

SALT LAKE CITY
HISTORIC LANDMARK COMMISSION
Minutes of the Meeting
Room 326, 451 South State Street
May 5, 2011

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

A regular meeting of the Historic Landmark Commission was called to order on Thursday, May 5, 2011, at 5:53:21 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, Chairperson Warren Lloyd, Vice Chairperson Anne Oliver and Commissioner Dave Richards. Commissioner Creed Haymond was excused from the meeting.

Planning staff present for the meeting were Cheri Coffey, Assistant Planning Director; Janice Lew, Senior Planner; Carl Leith, Senior Planner; Ray Milliner, Principal Planner; Joel Paterson, Planning Manager and Cecily Zuck, Senior Secretary.

FIELD TRIP 4:30 PM

Commissioners Bevins, Davis, Funk, Hart, James, Chairperson Lloyd, Vice Chairperson Oliver, and Commissioner Richards were all present on the field trip. Planning staff present were Joel Paterson, Planning Manager and Ray Milliner, Principal Planner.

PLNHLC2010-00791: Mr. Milliner reviewed the proposal to modify the project previously granted by HLC in January of 2011. Staff noted the proposed modification would allow a composite bar-tile roof instead of the asphalt roof originally proposed. The Commissioners inquired after the style of the proposed tile, the reason for the request and other details of the original approval not related to the evening's proposal.

WORK SESSION 5:22:19 PM

Chairperson Lloyd recognized Carl Leith to discuss revisions to the design guidelines as outlined in the memo attached to these minutes.

Mr. Leith reviewed the revised format for the Commission. He noted each guideline now included a character definition and a design objective preceding the guideline text for additional clarity. Mr. Leith stated staff's intent was to model all the guidelines; residential, commercial and signage, in this manner. Mr. Leith noted staff would be proposing work sessions in the next several months to review the newly revised guidelines with the Commission and other public bodies involved in the process.

Chairperson Lloyd inquired if staff had a sense of the level of support from Council and the City Administration concerning the guidelines.

Mr. Leith stated both entities seemed to be well aware of the necessity of adopting the new and revised guidelines as well as in supporting the initiation of a conservation district tool and a preservation philosophy statement. Mr. Leith noted that between these tasks, there was quite a bit for staff to accomplish in the coming months.

Commissioner James inquired if staff felt design guideline specifications would change according to their different geographic locations and if it wouldn't rather make more sense to revise guidelines to relate to a particular streetscape or place.

Mr. Leith concurred it would make sense for the guidelines to be centered on sense of place.

Commissioner James noted that doing so would provide the opportunity to describe what elements made an area or location work as a significant resource and highlight the relationship to its surroundings and its livability, noting how it could remain sustainable.

Mr. Leith stated the current Residential Design Guidelines could improve upon these points and certainly needed to further illustrate how preservation was at the forefront of sustainability.

Commissioner James thanked staff for the revised format and noted he believed it was a step in the right direction towards a more cohesive, understandable document.

Mr. Leith concurred and noted the new format provided more an overview than the previous document, therefore granting a better sense of overall intent, so even if a specific guideline did not precisely meet the circumstances of a particular case, the user would better understand which direction to take.

Commissioner Bevins inquired if the City would be using the consultant which created the Commercial Design Guideline Draft for these revisions.

Mr. Leith noted staff would be revising the guidelines in house.

Seeing no further comments from the Commission, Chairperson Lloyd recognized Joel Paterson to provide a Preservation Plan update.

Mr. Paterson stated staff had hoped City Council would consider public comment on the plan sometime during the month of May, but a date certain was yet to be determined. He noted the Council also wished for the Commission to adopt a preservation vision statement before their final consideration of the plan. Mr. Paterson noted the Commission would review the first draft of that statement after their public hearing.

Mr. Paterson noted that Mr. Sommerkorn had begun meeting with several key individuals in the City and State Legislature to discuss the designation process for new historic districts as well as craft a strategy to approach the Legislature at its next session regarding preservation.

Commissioners Richards and James both noted they had concerns regarding inconsistencies in the draft philosophy statement.

Commissioner James inquired how the statement could better promote the concept that historic preservation truly protected a community's sense of place, or how the Commission could provide incentives to citizens who maintained their historic properties.

Mr. Paterson noted Commissioner James concern was also one of staff. He noted staff and CED Administration were currently examining potential incentives for citizens in local historic districts to maintain their properties.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES from April 6, 2011 was moved to “Other Business” at the end of the agenda by Chairperson Lloyd.

REPORT OF THE CHAIR AND VICE CHAIR [5:54:51 PM](#)

Chairperson Lloyd recognized Mr. Paterson for comment.

Mr. Paterson noted this was the first time the Commission was meeting in Room 326. He also recognized the change in the Commission’s meeting day from the first Wednesday of the month to the first Thursday.

PUBLIC COMMENTS [5:55:49 PM](#)

Cindy Cromer, 816 East 100 South, noted that City Administration was moving forward with a proposal regarding a bike path on 200 South which would extend into the University Historic District. Ms Cromer asked that the Commission request any related proposal which came before staff requiring a Certificate of Appropriateness be reviewed by the Commission in a public hearing.

Esther Hunter, 606 Trolley Square, representing the East Central and University Community Councils noted the park medians at 1200 East and 200 South were considered significant landscape site features within the original National Register Nomination for the University Neighborhood District. Ms Hunter noted these medians would be affected by the project previously mentioned by Ms Cromer. Ms Hunter noted that while the islands had evolved over time from lawn spaces to include trees and improved curbing, they were significant features in their own right and should be treated as such. The document Ms. Hunter provided for the Commission is attached following these minutes.

Chairperson Lloyd inquired if the Planning Division currently had a staff member assigned to the project.

Mr. Paterson noted staff was aware of the project, but as a Certificate of Appropriateness had not yet been requested, no one was assigned to review it. He stated that if the Commission chose to do so, staff would bring the issue to the full Commission once the City came forward with a request.

Commissioner Harding inquired how the proposal would alter the existing islands.

Mr. Paterson apologized, stating he was not currently aware of how the proposal would affect the islands.

Commissioner Hart noted she believed the City planned to place a bike and pedestrian path through the center of them.

Commissioner Richards noted the proposal was posted on the Open City Hall Public Forum online and had received several comments, all of which were available for the Commission to review.

Commissioner Funk moved that the Commission request the project come before the Historic Landmark Commission for a public hearing. Commissioner Hart seconded the motion. Commissioners Bevins, Davis, Funk, Harding, Hart, James, Vice Chairperson Oliver and Commissioner Richards all voted, “Aye”. The motion carries unanimously.

PUBLIC HEARING [6:03:09 PM](#)

PLNHLC2010-00791 Western Garden Center - A request by Western Garden Center represented by Ken Stuart to amend a previous HLC approval for an addition to the front facade, to allow a ceramic tile roof at 550 South 600 East. The subject property is located in the CN (Neighborhood Commercial) zone in Council District 4, represented by Luke Garrott. (Staff contact: Ray Milliner at 801-535-7645 or ray.milliner@slcgov.com)

Staff Presentation

Chairperson Lloyd recognized Mr. Milliner as staff representative.

Mr. Milliner noted the request was an alteration to an addition plan that had been approved by HLC in January of 2011. He noted staff and the applicant had agreed upon all subsequent details except for the roofing material. Mr. Milliner noted the original design called for an asphalt shingle roof, but the applicant now wished to install a ceramic tile roof and tile was not a traditional material in the Central City Historic District. He stated staff was therefore not comfortable approving the request administratively.

Questions from the Commission [6:06:14 PM](#)

Commissioner Harding inquired what roof forms were present on the buildings at Trolley Square.

Mr. Milliner noted most of the buildings at Trolley Square had flat roofs and therefore had membrane systems installed.

Commissioner James inquired if the tiles were ceramic or another material.

Mr. Milliner stated he believed it was not ceramic tile and that the applicant could clarify.

Mark Davidson, the applicant's contractor, noted the proposed product was a composite material which mimicked a traditional bar tile.

Chairperson Lloyd noted there were no further questions from the Commission and recognized the applicant.

Applicant Presentation [6:08:19 PM](#)

Lee Pettit, the property owner, noted they preferred this material for its appearance. He noted that bar tile roofs, while uncommon, were not completely absent from the area.

Vice Chairperson Oliver inquired if the proposed shingles came in different profiles or mimicked the appearance of other, more traditional materials.

Mr. Pettit noted that there were other options.

Mr. Davidson stated they came in several different profiles and there was an option which more closely mimicked a wood shingle.

Commissioner Funk inquired if the applicant had considered installing a metal roof more closely matching the appearance of the existing aluminum siding on the building.

The owner noted they had originally proposed installing a metal roof after deciding against asphalt shingles, but it was considered an inappropriate material by staff.

Mr. Milliner noted metal roofs were considered inappropriate according to the Residential Design Guidelines and the HLC Policy Document.

Commissioner Richards inquired which style of bar tile the applicant proposed to use.

Mr. Pettit noted it was a flat style which mimicked a slate shingle.

Commissioner Bevins inquired if the applicant's intent was to make the appearance of the addition more akin to its intended use as a reception center.

Mr. Pettit stated, yes, this was their intent.

Public Comments [6:13:24 PM](#)

Cindy Cromer, 816 East 100 South, noted she was troubled by the proposal as the building was considered contributory and she did not believe the addition approved by the Commission was compatible with the existing contributing structure. She noted her dilemma that the proposal did not move the addition any closer to that status and she did not feel a metal roof would be inappropriate on a mid-century modern building such as this now appeared to be.

Seeing no one else present to speak to the application, Chairperson Lloyd closed the public hearing. Noting that the applicant did not wish to respond, Chairperson Lloyd moved to executive session.

Executive Session [6:17:31 PM](#)

Commissioner James stated he did not believe it would be inappropriate, considering the style of the remainder of the structure, to install a standing seam metal roof. He noted that based upon the provided drawings, the addition was reminiscent of several styles but not true to any particular one.

Commissioner Funk concurred that even though a metal roof might grant a more appropriate appearance to the structure, it might not be the best solution for the district. She noted perhaps an asphalt shingle or ceramic tile roof was more appropriate for the district.

Commissioner Harding suggested the Commission consider forming an Architectural Subcommittee and examine the issue further.

Commissioner Richards questioned the building's contributory status; perhaps the status had been lost when the current concrete block addition had been constructed. He noted that regardless of the material, it was the roof form which affected the appearance most and therefore, he did not take issue with the installation of either a metal or bar tile roof.

Applicant Response [6:25:07 PM](#)

Lee Pettit, owner of Western Garden Center, noted that the intent was to allow the ivy to continue to grow on the wall. He noted that the windows would have a similar appearance to the windows on the 'Lion House' at 63 E South Temple Street.

Chairperson Lloyd inquired if the originally proposed metal roof would still be preferred to the bar tile.

Mr. Pettit noted their current intent was to create an appearance similar to the proposed metal roof with a bar tile composite.

There was continued discussion among the Commission regarding whether or not the addition should be considered contributing or non-contributing and which standards to apply. Several Commissioners noted that an Architectural Subcommittee might be useful in reviewing the addition.

Mr. Paterson reminded the Commission that the proposed addition had already been approved on January 5, 2011 and it was only the roof material which the Commission was now reviewing.

Mr. Milliner noted that the applicant had also obtained a building permit to construct the addition; the only item at question was the material for the roof.

Chairperson Lloyd noted detailing for a tile roof was not apparent in current drawings.

Commissioner Richards noted he did not see a significant difference between an asphalt shingle roof and a slate style tile roof.

Commissioner Davis noted that all proposed materials would look like slate and if the Commission considered this to be a non-contributing addition, either material would meet Standard 3.

Vice Chairperson Oliver concurred that any of the proposed materials could be considered acceptable according to the standards. She noted that it was a gable roof which required some type of shingle application. Vice Chairperson Oliver noted that a metal shingle roof might be much more appropriate.

Commissioner Richards noted that under Section 8 for additions he did not see any language referring specifically to standing seam metal roofing. He stated that some of the earlier comments about detailing returned to a common complaint of the Commission regarding improved submittal standards.

Commissioner Funk stated she believed a standing seam metal roof would be appropriate.

Chairperson Lloyd inquired if the Commission had a recommendation or motion.

Commissioner James requested the applicant provide more detail regarding the addition.

Mr. Pettit noted that he did not have specific information available, however, the project had been submitted to Building Services and permitted, the framing was complete and the addition was nearly done except for the roofing which depended upon the Commission's decision.

MOTION [6:50:14 PM](#)

Vice Chairperson Oliver moved to disagree with staff findings, because the Commission finds the addition to not be a character defining or contributing part of the building, but as a non-contributing addition; therefore, Standard 1 does not apply; Standard 2 does not apply; Standard 3, all sites, structures and objects shall be recognized as products of their own time, applies, as the use of a ceramic tile roof on this building is a product of its own time, it would speak to this period of architecture; Standard 5 does not apply as the Commission considers this new construction or a non-contributing addition; Standards 6 and 7 do not apply; Standard 8 applies, this design is compatible with the size, scale, color, material and character of the property, neighborhood and environment and is therefore an appropriate treatment.

Commissioner Richards seconded the motion.

Commissioners Davis, Funk, Harding, Hart, Vice Chairperson Oliver and Commissioner Richards voted, "Aye". Commissioner Bevins voted, "Nay". Commissioner James abstained from the vote. The motion carries, 6-1 and with one vote in abstention.

Chairperson Lloyd noted that the proposal was approved according to the motion.

Mr. Milliner inquired if the approved material was ceramic tile or metal shingles.

Chairperson Lloyd noted the approval was for the proposed ceramic tile.

OTHER BUSINESS [6:52:15 PM](#)

Chairperson Lloyd noted that the minutes of April 6, 2011 had not been approved and inquired if the Commission had any comments or a motion for approval.

Vice Chairperson Oliver moved to approve the minutes.

Commission Harding seconded the motion.

Commissioners Bevins, Davis, Harding, James, Vice Chairperson Oliver and Commissioner Richards all voted, "Aye". Commissioners Hart and Funk abstained from the vote as they were not present that day. The minutes of April 6, 2011 stand approved as written, 6-0 and with two votes in abstention.

Chairperson Lloyd recognized Joel Paterson to discuss the Commission's ideas for a future Salt Lake City Preservation Philosophy Statement.

Mr. Paterson noted a draft document had been included in the packet for the Commission's consideration and staff wished to hear the Commission's comments on the matter.

Commissioner Funk noted particular errors to be corrected and suggested insertions to improve the draft document's strength and clarity.

Vice Chairperson Oliver noted that as a statement it was not very compelling. She noted that the level of detail on certain points was not appropriate. Vice Chairperson Oliver stated that the philosophy statement itself did not need to be so detailed and could be more of a mission statement.

Commissioner Davis inquired if Vice Chairperson Oliver had specific ideas to this end.

Vice Chairperson Oliver noted that there was language in the original Preservation Plan draft which might serve the document well.

Commissioner James noted the statement isolated preservation from redevelopment and noted it should address the fact that preservation was a strong, proactive tool for bringing redevelopment to the forefront and reinvigorating the City. He stated that the statement also did not address how preservation was a piece of the overall development of the City.

Vice Chairperson Oliver stated that it seemed the Council was now gun shy after the Yalecrest issue, but the document should be used in a positive manner.

Commissioner Funk concurred and stated she believed the statement should be more positive about what could be accomplished with preservation.

Commissioner Richards concurred and noted that the jargon was very technical as well; if the target audience was meant to be district property owners, they would only see regulation and governmental interference.

Vice Chairperson Oliver noted that Salt Lake City was a very unique city in the West. She stated that the philosophy statement should be broader and convey the unique nature of place.

Commissioner James inquired how the City might reach out to different professional groups about aligning cultural and physical aspects throughout the City through preservation. He noted that this collaboration might also help eventually inform the crafting of the design guidelines or the City's master plans. Commissioner James noted preservation needed to move forward with something less abstract to engage groups within the Community and align future development around.

Commissioner Funk concurred. She stated that the word 'pride' needed to be included, that the City should take pride in its culture and resources, a kind of pride that was evident in other cities and lacking in Salt Lake.

Commissioner Davis concurred with Vice Chairperson Oliver's assessment that the document was not compelling; it also lacked positivity. He noted the word 'burden' should be completely eliminated from the document. Commissioner Davis stated while it was true there were additional costs when rehabilitating historic properties, there were tax credits as compensation and increased property values as an end result.

Commissioner Harding proposed that Vice Chairperson Oliver work with staff to draft a statement more in line with the aforementioned comments.

Vice Chairperson Oliver noted she would be happy to help staff, but felt that much of this language was already available for use in the Preservation Plan draft.

Commissioner Richards noted the compensations listed in the document for historic property ownership should be removed from the philosophy statement and reused as a separate publication for property owners and applicants.

Chairperson Lloyd noted there was no further business to discuss.

Commissioner Hart moved to adjourn. Commissioner James seconded the motion. There was no objection. The meeting adjourned at [7:12:42 PM](#).