Council District Four represented by Council member Luke Garrott. (Staff contact: Janice Lew, 535-7625 or janice.lew@slcgov.com.)
(*This item was heard at 6:10 p.m.*)

Chairperson Fitzsimmons recognized the applicant.

Ben Lowe, the applicant, noted that he wished to renovate the properties using historic tax credits.

Vice Chairperson Lloyd inquired if the listing was joint or individual.

Mr. Lowe stated that they would be stand alone properties.

Commissioner Funk inquired why the applicant was requesting stand alone designation.

Mr. Lowe noted that he was using federal tax credits and the stand alone designation was necessary for the state and federal tax credits.

Commissioner Hart noted that she did not think this was true, and suspected that the properties would actually be part of multiple property submissions and referred Mr. Lowe to the Registration Form in the staff memo.

Mr. Lowe noted that he wasn't certain of the designation as he had not prepared the application, and in the case of the nomination listing it as a multiple properties designation, it might be correct.

Mr. Paterson stated that the designation would list the apartment buildings as part of a larger national register list for early apartment buildings from Salt Lake City.

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

Cindy Cromer, 816 East 100 South, noted how pleased she was to see all three buildings nominated, but was especially pleased by the nomination of the apartment houses. She stated that Bill Schwab, an earlier preservation planner for Salt Lake City would have also been very pleased by the nomination.

Commissioner Oliver made a motion to forward a positive recommendation regarding petition 470-08-24 to the Board of State History in support of the applicants request to list the property on the National Historic Register, Historic Resources of Salt Lake City, Multiple Property Listing . Commissioner Hart seconded the motion. All voted "Aye". The motion carries unanimously.

Petition 470-08-25 Piccardy Apartments – A request by Kilmarmock Properties, LLC, property owner, soliciting comments from the Historic Landmark Commission to list the apartments located at 115 South 300 East on the National Register of Historic Places. The property is zoned R-MU; Residential Mixed Use, and is located in City Council District Four represented by Council member Luke Garrott. (Staff contact: Janice Lew, 535-7625 or janice.lew@slcgov.com.)
(This item was heard at 6:16 p.m.)

Chairperson Fitzsimmons invited the applicant forward to comment on the nomination.

Ben Lowe, the applicant's representative, had no comments for the Commission regarding the nomination.

Commissioner Oliver made a motion to forward a positive recommendation regarding petition 470-08-25 to the Board of State History in support of submission to the National Register as eligible under the Historic Resources of Salt Lake City, Multiple Property Listing. Vice Chairperson Lloyd seconded the motion. All voted "Aye". The motion carried unanimously.

Petition 470-08-13 Campbell House Legalization - A request by Jason Campbell, the property owner, to legalize work to the home that was done prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness. The work includes modifications to the roof and windows of the historic home at 840 East Sixth Avenue in the Avenues Historic District. The property is zoned SR-1A; Special Development Pattern Residential District, and is located in City Council District Three represented by Council Member Eric Jergensen. (Staff contact: Ray Milliner, 801-535-7645 or ray.milliner@slcgov.com.)
(This item was heard at 6:19 p.m.)

Chairperson Fitzsimmons recognized Ray Milliner as staff representative.

Mr. Milliner gave an overview of the legalization request. Mr. Milliner noted that the modifications to the home which had been made without a Certificate of Appropriateness included the replacement of a flat roof over an addition with a pitched roof, the replacement of metal clad double hung windows with vinyl windows with internal muntins and resizing of some of the exterior walls. Mr. Milliner noted that the staff recommendation was to legalize the alterations with four conditions of approval as outlined in the staff report; primarily that the Commission approve the pitched roof over the rear of the addition; approve the use of vinyl replacement windows matching the existing window configuration on the secondary and tertiary elevations of the addition; deny the request to legalize windows with an internal muntin system, not considered consistent with the historic character of the building; deny the request to change the size and style of the windows in the middle opening on the north façade.

Vice Chairperson Lloyd noted that the staff recommendation did not clarify on which elevations the windows with internal muntin systems were located.

Mr. Milliner noted that those windows were located on the north and east façades of the structure.

Mr. Pace noted that the staff report did not outline these conditions, and therefore, he added that the Commission might want to state in their motion: legalize or deny as follows and then state the conditions.

Chairperson Fitzsimmons stated that he had that concern as well regarding the staff report and thanked Mr. Pace for his counsel.

Chairperson Fitzsimmons invited the applicant forward to speak at 6:23 p.m.

Jason Campbell, 1123 West 600 North, noted that he had purchased the home with the intent of moving into it and had not been aware of the Historic District requirements at the time the alterations had been made. He noted that he was nearing completion of renovations, pending the decision of the Commission.

Chairperson Fitzsimmons inquired what the reason for resizing the windows was.

Mr. Campbell noted that the intention was to create a countertop height bay of windows in the kitchen; however he would be amenable to restoring those windows to their original configuration. He noted that his largest concern was that he did not want to have to replace all of the windows in the building.

Commissioner Oliver inquired if the applicant had seen the original tax photo of the property. She asked the applicant if he would be willing to install windows similar to those in the original photo.

Mr. Campbell noted that this was the first time he had seen the photo, and while he found it lovely, he did not have the time or resources to replace all of the windows, and while he were very willing to replace the windows on the north façade, he did not know how he could replace all of the windows to single hung individual pane type windows.

Commissioner Hart inquired if the applicant had pulled a permit for the window replacement.

Mr. Campbell noted that he honestly did not know that he needed any type of approval to replace the windows in his home.

Chairperson Fitzsimmons opened the floor to the public at 6:30 p.m.

There were no comments from the public.

Chairperson Fitzsimmons closed the public portion of the hearing at 6:31 p.m. and brought the Commission to Executive Session.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Commissioner Hart noted that she did not feel ignorance to be an excuse for skirting the law, and would like to see windows restored to the original openings on the North, East and possibly South façade. She stated that she would not recommend approval of the vinyl windows, and would be open to a variety of windows which the Commission would have originally approved.

Commissioner Oliver inquired if Commissioner Hart would require replacement on all of the façades.

Commissioner Hart noted that she would like to see the windows replaced on the east, north and possible the south façade. Commissioner Hart noted that the west façade was extremely close to the neighboring home, and therefore hardly visible.

Commissioner Oliver noted that the south façade was also very close to a neighboring home and not very visible either.

Commissioner Hart noted that her main concern then would be the two primary street-side façades.

Vice Chairperson Lloyd noted that the older tax identification photo seemed to indicate that the original windows may have been casement units, and another photo prior to the alterations looked as though the windows were single or double-hung.

Commissioner Oliver noted that she would favor the type of windows in the tax photo, which would help to again define the historic character of the home.

Commissioner Hart stated that she would agree with Commissioner Oliver, or recommend that the east and north windows return to their previous style before alterations were completed.

Commissioner Oliver stated that she would make a suggestion to have the applicant work with staff to restore windows similar to the tax photo.

Commissioner Hart noted that the addition had been determined to have been built in the 1950's, which would make it historic in its own right and would consider it with the rest of the house.

Vice Chairperson Lloyd stated that the internal muntins were problematic as they set a contemporary precedent.

Commissioner Hart inquired if Commissioner Lloyd would treat the double window next to the door in the addition differently than the casement windows in the original house.

Vice Chairperson Lloyd noted that he would not feel comfortable in requiring the applicant to put in casement windows; however, he did feel that there should be some difference between the two periods of construction.

Commissioner Oliver, noted that she felt there was some leeway in allowing that difference in the north side windows, but the Commission had no photos of the original addition, and therefore could not give much guidance.

Commissioner Funk stated that the way the home was re-roofed, it seemed to be a contiguous home and therefore the Commission might want to have the windows match all the way along the building.

Commissioner Oliver stated that she felt the opposite to be true; in allowing different styles of windows on the north façade, it would highlight the two distinct periods of construction.

Vice Chairperson Lloyd noted that he would agree with Commissioner Oliver on the windows. He noted that the step down in the roof and a distinct eave also helped to identify the addition, and the difference could be reinforced by differently sized windows.

Commissioner Oliver noted that the windows on the earlier portion of the home should be replaced.

Chairperson Fitzsimmons stated that she needed to address all four staff recommendations in the motion.

In regards to Petition 470-08-13, Commissioner Funk made a motion to legalize the roof addition on the home, deny the vinyl replacement windows on the primary elevations of the home (the north and the east) and request that they be replaced with a more appropriate historic window as evidenced in some of the photos presented this evening, that the internal muntin system be denied and removed, and the request to legalize the change in the size of the windows be denied.

Commissioner Haymond seconded the motion.

Discussion of the Motion

Commissioner Oliver inquired if the motion included removal of the muntin system on the south and west elevations as well.

Commissioner Funk indicated that it did not.

Commissioner Hart stated that she felt these windows still needed to be addressed.

Commissioner Bevins noted that the applicant replaced metal clad windows with vinyl windows and inquired what the Commission would request he replace the new windows with, whether it was metal clad or something different.

Commissioner Funk stated that the new windows could approximate either the original historic photo or the windows present when the applicant purchased the home.

Mr. Pace inquired of Commissioner Funk if by not recognizing the windows on the South and West in the motion; it was her intent to legalize those windows.

Commissioner Funk stated that this was her intention.

Commissioner Hart inquired if the Commission allowed interior muntin system on secondary and tertiary façades.

Mr. Paterson stated that staff generally recommended that an applicant use exterior muntins only.

Commissioner Hart proposed an amendment to the original motion to deny the applicant's request to legalize the windows on the South and West sides.

There was no second to the amendment.

Vice Chairperson Lloyd noted that in denying the petition in general they were giving latitude to staff to work with the applicant to find a reasonable outcome.

Commissioner Oliver noted that the problem with the original motion was that it would in effect allow the internal muntin system on the south and west elevations.

Vice Chairperson Lloyd stated that he did not feel allowing those windows would set a precedent of allowing interior muntins.

Commissioner Oliver inquired if the south and west façade windows had been replaced with the same type of windows as the north and the east.

Commissioner Funk noted that in further discussion of the motion she was leaning towards Commissioner Hart's amendment and felt the Commission might want to deny the interior muntin system on all windows.

Commissioner Oliver proposed an amendment to the original motion; that the Historic Landmark Commission deny the request to legalize windows with an internal muntin system on all elevations of the home, and the applicant should work with staff to find an appropriate window matching or approximating the historic window visible in the tax credit photo on the north and east façades as well as an appropriate window style which does not need to meet that standard on the south and west façades.

Commissioner Hart seconded the amendment to the motion.

Commissioner Funk stated that there was a substantial cost required in replacing all of the windows.

Chairperson Fitzsimmons noted that he certainly identified with the plight of the applicant; however, it was the Commission's job to enforce the zoning ordinance and residential design guidelines. He stated that there were other tools available to the applicant that might help defray costs.

Mr. Pace requested clarification regarding Commissioner Oliver's amendment and if the amendment was delegating approval of the windows to staff, or asking the applicant to come back to the Commission for approval.

Commissioner Oliver noted that she was delegating approval of the windows to staff. She also noted that with changes to the windows, the applicant might be eligible for tax credits.

Chairperson Fitzsimmons called for a vote on the amended motion. Commissioners Bevins, Funk, Hart, Haymond and Oliver voted "Aye". Vice Chairperson Lloyd voted "Nay". The motion carried 5-1.

Petition 470-08-10 Kimble Shaw Major Alteration - A request by Kimble Shaw, representative of the owner, for a major alteration located at approximately 30 North 'S' Street in the Avenues Historic District. The proposed project involves a new garage and alterations to an existing historic structure. The property is zoned SR-1A, Special Development Pattern Residential District in the Avenues Historic District. The property is located in City Council District 3, represented by Council Member Eric Jergensen. (Staff contact: Robin Zeigler, 535-7758, robin.zeigler@slcgov.com.)
(This item was heard at 6:56 p.m.)

Chairperson Fitzsimmons recognized Janice Lew as representative for staff member Robin Zeigler.

Ms. Lew reviewed the request for the Commission. Ms. Lew noted that the existing structure was a two story frame shingle style structure that was constructed about 1911 by Fredrick Pale as an associated structure to the Grant Walker House located at 1205 East South Temple Street. Ms. Lew gave the Commission a slide presentation reviewing the property's history and following proposed changes to the property at 30 North 'S' Street:

West Elevation

- Replace all existing wood windows with aluminum clad wood windows.
- Removal of existing door, to be replaced with windows
- Addition of a new wood barn door on a sliding track

East Elevation

- The addition of a covered patio with a hipped roof
- A dormer on the left side of the elevation to match the existing dormer
- Add a new interior chimney to be covered by wood shingles
- Replace all wood windows with aluminum clad wood windows
- Remove a majority of the lower level wall and windows to accommodate a series of French doors on the first floor

South Elevation

- Replace all wood windows with aluminum clad wood windows, not true divided light, but would have exterior muntins.
- Change existing lower wood window into a paneled door with a three light transom
- Replace existing double door and gabled roof with a shed roof and French doors

North Elevation

- Replace all wood windows with aluminum clad wood windows
- New opening with a paneled door with a three light transom

Detached Garage

- Located on the northeast side of the property to the rear
- Proposal requested a footprint of 600 sq ft and 20 ft in height

Ms. Lew noted that the garage proposal asked the Commission to consider a height exception to the Zoning Ordinance which only allowed a 14' height maximum. She stated that this request for additional height was included for the additional 120 square feet allowed for an accessory structure and referred the Commission to the drawings in the staff report for further detail. Ms. Lew noted that based upon analysis included in the staff report, staff recommended approval of the request. She stated that the staff conditions included the requests that the rear door and transom be relocated to the proposed north or south side entrance if possible, that the front entrance be redesigned with glazing similar to the historic stable door; and that a date stone be added to the proposed garage.

Commissioner Bevins inquired why the date stone had been requested.

Commissioner Oliver noted that the condition and findings for that item were located on page 9 of the staff report.

Mr. Bevins inquired if the door with the transom had already been relocated to the north elevation.

Ms. Lew stated that it was a new two paneled door rather than the current five paneled door, and staff was looking for a reuse of the historic door.

Commissioner Hart stated that in the staff report it had indicated that the requested garage was not oversized, but noted that Ms. Lew had indicated that 480 square feet was the maximum allowed by the ordinance.

Ms. Lew stated that the zoning considerations listed on page five of the staff report did not address the issue of the additional 120 square feet, and asked if Mr. Paterson could clarify the allowance for a 600 square foot structure.

Mr. Paterson noted that the ordinance already allowed for a primary accessory structure of 480 square feet, however, a secondary accessory would also be allowed with a maximum size of 120 square feet, which would allow for a total square footage of 600 sq feet. Mr. Paterson stated that the standard was based to some degree upon the Historic Landmark Commission's policy guidelines which would allow staff, prior to the compatible infill ordinances, to administratively approve garages up to 600 square feet in size, with anything larger than that coming before the Historic Landmark Commission. Mr. Paterson noted that when the SR-1A zoning district was developed, these guidelines had indicated that the secondary accessory structure be attached to the primary accessory structure, and the HLC under the authority of the SR-1A zoning ordinance, Chapter 34, had the authority to grant exceptions to these maximums.

Commissioner Hart inquired if the existing structure square footage, 2,070 square feet, was the footprint of the carriage house or total footage. She stated that having a 600 square foot garage might be outsized if the footprint of the home were only 1, 035 square feet.

Ms. Lew noted that Commissioner Hart should refer that question to the applicant or architect.

Chairperson Fitzsimmons invited the applicant forward to speak at 7:11 p.m.

Scott Anderson, 30 'S' Street, stated that the carriage house had been in existence since 1904 according to a Shipley photograph. He stated that it had been built by the Grant family, and shortly thereafter acquired by the Walker family. Mr. Anderson stated that the structure was originally open space on the main floor.

Mr. Anderson noted that the footprint originally calculated by staff was incorrect and the footprint was actually 1,325 square feet.

Mr. Anderson reviewed the history of the structure. He noted that part of the reason for the proposed exterior alterations was to preserve interior details of the structure which the Commission would not be aware of, for example parquet floors present in the hayloft and paneling from the entrance hall and stairway. Mr. Anderson stated that the original carriage door had also been found walled in the structure and was proposing to mount the door still on its original track system to the exterior.

Mr. Anderson noted that not all windows were to be replaced; the front stable windows which were originally openings for the horse stalls would stay as well as the windows for the turret or stair tower. Mr. Anderson noted that the two doors on the pediment on the south elevation were not original to the structure.

Vice Chairperson Lloyd stated that there was one window on the second floor west elevation that appeared to be the only window in the building which was an aluminum clad unit.

Mr. Anderson stated that there had been a bathroom added to that particular space at some point in the past and the window was part of that addition of an unknown date.

Vice Chairperson Lloyd noted that there was a beam attached to the front elevation where the sliding door was proposed which was not original to the structure.

Mr. Anderson noted that the beam was not original; however, it was keeping the building from shifting west or east.

Vice Chairperson Lloyd inquired where Mr. Anderson had found the original renderings for the home included in the staff report.

Mr. Anderson stated that they had been in the files of the historic preservation office for the property, and that they were probably the work of a University of Utah student sometime in the late 1960's or early 1970's.

Chairperson Fitzsimmons inquired if the applicant would keep all of the wood shingles on the home.

Mr. Anderson noted that all of the salvageable shingles would stay and they would re-shingle the east elevation after construction of new openings.

Commissioner Bevins inquired about the roof and materials.

Mr. Anderson stated that the roof would stay the same as far as materials were concerned; however, they were proposing to remove the power from the chimney, as the power lines were connected at that point.

Vice Chairperson Lloyd inquired if they would be adding a chimney on the north elevation.

Mr. Anderson noted that there had been a chimney there in the past, however ivy vines had pushed their way between the mortar and bricks and had pushed the chimney away from the façade. Therefore, Mr. Anderson stated, it had been removed for the sake of safety.

Commissioner Hart noted that the chimney would not be replaced according to the architectural drawings.

Mr. Anderson noted that it would not be replaced, as it was part of the 1940's addition to the structure.

Commissioner Oliver inquired if the applicant was deriving their interpretation of the west façade from the 1904 historic photograph of the structure.

Mr. Anderson stated that the original front (west) elevation was a mirror image of the east elevation which included a cross gable. Mr. Anderson stated that the framing still reflected this on the second story of the structure. He noted that previous owners had actually cut through the king trusses which had caused some structural issues.

Commissioner Oliver inquired if that façade could be seen from the historic photo.

Mr. Anderson noted that only the turret was truly visible.

Commissioner Oliver inquired if the applicant was proposing to keep the door west of the chimney on the façade.

Mr. Anderson stated that they were proposing to make it their front door.

Commissioner Oliver stated that the drive approach on the west side of the front elevation was an important historical element as well, and inquired how the applicant would be treating it.

Mr. Anderson noted that they did understand the importance of that element, and would preserve it somehow, and while they were not sure how at this point, it might be either broad steps to the south entrance or retained with plantings of groundcover in the wide strips. Mr. Anderson did state that Traffic Engineering required the approach to the street to be removed, so it would not be reinforced there, but would be retained in some manner on the property.

Vice Chairperson Lloyd inquired if the applicant had submitted profiles for the proposed aluminum clad wood windows.

Mr. Anderson noted that they had been submitted, and they were considering several windows from the Windsor line, but were very aware of the profile requirements.

Chairperson Fitzsimmons stated his concern regarding the size of the garage and inquired if the structure would house anything besides cars.

Mr. Anderson stated that they were hoping to be able to house the electric meter and other electronic components with the garage. He also stated that as the structure was not built as a residence, there was no basement or any other storage space; therefore, there was a need for storage to keep gardening tools and other necessities.

Vice Chairperson Lloyd stated that the staff report listed the acreage of the property as 0.33 acres.

Mr. Anderson stated that he thought the correct acreage was actually 0.31, due to succeeding some of the property to accommodate the driveway at 1205 East South Temple.

Commissioner Hart inquired how tall the carriage house currently was.

Mr. Anderson stated that he did not know the exact figure, however, page 46 of the staff report displayed the relationship in height between the house and proposed garage.

Commissioner Oliver noted that one of staff's recommendations was to change the proposed design for the west stable door and remove the sliding door, redesigning the door with glazing similar to the design of the historic stable door.

Mr. Anderson noted that he had spoken with staff in the past regarding the issue, and Ms. Zeigler's argument had been that sliding doors were not original to carriage houses, only swinging doors. He stated that there were two support posts on the walls which supported king trusses, however the door could be made to pass or slide if required.

Vice Chairperson Lloyd noted that the glass panels behind the original sliding door would be three operable doors with glass and wood paneling.

Mr. Anderson noted that the center unit would be operable, and the concept was provided to allow more light into the space when desired, but could be changed to four panels if required. Mr. Anderson noted that another reason for the single door in that space was due to a family member with health issues who could not easily operate multi-point doors.

Chairperson Fitzsimmons opened the floor to public comments at 7:39 p.m.

Benjamin Cohen, 1122 East First Avenue, stated that he shared border on the west side with the new owners of 30 North 'S' Street, and while he was delighted that the applicant was renovating the home, he was also concerned with the plan for the lengthy driveway and large garage. He noted that anything allowed beyond a moderately sized structure would wall off a large portion between their property's back yard and the applicant's property, reducing their enjoyment of the surrounding area. Mr. Cohen noted that the proposed garage would create a substantial presence for the neighbors and disrupt the neighborhood. Mr. Cohen stated that he would ask that the Historic Landmark Commission approve the alterations to the carriage house but carefully consider the proposal for the garage.

Peter Goss, while not a city resident, supported the project and wished the Commission would look at the unique character of the neighborhood when determining whether to allow the proposed garage. He stated his belief that the plans by the architect did an admirable job of addressing the historic qualities of the property while allowing for a more livable space.

Larry Montgomery, 1114 First Avenue, stated his concerned regarding the proposed garage size and placement, and noted that the neighbors would like to retain some open space in the back area of the lot. Mr. Montgomery stated that it would be his preference, from a historic context, to have no garage at all.

Chairperson Fitzsimmons closed the public portion of the hearing and brought the Commission to Executive Session at 7:49 p.m.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Commissioner Haymond stated that he was concerned regarding the placement of the garage, and inquired if the placement might be moved to the middle of the back yard area.

Mr. Paterson noted that the SR-1A (Special Residential Development Pattern) zoning district infill standards required that accessory structures in a rear yard be located a maximum of 5' from the rear property line unless it could be proven that more than fifty percent of the homes on that block face had garages set farther forward than that. Mr. Paterson noted that there was a Special Exception process which could be pursued where based upon topography, or mature vegetation, the Board of Adjustment could grant a greater setback, but the Historic Landmark Commission did not have the authority to modify the setback requirement for the garage.

Vice Chairperson Lloyd stated that he would refer the Commission back to the nomination documentation from the staff report which indicated that the carriage house was one of the best examples of shingle style architecture in Utah, and was therefore a significant piece of architecture. He noted that while the Commission had not discussed it, the proposed rear porch addition was consistent with the development of shingle style architecture.

Vice Chairperson Lloyd stated that as part of the Commission's recommendation, they should note that the applicant pay close attention to the type of window profiles to be used on both the house and accessory structure.

Commissioner Oliver stated that the carriage house was only used as such for approximately seven years from 1904-1911 when it became an auto house. She noted that the changes made to the front façade in the 1940's have also acquired historical significance in their own right, transforming to meet the needs of the time, reflecting the social history of Utah and the nation in general.

Chairperson Fitzsimmons noted that the structure had been an apartment in the past, and he personally was pleased that it would become a residence and not remain a garage any longer. He stated that the front entrance appeared to be new, but did not have an issue with the treatment;

however, the proposed garage size was an issue. Chairperson Fitzsimmons stated that he felt it was fair for the Commission to discuss the height increase, but found it difficult for the Commission to discuss minimum square footage when they had approved structures of such size in the past.

Commissioner Hart noted that she felt the height to be too much. She stated that she would understand the proposed height of twenty feet (20') if there was a second story or requested work space. Commissioner Hart stated that she did take issue with the large footprint of the garage, for two cars and storage.

Chairperson Fitzsimmons stated that the garage was essentially presented as a 480 square foot garage and 120 square foot accessory structure under one roof.

Commissioner Hart stated that this was still a very large structure and she understood the concerns of the neighbors. She noted that it was a fairly sensitive subject and felt the Commission should carefully weigh the options.

Commissioner Bevins inquired if the pitch of the roof on the garage should be the same as the pitch of the roof on the home.

Chairperson Fitzsimmons stated that this had been criteria for assessment in the past on other projects.

Commissioner Hart noted that the roof pitch of the proposed garage closely matched the pitch of the home's roof.

Vice Chairperson Lloyd stated that the size of the lot was significantly larger than most other properties in the Avenues. He noted that while the proposal seemed to match the roof pitch of the home, there may be a way to lower the pitch of the garage roof without impacting the consistency of the two buildings.

Commissioner Funk stated that there might be some middle ground on which the garage might be sized, adding that there was no basement to the primary structure as it was not built as a home and storage space would be needed. She noted that she was not advocating a 600 square foot structure, but to reduce it to 480 square feet arbitrarily seemed problematic.

Commissioner Hart noted that there was a fairly low three car garage just to the east of the subject property.

Commissioner Oliver noted that the Commission should consult the Residential Design Guidelines, referencing particularly guidelines 9.2:

Construct accessory buildings that are compatible with the primary structure.

And, *Accessory Structures in the Avenues*, pg. 150:

Garages in the Avenues District are simple wood or iron structures generally detached and located behind the house. Most are accessed from single-car width driveways from the street...

Commissioner Oliver noted that the proposed garage seemed quite compatible with these requirements. She stated that the guidelines also stated that the HLC should review garages which were over 600 square feet, and the proposed structure was not and was therefore essentially complying with the Ordinance. She noted however, that the guidelines also called for review when the proposed structure was more than one story in height and the proposed garage was over one-

story. She noted that she did not feel there to be any need for the structure to be more than 14' in height. Commissioner Oliver stated that the garage height could be denied and if limited to 480 square feet, an additional accessory structure could be built to address storage demands.

Commissioner Oliver noted her interest in the treatment of the original carriage door on the west façade and inquired of her fellow Commissioners their thoughts on the matter.

Vice Chairperson Lloyd noted that he understood staff's suggestion, however, applauded the applicant to reuse some existing materials in a different modern approach and felt it was appropriate to the design guidelines.

Chairperson Fitzsimmons noted his agreement with Vice Chairperson Lloyd's assessment.

Vice Chairperson Lloyd made a motion regarding petition 470-08-10 to accept staff's recommendation to approve a Certificate of Appropriateness for the proposed alterations for the home, denying the exception on additional height for the garage and but place a condition of approval on the garage, finding the sliding door replacement acceptable as designed, and a date stone be added to the proposed garage, and staff approve profiles of the aluminum clad windows with particular detail to the sill and rail proportions.

Commissioner Funk seconded the motion.

DISCUSSION OF THE MOTION

Commissioner Oliver noted that no mention was made on the reuse of the existing rear door and transom.

Vice Chairperson Lloyd made an amendment to his motion to recommend the reuse of the existing rear door and transom.

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

Chairperson Fitzsimmons called for a short recess at this time.

Petition 470-08-14 Carl Jones Legalization - A request by Carl Jones, owner, to legalize the windows that were replaced prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness at approximately 104 North 'F' Street in the Avenues Historic District. The property is zoned RMF-35, Moderate Density Multi-family Residential District. The property is located in City Council District 3, represented by Council Member Eric Jergensen. (Staff contact: Robin Zeigler, 535-7758, robin.zeigler@slcgov.com.)
(*This item was heard at 8:21 p.m.*)

Ms. Lew reviewed the legalization request. She noted that the existing wood windows had been replaced with vinyl windows and the applicant had not received the proper permits before replacement. She noted that the replacement windows included interior muntins which were normally not allowed. Ms. Lew noted that based upon staff analysis, staff recommended approval of the rear and side elevation windows, but replace the main façade windows with historically appropriate units. Ms. Lew reviewed photos of the home's elevations and an old tax photo of the front façade to highlight the difference between the old and replacement windows.

Mr. Pace noted that the agenda referred to the item as a legalization case but the staff report indicated it was an appeal of administrative decision.

Ms. Lew noted that there was conflicting language; however the petition was also referred to as a legalization case in the staff report title.

Mr. Pace noted that the windows had therefore been installed and the applicant had requested approval of the replacement units from staff, however, had been denied and was therefore before the Commission for a legalization request.

Ms. Lew noted that this was correct.

Commissioner Hart stated that language in the staff report indicated that the contractor had been to staff and was told a Certificate of Appropriateness was required, but went ahead without one.

Ms. Lew noted that it appeared the contractor came in, was informed of the need to obtain a Certificate but did not return to obtain one, and then the issue was enforced upon based upon a complaint to the City through Zoning Enforcement.

Mr. Jones, 104 North 'F' Street, noted that on February 1st, 2008, the contractor went in to get a permit, but did not obtain one. Mr. Jones stated that he did not realize that the permit had not been obtained until February 14th once the work had been completed and the enforcement officer came to the property. Mr. Jones noted that there was a home across the street that had the same type of windows with internal muntins which had been approved prior to his window replacements.

Chairperson Fitzsimmons inquired if Mr. Jones still had the original windows.

Mr. Jones noted that they had been disposed of, and the center panes had been aluminum panels before replacement.

Chairperson Fitzsimmons inquired what the side panel windows had been.

Mr. Jones noted that they had been divided light wood windows.

Commissioner Oliver inquired if the applicant had a better tax photo than the Commission.

Mr. Jones noted that he had attempted to obtain the original but was unsuccessful. He noted that he had taken the tax photo from the staff report and attempted to enlarge it for the benefit of the Commission.

Vice Chairperson Lloyd inquired if the applicant had seen the attachment to the staff report, pg. 19 from *The Old House Journal* which demonstrated the efficacy of various replacement window options.

Mr. Jones noted that he had not seen it prior to seeing the staff report and wished he had seen it prior to replacing his windows, as it would have been much cheaper.

Vice Chairperson Lloyd noted that the message of the attachment was basically to say that vinyl replacement windows were not the energy saving option that they were purported to be.

Commissioner Oliver noted that she could not tell from the tax photo that there had ever been muntins in the center pane of the windows.

Commissioner Haymond noted that he thought he saw them there.

Commissioner Hart noted that in her study of architecture it seemed likely that the only way there would be muntins there is if the center panes had been replaced in the 1930's or 40's with metal muntins.

Chairperson Fitzsimmons opened the floor to public comment at 8:35 p.m.

Linda Lasater, 114 North 'F' Street, noted that she was very pleased to see the improvements Mr. Jones had made to the property. She stated that she felt, in aggregate, the improvements he had made to the home had improved the historic charm and the windows were not a particularly noticeable detraction.

Ms. Cromer, 816 East 100 South, noted that the windows had been removed from the home and destroyed. Ms. Cromer stated that the title carried notice regarding the home's position in a historic district and the owner should always be aware of such issues. She noted that the contractor had been absolutely defiant and it had taken a great deal of coordination from City staff to address the issue.

Mr. Jones apologized to Ms. Cromer for the contractor's rudeness. He stated that he honestly was not aware of the home's location in a local historic district and that he would like to see some sort of educational program within his community regarding the restrictions and benefits of these districts.

Chairperson Fitzsimmons brought the Commissioner to executive session at 8:41 p.m.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Commissioner Funk noted that for the sake of consistency, the Commission would have to require the applicant to replace all of the windows on the home. She noted that unfortunately, they were simply the wrong type of windows and were highly visible on three façades of the home. She stated that there was money available through historic preservation to possibly help the applicant replace the windows.

Commissioner Funk stated that it would be her suggestion that staff create a brochure regarding what it means to live in a local historic districts and distribute it to title companies in the area. She noted that the fact the information is located on the deed does not necessarily mean anything to the people in receipt. She noted that in her conversations with members of City Council, they would support some type of action along that vein as it is great public education.

Commissioner Oliver stated that this issue was something that could be discussed at the upcoming Commission retreat and the brochure could include tax credit information and emphasize the benefits of living in a local historic district.

Commissioner Hart noted that in both of the legalization cases before the Commission that evening, the applicant had failed to obtain a building permit. She stated that people should know that if they plan to change something, they should obtain a building permit, and when in the process, these individuals would have known they lived in a historic district.

Commissioner Bevins inquired how long the applicant would have to replace the windows.

Mr. Paterson stated that staff would work with the property owner and enforcement staff to define a timeline. He stated that the Division did have a brochure regarding property ownership in local historic districts and had discussed increasing community outreach in the future.

Vice Chairperson Lloyd noted that if the Commission decided to vote against the staff recommendation, they needed to clearly demonstrate the reasons for doing so. He stated that he

would like some clarification regarding the standards for approval of vinyl windows on secondary façades in the future.

Regarding petition 470-08-14, Vice Chairperson Lloyd made a motion to uphold the administrative decision to deny the removal of historic wood windows, and deny the request to keep any of the replacement windows, and request that the applicant work with staff to find an appropriate replacement window for all façades.

Commissioner Hart seconded the motion.

There was no discussion of the motion.

All voted “Aye”. The motion carries unanimously.

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. (Staff contact: Robin Zeigler, 535-7758, robin.zeigler@slcgov.com.)
(This item was heard at 8:49 p.m.)

Chairperson Fitzsimmons recognized Joel Paterson as staff representative for Ms. Zeigler.

Mr. Paterson noted that the ZCMI façade was advertised on the agenda with the intent that the Commission would make a decision that evening. Mr. Paterson stated that in review with staff and the applicant it had been decided that the item might be used as an Issues Only Hearing and be continued to the next Commission meeting on July 2, 2008.

Mr. Paterson noted that proposal was to reconstruct the historic ZCMI façade as a focal point for the new Macy's in City Creek Center. He noted that the new Macy's front façade would be located on the east side of Main Street. He stated that the Landmark Commission had considered a portion of the original proposal in June of 2007.

Mr. Paterson noted that the new structure would not extend above the façade as the previous building behind the façade had and no changes would be made to the cast iron façade itself. He noted that the front entrance of the new Macy's would be recessed 12' behind the ZCMI façade and 2'10" below the grade of the sidewalk. He noted that the applicants had gone through a significant amount of effort to address all existing grade challenges.

Mr. Paterson stated that all of the glass on the first floor of the Macy's building would be clear glass providing a clear view into the store, and windows on the above floors would be a combination of storefront show windows and opaque spandrel glass. Mr. Paterson noted that the display windows above the ground level would have a solid backdrop and not present views into the store as they would not match internal floor levels. He noted that staff had voiced concern regarding the blank nature of the spandrel glass, and therefore, the applicants had proposed a solution of LED lighting behind the façade to allow lighting in the evening and variations of that lighting throughout the seasons.

Mr. Paterson noted that with the lack of design guidelines for such commercial projects in the past regarding downtown historic structures, staff had used some of the Residential Historic Design Guidelines to assess the project's appropriateness. He noted that when looking at standards 21A.34.020.G, numbers 1, 2,4,5,6,7,9,10,11 and 12 all applied. He noted that staff had concerns regarding standards 2,3 and 8.

Mr. Paterson noted that historically, window glass was clear, with the exception of transom windows with lights, and awnings and shades helped to provide protection from the elements for pedestrians. He noted that the cast iron façade openings were still an intact defining historic feature.

Mr. Paterson stated that recessing the entrance both horizontally and vertically was an issue with staff and according to standards, falsifying architectural elements should not be allowed. He noted that in the case of windows and doors that no longer existed, trying to duplicate them would not be an authentic interpretation. Mr. Paterson noted that proposed external muntins for the spandrel glass did not match the division of the original windows, but provided a possibly more appropriate modern interpretation of the historic window design.

Chairperson Fitzsimmons invited the applicant forward at 9:07 p.m.

Alan Sullivan, legal representative for CCRI (City Creek Reserve, Inc.), gave a brief history of the project to the Commission, noting that the process for City Creek Center began before the City Council in October of 2006.

Ron Locke, Senior Vice President of design for Taubman Incorporated and supervisor to the project architects gave a visual overview of the City Creek project to the Commission, noting that the objective was to create a walkable development downtown. Mr. Locke then presented a fly-through video, three-dimensional rendering of the entire City Creek project.

Bill Williams, Director of Architecture for CCRI, reviewed a brief history of the ZCMI façade for the Commission. He noted that in its first incarnation, only the center section of the current ZCMI façade existed. In 1875, he noted that the central element was replicated on the north side of the façade. He noted that a new piece was added later which did not match the other two sections, and in the 1940's, a very large awning was added to deal with the west sun. He noted that the historic façade was reconstructed in 1975 to combine the façade with a modern building and at that time, they had set the building back to create a loggia to allow for a separate entrance.

Mr. Williams noted that the main face of the building was set back from the historic façade as the façade needed to be very stiff, and in the case of a seismic event, the cast iron would just crack and fall off the face of the building if not supported. He noted that the rest of the building would be set back so that in case of a seismic event, the elements could move separately. Mr. Williams noted that the first story loggia in the new structure had been created to increase the project's permeability, or site lines into the store. Mr. Williams noted that City Council had asked CCRI to reduce the distance in elevation between the sidewalk and lower landing to the entrance, and CCRI had reduced the height of the staircase to 2'10". Mr. Williams clarified that the historic façade would be recessed 12' from the entrance through the loggia but 4-6" from the rest of the façade of the new Macy's.

Mr. Williams noted that the glass could be brought out to the front plane of the building, but would make it problematic in terms of the requested visual permeability and retail placement. He stated that valuable storage space would also be lost. He noted that they were trying to create the best compromise between the best backdrop for the historic façade, the modern vision of the retailer and something better than the 1975 interpretation of the façade.

Laurie Etella, Vice President for Macy's Corporate Services, Store Planning, Design and Construction, noted that a typical department store had the objective of selling merchandise. He stated that the floor pattern for the ZCMI Macy's would vary greatly from the typical department store to address the requirement for increased visibility and permeability.

Commissioner Lloyd inquired if Macy's had dealt with a historic façade in the past.

Mr. Etella noted that they had dealt with store installations and renovations in historic structures in the past but not applying a historic façade to a new building. He noted that they had used show windows in the past, but had also done pseudo show windows as well in other projects. He noted that the busiest entrances would be the mall entrances.

Mr. Etella noted that there would be four levels of parking below the store, and elevators or escalators could be taken without accessing any of the main entrances.

Mr. Williams noted that there were also elevators and stairs on Main Street, so that when the customer came from the parking area, there were also easily accessible connections to Main Street.

Vice Chairperson Lloyd inquired about the façade column bases, and noted that the adjustment to grade appeared to be taken care of by an extension of some sort below the cast iron façade base.

Mr. Williams noted that it was apparent from the 1975 façade base that they had set a datum point and then placed the cast iron base elements in relationship to that point supported by a type of reinforcement system which Mr. Williams did not specify.

Vice Chairperson Lloyd noted that the cast iron base of the façade was actually 1975 construction although the whole façade was considered a landmark.

Vice Chairperson Lloyd inquired what the applicant would anticipate at the base of the columns in the proposed design.

Mr. Williams stated that they had anticipated using the same motif to make up the difference, trying to adjust the grade slightly.

Commissioner Funk stated that she felt it was very appropriate for the Commission to see the reasoning behind the proposal.

Commissioner Oliver inquired if customers would be more willing to come into the store if no grade change existed.

Mr. Etella noted that it would be ideal, but they could not do it with the 4' grade differential across the front face of the store.

Bob Corcoran, architect for Macy's, noted that there was a Nordstrom's in Washington D.C. where the customer had to go down five steps into the main entrance. He also noted that there were 17 buildings on South Temple with entrance stairs, either up or down. He noted that even show windows on the façade of the building ranged 4-7' above the existing floor and would only be accessible by ladders. Mr. Corcoran noted that there had been a lot of complications, but they had been addressed to try and help the façade not read like the 1970 concrete wall.

Commissioner Hart noted that she took issue with the opaque glass as it still seemed akin to dead space, and while she sympathized with how the applicant needed to use the space, she still found it quite sparse and uninviting.

Commissioner Oliver inquired if there were any type of treatment which could lessen the effect.

Mr. Williams noted that the spandrel glass was the best way to deal with modern mechanical systems which would be exposed with clear windows. He noted that a variety of options for spandrel treatments could be presented to the Commission.

Commissioner Hart noted that there were two strips, horizontal and vertical of aluminum in the interpretation, and wondered if the applicant would be open to changing the treatment to a more traditional look similar to the 1949 double-hung windows.

Mr. Williams noted that the false window treatment had been discussed a great deal with staff and their concern had been that they did not want it to look like the applicant was trying to replicate the original pattern.

Commissioner Oliver inquired if the applicant had reduced the height between the sidewalk and the lower landing on the front elevation since the last City Council meeting.

Mr. Locke noted that the grade had been reduced by 1' or twenty-five percent since the April 8th City Council meeting.

Mr. Williams noted that they had tried to maintain the height of the top of the stores.

Chairperson Fitzsimmons opened the floor to public comment at 10:16. p.m.

Cindy Cromer, 816 East 100 South, noted that the project kept improving, however, she still had concerns. She noted that she felt the proposed fenestration patter with the aluminum strips to be distracting and would look strange from angles with the high horizontal lines. She noted that the project had greatly improved from its initial conception, and this was the most important elevation from a historical standpoint.

Seeing no further comments, Chairperson Fitzsimmons closed the public comment portion of the hearing at 10:19 p.m.

Commissioner Hart made a motion to recess case 470-08-17, until July 2, 2008, and convene an Architectural Committee meeting regarding the petition beforehand.

DISCUSSION OF THE MOTION

Commissioners Hart, Funk, Oliver and Vice Chairperson Lloyd volunteered to attend the Architectural Committee meeting.

Vice Chairperson Lloyd seconded the motion. All voted "Aye". The motion carried unanimously.

OTHER BUSINESS

There was no further business.

The meeting adjourned at 10:21 p.m.

Cecily Zuck, Historic Landmark Commission Secretary