

**SALT LAKE CITY  
HISTORIC LANDMARK COMMISSION  
Minutes of the Meeting  
Room 326, 451 South State Street  
August 4, 2011**

*This document along with the digital recording constitute the official minutes of the Historic Landmark Commission regular session meeting held on August 4, 2011.*

*Historic Landmark Commission Meetings are televised on SLCTV 17. Archived video of this meeting can be found at the following link under, "Historic Landmark Commission and RDA":  
[http://www.slctv.com/vid\\_demand.htm](http://www.slctv.com/vid_demand.htm),*

A regular meeting of the Historic Landmark Commission was called to order on Thursday, August 4, 2011, at [5:42:08 PM](#) in Room 326 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, Polly Hart, Stephen James, Acting Chairperson Oliver and Commissioner Dave Richards. Chairperson Warren Lloyd was excused.

Planning staff present for the meeting included Carl Leith, Senior Planner; Janice Lew, Senior Planner; Michaela Oktay, Principal Planner; Joel Paterson, Planning Manager and Cecily Zuck, Senior Secretary. City Attorney Paul Nielson was also present.

#### **FIELD TRIP**

Commissioners Bevins, Hart, James, Oliver and Richards were present for the field trip along with staff members Joel Paterson, Michaela Oktay and Carl Leith. All left the City and County Building at 4:00 p.m. and visited the sites of the public hearing items that evening.

**545 E 900 South (PLNHLC2011-00214):** Staff reviewed the proposal for a major rear addition fronting Park Avenue. The Commission asked questions regarding the height of the addition, how close the addition would be to the sidewalk and the extent the addition would project beyond the west façade of the home and other homes on Park Avenue. The Commission also requested information regarding the height of the proposed fence along 900 South and Park Street, the proposed garage doors facing Park Street and the existing expanse of the driveway leading to the existing garage.

**876 E 4<sup>th</sup> Avenue (PLNHLC2011-00390):** Staff presented the proposal for a rear addition to the Commission. The Commissioners requested information regarding the configuration of the lot and the location and scale of the proposed addition. The Commission also asked about the roof pitch of the proposed addition and inquired after details of the design and proposed materials, particularly for the windows and decks.

#### **DINNER [5:12:26 PM](#)**

Dinner was served to the Commission and staff at 5:00 p.m. in Room 126. The Commission had no substantive business to discuss.

#### **WORK SESSION [5:42:24 PM](#)**

**Preservation Program Transmittal** – Staff briefed the Commission on the transmittal to City Council.

Mr. Paterson provided an update, indicating the Commissioners had received a copy of the transmittal in their packets. He noted planning staff would be working with council staff to analyze and strengthen the policy statements within the plan prior to the Council briefing, set for August 23, 2011. Mr. Paterson

noted staff would discuss the Preservation Philosophy Statement; the rewriting of the residential design guidelines as well as new commercial and sign guidelines; current projects; upcoming ordinance amendments; and the creation of a local conservation district tool.

Mr. Paterson noted staff asked the Commission consider convening for two meetings throughout the fall to review petitions during the first meeting of the month and review the aforementioned guidelines during the second. Mr. Paterson said that the intent of the meetings would be to refine the guidelines to a point where the Commission would be comfortable with their transmittal to City Council by the end of 2011.

Mr. Leith gave a copy of proposed timelines for these upcoming revisions to the city's Residential Design Guidelines to the Commissioners.

Acting Chairperson Oliver inquired if the City Council had proposed a timeline for the process.

Mr. Paterson noted that a specific date had not been mentioned and the upcoming briefing would be the first round of discussion. He stated his impression was the Council wished to work through this information now and would not require all elements of the policy to be finalized before they could act on the Preservation Plan. Mr. Paterson noted the Council had identified the adoption of the Preservation Plan as a priority during their retreat earlier in the year.

#### **ADMINISTRATIVE BUSINESS [5:50:02 PM](#)**

##### **Report of the Chair and Vice Chair [5:50:04 PM](#)**

Acting Chairperson Oliver noted she had nothing to report.

#### **APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES from July 7, 2011 and July 21, 2011. [5:50:16 PM](#)**

**Acting Chairperson Oliver noted one correction for the minutes from July 7, 2011. Commissioner Hart moved to approve the minutes of July 7, 2011 as corrected. Commissioner Harding seconded the motion. Commissioners Bevins, Davis, Funk, Harding, Hart, James and Richards all voted, "Aye". The minutes stand approved unanimously.**

Commissioner Hart noted the minutes from July 21, 2011 did not include the winners chosen by the Commission.

The secretary noted this was intentional as the minutes would become public record prior to the awards ceremony on August 29, 2011.

**Commissioner Hart moved to approve the minutes from July 21, 2011, noting the winners were not included as they would not be made public prior to the awards ceremony on August 29<sup>th</sup>. Commissioner Harding seconded the motion. Commissioners Bevins, Davis, Funk, Harding, Hart, James and Richards all voted, "Aye". The minutes stand approved unanimously.**

#### **PUBLIC COMMENTS [5:52:43 PM](#)**

Seeing no one present from the public to comment, Acting Chairperson Oliver moved to the public hearings portion of the meeting.

#### **PUBLIC HEARINGS [5:53:14 PM](#)**

**PLNHLC2011-00214, 545 East 900 South, Certificate of Appropriateness for Major Alterations –**

A request by Mark Loewen for major alterations to a significant contributing structure located at 545 E 900 S. The proposal is to construct an approximately 1,308 square foot attached garage addition to the primary residence as well as other minor alterations to the subject property. The subject property is located in the RMF-30 (Low-density multi-family residential) zoning district in Council District 4, represented by Luke Garrott. (Staff contact: Michaela Oktay at 801-535-6003, [michaela.oktay@slcgov.com](mailto:michaela.oktay@slcgov.com).)

**Staff Presentation [5:53:44 PM](#)**

Staff member Michaela Oktay reviewed the proposal for the Commission. She noted the applicant proposed to construct an attached addition to the primary residence as well as new fencing, a pool and a covered porch addition. Ms. Oktay noted the Victorian eclectic, a significant contributing single family home, was located on the north side of Liberty Park and in the Central City Historic District.

She stated the applicant wished to construct a four foot fence in the front and corner side yard and reviewed proposed options for the design of the fence with the Commission. She noted staff requested the Commission provide guidance regarding an appropriate height and design for this fence. Ms. Oktay noted the applicant also wished to construct a privacy fence in the rear and east side yard. She reviewed the site plan for the Commission, detailing the locations of both proposed fences.

Ms. Oktay noted Mr. Loewen also proposed to remove an unoriginal covered porch addition on the east side elevation and replace with a new porch addition designed to match the existing original front porch, with the exception of the proposed Trex composite material. She noted that staff had approved Trex for decking in the past, but could not recommend Trex be used on the covered porch as it would highly visible. Ms. Oktay noted staff's recommendation would be that the applicant use wood. She reviewed the proposed location of the covered porch addition with the Commission.

The major alteration of the project, Ms. Oktay noted, would remove a dilapidated garage and enclosed screen porch at the rear of the property. She noted a street tree would also be removed to create a new widened approach to an approximately 1300 square foot three car garage addition. Ms. Oktay stated that the new addition would be accessed from Park Street and would include a 36 foot wide concrete driveway. Ms. Oktay noted staff's analysis found the proposed addition conflicted with a number of the basic principles of standards for additions as well as a majority of the design guidelines for new additions and garages.

Ms. Oktay noted the home had two primary façades as it was located on a corner lot and the question was therefore if the addition was subordinate to the principal structure. She stated the applicable standards and guidelines, the size, scale and massing of the proposed addition, and its placement on the lot all were in conflict and would create a negative cumulative effect. Ms. Oktay noted the average setback along Park Street from the front of the sidewalk to the front wall of homes was 20 feet. She noted that the new addition as proposed would be setback 14 feet from the sidewalk, disrupting views and continuity. She stated staff felt an attached three car garage was not appropriate in terms of the context of the site, street and neighborhood.

Ms. Oktay provided a summary noting staff requested guidance regarding the proposed height of the front and corner side yard fence; guidance regarding the material for the covered porch addition, particularly the balustrades and railings; and pertaining to the garage addition and the pool, staff recommended denial. She noted staff had met with the applicant on various occasions and discussed the fact that the current

zoning designation and size of the property allowed significant latitude to analyze alternate accommodations to meet the applicant's needs.

### **Questions from the Commission [6:01:58 PM](#)**

Commissioner Hart requested clarification regarding the proposed square footage of the home and addition, both noted as 1228 square feet in separate locations.

Ms. Oktay noted the correction in the report; it was the primary residence that was 1228 square feet. She stated the plan provided by the applicant's contractor indicated the first floor of the primary residence was 1100 square feet; however, the quote of 1228 square feet probably came from the County Assessor's Office.

Commissioner Harding inquired about the pool and what the design guidelines recommended for such an addition.

Ms. Oktay noted the design guidelines did not specifically speak to such modern additions as pools but did address open space as well as the configuration of a site.

Commissioner Harding inquired if the pool would be visible.

Ms. Oktay noted it would not be visible as proposed. She noted both additions were proposed at the same time; as the location of the garage would ultimately effect the pool location, both were recommended for denial at this time.

Commissioner Hart inquired if the Commission could choose parts of an application to approve while denying others.

Mr. Nielson noted it depended upon the applicant's amenability to changing portions of the request. He stated that if there were a part of the request which the Commission wished to table to a later date that was possible, but the Commission could not simply pick and choose.

Acting Chairperson Oliver inquired if the Commission could vote according to the way in which staff had structured the request.

Mr. Nielson noted the Commission could do so.

Commissioner James inquired if the Trex material would be left as a raw material or would be painted.

Mark Loewen, the applicant, noted it was a new Trex material that came off the line white, not painted, and was advertised as impervious.

### **Applicant Presentation [6:10:33 PM](#)**

Mr. Loewen reviewed additional slides, photographs and architectural drawings of his request with the Commission. He noted he also wished to remove a tree in the park strip which was half dead and plant two new trees in its stead. Mr. Loewen stated he had analyzed existing photos of the fence previously on the site in relationship to the existing front porch and believed it was originally four feet tall. Mr. Loewen stated he believed the proposal would be subservient to the original house. He noted the home directly across Park Street from the subject property was nine feet from the sidewalk; therefore he felt there was an existing precedent for his proposed setback.

## Questions from the Commission [6:15:02 PM](#)

Commissioner Richards noted the footprint measurements on the addition did not add up. He noted that as indicated on the plan the addition would be 42 feet by 30 feet 4 inches; 1272.6 square feet instead of 1070 as indicated by the contractor. He noted these numbers were important as they spoke to the addition's true subservience to the main structure and if the drawings were correct, the addition would be larger than the original home and not subservient.

Mr. Loewen noted that the addition would pass all zoning requirements and that he had attempted to be respectful of the nature of the home while meeting his needs. He reviewed photographs of properties within the neighborhood which had large additions and detached parking structures. He noted the goal was also to create a private yard area for his family beside and behind the home.

Acting Chairperson Oliver inquired if the applicant had considered placing the garage doors on the north face of the addition.

Mr. Loewen stated he had considered it; however, he would have to maintain the gravel driveway in the rear and would lose the green space he desired.

Commissioner Richard noted the breezeway was very small and did not do much to articulate between the primary structure and the addition and inquired if the applicant had considered elongating the breezeway.

Mr. Loewen stated that he could not increase the size of the breezeway as the addition was already as large as it could be while meeting setback requirements.

Commissioner James inquired if a detached structure would be subject to the same setback requirements.

Mr. Paterson noted that if the structure was detached, there were allowances; on the rear and interior side yard an accessory structure's foundation could be built within one foot of the property line.

Commissioner Funk inquired if the proposed grading would ultimately affect the fence height.

Ms. Oktay noted the request would be allowed under the ordinance; a change of up to two feet was allowed without a permit and a six foot tall fence could be built on top of the grade change.

Mr. Loewen noted that the grade change would be to level the area for the pool and create a deck one foot below the line of the home. He noted the fence would only be eight feet high around this pool area and that the structure to the east was an apartment building with an existing eight foot fence.

Commissioner Funk noted her concern regarding the mass of the proposed addition. She stated she believed it would diminish the home. She noted that while the applicant may prefer the current proposal, the secondary proposal of building a detached garage and smaller addition would provide for the needs of the applicant while maintaining a more appropriate appearance for the home and neighborhood. Commissioner Funk noted she understood the desire of the applicant to maintain a yard area, however, the applicant would be able to use the yard on the front and west side of the home as well as that on the east side. Commissioner Funk commended the applicant for his attention to detail and willingness to put such care into the design, but felt the proposal was too massive, too close to the street and its impact needed to be reduced.

Commissioner Richards concurred the mass of the proposed addition dominated the existing structure.

Commissioner Funk again stated the second proposal would be more appropriate.

Acting Chairperson Oliver asked the Commissioners to hold these comments for the executive session and asked if there were any further direct questions for the applicant.

Seeing no further questions for Mr. Loewen, Acting Chairperson Oliver thanked him for his presentation and opened the floor to public comments.

**Public Comments [6:34:04 PM](#)**

Cindy Cromer, 816 East 100 South, noted she owned a property one block north of the subject parcel. She indicated that the home was very important in the neighborhood and district and was pleased to see an owner who was willing to make such an exceptional reinvestment in the area. Ms. Cromer stated that a four foot fence was essential in the neighborhood. She noted there was a great deal of foot traffic in the neighborhood and individuals with no qualms about passing through private yards if possible. She stated her concerns about white paint for the fencing as it was very difficult to maintain in the area. She stated that the garage bays should not face Park Street. Ms. Cromer noted that it drove the look of the addition from the street and that any alternate locations should be evaluated closely.

Seeing no further comments, Acting Chairperson Oliver moved to the executive session.

**Executive Session [6:38:31 PM](#)**

Commissioner Harding noted she concurred with Commissioner Richards' and Funk's comments on the secondary option of a detached garage and smaller addition, thus creating a structure subservient to the primary residence.

Commissioner Davis stated he did not necessarily agree; it would seem like a continuous line of buildings.

Acting Chairperson Oliver noted that side elevation drawings could also be deceiving as they often appeared more massive than the built structure.

Commissioner Funk inquired how the Commission felt about Ms. Cromer's suggestion that the applicant place the garage doors on the north elevation.

Commissioner James noted he was sensitive to the applicant's desire to maintain a private yard area. He noted that he believed there were still options to explore which could meet this need; as proposed, the addition crowded the main building. He commended the applicant on the quality of his submittal and noted the Commission should work to encourage such investment. He noted that the applicant might consider turning the garage orientation or changing the site of the garage to yield a better option. He noted that working out the site issues and maintaining the relationship between the home and yard areas was exactly what would make the home more livable.

Commissioner Davis noted the primary objections to the addition were the massing and the garage doors facing Park Street. He inquired if moving two of the garage doors to the north side would be an option while maintaining one door on the west and eliminating some of the proposed approach width.

Acting Chairperson Oliver noted it seemed the Commission concurred that the massing and orientation of the addition were not appropriate as proposed and that alternate solutions existed. She inquired if the Commission might be amenable to forming an Architectural Subcommittee (ASC) to further consider the matter and not derail the applicant completely.

Mr. Paterson noted that an ASC was absolutely a possibility.

Commissioner James noted the Commission loved to see an applicant so willing to reinvest the time and effort into maintaining the property.

Commissioner Funk inquired if the applicant would be willing to work with an architectural subcommittee.

Acting Chairperson Oliver inquired if the Commission were willing to form one.

Several Commissioners indicated they were comfortable with the idea.

Acting Chairperson Oliver invited the applicant forward to inquire if he would be willing to work with the ASC. She noted that the ASC would work with the applicant to find an alternate solution and that any solution would have to come back before the full Commission for an approval.

Mr. Loewen stated he would be willing to work with the ASC. He inquired if the Commission could give a ruling regarding the front and corner side yard fence now. Mr. Loewen stated that if he could obtain approval from the Commission and staff he would work on constructing the fence in the meantime.

**Motion [6:52:02 PM](#)**

**Regarding Petition PLNHLC2011-00214, Commissioner Funk moved to create an Architectural Subcommittee to work with the applicant to reduce the mass of the building and come back to the Commission as a whole for their recommendation at a date yet to be determined.**

**Commissioner Harding seconded the motion.**

**Discussion of the Motion [6:52:50 PM](#)**

Commissioner Hart inquired how the Commission should then proceed on the applicant's proposal for the fence.

Mr. Nielson noted the Commission could break the request into parts and would recommend that the Commission make a separate motion and vote upon the fence. He noted the proposal did not need to be handled all under one motion.

Acting Chairperson Oliver inquired if there was any further discussion or volunteers for the ASC.

**Amendment to the Motion [6:53:58 PM](#)**

**Commissioner Davis noted he would suggest the motion be amended to state a motion to establish a subcommittee to work with the applicant regarding alternate designs.**

**Commissioner Funk accepted the proposed amendment. Commissioner Harding seconded the amendment.**

**Therefore, the amended motion states:**

**Regarding Petition PLNHLC2011-00214, Commissioner Funk moved to establish a subcommittee to work with the applicant regarding alternate designs and come back to the Commission as a**



**whole for their recommendation at a date yet to be determined. Commissioner Harding seconded the amended motion.**

Acting Chairperson called for a vote on the motion.

**Commissioners Bevins, Davis, Funk, Harding, Hart, James and Richards all voted, "Aye." The motion carries unanimously.**

Acting Chairperson Oliver called for subcommittee volunteers.

**Commissioners James, Davis and Funk all volunteered to serve on the Architectural Subcommittee.**

#### **Discussion of the Fence [6:55:50 PM](#)**

Commissioner Funk inquired if the Commission should entertain a motion regarding the demolition aspects of the petition.

It was noted Mr. Loewen indicated earlier he was not seeking this approval without an approved design.

Acting Chairperson Oliver noted that it appeared the Commission agreed that recreating the original fence was a wonderful idea, however, the Commission should decide upon an appropriate height.

Commissioner James stated that a three foot fence would still serve as an inferred barrier. He noted that if there were real concerns regarding safety that might be addressed, however, aesthetically and functionally speaking, even three foot pickets inferred a semi-private zone between the home and street.

Commissioner Richards noted he disagreed. He stated the area did get a great deal of foot traffic and didn't feel the extra foot would ruin things in terms of appearance. He noted there was also a grade drop off on the west elevation.

Acting Chairperson Oliver stated that it seemed any fence would prove against intrusion and that the rear, higher privacy fence would prove an even greater deterrent to those seeking to cut across the yard.

Commissioner Harding stated that the applicant was attempting to recreate what had been present before and it would be a shame to create a stunted appearance by erroneously assuming the fence was three feet.

Acting Chairperson Oliver recognized Mr. Loewen for a comment.

Mr. Loewen noted he would find forty inches acceptable as well; this would allow for an easier constructed reproduction in terms of materials.

There was further discussion as to material detailing.

Commissioner Hart inquired if the applicant wished to use Trex.

Mr. Loewen stated he would love to use it if allowed. He asked that the Commission consider allowing it on the fence bottom rail at the least for reasons of durability.

Commissioner James stated that he had seen more broken vinyl fences than anything and these alternate materials did not seem to hold up well to lawnmowers or rocks.



**Second Motion [7:06:44 PM](#)**

**In the case of Petition PLNHLC2011-00214, Commissioner Hart moved to approve the petition to build the fence along 900 South and Park Street as proposed, up to 40 inches, out of wood, but leaving details to staff.**

**Commissioner Harding suggested “details” could include the consideration of TREX (composite) for the ledger board at the bottom of the fence.**

**Commissioner Hart accepted the condition as an amendment.**

**Commissioner James seconded the motion.**

**Discussion of the Motion [7:07:44 PM](#)**

Commissioner Richards noted the motion should clarify the 40 inch height limit.

Commissioner Hart noted 40 inches would be the highest point from the sidewalk.

**Commissioner Richards suggested an amendment to state “from the adjacent existing grade”.**

Commissioner Hart inquired what this meant.

Commissioner Richards noted a fair reference was required as the sidewalk might be a couple of inches lower than the adjacent grade at any given point.

**Commissioner Hart amended the motion to state, “40 inches from the adjacent existing grade”.**

Mr. Paterson requested clarification regarding the varying picket height.

Commissioner James believed the forty inches would be to the top of the tallest picket.

**Commissioner Hart noted she would agree to 42 inches to the top of the highest picket.**

Mr. Nielson noted that from a procedural point the amendments should be accepted and seconded.

**Commissioner Hart accepted the proposed amendments and Commissioner James seconded.**

*Therefore the amended motion states:*

**In the case of Petition PLNHLC2011-00214, Commissioner Hart moved to approve the petition to build the fence along 900 South and Park Street as proposed, up to 42 inches from the adjacent existing grade to the top of the tallest pickets, out of wood, but leaving details, including the consideration of TREX (composite) for the ledger board at the bottom of the fence, to staff.**

**All seconded by Commissioner James.**

Acting Chairperson Oliver called for a vote on the motion.

**Commissioners Bevins, Davis, Funk, Harding, Hart, James and Richards all voted, “Aye”. The motion carries unanimously.**

## **PUBLIC HEARINGS [7:10:36 PM](#)**

### **PLNHLC2011-00390, 876 East 4<sup>th</sup> Avenue, Certificate of Appropriateness for Major Alterations –**

A request by James Carroll, architect, for major alterations to a single family residence located at 876 East 4<sup>th</sup> Avenue, Salt Lake City. The request is for an addition to the rear of the property, increasing the current roof height to the rear to create accommodation on two levels. The property is located in the Avenues Historic District and the SR-1A (Special Development Pattern Residential) zoning district, in City Council District 3, represented by Stan Penfold. (Staff contact: Carl Leith, 801-535-7758, [carl.leith@slcgov.com](mailto:carl.leith@slcgov.com).)

### **Staff Presentation [7:11:04 PM](#)**

Mr. Leith reviewed the request. He noted the applicant proposed to construct a second story addition to the rear of the home while maintaining the present footprint. Mr. Leith noted that the front façade faced Fourth Avenue, but also contained a narrow frontage along ‘O’ Street with a garage facing the street. Mr. Leith reviewed current and historic elevation photographs, drawings and sections for the Commission as well as photographs of surrounding structures. He noted the increase in maximum height for the addition was limited to approximately one foot. Mr. Leith stated that the home dated to approximately 1890 and was considered contributing, with substantial alterations. He noted that the home had likely undergone further substantial alterations during the 1970s and 1980s after receiving contributing status; particularly to the east wing and rear of the building.

Mr. Leith noted a comment had been received from the public regarding the request after the staff report had been published. (A copy of that email has been kept with the record of these minutes.) Mr. Leith noted the email stated the neighbors were concerned about the loss of their view and privacy in their yard.

Mr. Leith stated staff found the proposal was in keeping with the design standards and the guidelines. He noted that the only concern of staff was the slight lift of the rear section of the home higher than the front of the home. He noted this was something staff would normally not approve, however the configuration of the lot presented particular design challenges; therefore, staff felt the proposal should be reviewed by the Commission.

### **Questions from the Commission [7:19:30 PM](#)**

Commissioner Harding inquired if the increase in height would be visible from the street.

Mr. Leith noted it would be visible primarily in approaching the northeast elevation.

Seeing no further questions, Acting Chairperson Oliver invited the applicant forward to speak.

### **Applicant Presentation [7:20:32 PM](#)**

James Carroll, project architect, noted he had nothing to add to staff’s presentation but could answer any questions. He stated he thought it was difficult to perceive how visible the addition would be as it would be set far back on the home. He noted it was likely one would catch glimpses of the addition walking along Fourth Avenue and on ‘O’ Street.

### **Questions from the Commission [7:21:33 PM](#)**

There was a brief discussion regarding the existing tax photo. Commissioner Hart and Acting Chairperson Oliver concluded the home had likely been more heavily altered than anyone realized and that the front portion of the home not being altered by the request may have actually been a later addition to the home, built in the 1970s or 80s.

Commissioner Richards noted there had been a letter of concern from the neighbors and inquired if the applicant had considered building out instead of up as suggested in the letter.

Susie Wiet, the property owner, noted she had spoken with the neighbors in question before beginning the process and had approached them with the plans recently. She noted they could have looked at adding on to their home elsewhere, but they had invested a great deal into the landscaping. She noted that the option of building back on the lot might create an even greater sense of enclosure as it would limit the open space behind their neighbor's home.

Commissioner James inquired if there were any other updates or modifications planned besides the rear addition.

Ms. Wiet noted the only plan for now was to construct the rear addition.

Seeing no further questions from the Commission and no one present from the public to speak to the matter, Acting Chairperson Oliver moved the issue to executive session.

### **Executive Session [7:25:49 PM](#)**

Commissioner James noted his concern that the rear east wing of the home seemed to have become significant in its own right, establishing the plate height. He noted that even if it was not original, it was sensitive regarding the original scale of the home. Commissioner James stated he felt "popping the top" of the home would be uncharacteristic of the existing home. He noted that traditionally, a one story home of this character would be further developed as a one and a half story home, not as a two story home. He indicated the Commission might instead consider granting some flexibility in allowing the applicant to alter the entire roofline and come up with a solution more in keeping with the current home.

Commissioner Hart inquired if the home was still considered contributing.

Mr. Leith noted it was.

Acting Chairperson Oliver inquired if it was considered contributing in the more recent survey of the Avenues as well.

Mr. Leith noted it was. He stated there was a note in the staff report regarding this issue.

Commissioner Funk noted she agreed most of the remaining character of the original home would be lost with the new addition and it would be possible to come up with a more appropriate plan.

Commissioner Richards disagreed, noting that in order to make it appear more appropriate, it would probably require raising the roof height by several feet. He noted the elevation drawings were not able to convey perspective very well and the addition would actually be setback from the front façade by 20 to 25 feet. He noted that during the field visit it was difficult to see any of the side elevations from the street and the addition would likely not be very visible.

Ms. Wiet stated that when she originally saw the design she felt that front corner did look massive, however, the main roofline would be maintained and the addition would likely look much smaller than the drawings indicated because the setback couldn't be perceived.

Commissioner James inquired if the Commission should be concerned about the existing character of the home being altered.

Commissioner Richards noted he felt the character had already been substantially altered in the 1970s and 80s.

Commissioner Harding stated that most historic buildings experienced additions over time and staff found that the proposal was within the realm of what was appropriate.

Commissioner James concurred that a home can change and grow over time; however, suggested the proposed addition represented a modification which would not work to enhance the existing character of the home. Commissioner James noted he felt there should be a more sensitive way to do so.

Mr. Carroll stated there was a similarly executed and beautiful addition to a home on 'O' Street, however, that home had more height to work with at the time they completed their addition. He noted that if there were an exception the Commission could make to allow the roofline to be built higher it might be possible.

Commissioner James stated that the earlier addition was significant, if not in terms of age, then in its scale and proportion to the home.

Acting Chairperson Oliver noted the side wing of the house appeared to be the only original portion; the front gable end of the home was in fact a later addition from the 1970s. She stated two main points to be considered should be, firstly; the home was still considered contributing and while that might be a point for later debate, the design should respect the current home; secondly; the proposed design should not impact that character too much. She noted the Commission could consider forming another architectural committee to address this issue should they choose to do so.

Commissioner James inquired after Standard 8.5 which indicated an addition should respect the established massing and orientation of a historic building. He noted the established massing should be preserved and didn't feel this proposal achieved that objective.

Commissioner Davis concurred with Commissioner Richards' earlier point that the perspective drawings were deceptive. He noted he was comfortable with the proposal as it was, particularly because the addition would be set back at least 20 feet on the home and not highly visible.

Commissioner Hart noted the east face of the home was not very visible from any elevation; it was close to the adjacent property, set back from the sidewalk and obscured by several trees.

Acting Chairperson Oliver stated it seemed the most objectionable portion of the proposal was the left (east) dormer. She inquired if there was something that might be changed about that portion of the addition which could bring it more into character with the existing structure.

Commissioner James stated he was sensitive to the comments of the architect in that they were somewhat stuck in terms of maximizing the plate area and there was not much more to be done if the applicant wanted that interior room, however, the proposal did not fit with the home.

Commissioner Harding concurred with Acting Chairperson Oliver's earlier comment and noted the window on the proposed left front dormer was out of scale and character with the other windows on the front; perhaps a change to the window would go a long way towards improving the addition's relationship to the home.

Commissioner Funk inquired if the Commission had the power to approve additional height.

Mr. Leith noted that the proposed height was taken as a median from the surrounding block face. He stated he believed the Commission did have the power to approve additional height if requested.

Commissioner Davis noted the window on the left dormer also bothered him and regardless of particular elements, the home, again, had been substantially altered in the 70s and 80s and was not the same structure.

Commissioner James noted the window was one of the elements which bothered him, however, the gables should have end returns and the fascia or frieze board detailing should be repeated or respond to those elements somehow.

Acting Chairperson Oliver stated she felt the lower roof line to be more appropriate with a cottage style home. She noted that tweaking the window size and incorporating gable end returns could help to bring the addition more in line with the existing home.

**Motion [7:53:30 PM](#)**

**In the case of petition PLNHLC2011-00390, Commissioner Funk moved to continue the petition to allow the applicant to redesign of the front of the home according to their comments and return at a later date.**

#### **Discussion of the Motion**

Mr. Nielson noted the Commission should invite the applicant forward to first see if they would be amenable to changing their design and returning at a later date.

Acting Chairperson Oliver invited the applicant forward to speak and explained the motion.

Mr. Carroll stated the issue seemed simple and requested rather that the Commission consider approving the application with minor alterations to the design, incorporating certain characteristics. He noted that the dormer in question had been smaller in the original design and did have a steeper roof pitch matching the front gable. He noted that it was possible to redesign the front dormer to keep with the existing front dormer and add gable end returns.

Commissioner Funk stated she did not feel the Commission could approve those changes without first seeing them.

Commissioner Davis stated that the Commission could move to allow staff to approve any redesign of the front façade.

Mr. Nielson inquired if there had been a second on the motion.

**Acting Chairperson Oliver called for a second on the motion.**

**No one seconded the first motion. The motion failed.**

**Second Motion** [7:59:12 PM](#)

**In the case of petition PLNHLC2011-00390, Commissioner Davis moved that the Commission concur with the staff recommendation to approve the request with the exception of the north facing dormer on the second floor, requesting that the design be altered in terms of window size and the dormer pitch, leaving final approval of that modification to staff, consistent with these comments.**

**Commissioner Hart seconded the motion.**

**Discussion of the Motion**

Commissioner Funk expressed her doubts this would do enough to preserve the integrity of the front façade.

Seeing no further comments, Acting Chairperson Oliver called for a vote.

**Commissioners Bevins, Davis, Harding, Hart and Richards voted, “Aye”. Commissioners Funk and James voted, “Nay”. The motion carries, 5-2.**

**OTHER BUSINESS** [8:01:19 PM](#)

Acting Chairperson Oliver noted the other business for the evening was the election of a new chair and vice chair

The Commission discussed the process and options briefly.

Commissioner Davis inquired what the chair did and what the time commitment was.

Mr. Paterson noted that the time commitment outside of the meetings was not significantly greater for the chair and vice chair; outside of an occasional meeting or phone call to discuss the upcoming agenda, it would not affect them.

Mr. Nielson noted the chair had quite a bit of control over the process in the meeting. He stated the chair could not vote except to break a tie but could limit comments or allow speakers more time and so forth.

Polly Hart volunteered for vice chair. She nominated Anne Oliver for chairperson.

Commissioner Hart inquired if anyone else wished to run.

No one else stepped forward.

**Motion** [8:08:34 PM](#)

**Commissioner Funk moved to elect Commissioner Oliver as Chair and Polly Hart as Vice Chair of the Historic Landmark Commission for the upcoming year.**

**Commissioner Davis seconded the motion.**

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

*Hereafter, Anne Oliver will be acknowledged as Chairperson and Polly Hart as Vice Chair for the term lasting August 2011 to August 2012.*

**Vice Chairperson Hart moved to adjourn.**

**There was no objection.**

**The meeting stood adjourned at [8:09:09 PM](#).**

---

Cecily Zuck, Historic Landmark Commission Secretary