

**SALT LAKE CITY  
HISTORIC LANDMARK COMMISSION  
Minutes of the Meeting  
Room 315, 451 South State Street  
July 7, 2010**

*This document along with the digital recording constitute the official minutes of the Historic Landmark Commission regular session meeting held on July 7, 2010.*

To download the FTR player and listen to audio excerpts from the record, click [here](#).

A regular meeting of the Historic Landmark Commission was held on July 7, 2010, at [5:52:54 PM](#) 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, Bill Davis, Thomas Carter, Sheleigh Harding, Polly Hart, Creed Haymond, Warren Lloyd, Chairperson; Anne Oliver, Vice Chairperson and Dave Richards. Commissioner Arla Funk was excused from the meeting.

Planning staff present for the meeting were: Cheri Coffey, Assistant Planning Director; Carl Leith, Senior Planner; Janice Lew, Senior Planner; Ray Milliner, Principal Planner; Paul Nielson, City Attorney; Katia Pace, Associate 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 Davis, Harding, Haymond, Hart, Richards, Chairperson Lloyd and Vice Chairperson Oliver. A quorum was present. Field trip notes are included with the record of the minutes in the Planning Division Office. Commissioner Funk had to leave prior to the field trip to attend to other matters.

**WORK SESSION [5:09:57 PM](#)**

Mr. Leith reviewed the document *Preservation in Brief* for the Commission. He noted that staff had distributed the current version of the document in the meeting packet and provided the first draft for the Commission to review as well. Mr. Leith stated that staff intended to eventually use the document as a web resource and possibly broken into individual components to provide summary information in a more accessible format.

Commissioner Richards inquired how the document had been disseminated in the past.

Mr. Leith noted that it had been distributed in recent meetings with the Westmoreland and Yalecrest neighborhoods.

Vice Chairperson Oliver inquired if the document would help to answer frequently asked questions from the public.

Mr. Leith noted that it had helped to answer questions during recent meetings.

Vice Chairperson Oliver noted that she felt it would be better distributed as individual portions rather than one booklet.

Mr. Leith stated that he agreed, but that staff was currently attempting to create a cohesive document that could be used either in whole or in part.

Commissioner Richards inquired if the document might be provided for real estate professionals or new homeowners of local district properties.

Mr. Leith noted that they did receive requests for such information from realtors and it could be distributed to that group in the future.

Chairperson Lloyd inquired if the document was available on the HLC website.

Mr. Leith stated that it was not, but staff was planning on including it on the web in the near future.

Chairperson Lloyd noted that summary sections could be linked to the Residential Design Guidelines.

Commissioner Carter stated the HLC had not really reached architects within the Salt Lake Community and inquired how Chairperson Lloyd believed this might be accomplished.

Chairperson Lloyd noted that the AIA could do a better job of distributing such information among the local professional community. He stated that the Commission should bring credible residential designers into the process wherever possible.

At this time, Chairperson Lloyd identified Cheri Coffey, Assistant Planning Director, to provide an update on the City Council's actions on July 6, 2010 regarding the Yalecrest temporary regulations.

Ms. Coffey reviewed the area of Yalecrest in which the temporary regulations had been lifted and provided two maps for the Commission to review. She noted that there were several newer homes representing post World War II architecture within this area and the Council felt that type of architecture was already well represented in the City. Ms. Coffey noted that until September 10, 2010 when the temporary regulations expired, the area of Yalecrest where regulations had not been lifted would still need to defer to the Residential Design Guidelines and work with the Historic Landmark Commission.

Ms. Coffey stated that residents still under the regulations had been granted the opportunity to work within their neighborhoods and come up with some sort of solution, whether it be local historic district designation or a conservation district, by January 15, 2011 at which time they would approach Council again.

Ms. Coffey noted that the City Council had also requested that Planning Staff create an ordinance to adopt before September 10, 2010. She stated that this ordinance must state that structures built prior to 1942 cannot be demolished before going through an economic hardship process or unless hazardous to public safety. Ms. Coffey noted that the proposal would need to be completed within the next week or so as it would have to go before the Planning Commission by July 28, 2010 in order for the Council to act upon it by September 10, 2010. Ms. Coffey stated that it was fairly clear that these issues would be separated from the HLC and would instead be reviewed by the Planning Commission. Ms. Coffey stated that the defined economic hardship process would probably include standards similar to those in the Landmarks Ordinance, but it was uncertain how that would work.

Chairperson Lloyd noted that petition PLNHLC2010-00206, would no longer be reviewed by the Commission as the property was within the area where temporary regulations had been lifted.

Ms. Coffey noted that the City Council had also discussed the Westmoreland Local Historic District Designation. During that hearing, Ms. Coffey stated, Council had indicated that they would like some type of neighborhood involvement in the survey. Ms. Coffey noted that staff had attempted to explain that these were professional research surveys and had not included a lot public involvement in the past.

Therefore, Ms. Coffey noted, staff was looking into a way to notify the public without compromising the integrity of the survey with conflicting personal opinions.

Chairperson Lloyd stated that Council Member Stan Penfold had indicated in the meeting that through discussion with constituents in his district, it had been revealed that a lot of information had been brought to the Avenues Surveys from residents in the area which lent credibility within the community to those results.

Commissioner Davis noted that he did not believe that anyone ever explained what a Reconnaissance Level Survey was during the meetings with Yalecrest residents. He stated that it seemed the community felt the survey was inaccurate but it was not a microscopic examination of their property as they seemed to believe. Commissioner Davis noted he felt this misunderstanding might have helped lead to the general feeling among the residents of the incompetence of local government.

Ms. Lew noted that there were bound to be some inaccuracies within a large survey area such as Yalecrest, but also stated that the survey was completed in 2005 and changes had certainly occurred throughout the district since that time.

Vice Chairperson Oliver inquired how staff replied to letters such as that received by the Commission regarding Yalecrest.

Ms. Lew noted that staff generally received such inquiries from Council or the public and responded.

Chairperson Lloyd inquired how the Yalecrest GRAMA request was proceeding.

Mr. Nielson noted that the applicant needed to come up with a fee deposit for the research time associated with the request. Ms. Nielson stated that the applicant had spoken with some of the Council members and would narrow the request and pay a fee representing a deposit. Mr. Neilson noted that the obligation was therefore ongoing.

Ms. Lew noted that the Trudell-Thompson case, originally heard by the Commission on May 5, 2010, had been appealed to the Land Use Appeals Board. Ms. Lew noted that the meeting was tentatively scheduled for Monday July 26, 2010.

Chairperson Lloyd stated that there was not a second meeting scheduled for July.

*At this time the Commission moved to Room 315 of the City and County Building to continue that evening's agenda proceedings. Commissioner Lloyd called the meeting to order at 5:52 p.m.*

**APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES from February 3 and June 16, 2010. [5:54:26 PM](#)**

**There were no minutes available from February 3, 2010 to approve.**

**Commissioner Harding made a motion to approve the minutes of June 16, 2010 as written. Commissioner Richards seconded the motion. All voted "Aye". The minutes were approved unanimously.**

**REPORT OF THE CHAIR AND VICE CHAIR [5:55:11 PM](#)**

Chairperson Lloyd noted he had nothing to report.

Vice Chairperson Oliver noted she had nothing to report either.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS [5:55:48 PM](#)**

Seeing no one present from the public to speak to any item not on the agenda, Chairperson Lloyd moved on to the Public Hearing portion of the meeting.

**PUBLIC HEARING [5:56:11 PM](#)**

**PLNHLC2010-00401 –Pacific Northwest Pipeline Building National Register Nomination (Public Safety Building)** – A request by Sheri Murray Ellis of SWCA Environmental Consultants soliciting comments from the Historic Landmark Commission regarding listing the property on the National Register of Historic Places. The property is located at approximately 315 East 200 South in the R-MU (Residential/Mixed Use) zoning district in City Council District 4, represented by Council Member Luke Garrott. (Staff contact: Janice Lew at 801-535-7625 or [janice.lew@slcgov.com](mailto:janice.lew@slcgov.com).)

**Consultant Presentation**

Sheri Murray Ellis presented the nomination report. Ms. Murray Ellis noted that the building was of particular architectural significance. She stated that the City was in support of a National Register Nomination and the property had also received support from the Utah Heritage Foundation.

Ms. Murray Ellis noted that there were two areas of particular significance associated with the property; architecture and commerce. Ms. Murray Ellis stated that the Pacific Northwest Pipeline was completed in 1956 and necessitated the creation of a headquarters and Salt Lake City was selected as the location. Ms. Murray Ellis stated that the structure had been constructed between 1957 and 1958 by Slack and David Winburn, a father and son design team. Ms. Murray Ellis noted that the Pacific Northwest Pipeline Building was the second commercial high-rise built in the International Style after the First Security Bank building at 400 South Main Street. Ms. Murray Ellis stated that she believed the Pacific Northwest Pipeline building was the better preserved of the two.

Ms. Murray Ellis reviewed important architectural features of the site including the following:

- Rectilinear form
- Muted color palette of blues and grays
- Emphasis on horizontal and vertical elements through the use of structural elements, fenestration pattern and color
- Little to no exterior ornamentation
- Retention of the original construction materials including porcelain enameled steel

Ms. Murray Ellis reviewed photographs of these features for the Commission.

Ms. Murray Ellis noted that the building was constructed as part of a boom during the 1950s in the West. She stated that Pacific Northwest Pipeline employed a large number of people at the time with an estimated payroll of 1.5 million dollars. She stated that they could manage the 1,500 mile long Pipeline from their headquarters in Salt Lake City through the use of automated controls within the building; quite innovative technology at the time.

**Questions for the Consultant from the Commission [6:08:50 PM](#)**

Chairperson Lloyd inquired how unique the horizontal sunscreens present on the structure were.

Ms. Murray Ellis stated that the sunscreens were quite significant and she was not aware of another structure anywhere where they had been used so extensively. She noted that they were very specifically placed to help with interior climate control and were therefore very functional, one of the hallmarks of the Modern architecture movement.

**Public Hearing [6:11:08 PM](#)**

Cindy Cromer, 816 East 100 South, noted that she was delighted to see the City take a role in nominating the building before placing it on the market. Ms. Cromer stated that she believed residents of Salt Lake City were truly blessed to have so many of Slack Winburn's buildings within the City to admire.

**Executive Session [6:12:37 PM](#)**

There were no comments from the Commission regarding the application.

**Motion [6:12:56 PM](#)**

**In the case of Petition PLNHLC2010-00401, Commissioner Hart made a motion to request staff forward a positive recommendation to the State Board of History for a National Register Nomination of the Pacific Northwest Pipeline Building also known as the Public Safety Building. Commissioner Carter seconded the motion.**

There was no discussion of the motion.

**Commissioners Bevins, Carter, Davis, Harding, Hart, Haymond, Richards and Vice Chairperson Oliver voted, "Aye". The motion carries unanimously.**

**PLNHLC2010-00337 – Mitchell Certificate of Appropriateness for Minor Alterations** –A request by Joe Mitchell for a certificate of appropriateness to build a fence made from composite materials. The property is located at approximately 77 and 79 Hillside Avenue in the R-2 (Single and Two Family Residential) zoning district in the Capitol Hill Historic District in City Council District 3, represented by Stan Penfold. (Staff contact: Ray Milliner at 801-535-7645 or [ray.milliner@slcgov.com](mailto:ray.milliner@slcgov.com).)

**Staff Presentation [6:14:25 PM](#)**

Mr. Milliner reviewed the request, noting that the applicant was proposing to install a composite material fence in the rear yard. He noted that in the past the Commission had reviewed such applications on a case by case basis. He noted that there was a section of fence within the corner side yard on a prominent street. He noted that staff recommended that the rear section would meet criteria within the guidelines, but requested a determination from the Commission as to whether the proposed section within the corner side yard met the requirements of the design guidelines. Mr. Milliner noted that it was not technically in the front yard and was set back 15 feet from the front property line.

**Questions for Staff from the Commission [6:17:01 PM](#)**

Seeing no questions from the Commission for staff, Chairperson Lloyd moved on to the applicant presentation.

**Applicant Presentation [6:17:35 PM](#)**

Joe Mitchell, the applicant, was present to speak. Mr. Mitchell noted that he felt the proposed material would blend in with the refurbished home and would match the new trim color.

**Questions for the Applicant from the Commission 6:18:38**

Chairperson Lloyd inquired if the existing fence was solid.

Mr. Mitchell noted it was a privacy fence and had been there since the last purchase of the property. He stated that the current fence was in disrepair and required replacement.

Commissioner Richards inquired if the applicant was aware of newer composite fencing styles resembling traditional picket styles.

Mr. Mitchell noted that he was not aware of any.

**Public Hearing [6:20:02 PM](#)**

Seeing no one present to speak to the issue from the public, Chairperson Lloyd closed the public hearing portion of the item and moved to Executive Session.

**Executive Session [6:20:12 PM](#)**

Commissioner Harding noted that she was open to the use of the composite material, but was concerned about the height of the fence in the side yard.

Commissioner Hart concurred with Commissioner Harding. She noted that the material completely obstructed any view of the yard and needed a bit of transparency.

Commissioner Haymond stated that visually, the proposed material would look better than the current fence.

Commissioner Carter noted his concern that the State Street front façade was a very prominent location.

Commissioner Richards noted that there was a composite fencing product within the Trex line called “Surroundings” which did make a picket style. He stated he wished there were more design choices available from manufacturers.

Vice Chairperson Oliver noted it would be appropriate to request wood in the State Street side yard. She also inquired if there were a trim that might provide some transparency.

Commissioner Richards noted that he had attempted to investigate this possibility, but was not aware of any product available.

Chairperson Lloyd invited the applicant forward to address questions concerning possible alternatives for a more transparent panel on the top of the fence.

Mr. Mitchell noted that he did not know of a composite material with lattice top panels. He stated he was aware of a vinyl manufacturer which provided lattice panels. Mr. Mitchell noted that the fence height could be modified easily to whatever the Commission preferred and the posts could be lowered to appear more level with the fence panels.

Commissioner Carter noted it seemed the owner should have some privacy in that corner side yard and did not consider the height to be an issue.

Commissioner Hart inquired if the intended color was the selection presented in the staff report.

Mr. Mitchell noted it was.

**Motion [6:40:49 PM](#)**

**In the case of Petition PLNHLC2010-00337, Commissioner Carter made a motion to find the material within the guidelines for replacement fences and consistent with the Commission's approval of Trex fences and based upon that, to approve the application. Commissioner Haymond seconded the motion.**

**Discussion of the Motion [6:41:39 PM](#)**

Commissioner Bevins inquired if the motion accepted the application as proposed.

Commissioner Haymond noted that was correct.

**Commissioners Carter, Davis, Harding, Hart, Haymond, Oliver and Richards voted, "Aye". Commissioner Bevins voted, "Nay". The motion carries 7-1.**

**PLNHLC2010-00299 – Town Club Preservation Foundation Certificate of Appropriateness for Major Alterations** – A request by the Town Club Preservation Foundation to use corrugated steel as a siding material on a dumpster enclosure. The property is located at approximately 1081 East South Temple in the SR-1A (Single Family Special Development Pattern) Zoning District in the South Temple Historic District in City Council District 3, represented by Stan Penfold. (Staff contact: Ray Milliner at 801-535-7645 or [ray.milliner@slcgov.com](mailto:ray.milliner@slcgov.com).)

**Staff Presentation [6:42:38 PM](#)**

Mr. Milliner reviewed the application noting that the request was to replace a rear fence enclosing a dumpster area which was in great disrepair and in need of replacement. Mr. Milliner noted that the applicant proposed to use corrugated steel for the main structure and the top portion would be a metal mesh material. Mr. Milliner noted that staff recommended approval as it was in an area facing the parking lot away from the street, adjacent neighbors and those associated view sheds.

**Questions for Staff from the Commission [6:44:31 PM](#)**

Commissioner Hart inquired if the applicant had provided a sample of the mesh material.

Mr. Milliner noted he did not have an example.

The applicant provided a sample of the material.

Mr. Milliner noted that the requested height would be eight feet; allowed by the Zoning Ordinance in the case of dumpster enclosures.

**Applicant Presentation [6:46:19 PM](#)**

Liz Blackner, the project architect, noted that the screening system would be painted white and the enclosure height would be raised to conceal the dumpsters as well as existing cooling equipment.

**Questions for the Applicant from the Commission [6:47:03 PM](#)**

Commissioner Richards inquired if all the galvanized metal would be painted white.

Ms. Blackner noted this was true.

Vice Chairperson Oliver inquired if this was the preference of the applicant.

Ms. Blackner stated it was the applicant's intent to match the existing unit as much as possible.

Commissioner Bevins inquired how close the fence would come to the fascia on the back of the building.

Ms. Blackner noted it would come right to the base of the fascia.

**Public Hearing [6:48:48 PM](#)**

Seeing no one present to speak to the issue from the public, Chairperson Lloyd closed the public hearing portion of the item and moved to Executive Session.

**Executive Session [6:48:58 PM](#)**

Commissioner Carter noted he felt the proposal to be a great solution for the screening issue.

Commissioner Richards concurred with Commissioner Carter and noted that the alternate material would be reinterpreting a traditional theme and would all be painted, creating more harmony with the existing structure.

**Motion [6:49:57 PM](#)**

**In the case of Petition PLNHLC2010-00299, Commissioner Richards made a motion based upon the findings in the staff report to approve the motion as described therein. Commissioner Carter seconded the motion.**

**Discussion of the Motion [6:50:21 PM](#)**

**Commissioner Harding proposed an amendment to state approve the petition rather than approve the motion.**



**Commissioner Hart proposed an amendment to allow Planning Staff to review the lattice options with the applicant.**

**Commissioner Richards accepted the amendments to the motion. Commissioner Carter seconded both.**

**AMENDED MOTION**

Therefore, the amended motion states:

**In the case of Petition PLNHLC2010-00299, Commissioner Richards moved that based upon the findings in the staff report, the Commission approve the petition as described therein, granting staff permission to review lattice options with the applicant. Commissioner Carter seconded the motion.**

**Commissioners Bevins, Carter, Davis, Harding, Hart, Haymond, Richards and Vice Chairperson Oliver voted, “Aye”. The motion carries unanimously.**

**PLNHLC2010-00377 – Frazier Certificate of Appropriateness for Major Alterations** – A request by Steve Scoville, architect, for major alterations to a townhome located at approximately 208 E. First Avenue. The request is to change the roof line, add a patio and change the siding and fenestration. The property is zoned RMF-45 (Moderate/High Density Multi-family Residential District) and is located in the Avenues Historic District in City Council District 3, represented by Council Member Stan Penfold. (Staff contact: Katia Pace, (801)535-6354, [katia.pace@slcgov.com](mailto:katia.pace@slcgov.com))

**Staff Presentation [6:52:19 PM](#)**

Ms. Pace reviewed the request for the Commission. She noted that the non-contributing townhomes were constructed in 1977 and the proposed renovations included extension of the front walls and roof to create a flat roof on which a deck will be placed, extension of the rear roof to create a loft and extension of the rear balconies. Ms. Pace noted that the applicant would replace the existing wood cladding with a treated redwood product. She stated that the roofing would be replaced with metal and an existing front enclosure would be clad in zinc. Ms. Pace noted that staff found the proposal met most of the criteria within the guidelines, but sought a determination from the Commission regarding the zinc siding and the metal roof, which were materials the design guidelines did not generally allow on new construction.

**Questions for Staff from the Commission [6:56:54 PM](#)**

Chairperson Lloyd inquired if the zinc material would be limited to the area indicated in the elevation drawing.

Ms. Pace stated that this was correct and the footprint of that area would not be altered.

Commissioner Carter clarified that the project met all of the applicable criteria within the district except for the proposed materials on the roof and front enclosure and the Commission would only be reviewing these materials.

Ms. Pace noted this was correct.

**Applicant Presentation [7:00:48 PM](#)**

Steve Scoville, the project architect, noted that the proposal began primarily as an interior remodel; however the state of deterioration of the existing exterior cladding material prompted the current proposal. Mr. Scoville stated they had decided upon a redwood rain screen product and the zinc cladding for the exterior of the building.

**Questions for the Applicant from the Commission [7:01:36 PM](#)**

Commissioner Harding inquired what the advantages of zinc were.

Mr. Scoville noted that in comparison with other metals it was an extremely durable, versatile and energy efficient material as it could be used with a true rigid insulation product.

Commissioner Haymond inquired what material the garage doors would be comprised of.

Mr. Scoville noted they would be metal doors.

Chairperson Lloyd invited the property owner forward to speak.

Todd Frazier, property owner, noted that they were not fixated on the look; the energy efficiency was of greater concern and they were therefore interested in the option of zinc cladding.

**Public Hearing [7:05:54 PM](#)**

Shirley Metters Brown, 214 First Avenue, noted her concern regarding the extension of the rear deck and how it would impact delivery and drop off accessibility to the inner-most units in the complex.

Vice Chairperson Oliver inquired who would look at accessibility issues.

Ms. Pace noted that the petition complied with the Zoning Ordinance, however, the height clearance had not been reviewed. She stated that this was something which could be reviewed by the Transportation Division at the time of the permitting process.

Seeing no one else wishing to comment on the item, Chairperson Lloyd moved the hearing item into Executive Session.

**Executive Session [7:11:53 PM](#)**

Commissioner Carter noted his support of the request and that it seemed to be a sensitive and interesting update.

Commissioner Haymond concurred with Commissioner Carter.

Chairperson Lloyd noted that zinc was a muted, soft material and it would likely be used more often in the future.

Ms. Lew noted that in reference to the materials to be used, the Commission should also consider the proposed metal roof material. She requested that the Commission make specific findings.

Vice Chairperson Oliver noted that the alteration of the roofline would make the material non-visible from the front streetscape and therefore did not take issue with the proposal.

Commissioner Richards noted that the motion should also specify that staff review the zinc material for appropriateness.

**Motion [7:17:00 PM](#)**

**In the case of Petition PLNHLC2010-00377, Vice Chairperson Oliver moved; based upon the analysis and findings in the staff report, the Commission approves the project pursuant to the conditions of approval listed in the staff report and finding the use of a non-reflective, pre-weathered zinc to be appropriate in this case as a material speaking to its own time, but one that integrates well with traditional materials in the neighborhood, and that the metal roof is appropriate given its lack of visibility in this particular instance. The Conditions of Approval in the Staff Report are as follows:**

- 1. Approval of final details of the design shall be delegated to the Planning Staff based upon direction given during the hearing from the Historic Landmark Commission.**
- 2. The project must meet all other applicable City requirements, unless otherwise modified within the authority of the Historic Landmark Commission, Administrative Hearing Officer or Board of Adjustment.**

**Commissioner Harding seconded the motion.**

**Discussion of the Motion [7:17:55 PM](#)**

Commissioner Bevins inquired if they should add anything regarding the extension of the deck.

Vice Chairperson Oliver noted she did not see a need as it met the Zoning Ordinance and was not part of their purview. She stated that they could request Planning Staff to ask the Transportation Division Staff to review the issue.

**Commissioners Bevins, Carter, Davis, Harding, Hart, Haymond, Richards and Vice Chairperson Oliver voted, “Aye”. The motion carries unanimously.**

Ms. Lew requested that the Commission consider a motion to postpone the Lindsley application.

Mr. Nielson noted that he did not feel that this was necessary.

Chairperson Lloyd noted he had mentioned at the beginning of the meeting that the item had been postponed.

**PLNHLC2010-00192 – Lindsley Certificate of Appropriateness for Major Alterations – (Unfinished Business)** A request by property owner, Robert Lindsley for major alterations to a single-family residence located at approximately 1086 S Military Drive in the Yalecrest National Register Historic District. The property is zoned R-1-7000 (Single Family Residential District) and is located in City Council District 6, represented by JT Martin. This item was continued from the May 19, 2010 meeting. (Staff contact: Janice Lew at 801-535-7625 or [janice.lew@slcgov.com](mailto:janice.lew@slcgov.com).)

**The above item was postponed by the applicant to August 4, 2010.**

**PLNHL2010-00015 – Elks Club Building Certificate of Appropriateness for Major Alterations – (Unfinished Business)** A request by Kent Gibson representing Property Reserve Inc., to consider conceptual approval of a new entrance on the west facade, alterations to the front entrance element, and construction of an addition to the east side of the building. The property is located at approximately 139 E South Temple Street, zoned R-MU (Residential/Mixed Use District) and is located in the South Temple Historic District in City Council District 3, represented by Council Member Stan Penfold. (Staff contact: Janice Lew at 801-535-7625 or [janice.lew@slcgov.com](mailto:janice.lew@slcgov.com).)

**Staff Presentation [7:20:27 PM](#)**

Ms. Lew noted that the requested modifications had not been listed on the first page of the staff report; however, they were listed on page three. Ms. Lew noted that the Elks Club Building was notable as being designed by Carl Scott and George Welsh, under Richard Kletting. She noted that the Elks Club was at one time the largest non-Mormon club in the state. Ms. Lew outlined the review process which the application had undergone, including the following:

- March 3, 2010: The Historic Landmark Commission reviewed preliminary plans for the first time. At that meeting, members made a variety of remarks regarding the project and referred the matter to an architectural committee to arrive at an equitable solution.
- The applicant met twice with the Architectural Committee
- May 5, 2010: The Commission held an issues only hearing to review options created as a result of the Architectural Committee meetings. The Commission found the design approach unacceptable and appointed two new members to the Architectural Committee.
- The project was last reviewed by the Architectural Committee on June 8, 2010 and the Committee was generally comfortable with the revised proposal at that time.

Ms. Lew noted that the extent of the design proposal included:

- Creation of a main entrance located on the west side of the building.
- Change of the grade to allow access to the lower level of the building on the west side.
- Removal of the existing west entrance and fire escape.
- A canopy would be proposed over the new west entrance.
- Daylight the lower level on the west wall, cutting additional openings into the west wall
- Construction of a wall parallel to the west wall to accommodate the existing driveway and the new entrance.
- Creation of a west side garden space.
- Adjustment of the landscape berm boundaries to parallel the east and west façades of the building.
- New wall on the west side to accommodate the berm.
- Similar wall constructed on the east side of the berm as well.
- Shortening the existing retaining wall along the south side and possibly replace that retaining wall.
- Construction of an addition to the east side of the property which the Commission has reviewed in the past.

Ms. Lew noted that staff was of the opinion that the revised proposal met the applicable ordinance standards and staff recommended conceptual approval as outlined on page three of the staff report.

**Questions for Staff from the Commission [7:29:47 PM](#)**

Commissioner Carter inquired how much of the landscape berm walls would be removed.

Ms. Lew noted that the berm walls would be reduced in length to be in line with the front façade of the building.

Vice Chairperson Oliver inquired if they were approving the idea of construction or just the design details presented.

Ms. Lew noted that the issue before them was just the idea and further details would come back to the Commission for approval.

**Applicant Presentation [7:31:45 PM](#)**

Doug Sterner, with Property Reserve Incorporated, noted that additional three-dimensional electronic renderings were available if desired by the Commission.

Mr. Nielson noted that as the renderings would be considered part of the record, a copy would be required.

Mr. Sterner stated it seemed they had arrived at a compromise which would work for both the Commission and the property owners. Mr. Sterner noted that the proposal included lowering the driveway on the west side to level it with the sidewalk and allow better pedestrian access. He indicated that they would also cut additional openings into the west wall. Mr. Sterner noted that reducing the size of the berm on the west side would also improve accessibility to the new entrance.

Mr. Sterner noted that they had left the grass area primarily intact and the walls would be shorter not from a vertical perspective, but rather a horizontal perspective. He stated they would leave the stairs in front and the tunnel, however, they would prefer to seal the tunnel entrance. Mr. Sterner noted they would retain a recessed area and possibly include a plaque explaining the significance of the original tunnel entrance. Mr. Sterner stated they would restore the stairs as well.

Mr. Sterner indicated that Mike Stransky, the project architect was also present to answer any questions which Mr. Sterner could not.

**Questions for the Applicant from the Commission [7:38:27 PM](#)**

Commissioner Richards inquired if there were bricked-in openings on the west elevation that would be reopened.

Mr. Sterner noted that there would be previously bricked-in openings which would be reopened on the west side.

Commissioner Richards inquired how many openings would be created.

Mr. Stransky noted that he was not aware off hand, but that in placing a prominent entrance on the west side they would prefer to clean up the west elevation and create a sense of symmetry.

Chairperson Lloyd noted that the back half of the west elevation did not look asymmetrical.

Mr. Stransky stated that the building had been constructed in sections which accounted for the current lack of symmetry. He noted that they felt the north end ballroom windows to be lovely, but wished to create a greater sense of symmetry by adding openings to the south end of the west façade.

Commissioner Bevins inquired if the entrance at the top of the front stairs would be maintained.

Mr. Stransky noted that it would be maintained, however, it would not be accessible to those with disabilities.

Commissioner Hart noted that the ADA accessible entrance would be at the west side of the building.

Mr. Stransky stated this was correct. He also noted that the upper deck of the stairs at the front entrance would require some type of balustrade or railing to meet current codes.

Chairperson Lloyd requested clarification regarding the proposed daylighting on the west elevation.

Mr. Stransky noted that there was little to no daylight in the basement level, particularly on the west façade and the addition of daylighting would greatly help the financial viability of the project.

Commissioner Carter inquired if the only reason for aligning the east side berm with the front façade was for the sake of symmetry.

Mr. Sterner noted that the symmetry was a consideration, but it was also to bring a level plaza to the east addition.

Commissioner Richards stated that during the last Architectural Committee, photos of surrounding sites had been examined and those sites were fairly symmetrical. He noted that in light of those photographs, the proposal to make the berms in line with the front façade made sense when considering the overall streetscape.

Chairperson Lloyd inquired how the applicant would proceed if conceptual approval was granted.

Mr. Stransky noted that they would bring back a more in depth schematic design developing the west and east sides as well as defining some of the landscaping features and the berm walls.

**Public Hearing [7:53:27 PM](#)**

Cindy Cromer, 816 East 100 South, noted that the application had come quite a long way. She noted that she felt the entrance to the tunnel needed to look somewhat like a door rather than a wall. Ms. Cromer stated she better understood that the term “shortening of the walls” meant clipping the ends rather than lowering the height of the wall itself.

Elizabeth Giraud commended the applicant and architects for preserving as much of the berm and walls as they had. She noted she felt the proposal for the west side would be a great improvement and allowing tenants to enter from that side would make it a fairly prominent feature and noted that there were existing plans by Miles Miller which might provide information on the fenestration pattern. Ms. Giraud stated she agreed with Ms. Cromer that a door needed to be maintained on the tunnel face. Ms. Giraud stated she would like to see more of the east retaining wall and berm retained as it was not a necessity to provide

accessibility on both sides or to create perfect symmetry. She noted that the loss would be perceived by pedestrians along South Temple.

Chairperson Lloyd inquired what Ms. Giraud's thoughts would be regarding the tunnel door.

Ms. Giraud noted that the plane seemed to come in much farther back than in the applicant's rendering. She stated that she would like to see some other explorations and that a conjectural application might be fine as long as it wasn't too ornate.

Seeing no one else present to speak to the hearing item, Chairperson Lloyd closed the public hearing and moved to Executive Session.

**Executive Session [8:00:25 PM](#)**

Commissioner Haymond noted that the proposal looked quite acceptable, but agreed that a door, even if sealed, should be maintained on the tunnel.

Chairperson Lloyd noted the Commission could require some level of refinement on the landscape berm without holding back the progress of the applicant.

Commissioner Davis stated that he found the shortening of the berms to be of minor concern.

Commissioner Carter noted that the Commission might consider requesting that the applicant retain more of the east side berm as the new addition would already disrupt the overall symmetry of the structure.

**Motion [8:07:05 PM](#)**

**In the case of petition PLNHLC2010-00015, Commissioner Harding made a motion, based upon staff analysis and findings, to give conceptual approval of the proposed project as outlined on page 3 of the staff report and subject to the conditions set forth;**

- 1. That the final details of the design shall be considered by the Commission based upon direction given during the hearing from the Historic Landmark Commission**
- 2. That the project must meet all other applicable City requirements, unless otherwise modified within the authority of the Historic Landmark Commission, Administrative Hearing Officer, or Board of Adjustment.**

**Commissioner Bevins seconded the motion.**

**Discussion of the Motion [8:07:31 PM](#)**

Commissioner Hart noted that the plan on page three indicated the tunnel would be sealed and wished to request that the applicant use an actual door on the face of the tunnel.

Chairperson Lloyd inquired if the Commission should require the applicant research that door.

Commissioner Harding stated she believed the applicant could research the issue if they wanted to, however, the tunnel entrance should look like a door whether sealed or not.

Commissioner Richards stated that he was uncomfortable with this requirement if there was no existing historical evidence of that door.

**Commissioner Hart suggested an amendment to the motion that if historical evidence of a door remains, they should use a door as close as possible, but if not the Commission will proceed from there.**

**Commissioner Harding accepted the amendment to the motion.**

#### **Amended motion**

Therefore the amended motion states:

**In the case of Petition PLNHLC2010-00015, Commissioner Harding made a motion based upon staff analysis and findings to give conceptual approval of the proposed project as outlined on page 3 of the staff report and subject to the following conditions set forth;**

- 1. That the final details of the design shall be considered by the Commission based upon direction given during the hearing from the Historic Landmark Commission**
- 2. That the project must meet all other applicable City requirements, unless otherwise modified within the authority of the Historic Landmark Commission, Administrative Hearing Officer, or Board of Adjustment.**
- 3. If historical evidence of a door remains, use a door as close as possible on the sealed tunnel; if no historical evidence exists, the Commission will proceed from there.**

**Commissioner Bevins seconded the motion**

**Commissioners Bevins, Carter, Davis, Harding, Hart, Haymond, Richards and Vice Chairperson Oliver voted, “Aye”. The motion carries unanimously.**

**PLNHLC 2009-01346 – Eastside Apartments New Construction – (Unfinished Business)** A request by PEG Development for final design approval for New Construction located at approximately 556 East 300 South and 350 South 600 East. The subject property is located in an RMF-35 (Moderate Density Multi-Family Residential), RO (Residential Office) and RMU (Residential Mixed-Use) zoning districts, all proposed to be rezoned to RMU, in the Central City Historic District in Council District 4, represented by Luke Garrott. (Staff contact: Doug Dansie at 801-535-6182 or [doug.dansie@slcgov.com](mailto:doug.dansie@slcgov.com).)

#### **Staff Presentation [8:12:39 PM](#)**

Commissioner Hart inquired if the requested zoning had not been granted and the current zoning was RMF-35, was the request putting the cart before the horse.

Mr. Dansie noted that the Planning Commission had forwarded a positive recommendation for City Council on the rezoning and they had also approved the Planned Development Petition; however, noted Commissioner Hart’s assumption was correct, the Commission’s approval would be moot if the City Council denied the rezoning request.



Mr. Dansie noted that the project had been before the Commission several times and did require a rezone. He noted that the Historic Landmark Commission had approved the general massing of the project. Mr. Dansie noted that there were some conditions associated with that approval including; design the 300 South façade to reduce some of the perceived mass; on the 600 East façade, create a distinction in materials so the building did not create a continuous wall with the neighboring Emigration Court Development. Mr. Dansie noted that the petitioner's response to these requirements included bringing balconies onto the 300 South Façade as well as changing the proposed materials.

Mr. Dansie stated that the windows would be flush with the exterior but would include exterior detailing to create shadow lines. He noted that the building also included base, middle and top facing sections incorporating different materials in an attempt to break up the massing of the project. Mr. Dansie noted that the revised proposal included unique treatment of the balconies as well and reviewed elevation drawings for the Commission illustrating proposed materials.

**Questions for Staff from the Commission [8:21:11 PM](#)**

Chairperson Lloyd inquired if the material referred to as Dryvit was a composite system and if the stucco panels would be coated with a synthetic or hard coat stucco finish.

Mr. Dansie noted that he was uncertain.

Seeing no further questions from the Commission, Chairperson Lloyd invited the applicant forward to comment at this time.

**Applicant Presentation [8:21:47 PM](#)**

Jory Walker, project architect, noted that the Dryvit material would be a panel system, milled to match reveals of the design resembling aluminum or metal panel systems and that it could be painted. Mr. Walker noted that this system would allow for smooth reveals between panels. He stated that they could also build the porches and rails with a composite material such as hardiplank to grant the same modern warehouse look to those components.

Mr. Walker stated that on the 300 South Building, they believed the detailing helped to make the brick veneer look more appropriate. He noted that they preferred a higher brick veneer to a first story only full brick treatment resembling wainscoting.

Mr. Walker noted that they intended to use casement windows with projecting molding and sills on 300 South, but more modern, flush windows on the more contemporary 600 East façade.

**Questions for the Applicant from the Commission [8:25:56 PM](#)**

Chairperson Lloyd inquired how the panel system would be attached to the building.

Mr. Walker noted that the panel system would be routed to allow attachment to the face of the building at the panel joints.

Chairperson Lloyd noted that the product could then be prefinished.

Mr. Walker stated they would prefer this.

Commissioner Richards inquired how the window surrounds would be treated.

Mr. Walker noted they would be built out with foam-cut molding to mimic historic detailing. He stated they could recess the window somewhat if required, but were looking primarily to create some kind of shadow line on the 300 South façade.

Chairperson Lloyd inquired how they might change the 300 South façade if the Commission decided a more contemporary treatment would be appropriate.

Mr. Walker noted that they could treat the 300 South façade the same as the proposal for 600 East, however, their consultants had found that as it was proposed to be part of a Senior living facility, most Seniors would be more comfortable with architecture which they were more familiar with.

Chairperson Lloyd inquired what a four-level glass panel on the courtyard elevation would be part of.

Mr. Walker indicated it would be a lobby window and part of the two residences directly above the lobby.

Commissioner Richards requested clarification regarding material location on the 600 East elevation drawing.

Mr. Walker noted that each box indicated on the 600 East elevation drawing would be a different material; alternating between the proposed hardiboard system and an EFIS (Exterior Insulation and Finishing System) cladding.

#### **Public Hearing [8:35:28 PM](#)**

Cindy Cromer, 816 East 100 South, noted she felt the project to be bold considering the City's current vacancy rate. She stated the 600 East building had improved considerably from the original proposal; however felt the proposal on 300 South was less appealing than in its original configuration. She stated that the recessed entry on the north elevation would be problematic as it would be very dark and cold in the winter and the brick veneer looked false as it stopped mid-story. Ms. Cromer stated that the entry should be more prominent on 300 South.

Seeing no further comments from the public, Chairperson Lloyd closed the public hearing and brought the applicant forward to respond.

#### **Applicant Response [8:38:43 PM](#)**

Mr. Walker noted that the owners would be willing to replicate the design concept on 600 East for the 300 South building if so desired by the Commission. He stated that there would be a senior drop off lane behind the building, not on 300 South.

Commissioner Richards noted that the back entry was not indicated on the provided drawing.

#### **Executive Session [8:40:05 PM](#)**

Commissioner Harding noted that the balconies appeared very shallow to her, long and narrow, and reminded her more of a hotel balcony.

Chairperson Lloyd noted he would agree that if the balconies were not deep enough for sitting, it would be problematic. He stated that the current proposal, however, was a much more sympathetic concept than

other such structures in the area. Chairperson Lloyd noted that it seemed the 300 South building with its stepped column bases and capitals on the porches was attempting to replicate the same such elements on surrounding historic buildings and asked the Commission how they felt about that attempt at replication.

Commissioner Richards inquired what level of detail the Commission was accepting at this point in time.

Chairperson Lloyd noted they were requesting final approval. He stated that the Commission could approve the request but ask that certain items be further resolved with staff.

Commissioner Haymond noted that he would like to see a repetition of the roofless balconies on the ends of the 300 South building on the top level of the center balconies.

Commissioner Carter noted he was comfortable with the proposal for the 600 East building. He indicated that although he was fairly comfortable with it, there seemed to be general unease about the concept for the building on 300 South. He noted that they should do what was necessary to grant approval and allow the applicant to move forward.

Chairperson Lloyd noted that if the top level were treated like a trellised structure, the detailing of the roof would be differentiated and if the columns were treated differently, that would be sufficient.

Commissioner Haymond noted that he wondered if there were simply too many differing opinions.

Commissioner Richards noted that he concurred with Commissioner Carter in that he was in agreement regarding the treatment of the building on 600 South, but did not feel the building on 300 South was there. He noted that he felt the fenestration was of concern, particularly the projecting EFIS treatment, as recessed windows and a full course brick would be more appropriate. He noted that the applicant might consider using the panel system on the upper story to create some shadow lines and continue a theme from the other building. He stated that this might be contemporary, but not so much that the seniors would be thrown off by it.

Chairperson Lloyd clarified that this would mean swapping the proposed EFIS for the panel system proposed on the 600 East building.

Chairperson Lloyd invited the applicant forward to respond to this proposal.

Mr. Walker noted he believed the suggestion made sense. He noted that the proposal for the building on 600 East would be submitted to HUD on July 17, 2010 with final drawings, but they were still 40-45 days away from submitting drawings on the 300 South building, so there was time for change. Mr. Walker stated he liked the idea of removing the porch roofs on the center balconies. He noted they could bring the brick down to one course and then incorporate the panel system on the remaining floors and go to a board and baton or shingle application to still indicate a difference in the levels of materials. Mr. Walker stated they could come back to the Commission with these changes in the near future.

**Motion [8:56:31 PM](#)**

**In the case of Petition PLNHLC2009-01346, Commissioner Richards made a motion based on the Findings and the Staff recommendations, to approve the 600 East Building and request that the 300 East building be brought back for further refinements and review by the Commission. Commissioner Haymond seconded the motion.**

**Discussion of the Motion [8:57:00 PM](#)**

Commissioner Haymond inquired if this would require an Architectural Committee meeting.

Chairperson Lloyd inquired if staff had enough information to move forward.

Mr. Dansie indicated he had enough information.

Vice Chairperson Oliver inquired if they needed to clarify in the motion the swapping of material on the 600 East side to clarify for the applicant that the use of the hardiplank be swapped for the other material.

Ms. Coffey suggested that they should make that clarification in the motion.

**Vice Chairperson Oliver suggested an amendment to the motion to clarify for the applicant that the use of hardiplank be swapped for the use of Dryvit on all portions of the building.**

**Commissioner Richards accepted the amendment to the motion. Commissioner Haymond seconded the amendment.**

Chairperson Lloyd inquired if the Commission wished to bring the item back to a public hearing.

Ms. Coffey noted she would suggest they not name a date certain as staff could not know when the applicant would be ready.

**Amended Motion**

Therefore the amended motion states:

**In the case of Petition PLNHLC2009-01346, Commissioner Richards made a motion based on the Findings and the Staff recommendations, to approve the 600 East Building and request that the 300 East building be brought back for further refinements and review by the Commission noting that the use of hardiplank be swapped for the use of Dryvit on all portions of the building. Commissioner Haymond seconded the motion.**

**Commissioners Bevins, Carter, Davis, Hart, Haymond, Richards and Vice Chairperson Oliver all voted "Aye". Commissioner Harding voted "Nay". The motion carries 7-1.**

**OTHER BUSINESS [9:00:24 PM](#)**

There was no further business.

**Commissioner Hart moved to adjourn. Commissioner Carter seconded the motion. There was no objection. The meeting stands adjourned at 9:00 p.m.**