

**SALT LAKE CITY  
HISTORIC LANDMARK COMMISSION  
Minutes of the Meeting  
Room 315, 451 South State Street  
September 1, 2010**

*This document along with the digital recording constitute the official minutes of the Historic Landmark Commission regular session meeting held on September 1, 2010.*

A regular meeting of the Historic Landmark Commission was held on September 1, 2010, at [5:52:24 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, Arla Funk, Warren Lloyd, Chairperson; Anne Oliver, Vice Chairperson and Dave Richards. Commissioners Sheleigh Harding, Polly Hart and Creed Haymond were excused from the meeting.

Planning staff present for the meeting were: Cheri Coffey, Assistant Planning Director; Carl Leith, Senior Planner; Janice Lew, Senior Planner; Paul Nielson, City Attorney; Joel Paterson, Planning Manager; Casey Stewart, Senior Planner and Cecily Zuck, Senior Secretary.

A field trip was held prior to the meeting at 4:00 p.m. The field trip was attended by Commissioners Bevins, Funk, Richards, and Vice Chairperson Oliver. Commissioner Davis and Chairperson Lloyd were excused from the field trip. A quorum was not present; however, field trip notes are still available with the record of the minutes in the Planning Division Office.

**WORK SESSION [5:23:18 PM](#)**

Chairperson Lloyd noted that there were two items which the Commission should address; the first item being a discussion of the comments received from Commissioner Richards regarding electronic packets.

Commissioner Richards noted he was concerned regarding the clarity of the applications submitted. He noted that the application form required the applicant to submit reduced scale drawings and legible copies were not always provided for the Commission. He stated that this would be helpful to decipher finer details and notes of a project. Commissioner Richards noted he would also like to see the delineation of existing versus new construction. He stated that this could be provided fairly easily through the use of shading or differently colored lines on an elevation drawing. Commissioner Richards noted he would also like to see 3D renderings or modeling whenever possible; noting that it would not be possible for all applicants to provide, particularly on smaller residential projects.

Commissioner Richards stated he would like to also see an electronic version of the packet to better analyze drawings and details.

Mr. Paterson noted that packets were available electronically on the internet, but staff could also utilize a File Transfer Protocol or deliver a PDF portfolio on a compact disc.

Ms. Coffey noted that staff could produce electronic packets for those Commissioners who were interested, while maintaining hard copies for those Commissioners who did not wish to participate.

Chairperson Lloyd stated that staff was also limited by what quality of drawings and photos the applicant submitted.

Mr. Paterson noted that this was true, but that staff could work to increase the quality of the submission as well as internal distribution so a scanned copy of a copy was not being distributed to the Commission.

Ms. Coffey noted that most of the projects which came before the Commission were fairly sophisticated and staff could require higher quality photo reproductions and drawings from the applicant once it was determined that an application for major alterations or new construction would go to the Commission.

Ms. Lew noted that it was usually the larger projects which came to the Commission; when staff discussed revisions with the applicant or representative, those types of drawings could be requested.

Commissioner Richards inquired if the application could include information regarding appropriate and inappropriate submittals.

Mr. Leith noted that a packet of this nature was already included, but the application could also include links to the Residential or Commercial Design Guidelines for access to more detailed information.

Chairperson Lloyd stated that the second item for consideration was a status report from Staff regarding the Yalecrest process.

Mr. Paterson noted that in the fall of 2009, Planning Staff had received a request from the Yalecrest Community Council to consider a Local Historic Designation for their neighborhood. He stated that in March of 2010, the Commission had prioritized Westmoreland, Yalecrest and the University Extension as the areas requiring consideration at that time. He stated that the direction to those communities had been to return and demonstrate the existing desire to pursue a designation. He noted that the process had been completed with the Westmoreland Place neighborhood. Mr. Paterson stated that Planning Staff anticipated receipt of a letter from a group called, "Yalecrest Yes" regarding establishment of a Local Historic District. He noted that this group claimed they had 72 percent approval for the proposal.

Chairperson Lloyd noted that there was a group on the other side of the argument as well, "Yalecrest Preservations for Property Rights" (YCPPR).

Mr. Paterson noted this was correct and that staff had met with the attorney representing YCPPR, which was not in favor of designation. He stated that he had informed that attorney that the group could make a presentation during the Public Comment portion of a Commission Meeting.

Mr. Paterson noted that both sides, for and against, were claiming about 70 percent support for their position.

Chairperson Lloyd noted that the Yalecrest Yes group had met with the Planning Staff and hoped that this meeting gave them the information to move forward in their objective. Chairperson Lloyd noted that there would also be discussion of the matter in the Yalecrest Community Council Meeting that evening.

Mr. Paterson noted that there were three new planners in attendance and introduced them to the Commission; Maryann Pickering, Michaela Oktay and Elizabeth Reining.

**APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES from February 3 and August 4, 2010. [5:53:58 PM](#)**

**Vice Chairperson Oliver made a motion to approve the minutes from February 3, 2010 as presented. Commissioner Funk seconded. All voted "Aye". The minutes stand approved.**

**Commissioner Funk moved to approve the minutes from August 4, 2010 as corrected. Commissioner Richards seconded. All voted “Aye”. The minutes stand approved.**

**REPORT OF THE CHAIR AND VICE CHAIR [5:57:50 PM](#)**

Vice Chairperson Oliver noted she had nothing to report.

Chairperson Lloyd noted he also had nothing to report.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS [5:58:03 PM](#)**

Mr. Nielson noted that the Planning Commission forwarded a favorable recommendation to the City Council regarding a text amendment to allow the Commission to initiate land use petitions related to preservation.

Katherine Gardner, Capitol Hill Community Council Chair, noted that on the corner of 200 West and 200 North there was a small service station. Ms. Gardener stated that the station was on a very small lot in a mostly residential neighborhood. She noted that the property was up for sale and inquired if the Commission might suggest any solutions or alternatives regarding the property as it was having great difficulty selling and the community was very interested in a positive outcome for that sale.

Chairperson Lloyd inquired if the property in question was Hansen’s Service at the northeast corner of 200 West and 200 North.

Ms. Gardner noted that it was and that the station had provided wonderful service over the years.

Chairperson Lloyd suggested that the property owner or potential buyers investigate the Utah Heritage Foundation Revolving Loan Fund available for rehabilitation of structures in historic districts. Chairperson Lloyd also suggested that Ms. Gardner speak with preservation staff members Janice Lew or Carl Leith regarding incentives and options.

Mr. Paterson noted that staff had talked to the realtor and the property owner about possibilities for the parcel. He stated that it was a non-conforming use in a residential zone and he would be happy to talk to Ms. Gardner about the suggestions made during that pre-submittal meeting.

Cindy Cromer, 816 East 100 South, noted that earlier in the summer the Commission had approved a “Trex” fence on the corner of Hillside and State St. She stated that it worked very well with the character of that large duplex and invited the Commissioners to go and look at it.

Esther Hunter, East Central Community Council Co-Chair, provided a few reports for the Commission. She thanked the Commission for their role in preservation. She noted that the University neighborhood had been conducting their cottage meetings regarding the proposed University Local Historic District Extension; they had met with residents as well as representatives of St. Paul’s Cathedral to discuss the guidelines and nomination process.

Ms. Hunter noted that interested parties had met with Tracy Aviary representatives, neighbors and the Urban Forester and had created a group entitled, “Neighbors of the Tracy Aviary”. She stated that this group was working through the documentation included in the special collections at the University of Utah Marriott Library regarding the trees in the Aviary. Ms. Hunter stated that within the purpose statement for the Historic Preservation Overlay District, 21A.34.020, landscape features were specifically

referred to as contributing to historic preservation goals of the City. Ms. Hunter noted she had also pulled the Liberty Park National Historic Register Nomination Form for the and the building type was listed as “landscape”.

Chairperson Lloyd noted that the Commission had received a letter which they had not had time to read from the “Yalecrest Yes!” group.

[6:10:26 PM](#) Kelly Marinan noted she was speaking as a representative of the “Yalecrest Yes!” Heritage Preservation Committee and read the presented letter into the record. (A copy of that letter is included with the record of the minutes in the Planning Division Office.):

On March 17, the Historic Landmark Commission elected to move the Yalecrest National Register Historic District forward for potential local historic district designation. Specifically, the Commission unanimously recommended “... Westmoreland and Yalecrest be moved forward [in order] to determine if the wish to become designated local historic districts and to move that process forward if they so desire.”

Since then, at least five Yalecrest neighborhood educational meetings have been held, as well as review by the Salt Lake City Council July 6, when it voted to lift the temporary zoning regulation from a portion of the neighborhood. Public comment has been taken in all of these instances.

Additionally, the Yalecrest Yes Heritage Preservation Committee (a pro-historic preservation group with representatives throughout the entire Yalecrest neighborhood) has worked actively the past five months to educate residents and gauge support. We can now document 72% of residents who have provided input on the issue support LHD designation for the neighborhood. We have defined our support level, can show all work groups are represented, and now desire the process move toward implementing a Local Historic District for Yalecrest.

Yalecrest Yes asks the HLC to consider the Yalecrest neighborhood request as the six combined work groups – minus the City Council’s eliminated portion – for Local Historic District designation as it meets all of the criteria for an H Historic Preservation Overlay District.

According to the SLC Zoning Ordinance, the HLC is not required to hold a public hearing on the issue, but may wish to do so. We would ask the Commission to consider the urgency of initiating the process, as there are multiple steps involved before official designation can take place, and the progression to date has already taken considerable City staff time and resources. Furthermore, a number of contributing homes are at immediate risk of demolition or modification that will compromise the architectural and historic integrity of the Yalecrest neighborhood.

Please keep in mind the monthly Yalecrest Neighborhood Council meeting is held the first Wednesday of every month. Also, Mayor Becker is scheduled to speak at the Oct. 6 YNC meeting. We would prefer there not be any conflicts with this date.

We look forward to continuing the LHD discussion for our neighborhood. We can be contacted at [yalecrestyes@gmail.com](mailto:yalecrestyes@gmail.com). Thank you for your efforts on behalf of historic preservation for the district.

Respectfully,

Yalecrest Yes Heritage Preservation Committee

Chairperson Lloyd noted that there were no further public comments and moved to the first public hearing for the evening.

**PUBLIC HEARINGS [6:13:12 PM](#)**

**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. 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. The property is located 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).) This item was continued from the July 7, 2010 meeting of the Commission during which the design for the building at 350 South 600 East was approved.

**Staff Presentation [6:14:03 PM](#)**

Mr. Dansie noted that on July 7, 2010 the Commission approved the building at 350 South 600 East. He noted that the Planned Development and Rezone requests had now been approved by the City Council. Mr. Dansie noted that the second portion of the project, the building at 350 South 600 East, was scheduled to be heard before the City Council on September 21, 2010.

Mr. Dansie noted that the revised proposal included the following changes:

- Full brick on the ground level
- Hardiplank siding on the 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> floors
- EFIS panel system on the upper floor
- Replacement of slider window units with casement units
- Windows recessed from the plane of the building by approximately six inches
- Smaller divisions in the window panes
- Mr. Dansie noted that the footprint had not changed, but the applicant had attempted to respond to the Commission's concerns.

**Questions for Staff from the Commission [6:18:36 PM](#)**

Commissioner Richards noted it appeared there would still be external trim on the windows to provide further detailing.

Mr. Dansie noted that they were still including trim with some depth and the windows had also been recessed.

He noted that the architect was also available to answer further questions.

**Applicant Presentation [6:19:53 PM](#)**

Jory Walker, the project architect, noted the staff report included a section illustrating the external materials for the building. He noted he felt the changes to present a cleaner, simpler concept.

**Questions for the Applicant from the Commission [6:21:19 PM](#)**

Commissioner Richards inquired if the hardiplank would be the same color as the EFIS system.

Mr. Walker noted the hardiplank would be a darker, warmer color. He noted he believed the fenestration between the bottom, middle and top of the building to be very beneficial to the overall design.

Chairperson Lloyd inquired if windows on the end were part of the stairwell.

Mr. Walker noted that they were. He stated that they hoped it would be used quite a bit by the tenants on the lower floors.

Chairperson Lloyd stated that the windows appeared to be trimmed out in a precast product.

Mr. Walker noted that it was currently a foam trim but would have an applied sand finish to look precast. He noted they could also apply a fiber board trim if requested.

Commissioner Richards inquired about the plan for the rear of the building.

Mr. Walker stated that the back of the building abutted the parking structure and there would be a senior drop off at ground level.

Commissioner Richards noted that the windows might not require a complicated trim with the recessed windows.

**Public Comments [6:27:09 PM](#)**

Cindy Cromer, 816 East 100 South, noted that the City needed guidelines for multi-family structures. She stated that she felt the building entrance was now more welcoming and that generally the building looked less phony. She noted she was still concerned that access to the rear would not be friendly to pedestrians.

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

Chairperson Lloyd inquired if the project required further approval from the Planning Commission.

Mr. Dansie noted that the Planning Commission had approved the Planned Development request and had discussed the drop off zones. He stated that it was a conscious decision to install some handicapped parking stalls immediately adjacent to the back door as this was a closer drop off to the building than the front.

Mr. Walker noted that they had first proposed a curb cut drop off, but it was not allowed. He noted they instead provided five parking stalls adjacent to the proposed drop-off zone.

Chairperson Lloyd noted it seemed the applicant had resolved some pertinent issues the Commission had initially raised.

Commissioner Richards noted he felt the detailing had improved, but the window detailing could be simplified if desired. He stated that the rear entrance was still rather obscure looking, but space limitations might limit other options.

Commissioner Bevins concurred and noted it seemed sensitive to the concerns of the Commission.

**Motion** [6:34:48 PM](#)

**In respect to petition PLNHLC2009-01346, Commissioner Bevins made a motion to approve the final design of the apartment building at 556 East 300 South. Commissioner Richards seconded the motion.**

There was no discussion of the motion.

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

Mr. Dansie inquired if the Commission intended to place a condition in the motion to change the trim around the windows.

Chairperson Lloyd noted that he did not feel a formal condition was necessary, but that the applicant should take staff recommendations.

**PLNHLC2010-00489, 661 Green Street Certificate of Appropriateness for Minor Alterations** – A request by James Olsen, contractor, on behalf of owners Diamond Property Management, for alterations to a series of 10 single story apartment buildings located at approximately 661 & 662 Green Street, Salt Lake City (inc. Nos. 665, 666, 669, 670, 673, 674, 677, 678, 679 & 680). The request is for new additions replacing existing additions to the rear of the properties, and to rebuild the front porches. The property is located in the Central City Historic District and the RMF-30 (Low Density Multifamily Residential) zoning district, in City Council District 4, represented by Luke Garrott. (Staff contact: Carl Leith at 801-535-7758 or [carl.leith@slcgov.com](mailto:carl.leith@slcgov.com).)

**Staff Presentation** [6:36:40 PM](#)

Mr. Leith noted that the properties had been constructed in 1919 and that two of the units to the immediate west had been destroyed by fire. He stated that the units were currently in poor condition and the applicant intended to perform phased improvements on the property. Mr. Leith stated that the proposal was to rebuild the front stairs and porches in a composite material and to also rebuild the rear additions with a 4’ extension and new gable roof form. He noted that the applicant proposed to clad the additions with a fiber cement product.

Mr. Nielson noted at this time that the applicant was not present to represent their case. He noted that it was up to the Commission to decide whether to proceed or not, but cautioned them to consider the pros and cons of either decision.

Mr. Leith noted that the applicant had been aware of the hearing and had intended to attend.

Chairperson Lloyd noted that if the applicant’s interests were not represented, they might want to consider not hearing the item at that time.

Commissioner Funk inquired if they could delay the item to the end of the meeting and see if the applicant appeared. She noted that if the applicant did not show, they could also postpone.

Mr. Nielson noted they could change the order of the agenda by vote.

**6:42:30 PM Commissioner Funk moved to change the order of the agenda to proceed to the following case, PLNPCM2009-01338, and wait until that item ends to determine whether or not to consider PLNHLC2010-00489 at that time. Commissioner Richards seconded the motion.**

There was no discussion of the motion.

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

Mr. Paterson stated that staff was attempting to track down Mr. Stewart to present the next item.

Mr. Leith left the meeting at this time to attempt to contact his applicant.

**PLNPCM2009-01338, Sustainability Development Code Changes for Accessory Buildings** – A request by Mayor Ralph Becker to amend the Zoning Ordinance in regards to accessory structures associated with urban agriculture (such as greenhouses) and renewable energy systems (such as small solar and wind energy collection systems) in an effort to facilitate and regulate those activities throughout the City. Discussion will focus on location priorities for new solar collection systems in the Historic Preservation Overlay District. This is a Citywide policy issue which will affect all Council Districts. (Staff contact: Casey Stewart at 801.535.6260 or [casey.stewart@slcgov.com](mailto:casey.stewart@slcgov.com).)

**Staff Presentation 6:45:07 PM**

Mr. Stewart noted that the Mayor had initiated a petition to develop a Citywide Sustainability Code. Mr. Stewart stated a consultant had been hired to work on the issue and then the code had been broken into smaller portions, and his portion involved agricultural accessory structures relating to urban agriculture as well as renewable energy systems such as small solar and wind energy collection systems. Mr. Stewart stated that the Planning Commission had reviewed the code and tabled the item for further investigation of the wind energy collection ordinances. He noted that questions had arisen at that time as to how the Historic Overlay Zone would affect the regulations on some of those structures. He noted he had included the Clarion Associates Discussion Paper for the Commission regarding their hierarchy of locations produced in 2009. He noted that staff requested direction regarding solar collection systems. Mr. Stewart reviewed the priorities proposed in the Discussion Paper:

1. Solar panels should be installed below the ridgeline of a pitched roof when possible or setback from the edge of a flat roof.
2. Solar panels should be located so as not to change a historic roofline or obscure the relationship of a historic roof to character defining features such as dormers or chimneys.
3. Should be installed in a manner which does not damage or obscure the character defining features
4. Should be located on the rear or sides of a pitched roof. Locating solar panels on a front pitched roof of the primary façade is inappropriate.
5. Should be mounted parallel to the plane of a pitched roof and have a low profile.
6. Should be installed in a location on the roof so as not to be readily visible from public streets.

Mr. Stewart then reviewed the six priorities laid out in the proposed text amendment language.

1. In a rear yard in a location not readily visible from a public right-of-way (except an alley).
2. On an accessory building or structure (such as a garage), in a location not readily visible from a public right of way (except an alley).
3. In a side yard in a location not readily visible from a public right-of-way (except an alley).

4. On the principal building in a location not readily visible from a public right-of-way (except an alley).
5. On the principle building in a location that may be visible from a public right-of-way, but not on the structure's front façade.
6. On the front façade of the principal building in a location most compatible with the character defining features of the structure.

Mr. Stewart noted that staff had done some research regarding the Secretary of the Interior's Standards regarding these types of systems. He stated that items proposed for the front façade of the principal building were traditionally denied. He noted that staff originally proposed that item six be removed from the location priorities and that consideration of systems on the front façade not be allowed.

Mr. Stewart noted that installation standard number two on page eleven of the staff report indicated that additional restrictions put in place by the Historic Overlay should not reduce the effectiveness of the system by more than twenty percent or exceed \$2000. He noted that staff was of the opinion this was an overly complicated and hard to measure standard, and staff recommended removal of that language.

Ms. Coffey noted that the Commission might want to recommend meshing their current policy regarding solar panel systems with the proposed hierarchy.

**Questions for Staff from the Commission [6:54:48 PM](#)**

Chairperson Lloyd inquired of Ms. Coffey if it would make more sense to propose that sections of the Commission's current guidelines be inserted into the text amendment or to refer to the standards directly.

Ms. Coffey noted that it would be easier for the sake of clarity to insert sections of the current guidelines into the amendment. She noted that staff could make these changes easily.

Commissioner Funk noted she did not appreciate the economic amount in the ordinance as these numbers were subject to change as new developments emerged and it needed to be not quite as specific. She stated that solar technology was evolving so quickly, there might come a time when appropriate materials would become readily available for the front façade of a residential home, such as recently developed shingles.

Commissioner Richards noted that he originally considered dropping standards 5&6 which would allow for panels on the front of the house. He noted that the language also indicated that a panel could be erected at a height of 12 feet above the roofline.

Chairperson Lloyd inquired if the language distinguished between solar photovoltaic systems and solar thermal collection systems. He stated that many solar thermal collectors were being treated in the same manner as skylights and were not always specifically precluded from the principal façade of a structure.

Mr. Stewart noted that the language did not distinguish between the two.

Chairperson Lloyd noted that performance levels also varied greatly between the two systems. He noted that the Commission might want to further investigate particular systems and their relative appropriateness as suggested by Commissioner Funk.

Commissioner Richards noted that the thermal systems would always require a certain amount of bulk as they required fluid to move through them whereas the photo voltaic systems were essentially batteries and could become very thin over time.

Chairperson Lloyd stated that then it became a question of the appropriateness of the type, appearance and thickness of a system.

Vice Chairperson Oliver noted language could be added to require that a system be flush with the roof or provide less than a 3 inch projection over the roofline.

Commissioner Richards noted it could also be changed to state that requests front façade placement be reviewed on a case by case basis. He stated that they wanted to be positive and embrace the technology, but didn't want to set a precedent by specifically precluding systems on the front façade when they might be allowable in certain applications in the future. Commissioner Richards noted they might also look at the issue more like a conditional use request.

Ms. Coffey noted that under the proposed General Provisions section, "...If there is any conflict between the provisions of this subsection and any other requirements, the provisions of the subsection shall take precedence." She stated the Commission might consider removal of that language if wanting to review particular issues on a case by case basis.

Commissioner Bevins inquired if the applicant would have to prove if all other locations were not feasible.

Commissioner Richards noted they could delineate the issue and delegate certain applications to staff; particularly those in the rear, on an accessory structure or at the rear of a principal building and not readily visible from the street.

Chairperson Lloyd noted that the principal building would almost always be the best placement for a collection system as it was normally the tallest and most free of shade or other obstructions.

Ms. Coffey noted that there was a current case where the applicant proposed to place panels on a shed that was somewhat visible from the street. She stated that this case might be a proof for the concept that if a system was placed on a shed or other structure beside the primary building, more latitude might be given as to what could be allowed.

Chairperson Lloyd noted that this seemed reasonable.

Vice Chairperson Oliver noted that section 2(c), items 1-4 read to her that projecting panels would be allowed if not placed on the principal façade or readily visible from the street.

Commissioner Funk noted that section 1(a), item 2 would allow a panel to project 12 feet above a roofline, which seemed undesirable and obnoxious in any zone, historic overlay or not.

Chairperson Lloyd noted that this language would only allow that if the roof was 12 feet below the zoning cap.

Mr. Stewart noted that this was intended to allow for a better collection angle on accessory structures such as garages.

Commissioner Funk noted that they could take out numbers and make determinations more by the appropriateness of the application.

Mr. Stewart noted that incorporating the Commission's current guidelines into the text could eliminate some of those issues with the regulations within the overlay.

Ms. Coffey noted that the issue was part of a public hearing and inquired if the Chair wished to open the meeting to public comment.

Chairperson Lloyd opened the floor to public comment.

**Public Comments [7:15:42 PM](#)**

Cindy Cromer, 816 East 100 South, noted that aside from everything else, the City's existing guidelines for solar collection systems were better written than the proposed amendment. She stated that there was a huge amount of force coming from Clarion regarding the Sustainability Ordinance. Ms. Cromer stated that while important, the Sustainability Ordinance should not trump all and there had been no response from Clarion to objections for over a year.

**Executive Session [7:18:18 PM](#)**

Commissioner Funk inquired if the Wind Collection Systems were up for discussion.

Mr. Stewart noted that anything in the text amendment was open for discussion.

Commissioner Funk noted that page 8, 1(a), indicated, "...if the small wind energy system is on a roof, the total extended height is equal to the roof height and the tower height", and requested clarification.

Commissioner Richards noted that he believed that regulation was meant to determine how far from the property line the wind tower must be located.

Commissioner Funk stated other concerns, including:

Section D. Appearance, Color and Finish, which stated that a tower had to remain the original applied manufacturer's finish and added that bright, luminescent or neon colors as determined by the City are prohibited. She noted the second portion seemed unnecessary.

Section H. Access, stated that any climbing foot areas or rungs below 12 feet of a free standing tower shall be removed to prevent unauthorized climbing. She stated that the language regarding unauthorized climbing seemed unnecessary also.

Section M. Abandonment, stated if a wind turbine is inoperable for six consecutive months the owner shall be notified that they must, within six months of receiving the notice, restore their system...She inquired who would enforce this and how would one determine what was inoperable.

Commissioner Davis noted if someone had invested the money to put up a wind turbine, they had a strong economic incentive to keep it operating and didn't know many people who would let it fall into disrepair.

Chairperson Lloyd noted he felt the language helped to provide the City some control over enforcement of the issue.

Commissioner Funk noted that as technology evolved wind turbines might also become obsolete and remain as monoliths and the owner should be responsible for removal.

Mr. Stewart stated the language did place financial burden of removal upon the owner.

Chairperson Lloyd stated the Commission felt historic neighborhoods within the City to be some of the most sustainable communities and full of people likely to be interested in renewable energy. He stated he would like to see language regarding the inherent worth of historic neighborhoods in regards to sustainability. He noted that because of the embodied energy, building materials, lot density, living patterns historic districts contributed to making Salt Lake City a sustainable city.

Commissioner Davis noted the Commission had to be open to renewable forms of energy in historic districts because that sustainable tradition should be promoted. He stated that if energy prices increased tenfold and it was difficult to utilize alternative energy forms because a property owner lived in a historic district, it would create a disincentive to live there.

Commissioner Funk concurred with Commissioner Davis but noted that she still did not believe that sustainability should always trump the preservation ordinance.

Chairperson Lloyd inquired what staff required of the Commission.

Mr. Stewart noted staff was ultimately looking for a recommendation for the proposed amendments to forward to the Planning Commission.

Ms. Coffey stated that if it was too difficult to recommend the proposed ordinances, the Commission could make recommendations without formally approving of the draft ordinance.

Chairperson Lloyd noted the Commission could note general approval then, but provide specific recommendations to staff.

Commissioner Funk noted she felt it was difficult to sift through the entire amendment in one hearing and recommended that the Commission form a subcommittee to examine the issue and offer amendments.

Ms. Coffey noted she would prefer that the entire group vote on recommendations made by a subcommittee or through individual comments.

Commissioner Davis concurred with Commissioner Funk and felt the issue required further examination.

Mr. Stewart noted that if the Commission agreed with parts of the ordinance such as the section on accessory structures, the Commission might forward a recommendation on that portion.

Commissioner Funk noted she was not entirely comfortable with that part of the amendment either as it proposed that an accessory building might be as large as fifty percent of the principal structure and that seemed excessive.

Commissioner Richards noted he had been disheartened by the previous response to comments made by the Zoning Amendment Project Committee.

Ms. Coffey noted that this ordinance was now in the hands of the Planning Staff and they would be making the proposed text changes.

**Motion [7:39:45 PM](#)**

**Commissioner Funk moved to create a subcommittee to review petition PLNPCM2009-01338 and make recommendations back to the Planning Commission. Commissioner Richards seconded the motion.**

There was no discussion of the motion.

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

**Commissioners Funk, Bevins, Richards and Davis volunteered for the subcommittee.**

Commissioner Richards inquired if staff could provide updated copies of the proposed ordinance for review before the subcommittee meeting.

[7:42:00 PM](#) Vice Chairperson Oliver was excused from the meeting at this time.

*The following item was moved from earlier on the agenda to the end in order to allow time for the applicant to appear. Mr. Leith confirmed that the applicant was present to participate.*

**PLNHLC2010-00489, 661 Green Street Certificate of Appropriateness for Minor Alterations** – A request by James Olsen, contractor, on behalf of owners Diamond Property Management, for alterations to a series of 10 single story apartment buildings located at approximately 661 & 662 Green Street, Salt Lake City (inc. Nos. 665, 666, 669, 670, 673, 674, 677, 678, 679 & 680). The request is for new additions replacing existing additions to the rear of the properties, and to rebuild the front porches. The property is located in the Central City Historic District and the RMF-30 (Low Density Multifamily Residential) zoning district, in City Council District 4, represented by Luke Garrott. (Staff contact: Carl Leith at 801-535-7758 or [carl.leith@slcgov.com](mailto:carl.leith@slcgov.com).)

**Staff Presentation** [7:42:16 PM](#)

Mr. Leith continued his staff presentation from earlier noting that Green Street at that point was part of a pedestrian walkway and 10 of 12 original units still existed. Mr. Leith noted that the buildings were in poor condition, the front porch and stairs in disrepair and the proposal would replace those stairs and front porches, extend new rear additions by 4’ and would add a gable form roof to improve the current internal layout of the apartment units. He noted that the applicant proposed to use a fiber cement siding and due to the prominence of the rear of the structures from 700 South, staff would rather see a wood siding applied. Mr. Leith noted that staff recommended the Commission approve the request requiring details to be agreed upon with staff, alterations including:

1. Front porch and stairs
2. Rear addition design and cladding
3. Rear addition deck and stairs
4. Window framing to new additions
5. Rear doors to new additions

**Questions for Staff from the Commission** [7:47:33 PM](#)

Commissioner Bevins inquired where the rear addition deck would be located.

Mr. Leith noted the rear addition deck referred to the landing at the top of the rear stairs.

Chairperson Lloyd inquired if alterations would include foundation work as well.

Mr. Leith noted that foundations would be rebuilt and would let the applicant answer further.

Commissioner Richards noted that Standard 10, Certain building materials are prohibited including the following: (b) stated, Any other imitation siding material designed to look like wood siding but fabricated from an imitation material or materials. He noted that the Commission had approved composite or other materials which replicated wood in the past and was confused that the report indicated it should not be approved in this case.

Mr. Leith noted the Commission had approved such materials in the past but usually not on a principal structure and not on a location visible from the streetscape. He stated that in rebuilding and altering the structures, they would become more a part of the principal building. Mr. Leith stated the Commission could also take the view that they were new construction instead and could thereby find the material appropriate.

Mr. Paterson stated this standard referred to imitation siding material that would often have an imprinted wood patterning or faux wood grain.

Commissioner Richards noted this was not very different than a smooth clapboard siding which had been maintained, but that he understood the logic.

#### **Applicant Presentation [7:51:04 PM](#)**

James Olson, the contractor, was present to speak. He noted that they wanted to use a decking material suitable to avoiding extensive maintenance, which is why they were interested in a composite material such as "Trex". Mr. Olson stated the handrails and posts would remain wood. He stated that on the addition on the back they were not certain what they would use.

Jo Jeppson, the property owner, stated he was hoping to get a recommendation on an appropriate material for the rear addition from the Commission. He noted that in the past they had received approval for fiber cement siding on another property in the Central City Historic District. He stated that the material had held up well on that project and believed it would be suitable in this situation as well. He noted, however, they were open to any recommendations from the Commission.

Chairperson Lloyd inquired if the application would be part of a panel system or siding.

Mr. Jeppson noted it would be a siding or shingle application.

Commissioner Richards noted his concern that the applicant preserve as much of the original wood as possible when repairing the front porches.

Mr. Jeppson stated that besides replacing the front decking, they wanted to keep as much intact as possible and would rebuild in kind what could not be saved.

Commissioner Richards inquired how they would execute the porch rehabilitation.

Mr. Olson noted that the columns in some instances were already falling off of the porches. He stated that they planned to temporarily brace the porches from the ground, raise them, replace the decking and then stabilize the posts and rails. He stated that they were planning to replace the handrails to replicate the original.

Commissioner Richards noted he did not feel a shingle fiber cement product to be appropriate. He stated that most structures in the area were either brick or had horizontal clapboard siding.

Chairperson Lloyd noted that in using a product with a 6 inch lap, the applicant could cut it down to create an appearance more in line with the surrounding character of the neighborhood and guidelines.

Commissioner Richards noted his concern regarding the limited range of colors of composite decking materials and how they would look in comparison to the homes, which were currently painted very vivid colors.

Mr. Jeppson noted that they intended to repaint the homes in a more muted scheme. He noted that they would probably use a tan or grey composite. He stated they would like to match it as closely as possible to the color scheme of the homes. Mr. Jeppson stated that they were attempting to move away from having to paint high traffic areas.

Chairperson Lloyd inquired if they had met with the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) and discussed the possibility of tax credits.

Mr. Jeppson noted that he had discussed credits with staff, but he did not feel there was a lot to gain from pursuing them.

Chairperson Lloyd noted he believed that nearly all items within the proposal seemed consistent with the State's standards for rehabilitation and credits could be significant. Chairperson Lloyd gave Mr. Jeppson contact information for SHPO.

Commissioner Davis noted that the applicant had answered his question when noting that they would repaint the structures.

Chairperson Lloyd noted that the Commission did not regulate paint colors, but jokingly hoped that the applicant would not paint them grey and mauve.

Mr. Jeppson noted that they were replacing all of the windows on the structures in conjunction with the County's lead safety program and would probably purchase all of the windows before the rear additions were fully constructed. He inquired if a double hung vinyl window would be appropriate at least on the new rear addition.

Chairperson Lloyd noted that Mr. Jeppson should address this issue with staff.

Mr. Jeppson noted that there had been a question earlier regarding the back foundation. He stated they believed that there currently was no foundation and they would be pouring foundations for the new additions.

**Public Comments [8:05:34 PM](#)**

Cindy Cromer, 816 East 100 South, noted that she was delighted to see reinvestment in the property. She noted that the existing shed structures had been wide open with windows on all three sides and was concerned that fenestration pattern would be lost. Ms. Cromer stated that the addition wall would look blank from the street.

**Applicant Response [8:07:29 PM](#)**

Mr. Jeppson stated that the County Assessor's Office counted the apartments as two bedroom units with the current rear shed additions. He noted that the visible portion of the new additions on 700 South would be the mudroom area of the units and they would not be opposed to placing a window on that wall.

**Executive Session [8:09:00 PM](#)**

Commissioner Richards noted he was fairly comfortable with the proposal, except that the siding be a lap product with a 4-6 inch reveal which could be in a cement fiber material.

Commissioner Funk inquired if Commissioner Richards was comfortable with the proposed composite decking material.

Commissioner Richards noted he saw both sides of the issue; durability and maintaining the historic character, but did not feel strongly one way or the other.

Chairperson Lloyd noted that he was encouraged by the applicant's approach and felt that they were planning to reconstruct proportions as closely as feasible.

Commissioner Funk inquired what the Commission felt about requiring more windows in the rear addition.

Chairperson Lloyd noted the Commission might recommend that the applicant place an additional window on the rear addition, particularly on the units directly facing 700 South.

Commissioner Bevins noted that the Central Community Master Plan called for more flexibility, particularly regarding renovation details.

**Motion [8:13:09 PM](#)**

Commissioner Funk made a motion, in the case of PLNHLC2010-00489 to approve the request, subject to the staff approval of materials for the front porch deck and stairs, the lap siding be placed on the back addition to be not wider than 6", one new window on the rear side street facing additions and staff approve the rear doors for the addition, allowing the applicant to use composite materials for the surface of the deck and the front porch stairs and the rear deck and stairs.

Commissioner Davis seconded the motion.

**Discussion of the Motion [8:14:45 PM](#)**

Commissioner Richards inquired if there was any discussion of the staff approving the replacement and new windows.

Chairperson Lloyd noted that the inclusion of a new window would require staff review and approval.

There was no further discussion of the motion. Chairperson Lloyd called for a vote.

**All voted "Aye". The motion carries unanimously.**

**OTHER BUSINESS [8:15:56 PM](#)**

There was no further business.

**Commissioner Funk moved to adjourn. Commissioner Bevins seconded the motion. All were in favor. The meeting stood adjourned at 8:16 p.m.**

---

Cecily Zuck, Historic Landmark Commission Secretary