

**SALT LAKE CITY HISTORIC LANDMARK COMMISSION  
MINUTES OF THE MEETING  
Room 315, 451 South State Street  
March 3, 2010 at 5:45 p.m.**

*This document along with the digital recording constitute the official minutes of the Historic Landmark Commission regular session meeting held on March 3, 2010.*

**To download the FTR player and listen to audio excerpts from the record if you are already viewing this document on the worldwide web, click [here](#).**

The regular meeting of the Historic Landmark Commission was held on March 3, 2010, at [5:50:14 PM](#) 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: Warren Lloyd (Chairperson), Anne Oliver (Vice Chair), Thomas Carter, Arla Funk, Polly Hart, Bill Davis, Sheleigh Harding, David Richards and Earle Bevins, III.

Planning staff present for the meeting were: Joel Paterson, Planning Manager; Janice Lew, Carl Leith, Katia Pace, and Angela Hasenberg, Acting Historic Landmark Commission Secretary.

A field trip was held prior to the meeting at 4:00 p.m. The field trip was attended by Warren Lloyd (Chairperson), Anne Oliver (Vice Chair), Thomas Carter, Arla Funk, Polly Hart, Sheleigh Harding, David Richards and Earle Bevins, III. Joel Paterson, Katia Pace, Janice Lew and Carl Leith attended for the Planning Division.

**FIELD TRIP 4:00 p.m. (Taken by Joel Paterson)**

1. Odd Fellows Hall: located at 26 W Market Street. Planner Janice Lew discussed the request and the reason to relist after the move of the building.
2. Elks Club Building: located at 139 E South Temple Street Janice Lew outlined the proposal and discussed reasons for day lighting the basement and that this was an issues only hearing no decision. The Commission walked part of the site.
3. Rhode Residence: located at 1205 E. South Temple Street, Planner Katia Pace outlined the proposal. The original carriage house for the building was converted to a residence in the 1930's and there was no garage. The proposed addition will include a garage with doors facing north with materials for the addition that will be similar to the house. Commissioners asked questions about window repair and replacement.

**MEETING CALLED TO ORDER [5:50:24 PM](#)**

**Report of Chair and Vice Chair [5:51:26 PM](#)**

The Chair and Vice Chair had nothing to report.

**Motion: Polly Hart made a motion to postpone the issues only discussion of the Elk's Building to present last on the agenda.**

Commissioner Harding seconded the motion.

Anne Oliver (Vice Chair), Thomas Carter, Arla Funk, Polly Hart, Bill Davis, Sheleigh Harding, David Richards and Earle Bevins, III all voted "aye" the vote was unanimous and the motion carried.

**COMMENTS TO THE COMMISSION [5:53:15 PM](#)**

Cindy Cromer spoke on the Preservation Plan, she is concerned about the direction given to the consultants regarding wrapping the Sustainability Modifications into the Preservation Plan and that they might pre-empt all other ordinances. She requested that a member of the Planning Commission attend. Ms Cromer also presented pictures' regarding the McDonald's located at 700 and Markea. The focus was the fence that was erected without a certificate of appropriateness, and made the point that the fence that was approved had not been installed.

**Public Hearing [5:55:40 PM](#)**

**PLNHLC2010-00031 Rhode Residence Certificate of Appropriateness of Major Alterations- A request by Dave Richards, architect, for major alterations to a single family residence location at 1205 E South Temple Street in the South Temple Historic District. The request is for an addition to the rear of the home with an attached garage, and a covered porch. The subject property is located in the SR-1A (Special Development Pattern Residential) zoning district.**

Chairperson Lloyd recognized Katia Pace as staff representative.

Commissioner Richards recused himself.

Attorney Nielson spoke on the matter stating that as Mr. Richards was a solo practitioner, it was appropriate for him to present on this matter. Noting also that Mr. Richards was a member of the Historic Landmark Commission and will be stepping down and will not vote. Mr. Richards's membership on the board did not influence the voting by the Commission.

Mr. Richards stated for the record that he had not had any communications with the Commission regarding this matter.

Katia Pace stated that the Walker residence was located at 1205 E South Temple and it was a landmark site, built in 1895 and was an example of the shingle style. The request was for an addition on the rear of the property. The addition was comprised of a link or connector that would connect the main home with the garage. The location of the connector would be at the back of the property. Currently, there were two structures that are not part of the historic part of this property, a shed and another small structure that would be removed. A window would be removed to accommodate the addition. Ms. Pace also noted that there was circular

driveway that was installed in 2004, which was not a characteristic of the property, and would be removed with the addition.

Originally, the property had a carriage house, however, in 1935 the carriage house was turned into a residence and the main structure has not has a garage since then. Staff has researched the zoning aspect and this addition complies with the zoning requirement of the SR-1, which is the zoning district of this property.

The Standards that pertain to the case are:

1. **Use and purpose of the addition should be minimal to the changing of the defining character of the property:** In this case, because the structure is a single family residence, the use will not change.
2. **The historic character of the property shall be retained and preserved:** Staff feels that the architectural elements of the proposed addition met these standards; however, one of the standards of the design guidelines mentioned that attached garages are not encouraged in historic districts and allowance of accessory structures are reviewed on a case by case manner, therefore, the commission will have to weigh their approval based on that.
3. **Distinctive features will not compromise the distinctive features of the building:** There are two mature trees that face "S" Street that the Planning Department encourages retention of, and add to the historic character of the street.
4. **Features shall be repaired, rather than be replaced:** The principal structure will retain its' historic features. Staff felt as though the architectural elements would be retained. Staff felt like the architectural elements with this proposed addition would not interfere with the existing historic design.
5. **New work shall be differentiated from the old:** The roof line and the inset of the addition would be differentiated from the principal structure.

Ms. Pace noted that no inappropriate materials have been proposed at this time. Staff listed materials at the beginning of the staff report. Staff stated that the request is consistent with the guidelines except for Standard Two, which discusses attached garages, and Staff stated that the commission should make a decision whether it is appropriate on this application to have an attached garage.

**Questions from the Commissioners:**

Commissioner Oliver asked for clarification for the link from the primary structure to the garage, inquiring if the commission denies the garage, would they still approve the link.

Ms. Pace responded that if the garage is denied, the project would need to be resubmitted.

Commissioner Hart asked about the two and half story wing of the house that the link would be connected to, and inquired about the age of that portion of the primary structure and when it was added.

Ms. Pace responded that historic photos of the property indicated that the addition appears on the 1935 photo, which was the earliest on record.

Commissioner Carter asked if there is a precedent for an attached garage in the area, particularly in the avenues district.

Commissioner Bevins responded that there was one on 1<sup>st</sup> Ave and approximately 'U' Street.

Commissioner Oliver noted that this house was in the South Temple Historic district and that the districts had different character and lot sizes.

Ms. Pace presented examples of the materials.

**Statements from the Applicant:**

Dave Richards, architect spoke, he was representing Mike and Jennifer Rhode, along with Jamie Orton from Lowell Construction. Mr. Richards stated that standard 2 caught them by surprise, and presented a letter discussing the issue. History of the project was presented, including the history of the recent purchase of the home, and his involvement.

12-11-2008 –preliminary review with HLC and planning staff. In attendance were: Cheri Coffey, Robin Ziegler and Joel Patterson.

2009-The project was placed on hold, pending sale of the applicants former home.

2010- Application for building permit.

Mr. Richards applied for a building permit to commence construction. When Mr. Richards brought the drawings into planning for brief review to determine what he needed to submit for Historic Landmark Commission, he was made aware of design guideline article 9.3 that discourages detached garages. Mr. Richards had never heard any reference to that concern, Mr. Richards did note that the standard is in the accessory building section and not in the addition section, it was his belief that it was not easy to find. Finally, he reiterated that approval can be granted on a case by case basis and that it is for the Historic Landmark Committee to grant approval.

In support he added:

- Design incorporates several features which tend to hide the existence of the garage.
- The covered patio attached is to one side of the garage, and the garage obscures it from view of the street.

- Garage entry to the north limits street views of the garage doors.
- 6ft fence further diminishes the existence of the garage as viewed from the street.
- Primary of the main structure is from South Temple, where the garage is not visible.
- The overall height of width and subordinate massing of the design is complimentary to the original but does not detract from the prominence of the original structure.

**Questions from the Commissioners:** [6:14:16 PM](#)

Commissioner Hart asked if this was a new garage on an historic house.

Mr. Richards responded that as far as they can tell the adjacent carriage house was original to the structure

Commissioner Funk asked if there was living space on the second floor of the addition, and would there be living space above the proposed garage.

Mr. Richards answered that there would be none. There was space for storage, but it was not suitable for living.

Commissioner Carter asked if it was Mr. Richards's intention to match the roofline as much as possible with the rest of the home.

Mr. Richards replied that the shingle style is such a strong textural element, that it is very hard to bring in other materials or textures with it. The Porch element changes the shape and shows the differentiation between the two.

Discussion continued about the historic merit of the home.

Commissioner Oliver asked design issue questions about the roof pitch and noted that she believed it was shallow, and the other pitch is very steep.

Discussion regarding roof and expanse of roof continued.

Commissioner Lloyd asked questions regarding the pitch over the covered porch.

Owner Jennifer Rhode spoke, stating that they love the house and the historic nature of it, the purpose of the garage is to increase the utility and livability of it.

Owner Mike Rhode spoke detailing the landscape of the backyard, included that more trees will be added.

**Comments from the Public:** [6:22:30 PM](#)

Scott Anderson, owner of the carriage house that was once part of the property in question. He was in support of the project.

He noted that while he normally would not be in favor of an attached garage, in this case he supported it.

Cindy Cromer is the owner of the other home owned by the original builder, Frederick Hales. He designed the Downy Mansion on the corner of South Temple and 8<sup>th</sup> East, and this structure has a carriage house located in the rear corner of the property. Ms Cromer noted that had the original architect been asked, he would have put the structure in the corner of the lot and it would have been substantial. She stated that she does not like the covered patio and encourages the use of shingles. Ms. Cromer gave the location of an existing attached garage addition in the area.

Executive Session: [6:28:52 PM](#)

Commissioner Carter noted his appreciation of the comments made by Mr. Anderson, noting the connection between the original home and the carriage house and how an attached garage would actually maintain the connection of the two original structures. However, he felt the roof of the porch seemed inappropriate and changing it would be something to consider. He suggested that the mud room connecting the garage with the house could be less like the original home to show a differentiation between the two.

Commissioner Oliver agreed and stated that the east elevation setback could be more pronounced and the porch could use more study.

Commissioner Funk stated that she doesn't mind the continuity of materials used throughout the design but felt troubled regarding the porch roof and believed that the style does not fit. Commissioner Funk liked the idea of an arbor, and liked the attached garage.

Commissioner Hart agreed and stated that she appreciates the use of the materials and finds the ratio of roof visual to wall visual. She noted her appreciation of the architect on having the entrance of the garage on the north end. Her concern is the porch roof, and that it is out of scale.

Commissioner Lloyd stated that the accuracy of the drawings indicated the scale remarkably. The Pitch and scale of the columns were odd, they differentiated from the original, and they didn't seem completely resolved. The proportions were off.

There was discussion regarding the pitch of the roof and additional columns between the commissioners.

**Motion:** [6:39:50 PM](#)

**In the case of PLNHLC2010-00031, Commissioner Oliver made the motion finding that the project substantially meets the applicable ordinances design guidelines and adopted policies**

**with the exception of the proposed attached garage, however, we choose to grant approval to the garage because we feel that it is important in maintaining a connection between the main house and the existing carriage house on the property to the north, the current design does maintain the connection between those two historic buildings better than a detached garage would be. However, we would like to request that the applicant redesign the porch that extends west of the garage, and leave the final design details to staff.**

Commissioner Hart seconded the motion.

Direction to staff: the proportion and style of the roof reflects the original house design, a suggestion would be a hip roof or a curving element for the roof. That column proportion reflects more traditional design.

Commissioners Oliver (Vice Chair), Carter, Funk, Hart, Davis, Harding, Richards and Bevins, III all voted "aye" the vote was unanimous and the motion passed.

**Public Hearing:** [6:42:19 PM](#)

**PLNPCM2010-00072 Odd Fellows Hall Historic Landmark Site Re-designation-** A request by the Administration for re-designation of the Independent Order of Odd Fellows Hall Located at approximately 26 W Market Street as a landmark site on the Salt Lake City of Cultural Resources. The petition is for a zoning map amendment to re-designate the landmark site, formally located at 41 W Market Street, at its new location. This request requires the Historic Landmark Commission to forward a recommendation to the Planning Commission and City Council. The property is zoned D-1 Central Business district.

Chairperson Lloyd recognized Janice Lew as staff representative.

Janice Lew stated that as part of the mitigation measures for the upcoming expansion of the Moss Courthouse, the GSA has relocated the Odd Fellows Hall formally located at 39 W Market Street across the street to approximately 26 W Market Street. Based on the analysis on the staff report, staff is of the opinion that the request significantly meets the applicable standards at its new location at the north side of the street the building exhibits significant historic and architectural significance and physical integrity to merit its' re-designation. Therefore, staff recommended that the Commission forward a favorable recommendation to the Planning Commission and City Council regarding the relisting of Odd Fellows Hall.

Ms. Lew displayed a PowerPoint presentation reviewing project evaluations and photographs of the site.

**Questions from the Commissioners:**

Commissioner Carter asked if the building will retain its listing on the National Register of Historic Places.

Ms. Lew responded that it will not lose its designation.

Chairperson Lloyd asked for the date in which the building was originally designated.

Ms. Lew referred to page two of the staff report where it states that it was listed as a landmark site in 1998. The National Register nomination was in 1977.

Chairperson Lloyd asked if there is any idea of the intended use for the building.

Ms. Lew responded that the GSA has not sold the property.

**Public Hearing:** [6:47:15 PM](#)

Kurt Huffaker from Utah Heritage foundation (UHF) spoke, after 14 years of involvement in this project, he wanted to add his recommendation to re-list this building. He would like all the designations re-assigned to this building.

**Executive Session:** [6:48:27 PM](#)

Commission Thomas expressed his approval of the designation.

**Motion:** [6:49:21 PM](#)

**In the case of PLNPCM2010-00072 Odd Fellows Hall Historic Landmark Site Re-designation, Commissioner Carter made the motion that in consideration of a building significance and its importance to the City that it be listed as a landmark site, technically forwarding a favorable recommendation to the Planning Commission and City Council.**

Commissioner Funk seconded the motion.

Commissioners Oliver (Vice Chair), Carter, Funk, Hart, Davis, Harding, Richards and Bevins, III all voted "aye" the vote was unanimous and the motion passed.

**Motion:** [6:51:03 PM](#) To reverse order of meeting.

**A motion was made by Arla Funk to reverse the order of the meeting back to the original agenda.**

Commissioner Bevins seconded the motion.

Commissioners Oliver (Vice Chair), Carter, Funk, Hart, Davis, Harding, Richards and Bevins, III all voted "aye" the vote was unanimous and the motion passed.

**Issues Only**



**PLNHLC2010-00015: 139 E South Temple Street ( Elk’s Club Building)** Certificate of Appropriateness for Major Alterations. A request by Kent Gibson representing Property Reserve Inc., to consider removal of the front entrance element, alterations to the basement-level, and construction of an addition to the east side of the building. The applicant is seeking guidance and no final action will be made by the Historic Landmark Commission at this meeting.

Chairperson Lloyd recognized Janice Lew as staff representative.

Ms. Lew outlined the purpose of the discussion was to allow the applicant to present the proposed project to gain feedback and direction from the Commission and give the public an opportunity to speak on the application.

The property was originally constructed in 1923; the proposal was to remove the front entrance of the building and included alterations to the basement level, to add daylight to the level, and construction to the eastside of the building.

Ms. Lew displayed a PowerPoint presentation.

Ms. Lew noted that staff identified a number of issues on the staff report

1. Staff used the historic progression of entry elements, a significant character defining feature of the site that should be retained
2. The proposed alterations failed to make use of the basic principles recommended by the city’s Design Guidelines, including changing the grade adjacent to the front of the façade building to allow development of a formerly below grade area which would dramatically alter the historic relationship between the building and its’ site and setting. And would diminish the historic integrity of the property and its context.
3. A significant amount of material that would exterior detail would be lost on what is now a very difficult façade on the eastside.
4. Basement level is situated behind an earthen berm.

The applicant, Kent Gibson spoke on the matter, displaying a PowerPoint presentation; stating that there hope is for help and guidance regarding this project.

**Major Points included:**

- Setbacks and the issues regarding them.
- The tunnel is the only “at grade” entrance that goes into the building, and the issues regarding its’ maintenance and usability.
- There are 20 steps that go in to the entry level. This is a difficulty for functionality and ADA requirements.
- The ballroom was three stories of volume space, and floors were added. The challenge is how to use the space in production and use.

- Structural deficiencies were found during a current condition assessment and the structure report states that it is a high risk for complete collapse in a disaster. The physical additions actually weakened the structure because of the addition to load bearers without significant
- HVAC systems and Electrical systems were failing. Plumbing needs to be overhauled. The whole project needs rejuvenation.

**Options reviewed were:**

- Demolition.
- The tenants are asking for improvements.
- Current tenants keep the project viable; one tenant is a subsidiary of the owner. The other is a tenant that occupies a floor of the building that is non-ADA compliant. Public health and safety show major deficiencies and there are environmental conditions that need to be resolved.
- Convert to residential use, negatives include lack of windows, it is more suited to an office core.
- Seismic codes are a concern, it creates a fortress element on the interior and that makes it more difficult to add windows.
- Possible removal of the additions to the building, the use of ballroom is in question.
- Life safety and load bearing situations on the building.
- Maintain the front façade and improve the west façade by removing the fire escape. The seismic stabilization can be improved by doing things to the core, provide additional bracing to the building.

Interior improvements were addressed.

**Questions from the Commissioners:** [6:05:43 PM](#)

Commissioner Hart asked if they explored first putting a top floor addition behind the existing top floor.

Mr. Gibson replied that there are no support columns for that, and that it would compromise the structure of the building.

Commissioner Hart asked regarding the history of the building, and inquired about future rental potential, and if was currently difficult to rent out, how would additional space alleviate that?

Mr. Gibson responded that with the changes in the design they could make it work.

Commissioner Carter discussed the significant architectural features of the setback and change of grade, particularly the tunnel.

He asked specifically if there would be a way to combine the changes with maintaining the tunnel entrance.

Mr. Gibson noted that landscaping issues and the tunnel combined makes the building uninviting. He reiterated that their purpose is to find a good solution. He stated that he knows that with the changes he can rent out the space, without them, the future is unclear.

Debate regarding the proposed changes occurred between the Commissioners.

The applicant requested an architectural subcommittee to determine solutions.

**Public Hearing:** [7:25:27 PM](#)

Cindy Comer spoke, noting the hill is such an important part of the streetscape of South Temple, and she is very concerned that changing that will change the historic nature of the street itself. She would like a compromise.

Kurk Huffaker on behalf of Utah Heritage Foundation spoke. He was not troubled about the building on the side, but was in favor of a compromise that would include maintaining the front. It is his opinion that the tunnel is one of the elements of the social/fraternal history of Salt Lake City. He would like the Commission and the owners to find a hybrid/compromise that would work for both.

**Executive Session** [7:30:23 PM](#)

Commissioner Oliver stated that from a preservation point of view, the front grading, tunnel entrance and double staircase as well as the main floor entrance is grand and important and are all things that she would like to see retained. The addition is necessary, but it needs verticality. She was very concerned about maintaining the staircase and the tunnel and found them necessary in maintaining the historical significance of the building.

Commissioner Richards agreed with Commissioner Oliver, and stated that the entrance is what makes the building significant, agreeing that the façade needs to remain.

Commissioner Funk agreed, but stated that a committee needed to be formed to work with the applicant.

**Motion:** [7:34:19 PM](#)

**Commissioner Funk made the motion to appoint a committee to work with the applicant to work out the design of the building.**

Commissioner Harding seconded the motion

**Discussion:** Commissioner Carter felt that discussion needed to be made regarding the guidelines and the elements and how change would affect the historic significance of the building. The façade and entrance are the defining features of the building. He stated that the addition is appropriate.

Chairperson Lloyd noted that according to bylaws, a subcommittee cannot be formed that would constitute a quorum, stating that the limitation of the subcommittee would be five or fewer.

Attorney Paul Nielson verified the information.

Commissioner Oliver added her concern that both points of view would be represented on the committee.

Commissioner Hart noted that she felt that there were very divergent views on the matter, and that a subcommittee limited to three or four may not effectively give input that would adequately reflect the opinions of the whole.

**Vote:**

Commissioners Oliver (Vice Chair), Carter, Funk, Hart, Davis, Harding, Richards and Bevins, III all voted “aye” Commissioner Hart, voted nay, the motion carried.

**PLNPCM2009-00638 Commercial Design Guidelines** – The Salt Lake Planning Division has hired consultants Thomason & Associates to create a new section for the design guidelines used by the Historic Landmark Commission to make design review decisions for properties with local designation, currently the design guidelines are for residential properties only. This supplemental information will provide guidance for commercial properties. The draft document is available at the City’s Web site at [www.slcgov.com/ced/planning](http://www.slcgov.com/ced/planning) (Recent Projects). No final action will be made by the Historic Landmark Commission at this meeting.

Chairperson Lloyd recognized Janice Lew as staff representative.

Ms. Lew informed the commission that the purpose of this discussion is to garner feedback and direction from the latest copy of the design guidelines.

Janice gave a PowerPoint presentation that outlined the Design guidelines.

**Public commentary:**

Cindy Cromer spoke, stating that she appreciates that the design guidelines were “less bad” than she had anticipated, and would like to propose that in the future the Planning Department hire locally, and that the City’s staff is best qualified to provide these documents. She also noted that she appreciated Ms. Lew’s efforts to make the changes that she had suggested, and also noted that there were also other comments submitted electronically.

Ms. Cromer also stated her appreciation of Chairperson Lloyd speaking to the Business Advisory Board.

**Discussion:**

Commissioner Oliver made the following points, compartmentalizing her comments into five categories:

1. Basic Formatting: Typographical errors, missing or incorrect addresses and inconsistencies, uses of acronyms, i.e. explaining what they mean and basically making it more user friendly.
2. Organization: Rearrange items for usability.
3. Content: Very little attention is given to office buildings, commercial use needs more focus.
4. Audience: Who is reading this? Who should be? Be clear in the introduction who the document speaks to.
5. Referrals: A segment should be included that indicates that professional help is available.

Commissioner Carter wanted it made clearer that the guidelines are tied to the Secretary of the Interior's Standards, referring to the Standards for Rehabilitation in Historic Districts document and that it impacts tax credit and that more people qualify.

Commissioner Bevins noted that he found it helpful in referencing to items brought before the board.

Language of the Guidelines was discussed.

**Chairperson Lloyd noted that this concluded the business of this meeting; the next meeting will be held on March 17, 2010.**

**Commissioner Oliver made a motion to adjourn. [8:32:55 PM](#)**

**Commissioner Hart seconded the motion. All voted "Aye". The meeting adjourned.**

---

Angela Hasenberg, Acting Historic Landmark Commission Secretary