

**SALT LAKE CITY  
HISTORIC LANDMARK COMMISSION  
Minutes of the Meeting  
Room 315, 451 South State Street  
May 19, 2010**

*This document along with the digital recording constitute the official minutes of the Historic Landmark Commission regular session meeting held on May 19, 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 May 5, 2010, at **5:52:14 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, Bill Davis, Arla Funk, Sheleigh Harding, Creed Haymond, Warren Lloyd, Chairperson; Anne Oliver, Vice Chairperson and Dave Richards. Commissioners Thomas Carter and Polly Hart were excused from the meeting.

Planning staff present for the meeting were: Carl Leith, Senior Planner, Janice Lew, Senior Planner, Paul Nielson, City Attorney, Joel Paterson, Planning Manager, Lex Traugher, Principal 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 Bevins, Harding, Haymond, 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.

**DINNER AND WORK SESSION [5:29:41 PM](#)**

Chairperson Lloyd recognized Assistant Director Pat Comarell.

Ms. Comarell reviewed proposed changes to the Historic Landmark Commission's Policies and Procedures document, including the following:

- Noticing requirements were not updated; recently approved ordinances reduced the number of days required for noticing an agenda from 14 to 12.
- Draft language regarding the approval of minutes may need to be amended to state that minutes will generally be approved within 30 days (or another period of time to be determined by staff) especially as the Historic Landmark Commission was routinely meeting twice a month. The draft language therefore presented the difficulty for staff that the minutes would be written, reviewed, edited and prepared for distribution in a week.

Commissioner Funk noted that thirty days might not be enough time when there is only one meeting a month and it might be wise to change the language to 40 or 45 days instead.

- Language regarding Procedure-Order and Decorum (Section G.26.g in the draft document) indicated that when the Historic Landmark Commission was in executive session the discussion would be closed to staff. Ms. Comarell inquired if the Historic Landmark Commission wished to amend this language to allow for staff or city attorney interjections when desired.

Several Commissioners concurred that they would appreciate this change be made to the language.

Ms. Comarell asked if there were any other questions regarding the Policies and Procedures.

Commissioner Funk inquired if the language regarding new construction was correct and the Historic Landmarks Commission was always involved in the review of such projects.

Mr. Paterson noted that under the current ordinance all new construction had to be reviewed by the Historic Landmark Commission.

Commissioner Funk stated that the meeting attendance language seemed very lenient regarding the resignation of members.

Ms. Comarell noted that under the City's form of government, only the Mayor could ask a member to resign.

Mr. Nielson stated that the language was intended as a polite way to request a resignation when necessary.

Commissioner Funk noted that appeal language had been completely removed from the document and was not present in the Zoning Ordinance.

Ms. Comarell noted that it was not in the Zoning Ordinance but should be as it was more a Zoning Ordinance requirement than typical language for a policy and procedures document. She stated staff would put that on their list of issues to be addressed through fine tuning of the ordinances in the coming year.

Ms. Comarell noted that there were some policy documents which still required review, particularly the Economic Hardship Provisions as well as other fine tuning issues throughout the Ordinance.

Chairperson Lloyd requested information regarding the status of language allowing the Commission to initiate petitions.

Ms. Comarell noted that the City Council did not take issue with the request and the City Attorney was working on draft language allowing the Commission the authority to initiate petitions.

Ms. Comarell stated that she had also approached City Council about removing the Historic Landmarks Commission code out of the Zoning Ordinance section and creating a new chapter of the municipal code so everything would not also require approval of the Planning Commission. She noted that the Council did not seem adverse to the suggestion, but staff would need to work with the City Attorney to see how that might be accomplished legally.

Ms. Comarell stated that this was her last meeting as she was retiring in June.

Several Commissioners thanked Pat Comarell for her experience, service, persistence and patience.

Ms. Comarell noted that it need to be said often that the Salt Lake City Planning Staff were stars, that Salt Lake City was a very difficult place to be a planner and they were quite courageous.

Mr. Paterson noted that there was not enough time to address the second item advertised for the work session; a discussion on new or alternate materials in local historic districts. Mr. Paterson indicated that the item could be rescheduled for the next meeting of the Commission on June 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2010.

**APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES FROM APRIL 12, 2010 AND MAY 5, 2010 5:53:36 P.M.**

Commissioner Funk made a motion to approve the minutes from April 12, 2010 with noted changes. Vice Chairperson Oliver seconded the motion. All voted “Aye”. The minutes were approved.

Commissioner Funk made a motion to approve the minutes from May 5, 2010 with noted changes. Vice Chairperson Oliver seconded the motion. All voted “Aye”. The minutes were approved.

**REPORT OF THE CHAIR AND VICE CHAIR 5:56:08 P.M.**

Chairperson Lloyd stated he had nothing to report.

Vice Chairperson Oliver noted she also had nothing to report.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS 5:59:16 P.M.**

Chairperson Lloyd noted that all cards the Commission had received were related to specific cases, there were no other public comments.

**PUBLIC HEARING 5:59:22 P.M.**

**PLNHLC2010-00057, Trudell/Thompson Determination of Non-Contributing Status** – A review to formalize findings regarding the determination of non-contributing status made by the Commission on May 5, 2010. The Commission may consider the request for approval of replacement windows and doors for the property located at approximately 249 South 1100 East in the University Historic District. The property is zoned R-2 (Single and Two-Family Residential District) and is located in City Council District 4, represented by Council Member Luke Garrott. (Staff: Lex Traughber, 801-535-6184, [lex.traughber@slcgov.com](mailto:lex.traughber@slcgov.com))

**Staff Presentation 5:59:50 P.M.**

Mr. Traughber noted that the Commission had reviewed the original request on May 5<sup>th</sup> and that it had been determined at that time that the home should be considered non-contributory. He stated the Commission had requested that the item be sent back to staff for review of the proposed window replacement under the guidelines for non-contributory structures. Mr. Traughber noted that staff had provided a memo citing standards from the Zoning Ordinance which would allow the Commission to formally make a finding to state that the home was indeed non-contributory and read into the record that statement included in the memo:

The subject home is a noncontributory structure in the University Historic District based on the criteria in Section 21A.34.020(C)(2)(b) of the Zoning Ordinance. The home has undergone extensive and irreversible alterations over the years and has lost the ability to meet the definition of a contributing structure in the District. Exterior alterations to said structure shall be reviewed in accordance with Zoning Ordinance Section 21A.34.020(H) which addresses the, “Standards for a Certificate of Appropriateness Involving New Construction or Alteration of a Non-Contributing Structure”.

**Questions for Staff from the Commission 6:01:31 P.M.**

Vice Chairperson Oliver inquired if staff would prefer a formal motion on the issue.

Mr. Traugher noted that staff would prefer a formal motion.

**Applicant Presentation 6:02:25 P.M.**

Ruth Ann Trudell, the homeowner, was present and noted that while she had nothing to add, she welcomed any questions from the Commission.

**Questions for the Applicant from the Commission 6:02:50 P.M.**

There were no questions for the Applicant from the Commission.

**Public Hearing 6:02:56 P.M.**

There was no one present from the public who wished to speak to the issue.

**Executive Session 6:03:08 P.M.**

Vice Chairperson Oliver thanked staff for authoring the finding.

**Motion 6:03:30 P.M.**

**In the case of PLNHLC2010-00057, Vice Chairperson Oliver made a motion to concur with staff findings as presented in the memo dated May 19, 2010, that the subject property is non-contributory and therefore should be evaluated under the standards for a Certificate of Appropriateness regarding alterations for a non-contributory structure. Commissioner Bevins seconded the motion.**

There was no discussion of the motion.

**All voted “Aye”. The motion carries unanimously.**

**PLNHLC2010-00181, Westmoreland Place Historic District Designation** – A request by the Salt Lake City Council to amend the Salt Lake City Zoning Map and establish an H Historic Preservation Overlay District for the area known as Westmoreland Place. The property is generally located between 1500 and 1600 East and 1300 South and Browning Avenue. This request requires the Historic Landmark Commission to forward a recommendation to the Planning Commission and City Council. The property is zoned R-1-7000 (Single-Family Residential District) and is located in City Council District 5, represented by Jill Remington Love. (Staff contact: Janice Lew, 801-535-7625, [janice.lew@slcgov.com](mailto:janice.lew@slcgov.com))

**Staff Presentation 6:05:25 P.M.**

Ms. Lew first reviewed the process for designating a local historic district in Salt Lake City:

1. Suggested Amendments to the Zoning Map are advertised;
2. Neighborhood and Community Council Meetings are held;
3. The Historic Landmark Commission holds a public hearing and forwards a recommendation to the Planning Commission and City Council;

4. The Planning Commission holds a public hearing and forwards a recommendation to the City Council;
5. The City Council holds a public hearing and makes a decision regarding designation and necessary amendments to the zoning map.

Ms. Lew noted that the proposed district would be called the Westmoreland Place Historic District. She stated that the listed boundaries might not include the gates and landscaped area in front of the District at 1500 East and 1300 South, but the intent of the designation had been to include those elements in the proposed district.

Ms. Lew reviewed the historical significance of the Westmoreland Place neighborhood. She stated that the neighborhood had been developed by prominent architects and developers of the early twentieth century and the structures within its boundaries displayed a remarkable level of visual cohesiveness and style, distinguishing it from surrounding subdivisions in the area.

Ms. Lew noted that there was an impressive array of bungalows as well as Period Revival style homes in the area which remained intact and she reviewed significant examples of these for the Commission.

She stated that that during the early twentieth century, Westmoreland Place had been located along the 1500 East streetcar line which provided easy access to downtown Salt Lake and this factor made it a desirable location for prominent residents.

Ms. Lew noted staff found that the application significantly complied with the zoning map amendment criteria for designation and therefore recommended that the Commission forward a positive recommendation to the Planning Commission and the City Council.

**Questions for Staff from the Commission 6:11:58 P.M.**

Commissioner Davis stated that the Zoning Amendment Map included some of the residences on 1500 East but not others and inquired why this was so.

Ms. Lew noted those properties on 1500 East indicated as part of the Zoning Map Amendment had requested the City include them in the designation.

Commissioner Funk noted that the presentation map seemed to be incorrect and that the south boundary of the district should end at Harrison Avenue, not Browning Avenue, as the houses on Browning were not part of the original Westmoreland Place Subdivision.

Vice Chairperson Oliver noted that the drawing on the slide presentation might not be correct, but the map included in the packet was correct, including the homes on the south side of Harrison Avenue, but not the homes on the north side of Browning Avenue.

Ms. Comarell stated for clarification that the map in the staff report, and more importantly, on the legal notice were correct.

There were no further questions for staff; therefore Chairperson Lloyd invited a neighborhood representative forward to speak in lieu of a Community Council representative for the applicant presentation.

**Applicant Presentation [6:17:30 P.M.](#)**

Jean Zancanella, 1374 Glenmare Street, noted that while they had no formal neighborhood association or council, they had held a number of public meetings and given the neighbors a number of opportunities to communicate via email and had received no comments of opposition to the request.

**Questions for the Applicant from the Commission [6:18:08 P.M.](#)**

Commissioner Richards inquired if Ms. Zancanella and volunteers had performed a survey regarding public support for the designation.

Ms. Zancanella noted that they had performed an informal door to door poll of about 80 percent of the neighbors and had sent invitations to open houses on the matter to every household in the neighborhood and had received only positive comments.

**Public Hearing [6:19:45 P.M.](#)**

Kirk Huffaker, with the Utah Heritage Foundation (UHF), noted he was present to encourage the Commission to forward a positive recommendation to the Planning Commission to designate Westmoreland as a new local historic district. Mr. Huffaker noted that the neighborhood demonstrated great historical and architectural significance and integrity. He noted that UHF believed designation of the area was the right step for the City to take. Mr. Huffaker stated that UHF believed a high level of education had occurred within the Westmoreland Neighborhood and that there was a great deal of public support indicated for the designation.

Cindy Cromer, 816 East 100 South, noted that it was not her neighborhood, but felt the neighborhood was extraordinary and would encourage the Commission to include the gates and landscaping feature at the beginning of the subdivision as part of the designation. She noted that she did take issue with the irregular boundaries on 1500 East and 1300 South and felt they should be addressed to make the district boundaries more uniform.

Lindsey Ferrari, 1547 Harrison Avenue, noted that the corner parcels at 1500 East and 1300 South had been included in the designation request because the rear of their properties abutted Westmoreland Drive, while other homes along 1500 East and 1300 South. Ms. Ferrari also stated that she had been impressed with the way the neighborhood had handled education on the issue in the area.

Gil Podolsky, 1555 Sherman Avenue, stated that the character of the neighborhood had been preserved and truly deserved the designation. He noted that as far as he could see the neighbors had been unanimous in support of the issue and had never heard a negative comment.

Nano Podolsky, 1555 Sherman Avenue, stated that the area had become very attractive to families due to the enclosed interior block and that currently as a result there were dozens of teenagers in their little enclave, which made it a very interesting place to be and only heightened the unique character of the district to her. She stated she hoped it could be preserved for generations to come.

Chairperson Lloyd noted there was no one else present from the public to speak to the item.

**Questions from the Commission [6:30:00 P.M.](#)**

Chairperson Lloyd inquired of Ms. Lew if there was a current map regarding the concentration of contributory and non-contributory structures in the area.

Ms. Lew noted that there was not a current reconnaissance level survey of the area but that the City would be hiring a consultant for that and for the National Register Nomination preparation as well.

**Executive Session 6:32:32 P.M.**

Commissioner Funk noted her belief it was a great neighborhood and that its residents were taking the correct step in requesting designation.

**Motion 6:32:35 P.M.**

**In the case of Petition PLNHLC2010-00181, Commissioner Funk made a motion to concur with staff analysis and forward a favorable recommendation to the Planning Commission and City Council for adoption of the Westmoreland Place Historic District. Commissioner Harding seconded the motion.**

**Discussion of the Motion 6:33:23 P.M.**

Commissioner Davis inquired if the City Council would perform a formal poll to ascertain the level of resident support.

Mr. Paterson noted that the Council would not perform any formal polling but all residents had been noticed of this public hearing and would be noticed for future public hearings as well and would then be provided the opportunity to comment on the issue.

Chairperson Lloyd noted that the motion had not clarified that the front gates and landscaping of the Westmoreland Place Subdivision be included in the designation and inquired if the Commission wished to offer an amendment to the motion to that effect.

**Amendment to the Motion 6:34:47 P.M.**

**Commissioner Funk made an amendment to the motion to include the landscape area in the front of the subdivision as part of the historic district designation. The amendment was seconded by Commissioner Harding. All voted “Aye”. The motion carries unanimously.**

**PLNHLC2009-01420, Hughes Certificate of Appropriateness for Major Alterations** – A request by Lynn Morgan, applicant and architect, representing the property owners Michael & Jennifer Hughes, for major alterations to the single-family home located at approximately 704 E 5th Avenue in the Avenues Historic District. The request is for an addition to the home, as well as a new two car garage. The property is zoned SR-1A (Special Development Pattern Residential District) and is located in City Council District 3, represented by Council Member Stan Penfold. (Staff: Lex Traughber, 801- 535-6184, [lex.traughber@slcgov.com](mailto:lex.traughber@slcgov.com)).

**Staff Presentation 6:36:15 P.M.**

Mr. Traughber reviewed the request for the Commission. He noted that the noticing error which had delayed the issue until this evening was his fault and apologized to the applicant. Mr. Traughber noted that the home was considered contributory and that the proposed addition would essentially eliminate the west façade of the structure and would alter the roofline of the structure. He stated that the proposal also requested approval of a detached, 480 square foot garage and the applicant had been working with Planning Staff and the Permits Office to meet applicable standards in the zoning district.

Mr. Traughber noted that the proposal did not meet Standards 2,4,5,8 and 9 as well as the associated design guidelines for those standards. He stated that the proposal was particularly inconsistent with Standard 2. Mr. Traughber noted that the staff recommendation was to deny the alterations to the original structure and approve the proposed garage height, delegating final approval of the garage to the Planning Director.

**Questions for Staff from the Commission 6:42:04 P.M.**

Commissioner Richards inquired if the proposed roof height specifically included parapets.

Mr. Traughber noted that it did.

**Applicant Presentation 6:42:53 P.M.**

Lynn Morgan, the project architect, presented a three dimensional model for the Commission's benefit and reviewed the architectural history of the property. Mr. Morgan noted the existing challenge was to design an addition for the subject property, which had several serious structural issues. Mr. Morgan stated that the proposal was to build a 12'x16' addition which would be an over-build to the cabin roof. He stated that the intent was to create a rear addition which would accommodate two regular bedrooms and a Master Suite. Mr. Morgan noted that this was a very difficult proposal as the historic portion on the home was 612 square feet and almost any configuration for the addition would create a massing larger than the original home.

Michael Hughes, the property owner, presented two letters of support from surrounding property owners to Chairperson Lloyd.

**Questions for the Applicant from the Commission 6:56:23 P.M.**

Commissioner Davis thanked the applicant for the model and noted he felt it made the dilemma much more comprehensible.

Mr. Hughes noted that they were attempting to keep as much of the historic façade of the home intact as was possible. He stated that much in the interior of the home was original to 1896, including a flop sink in the kitchen and that the flat roof addition was fairly unstable as well.

Mr. Morgan noted that at 655 E Second Avenue, there was a home which had undergone an addition approved by Landmarks some time ago. He stated that this home had originally had a cabin-like structure and the owners had added on a new addition and while it was a duplex, that lot had approximately the same width as the subject property. Mr. Morgan noted that while they did not currently propose a connector between the home and the addition, they did intend to differentiate between them through the use of modern materials on the addition such as stucco.

Chairperson Lloyd inquired what the proposed setback of the new addition on the side elevation would be.

Mr. Morgan noted that he hadn't measured it but believed it was currently about 37 feet to the face of the building. He noted that they would be adding about 400 square feet and would end up with a three bedroom home, not a massive remodel.

Commissioner Bevins inquired if there would be a daylight basement.

Mr. Morgan noted that there would be a daylight basement walk-out which would come out of the slope of the property. He stated that the existing slope was six feet to grade and there would be some type of basement configuration with the addition. Mr. Morgan noted that it did not look like this amount of slope was present, but it was clearly indicated from a two foot contour topography map they had created for the project.

Mr. Hughes noted that there was an existing garage on the property at the southeast corner. He stated that they felt the garage was secondary to the upgrading of the home itself and that they might leave it as is for the time being.

Commissioner Richards inquired about the windows on the west side of the proposed garage.

Mr. Morgan noted that the drawings looked as though a vinyl slider might be included at this elevation, but the intent was to include instead two square windows with wood trim.

Vice Chairperson Oliver noted she had an inquiry regarding the setback on the south side of the home.

Mr. Morgan stated that there would be 13 feet between the subject property and adjacent home on the south side after construction of the addition, which was typical of homes on that block face.

**Public Hearing 7:06:20 P.M.**

Chairperson Lloyd read the following written comment into the record:

Comment from the adjacent neighbor at 707 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue: I feel that the proposed alterations will improve the property values of our neighborhood, add to the tax base, while maintaining the historical integrity of the area.

Chairperson Lloyd stated that there were also two letters submitted in favor of the proposal from the property owners at 707 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue and 228 K Street. Those letters are included with the minutes of the meeting in the Planning Division Office.

**Executive Session 7:07:30 P.M.**

Commissioner Davis noted that he liked what he had seen and was sympathetic to the current condition and limitations of the home. He stated he could not, however, reconcile the proposal with the requirements set forth in the City's Design Guidelines.

Vice Chairperson Oliver stated that the exterior could be used to their advantage as it was a home with two fronts not dissimilar from several homes in Midway, Utah which she had consulted on in the past. She noted that they might look at these homes in thinking about shifting the design slightly and cited Standard 12 and Design Guideline 8.14 which both indicated that additions could occur but should be separated from the historic home. She stated she would prefer to see a connector between the home and the addition and see the addition pulled back and to the west somewhat, thus respecting the two fronts of the home on 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue and K Street.

Vice Chairperson Oliver noted she also took issue with the one story gable attached to the home as it would look so much like the original part of the home.

Chairperson Loyd noted that a one and a half story cross gable could work particularly if they would consider pulling the west facing one and a half story addition away from the original home with a connector of some sort.

Commissioner Haymond inquired if the Commission would be forced to deny the petition as proposed. He noted that if this was so, the Architectural Committee might be beneficial.

Chairperson Lloyd noted that he did not feel it was necessary to deny the item and instead could continue the item for further review.

Commissioners Harding, Haymond and Vice Chairperson Oliver all noted it would be beneficial to hold an Architectural Committee on the matter.

Chairperson Lloyd invited the applicant and architect forward to inquire if they would be willing to work with the Architectural Committee.

Mr. Morgan and Mr. Hughes noted they would be willing to work with the Architectural Committee.

**Motion [7:20:24 PM](#)**

In the case of petition PLNHLC2009-01420, Commissioner Funk made a motion to appoint an Architectural Committee to work with the Hughes and their architect to create a design which will better meet the Design Guidelines.

Commissioner Haymond seconded the motion.

**Discussion of the Motion [7:20:54 PM](#)**

Mr. Neilson noted that the motion should be amended to include language which would clearly indicate the item would return to the Commission after further review.

**Amendment to the Motion [7:21:12 PM](#)**

**Commissioner Funk amended her motion to include: continuing the case and after the Architectural Committee has met and a different solution has been found, the petition will return to the Historic Landmark Commission for review.**

**Commissioner Haymond seconded the amendment. All voted “Aye”. The motion carries unanimously.**

Commissioner Richards, Chairperson Lloyd, Vice Chairperson Oliver, Commissioner Harding and Commissioner Funk all volunteered for the Architectural Committee.

**PLNHLC2010-00095, Phillips Certificate of Appropriateness for Minor Alterations** – A request by property owner, Ray Phillips to retroactively request approval for replacement windows and alterations to a rear addition on the building located at approximately 565 E 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 3, represented by Council Member Stan Penfold. (Staff contact: Janice Lew, 801-535-7625, [janice.lew@slcgov.com](mailto:janice.lew@slcgov.com))

**Staff Presentation [7:23:34 PM](#)**

Ms. Lew reviewed the request for the Commission noting that it was based upon an earlier enforcement case in which the home owner had replaced upper-level windows with vinyl replacement units on the front façade, east and west dormers as well as windows in the gable on the rear facade. Ms. Lew noted that there were also changes to a rear addition including new sliding windows and fiber-cement siding. Ms. Lew noted that staff analysis had found that all existing replacement windows could be approved in this case; however, the requested replacement of the lower windows on the front façade could not be approved as they were character defining and had not significantly deteriorated at this point in time. Ms. Lew noted that staff recommended approval of a Certificate of Appropriateness for the windows that had been replaced, but denial of the request to replace the remaining front façade windows on the lower level.

**Questions for Staff from the Commission [7:28:25 PM](#)**

There were no questions for staff from the Commission.

**Applicant Presentation [7:28:32 PM](#)**

Mr. Rigby, representative for the applicant, noted that the property owner had been cited for not obtaining the proper Certificate of Appropriateness to replace the windows on the home. Mr. Rigby noted that Mr. Phillips was very sorry that his contractor had proceeded regardless of the City's requirements. Mr. Phillips had noted to Mr. Rigby that he would be happy to replace the windows on the front façade if required to do so and would amend the request to only replace the windows on the sides of the home on the first floor level.

**Questions for the Applicant from the Commission [7:31:02 PM](#)**

Commissioner Richards inquired if the windows on the front façade gable were sash kit replacements or vinyl frame windows.

Mr. Rigby noted that they were vinyl frame window replacements.

Vice Chairperson Oliver disclosed at this time that she had done a great deal of work with AJC Architects and could recuse herself if necessary, but she was not involved in the current project.

Mr. Nielson inquired if Vice Chairperson Oliver had any monetary interest in the case.

Vice Chairperson Oliver noted that she did not.

No one on the Commission objected to Vice Chairperson Oliver's continued involvement.

**Public Hearing [7:33:44 PM](#)**

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

**Executive Session [7:33:56 PM](#)**

Vice Chairperson Oliver noted that she concurred with staff's opinion, but felt that the second story gable windows on the front façade should also be replaced with the removed windows or new wooden one-over-one units.

**Motion [7:35:03 PM](#)**

**In the case of PLNHLC2010-00095, Vice Chairperson Oliver made a motion to concur with staff's recommendation that the project meets the majority of the Standards and Design Guidelines and approve the Certificate of Appropriateness with the exception of proposed replacement windows on the lower level of the front façade and that those windows should be retained and that the two windows on the south gable end be returned to wood one-over-one or to whatever style had been removed.**

**Commissioner Harding seconded the motion.**

**Discussion of the Motion [7:35:56 PM](#)**

Commissioner Funk noted her concern that the Commission did not know what would be appropriate replacements.

Ms. Lew noted that the original type of window was difficult to determine from existing documentation but it looked as though the original frame remained in place.

Commissioners Richards and Haymond concurred with Commissioner Funk and noted they were hesitant to require the applicant to replace the upper floor windows on the front façade.

Mr. Rigby stated that many of the windows had been previously replaced with aluminum windows and therefore it was difficult to determine the original style.

Vice Chairperson Oliver noted that the Commission would never have allowed vinyl window replacements had the proposal first been reviewed by staff, even if the windows had been aluminum.

Commissioner Richards inquired how the fact that the home had been substantially altered factored into the equation.

Vice Chairperson Oliver noted that the home was still considered contributing and the site form in the staff report indicated that there had been a bay of two double-hung windows in place at that time.

Chairperson Lloyd noted that there was a motion on the floor which he summarized for the Commission.

**Commissioners Funk, Haymond and Richards voted "Nay". Commissioners Bevins, Davis, Harding and Vice Chairperson Oliver voted "Aye". The vote stands at 4-3 in favor of the motion. The motion carries.**

**PLNHLC2010-00192, Lindsley Certificate of Appropriateness for Major Alterations** – 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 J.T. Martin. (Staff contact: Janice Lew, 801-535-7625, [janice.lew@slcgov.com](mailto:janice.lew@slcgov.com))

**Staff Presentation [7:45:16 PM](#)**

Ms. Lew reviewed the request for the Commission and noted that the property was located on a lot with double frontage. She gave a slide presentation for the Commission reviewing alterations which had occurred to the structure over time. Ms. Lew noted that the applicant proposed to add a large cross gable to the front of the home as well as a front window bay. She stated that other proposed alterations had included siding but the applicant had decided not to pursue this part at the time of the hearing.

Ms. Lew noted that staff recommended that the request be denied as the project conflicted with the objectives of Standards 2,5,8,9 and 10 and Design Guidelines 2.1, 4.1, 7.5, 8.3, 8.5 and 8.12.

**Questions for Staff from the Commission [7:49:21 PM](#)**

Vice Chairperson Oliver inquired if Ms. Lew could provide the date the garage had been constructed.

Ms. Lew noted she was uncertain and that the applicant may be able to provide further information, but it was her understanding that the garage was shown in an older tax photo from the 1930s with a flat roof, not in the current configuration.

**Applicant Presentation [7:50:11 PM](#)**

Mr. Lindsley, the property owner, noted that they had never liked the current configuration of the front façade, particularly the odd placement of the dormer and the slope of the garage roof and when they began to explore creating an addition to their home in 2007, the proposal had seemed like a good, minimalistic solution which met the confines of the existing Compatible Infill Ordinance.

Mr. Lindsley gave a power point presentation for the Commission reviewing the history of the property and their response to staff's findings. Mr. Lindsley stated that it was their belief that the front dormer may have been so poorly constructed, because the original owner found himself under great financial constraints in the 1930s, where records indicated he had been unable to pay his property taxes four years in a row. He stated that they believed this "historic" dormer to be inconsistent with the cottage style of their home and inappropriate.

Mr. Lindsley noted that he would be willing to work with the Commission regarding proposed materials for the addition and exterior of the home. He also stated that the Building Department had already charged the permit fee and he had been told that it could not be refunded if the request was not approved and hoped this inequity could be corrected somehow.

**Questions for the Applicant from the Commission [8:05:23 PM](#)**

Commissioner Richards requested if the applicant would be willing to stay with Board and Batton style rather than shingles.

Mr. Lindsley noted that he was willing to stay with that style of siding and would also consider a continuance and work with the Commission rather than have the petition denied.

Chairperson Lloyd inquired if the applicant's drawings had changed since the 2008 proposal.

Mr. Lindsley noted that they had not.

Chairperson Lloyd inquired if the process for Major Alterations had made Mr. Lindsley consider changing his proposal at all.

Mr. Lindsley said that he might be open to considering other options, however, the home posed a particular challenge in that the existing bathroom was at the front of the home and there was an existing stairway at the back, making other reconfigurations difficult and costly.

**Public Hearing [8:09:21 PM](#)**

Cindy Cromer, 816 East 100 South, noted that she felt a solution might be available in the homes built by the same architect nearby. She stated her opinion that the addition of a bay window would not work.

**Executive Session [8:10:47 PM](#)**

Commissioner Richards noted he had some thoughts on materials. He stated that he felt stucco to be more honest as an addition material which would respect the original structure rather than shingling every new surface.

Commissioner Bevins noted that he felt the earlier garage addition really affected the significance of the earlier dormer as it threw the symmetry of the home off.

Commissioner Richards concurred.

Chairperson Lloyd noted that this was a district which had the Design Guidelines placed upon it without specific tenets being created for it yet.

Vice Chairperson Oliver stated that they were obliged to follow the Design Guidelines and that the proposal was out of line with several basic tenets of preservation based upon the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation which would not be affected by the creation of Yalecrest specific Guidelines if Yalecrest eventually became a historic district. She noted that she commiserated with the applicant for the unfortunate timing and that they were caught in the middle of such a dilemma; however, she also felt the Commission was obliged to consider staff's report. She noted that there were possibly other options for the applicant, such as building a dormer off of the back.

Vice Chairperson Oliver noted her primary concern with the project was that they were not proposing to replace a dormer with like, but rather replacing a dormer with a gable roof which would create a large, triangular projection to the front of the house.

Commissioner Funk noted that she concurred with Vice Chairperson Oliver and would rather see a gable added to the rear of the home.

Chairperson Lloyd noted the Commission had the authority to continue the item and allow the applicant to return at a later date with a revised proposal.

Commissioner Richards noted that there might be some compromise available and a slightly increased shed dormer might be allowed on the front of the home.

Vice Chairperson Oliver stated that the first area which might accommodate change would be the garage. She noted that she agreed with the applicant that it did detract from the overall character of the home and her preference would be that change might first occur there on that side of the home, then on the rear of the home and thirdly, be confined to the second story only where a shed roof dormer might be used instead of a full gable end.

Chairperson Lloyd inquired from the Commission their thoughts regarding the request to increase the porch area and add a gable window on the main floor.

Vice Chairperson Oliver noted that this area was fairly intact and the Design Guidelines were clear that changes to a principal façade should be limited wherever possible.

Chairperson Lloyd inquired if the applicant would be willing to work with staff to modify the existing design based upon comments made by the Commission.

Mr. Lindsley noted that they would be willing to do so.

**Motion [8:30:33 PM](#)**

**In the case of petition PLNHLC2010-00192, Commissioner Funk made a motion to continue the item, requesting that the applicant work with staff to make modifications to the design and bring the modified request back to the Commission at the appropriate time. Commissioner Richards seconded the motion. All voted “Aye”. The motion carries unanimously.**

Chairperson Lloyd called for a recess at this time. [8:32:05 PM](#)

The Meeting reconvened at [8:39:26 PM](#)

**PLNHLC2010-00118, Shaver Certificate of Appropriateness for Minor Alterations** – A request by the property owner, Ben Shaver, to retroactively request approval for the construction of a dormer window at the rear of the property, a single family residence, located at approximately 318 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue. The property is located in the Avenues Historic District and the SR-1A (Special Development Pattern Residential) zoning district, and is within City Council District 3, represented by Stan Penfold. (Staff contact: Carl Leith, 801-535-7758, [carl.leith@slc.gov](mailto:carl.leith@slc.gov))

**Staff Presentation [8:39:58 PM](#)**

Mr. Leith reviewed the petition for the Commission with the aid of a PowerPoint presentation. He noted that the dormer in question was barely visible from the street face. Mr. Leith noted that while the dormer conflicted in part with Standards 2, 8 and 9 and in part with the intent of the objective of the Design Guidelines relating to roofs and dormers; the character of the building would be largely unaffected as it was a rear addition and its impact was minimized by its position. Mr. Leith noted that staff recommended approval of the application.

**Questions for Staff from the Commission [8:48:40 PM](#)**

Commissioner Bevins inquired when the lower rear addition had been constructed.

Mr. Leith noted he was not certain and would let the applicant respond but believed it was a fairly long-standing addition. He stated that it was poorly constructed and the family had the intention of rebuilding it at some time in the future.

**Applicant Presentation [8:49:37 PM](#)**

Ben Shaver, the property owner, noted that the rear addition had been a porch at one point in time but was unsure of the exact date that it had been covered.

**Questions for the Applicant from the Commission [8:50:27 PM](#)**

Vice Chairperson Oliver inquired what the applicant intended to use as finishing for the dormer walls.

Mr. Shaver noted he had been thinking he would use T-111 siding, a grooved plywood product.

Vice Chairperson Oliver inquired if this would be used on the east dormer as well.

Mr. Shaver noted he would wish to match the siding on the other dormers, so ideally he would use clapboard or some other type of lap siding.

**Public Hearing [8:51:46 PM](#)**

Chairperson Lloyd noted that there was no one present to speak to the item and moved to Executive Session.

**Executive Session [8:51:55 PM](#)**

Commissioner Harding stated that she did not have an issue with the proposal as it was hardly visible from the street.

**In the case of petition PLNHLC2010-00118, Commissioner Harding made a motion based upon the analysis and findings in the staff report, to grant retroactive approval for minor alterations to a single family residence located at 318 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue, leaving final approval of materials for finishing the dormer to staff. Vice Chairperson Oliver seconded the motion. Commissioner Funk abstained from the vote as she was absent for part of the discussion. All others voted “Aye”. The motion carries unanimously.**

**PLNHLC2010-00206, Janke Certificate of Appropriateness for Major Alterations** – A request by the property owners, Matt Janke and Carrie Christopherson-Janke, for major alterations to the single family home located at approximately 1621 Laird Avenue. The property is located in the Harvard-Yale Neighborhood and Yalecrest National Register Historic District, and the R-1-5000 (Single Family Residential) zoning district. It is within City Council District 6, represented by JT Martin. (Staff contact: Carl Leith, 801-535-7758, [carl.leith@slcgov.com](mailto:carl.leith@slcgov.com))

**Staff Presentation [8:54:24 PM](#)**

Mr. Leith reviewed the proposal for the Commission with the aid of a PowerPoint presentation. Mr. Leith noted that the proposal conflicted with several of the Design Guidelines. Mr. Leith stated that the

neighborhood presented a very consistent scale of single story dwellings with similar features. Mr. Leith noted that he had received one public comment in opposition to the project.

Mr. Leith noted that several character defining features would be altered in the proposal to add a second story to the rear of the structure and that those changes would conflict substantially with Standards 2 and 5, as well as Design Guidelines 2.1, 2.2, 7.1, 7.5, 8.1, 8.2, 8.3, 8.5, 8.7, 8.11, 8.12 and 8.13. Mr. Leith noted that enlarging the gables would over-clad the upper areas of the first floor with stucco. Mr. Leith noted that the relationship between the front and side gables would be altered significantly as well as the overall appearance of the roof. He indicated that the proposed increase in height would directly affect the appearance of the front of the home. Mr. Leith noted that the massing would be substantially affected as well and the scale of the proposed addition could not be considered subordinate to the original structure. Mr. Leith noted that based upon the analysis and findings listed in the staff report, staff recommended denial of the request.

**Questions for Staff from the Commission [9:09:20 PM](#)**

Chairperson Lloyd noted that Mr. Leith had indicated that another project from the Avenues of similar dimensions had been included.

Mr. Leith noted that the applicant had included a drawing from a project in the Avenues indicating a similar overall design.

**Applicant Presentation [9:11:00 PM](#)**

Matt Janke, the property owner, noted that they were in the same predicament as other Yalecrest neighbors who were subject to the temporary regulations enacted by City Council. He noted that they were in a bind as far as changing the roofline was concerned as it seemed to be the only viable way to add the space they needed and still preserve the small backyard they had. Mr. Janke stated that they had intended to keep the side gables but had found it difficult to engineer. He noted that they were willing to look at alternatives that might allow them to still add a second story to the home and preserve the open space on their lot to the extent that they could.

**Questions for the Applicant from the Commission [9:16:04 PM](#)**

Chairperson Lloyd inquired what the increase in square footage would be.

Mr. Janke noted that the upstairs addition would add approximately 650 square feet.

Vice Chairperson Oliver inquired if there was currently any usable space in the attic.

Mr. Janke noted that there was no real room in the attic.

Chairperson Lloyd requested information on the proposed floor to ridge height.

Annie Schwemmer, the project architect with Renovation Design Group, noted that from the bottom of the existing ceiling to the new floor would be 1'11" and then 7'7" from the outside wall to the bearing point of the new roof joist. She stated that by the time they added floor and roof structure to code they would only have six feet of usable space within the existing framework.

**Public Hearing [9:22:00 PM](#)**

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

**Executive Session [9:22:20 PM](#)**

Chairperson Lloyd noted that this was an issue which would arise frequently with the single level cottages with steep gable ends prevalent in the Yalecrest Neighborhood.

Commissioners Funk, Richards and Vice Chairperson Oliver all noted that staff's findings indicated that it conflicted so much with the Standards and Design Guidelines and so much of the primary structure would be changed by the addition it seemed they could not approve the proposal as it stood.

Vice Chairperson Oliver noted that if there were a way to reconfigure the addition so the front gables were not affected it might be something the Commission could accept.

Chairperson Lloyd noted that Mr. Nielson had brought to his attention that he was affiliated as the architect on another similar project in the Yalecrest area scheduled for June 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2010 and therefore might consider recusing himself from the remainder of the hearing.

Mr. Nielson noted his concern that he might be opening the door for something he would be advocating and this might raise eyebrows.

Chairperson Lloyd recused himself from the remainder of the item as not to suggest he might unduly influence the Commission.

**Motion [9:38:26 PM](#)**

**In the case of Petition PLNHL2010-00206 Commissioner Harding made a motion to deny the petition based upon the analysis and findings of the staff report. Commissioner Haymond seconded the motion.**

**Discussion of the Motion [9:38:59 PM](#)**

Commissioner Funk stated that she would rather see the case continued than denied.

Acting Chairperson Oliver invited the applicant forward to see if they were open to the proposition.

Mr. Janke noted that they were open to working with staff to attempt to find a solution that could work.

Acting Chairperson Oliver noted that their wish list included no change to the primary façade and that the addition be confined to the rear portion of the building and the addition be minimally visible.

**Commissioner Harding withdrew her motion.**

**Second Motion [9:41:51 PM](#)**

**In the case of Petition PLNHL2010-00206, Commissioner Harding made a motion to continue the case to allow the applicant the opportunity to meet with staff and to discuss alternative versions of the project and reschedule the matter before the Commission in a timely manner. Commissioner Haymond seconded the motion. All voted “Aye”. The motion carries unanimously.**

Chairperson Lloyd returned to the meeting proceedings at this time.

**PLNPCM2009-00628 Commercial Design Guidelines (Issues Only)**- 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. This supplemental information will provide guidance for commercial properties. The draft document is available on the City’s Web site at [www.slcgov.com/ced/planning](http://www.slcgov.com/ced/planning). (Staff contact: Janice Lew, 801-535-7625, [janice.lew@slcgov.com](mailto:janice.lew@slcgov.com))

**Staff Presentation [9:44:27 PM](#)**

Ms. Lew noted that staff had given the consultants a list of comments from staff and from the Commission and they had reworked the document to include changes prompted by these comments. Ms. Lew noted that there were still a number of editing issues to be addressed.

**Questions for Staff from the Commission [9:45:19 PM](#)**

Commissioner Harding noted that on page 54 there was an incomplete sentence regarding stairways. She also noted that several of the addresses were incorrect or incomplete.

Vice Chairperson Oliver noted she had not had a lot of time to look at the document but noticed that some of the same inconsistencies still existed that she had noted in the previous draft.

Ms. Lew noted that if the Commission had any further comments, they should forward those to her by Monday, June 24<sup>th</sup>, 2010.

**Public Hearing [9:48:14 PM](#)**

Cindy Cromer, 816 East 100 South, noted that she felt there had been a huge improvement in the document, particularly in the sections on signage, ADA Compliance and Windows and with the added historic photos, but that there were still issues with the draft. She noted that in particular, the Commission should address the text about sandblasting indicating that an expert should be hired when sandblasting occurred. Ms. Cromer submitted a letter for the record reviewing her concerns. That letter is included with these minutes.

**Executive Session [9:52:02 PM](#)**

Ms. Lew noted that as far as the adoption timeline was concerned, staff was trying to figure out additional changes to forward to the Consultants. She noted staff would try to get the final draft onto the June 19<sup>th</sup> agenda to move the item forward to the Planning Commission and City Council.

Commissioner Richards noted that the language for compatible infill needed to be elucidated further as it was very vague as it currently stood.

**OTHER BUSINESS** [9:54:43 PM](#)

There was no further business.

Vice Chairperson Oliver made a motion to adjourn. The meeting adjourned at 9:54 p.m.

---

Cecily Zuck, Historic Landmark Commission Secretary

*This document along with the digital recording constitute the official minutes of the Historic Landmark Commission regular session meeting held on May 5, 2010.*

To download the FTR audio player and listen to selected excerpts of the meeting, click [here](#).