

SALT LAKE CITY HISTORIC LANDMARK COMMISSION

Minutes of the Meeting Room 326, 451 South State Street October 20, 2011

This document along with the digital recording constitute the official minutes of the Historic Landmark Commission regular session meeting held on October 20, 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, October 20, 2011, at [5:32:49 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 Chairperson, Anne Oliver, Vice Chair, Polly Hart, Dave Richards, Stephen James, Earle Bevins III, and Bill Davis. Commissioner' Arla Funk and Sheleigh Harding were excused.

Planning staff present for the meeting included Cheri Coffey, Assistant Planning Director; Joel Paterson, Planning Manager, Carl Leith, Senior Planner; Janice Lew, Senior Planner, Elizabeth Reining, Principal Planner, Ray Milliner, Principal Planner; and Michelle Moeller, Senior Secretary. City Attorney Paul Nielson was also present.

FIELD TRIP

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

724 East 4th Avenue- The commission asked questions about the proposed addition and whether the addition would be visible from the street. They asked about materials and building height.

Ronald McDonald House Expansion- Staff explained the proposed project which would include a 15' height exception. Staff explained the finding that the Commission would have to make in order to approve the additional height. Staff explained the existing zoning surrounding the site.

DINNER

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

ADMINISTRATIVE BUSINESS [5:33:06 PM](#)

Mr. Frank Gray, CED Director, reported on the Philosophy Statement for the Historic Preservation Plan. He stated he viewed the preservation of the Salt Lake Valley as the celebration of the valley's growing up and to him it was really what the City was trying to do with Historic Preservation. He spoke of the native populations, the Europeans-Spanish, Trappers, LDS, etc. and the influence they had on the city. He said there was a need to celebrate the past and the future by acknowledging trends less than 50 years old and subdivision patterns such as those in Yalecrest. Mr. Gray stated the philosophy statement needed to be broader to state the purpose of what the City wanted to celebrate. He reviewed the importance to preserve form and structures as well as the character of neighborhoods. He discussed the creation of a "tool box" containing local designations, design guidelines, ordinances for historic areas and other information necessary to make decisions regarding these areas. Mr. Gray reviewed the needed language changes to the guidelines and the ordinance clarifying the requirements versus the suggested guidelines for projects lessening the confusion of applicants and staff. Mr. Gray spoke of the importance of implementing Character Conservation Districts and training all City Departments on the importance of preservation. He stated it was the job of all City Departments to work together in preserving the history of Salt Lake City and not just the responsibility of the Historic Landmark Commission and its staff.

Ms. Cheri Coffey, Assistant Planning Director, said Staff was working with the City Council on the Preservation Plan to make it more direct and contain more policies. She explained there were many ways the City implemented historic preservation whether it was through places such as the Fisher Mansion or the Housing Division programs and that the new plan would encompass all of those things.

Mr. Gray stated he also thought there were a lot of fun cultural things that could be recognized as historical. He gave the example of the old oak tree in Scottsdale Arizona. He stated landmarks such as the tree need to be researched and discovered locally.

Chairperson Anne Oliver thanked Mr. Gray and said she thought the Commissioners now understood that the City had stepped back, thought through the process, taken an overall approach to not just preservation but how it fit in with everything and how it was one of the foundation stones of any City.

Mr. Gray stated the City considered the process from a consumers stand point and reviewed the lengthy review process that had been taken in the past to approve projects, following distinctive guidelines, could be approved administratively. He stated allowing Staff to make those types of decisions would give people a positive feel about historic preservation and encourage them to keep the original look and feel of the areas rather than go around the process and lose the character of the neighborhoods and homes.

Commissioner Richards asked if Staff was able to make the administrative decisions currently. He said one of the biggest complaints, as an architect, he heard when it came to small projects was that it took such a long time to get the permits and approvals.

Mr. Gray stated yes, the approval process was currently being used. He said an applicant was still required to check in at the planning counter at which time the permit process would be followed but the approval could be issued sooner if the project followed certain criteria. Mr. Gray stated Staff's goal was to make the process easier but at the same time keep the historic character of the community. He said one of the goals in the next year was to create one page documents that would streamline the process for applicants and eventually have it available online.

Ms. Coffey stated the administrative approvals have been opened up in the last little while. She explained the review process.

PLNPCM2009-00628 Design Guidelines for Commercial Historic Properties [5:54:05 PM](#)

Ms. Janice Lew, Senior Planner stated Staff would like feedback on the fine tuning documents presented to the Commission. She stated staff anticipated presenting the entire document to the Historic Landmark Commission for public hearing and approval at the November 17th meeting. She said the new draft reflected the format of the document. Ms. Lew reviewed the layout of the document and the additions. She explained the photos and illustrations were not in final format. Ms. Lew explained the illustrations would illustrate the design guidelines and not restate the context of the document and the new format minimized the previous repetition. She said it was the Commission's decision as to how they would like to proceed, explained what staff was looking for were comments regarding substantive changes and she would be happy to take any corrections and suggestions.

Commissioner Richards stated there needed to be a more general statement before getting into the specifics and asked if there was something all ready in place.

Ms. Lew stated Staff started in the middle of the document and explained there would be a table of contents for each section of the document.

Commissioner Richards said on the sections where there was a design objective it seemed like it was a significant statement that needed to be in bold or somehow brought to the attention of the reader.

Commissioner James stated based on that idea it seemed like the big picture was left out or missed with focusing on the individual items. He asked how the process would be made important to people or how to make them understand that their property or project played into the overall process of creating a beautiful city. He stated the documents focused on the smaller

individual aspects such as retaining walls, roofs and windows but the issue was much larger. Commissioner James said he felt the character of place and helping individuals understand why windows and roof lines were important should be addressed. He suggested it could be done through the inclusion of a master plan with the identification of significant places, streets or districts and how they are all linked together instead of zooming right in on the more esoteric details. He said in order for people to understand and value historic preservation there needed to be an understanding of how it defined the city, that the character of the city defined how it was lived in and interacted with. Commissioner James stated if there could be something that explained the importance to it would become more accessible.

Chairperson Oliver asked if there was an introduction to the document that was yet to be written or was the present document chapter one.

Ms. Lew stated there was a complete overview of the program and its purpose. She stated the Commission would have a chance to review that information at a later date.

Chairperson Oliver asked if it would address the big picture, why preservation was important and who should be using the guidelines, layout, etc.

Ms. Lew stated the introduction would address those items.

Chairperson Oliver stated the residential guidelines integrated Commissioner James thoughts and concerns beautifully and should be used as a pattern for the subject document. She said the introduction would help to answer some of the question of “why” and “how” as well as talk someone through the idea of preservation. Chairperson Oliver stated in the residential guidelines, at the head of each section, the short purpose statement that addressed the “why” and suggested having something similar incorporated into the Commercial Design Guidelines.

Ms. Lew clarified that the Commission was suggesting that there needed to be more of a “why” in the character defining section.

Chairperson Oliver stated even within them, because as people use the guidelines they tend to skip the introduction or start at the back and flip through to the section that pertains to their project therefore, missing the introduction. She said the information could be added without being overly repetitious, may be just a sentence or two to say “why” and tie it to the bigger picture.

Commissioner James said it needed something to state why the standards were important.

Ms. Coffey asked if an example would be, retaining the characteristic of the store front was important because the store front does this, and then list the specifics as to what it did.

Chairperson Oliver stated that was correct and it happened to some extent, in the Commercial Design Guidelines, but the way it was written there are a bunch of different sentences stuck together and the paragraphs are not well crafted. She explained it had been a problem since the documents were written by the Consultant and that the purpose of the revision was to correct those issues.

Commissioner James stated it was not just an isolated issue. He said one couldn't just focus on store front it had to connect the street pattern to the store front and the desire for car location and pedestrian activity. He stated the language evolved from the way people interacted with buildings. Commissioner James said in a traditional context street and store front were critical if activity on the street was desired. He said it helped to link all the aspects together instead of isolating and fragmenting them into specific architectural elements.

Ms. Coffey asked if an example would be, characteristics of the historic commercial area are defined by the fact that the buildings are set to the street, have a sidewalk, lighting etc.

Commissioner James stated yes that was the idea. He said signage and how it is perceived worked into it. He said all of it work together to make the finished product.

Commissioner Bevins stated the document addressed the Commission's concerns on page 49.

Commissioner James stated the section described how it evolved historically.

Chairperson Oliver asked Commissioner James to suggest what he would add. She said she understood what he was saying but how did it happen.

Commissioner James stated he was thinking of it in terms of how parking, sidewalk location and entrances were addressed. He said he would put some organized thoughts together and give them to staff.

Ms. Coffey and Ms. Lew said that would be wonderful and give them an idea of the direction to go.

Commissioner Richards reviewed the language that needed to be addressed to make the document more usable by a regular person that may not have knowledge of what some of the terms mean.

Chairperson Oliver stated the abstract language was needed but an example or reference photo to help explain the language would work similar to the residential guidelines.

Commissioner James said the word "restoration" was used in the guidelines and he wondered if "rehabilitation" should be used as well.

Ms. Lew stated the purpose was to lead people through the restoration process but if that was not feasible then other alternatives would be suggested.

Commissioner James asked for clarification on the differences between traditional designs versus designs for the time. He asked Commissioner Richards how one would approach that as an architect.

Commissioner Richards said it was similar to the use of the word “compatible” and that it was a gray area.

Chairperson Oliver stated the introduction gave the background of the Commercial Design Guidelines and explained when they were first written there was almost no reference to anything post-1940. She explained how Staff was working to incorporate mid-century ideals to clear the way for the 1970’s. She said it was hard to take the old text and change it to incorporate the broader picture. Chairperson Olive said yes, there was a lot of reference to tradition which she interpreted as meaning pre-1940 but now in a sense it was a leftover word. She stated there were other words in the document that needed to be addressed as well such as the difference between a site, a structure and a building as stated in previous meetings. She suggested using definitions in the national register information to keep the language consistent.

Ms. Lew clarified that an overall definition was to be used in the document.

Chairperson Oliver stated agreed, and stated that an alternative would be to use the terms consistently so that it was clear as to what was constituted as a building or a structure.

Commissioner James stated it gets particularly confusing in section 13 under new construction particularly in 13.4 and 13.5. He read the sections were the language conflicted and might lead one astray. He asked how critical the emphasis was on developing a product of its own time or trying to create a great place that was contextual.

Commissioner Richards stated he was not sure and gave the example of when he spent time in Fort Collins, CO and how the new and old buildings meshed together. He said the similar materials are the reference but the form and detailing might be different. Commissioner Richards stated it was still very clear that the new building was more contemporary while the materials tied the buildings together visually.

Commissioner James said it seems like that would be a better description. He stated the language needed to be more descriptive instead of using the words “traditional design” or “product of its own time” because those conjured up extremes.

Ms. Lew stated she would make the necessary changes to make the language reflect what was suggested.

Commissioner James stated it would make sense to just say what was meant instead of using a common phrase or terminology. He said the idea related to the residential guidelines as well and he would give his notes to Ms. Lew for reference.

Commissioner Bevins stated the glossary was included in the portion of this document that was given to the Commission in April 2010, and it should be reviewed, redefined or made clear.

Commissioner James asked if the glossary document was in the current meeting packet.

Commissioner Bevins stated it was not included in the current packet.

Chairperson Oliver asked if a glossary would be included in the document.

Ms. Lew stated a glossary would be included. Staff was working on how to package it and how reproductions of separate pieces would be handled.

Commissioner James asked about the use of fences in Commercial Historic Districts and said he couldn't think of any presently outside of formal residential uses that had taken on another uses over time.

Chairperson Oliver stated she knew of one on South Temple in front of the Thai restaurant where a metal fence defined the seating area and was now part of the streetscape. She asked if the Commission wanted to have language governing fences or outdoor seating for a restaurant.

Commissioner James stated most of that is dictated by the health department.

Ms. Coffey stated that liquor licensing requirements dictated the fencing requirements.

Chairperson Oliver stated the Commission needed to discuss fences further because she didn't think they were clearly considered especially where restaurants extend onto the street. She stated having restaurants with outdoor seating brought life onto the street but it needed to be addressed as far as the fencing, dining and lighting for that specific purpose. Chairperson Oliver said what happened to the furniture in the winter or at night and asked if the Commission wanted to dictate standards regarding those things.

Commissioner James asked about other building types not clearly addressed which are not traditional typology, such as gas stations, tire repair shops, etc. He said it seemed that the Commission should accept that the function of those types of buildings is different and decide what was acceptable and not acceptable in the traditional urban context.

Chairperson Oliver suggested language regulating types of buildings that are not a store front, including medical office buildings, could be listed under new construction. She said it would include businesses that were not selling anything, schools, hospitals, institutional buildings, fuel centers, automotive repair, etc. She stated the standards needed to acknowledge that the automobile industry played a major role transforming the city. She gave the example of the demolition of corner buildings for the installation of gas stations. Chairperson Oliver stated the introduction also needed to explain who used these standards.

Ms. Lew said the introduction would address those areas.

Chairperson Oliver asked if anyone had further comments. She asked the Commissioners to write their names on the documents they were giving Ms. Lew. She thanked Janice and said the document would be very useful when it was complete.

Ms. Lew stated she would review the comments and make the changes.

PLNHLC2011-00471 Revisions to the Residential Design Guidelines for Historic Districts and Landmark Sites [6:20:04 PM](#)

Mr. Carl Leith, Senior Planner reviewed the changes and updates to the Residential Design Guidelines as presented to the Commission. He explained a mailing for the open house was sent as the Commission asked and a few people attended the open house as a result. Mr. Leith reviewed the design, layout and format of the document. He reviewed the redesign of the original text, how the illustrations and captions would further identify the appropriate design approach and give additional detail in terms of example and application. Mr. Leith stated the overall new format of the document made it easier to read and gave more of a concise focus on the actual guidelines themselves and hopefully more illustrated material to back it up. He stated, as mentioned by Mr. Gray, Staff was working to remove the ordinance language from the guidelines to help eliminate confusion. Mr. Leith said the guidelines needed to be flexible rather than only allowing a yes or no decision. Mr. Leith stated the policy statements were to become the introductory argument for each design topic. He said he hoped the language became more informative and positive. Mr. Leith said the line drawing content will stay and the black and white photographs were replaced with color photos. He stated the next stage of the process would be to give a completed draft of the document to the Commission Members for review, have it available for the Open House on October 27, 2011 and present it to the Commission on November 3 for approval.

Commissioner Richards stated the new format with additional white space was more legible and graphic. He suggested a new page be started when a topic began at the bottom of a page. He said it may make the document larger but electronic versions would be available so it would not necessarily cause the use of more paper.

Mr. Leith stated spacing would be addressed when the fonts were finalized. He said where appropriate text would also be placed into the graphics column to keep subjects on the same page.

Commissioner Richards said when a new topic started higher up on the page it was not a problem but at the bottom of the page it was more of an issue. He said the design objective needed to be emphasized in some manner to indicate its importance. He said he assumed there was an introduction section to the document that was not included.

Mr. Leith stated that was correct, there was an introduction section.

Commissioner Hart stated the Commercial Design Guidelines had addresses with the pictures and the Residential Guideline pictures did not. She suggested adding the addresses to enable people to visit the buildings for reference.

Mr. Leith stated it could be done at the back of the document and that the argument could be made that the address detracted from the focus of the picture. He stated he would add the address if it was the direction of the Commission.

Commissioner Hart stated in Chapter 7, page 3, the description of the slate roof contained a run-on sentence.

Chairperson Oliver stated she liked the double column spacing but it still felt crowded. She suggested widening the center margin for a more spacious feel and making the pictures smaller. She said the additional information section should be in a predictable place such as always at the end of the section.

Mr. Leith stated he was working on a specific design to help identify the additional information box as well as the appropriate place to locate. He said he was also working to make the maintenance notes distinctive. He stated some of the captions were cut off and would be adjusted when the formatting was completed.

Commissioner James asked if Mr. Leith could address what Mr. Gray reported on; in terms of pulling out the standard from the guideline and what would be the standard versus how the guidelines support it. He asked would the standard relate to the zone in terms of roof height or what was the standard and how was it determined to be the right standard.

Ms. Coffey stated the standard was to try to retain the historic character and structure as much as possible. She stated the standards were in the Zoning Ordinance, the guidelines helped interpret the standards and how to apply the standards to specific cases.

Commissioner James stated that sounded cut and dry but it really was not because in almost every case there was always a modification to the historical structure. He said it might make sense to review the standard.

Mr. Leith stated that was certainly a good idea and the Secretary of the Interior's standards are listed in the design guidelines and are the basis on which the City's Historic Preservation Overlay standards in the Zoning Ordinance are based.

Commissioner James stated he was referring to the Historic Preservation Standards and the underlying zoning. He questioned whether the Historic Preservation Overlay standard and the base zoning were at odds. He said when addressing new construction and additions it would be helpful to have a reference to the standard in the text in order to keep track of how the two documents work together as well as where to find the guideline for the standard and vice versa

Mr. Leith explained how having the ordinance and the guidelines linked digitally would help to accommodate this need. He explained the way they could be referenced through a live-link in the digital version and side bar explanations. He stated having the documents linked on paper could cause issues with updating information but if the online version was always kept current one could simply print off the needed information and its links.

Commissioner James stated someone who didn't use the system often might reference the guidelines and think they have all the information they need when they really didn't. He stated it was important to make sure people knew there were companion documents and all of the documents needed to be understood. He said the online versions would be useful and links to the overlay zone as well as the basic zoning would be useful.

Mr. Leith stated those were ideas that Staff had as well and would be used in reviewing the information. He said at the moment in the individual district chapters there were a number of side bar references that refer to other sections of the document that needed to be looked at, at the same time as the individual standards.

Chairperson Oliver asked if the standards appeared anywhere in the guidelines.

Mr. Leith stated the standards were listed in the form of the Secretary of Interior's standards which were the same.

Chairperson Oliver asked if those were spelled out in the beginning of the introduction.

Mr. Leith stated yes they were in the introduction.

Commissioner Richards asked what someone was given when applying for a permit? was it different if they came in, visited the website or called the City? He asked if they were given the

guidelines or standards or were they given both. He stated how the process worked needed to be looked at closely to make it easier for those applying to do projects.

Mr. Leith stated Staff had been working on the concept of procedural notes to address that issue. He stated the notes would refer to both the standard ideally if the information was being accessed online then there would be built in live-links to both documents.

Commissioner Richards stated he thought it would be confusing to most people and that they would wonder what information to follow if there were two diverging documents.

Mr. Leith stated the key point was that the guidelines served as a means of interpreting the standards therefore, the standards came first and the guidelines were the detailed back up.

Commissioner Richards stated the guidelines might be handled as a simple handout that explained and outlined the standards. He said the handout could state that the standards were the rules supplemented by the design guidelines that explain and helped one understand how the standards worked and what was encompassed.

Commissioner James stated it could be the “how to use this document” paragraph or section included in the guidelines.

Mr. Leith stated that was something that would need to be addressed at the front of the guidelines.

Commissioner Bevins stated the information needed to be useable for both a contractor and a regular person.

Mr. Leith stated the introductory section was in the works and needed to cover the mentioned items and flag what was important, in terms of overview and the character of the district. He said it then formed part of the introduction to the sections.

Commissioner Richards stated there were benefits to making the process as clear and simple as possible. He said the benefits would be that applicants would have a better understanding and there would be fewer cases with enforcement issues presented to the Commission because people would better understand things. He said the Commission would also see fewer of the case where duplicating old construction was attempted and decisions would be much easier in terms of where it was appropriate to issue certificates because all of the up-front information. Commissioner Richards said it would be easier for an individual to know if their project met the standards or not prior to coming to the Commission for approval.

Mr. Leith stated it was incumbent on staff to have enough of the material up front and summarized in relation to the application process to ensure people couldn't miss it. He said

most places do that to a greater or lesser extent and Staff had a number of good examples to follow in order to create the detailed procedural notes.

Commissioner James stated he had a number of suggestions for chapter 8 regarding roofs. He stated he questioned whether or not rooftop additions were in-keeping with the traditional fabric. He stated he agreed with the point in 8.1.1 regarding the mass and scale being subordinate to the scale of the historic building. He asked if it was possible for a roof top addition to be created that was subordinate to the main structure.

Mr. Leith stated it seemed to be a contradiction in terms but said the section also included the addition of dormers.

Commissioner James stated that was another section. He said the market pushed toward rooftop additions because it was a quick easy way to expand the volume of a house, but it generally never kept within the historic fabric. He said the better examples he had seen, had done away with the historic roof line and developed a new roof line sensitive to the historic fabric. He said there needed to be a cut-off to when something was allowed. Commissioner James stated many of the historic homes would never be returned to their historic nature and would continue to evolve. He said it didn't make sense to continue to cobble together additions that felt more like barnacles as opposed to an evolution as Mr. Gray discussed of a housing stock that was going to be functional over time.

Mr. Leith reviewed the issue of scale. He gave examples of where it could be an issue and what may work.

Commissioner James said the Commission discussed the need for Character Districts which spoke to the qualitative yet in many cases there was an underlying zoning that was so quantitative that people were trying to meet the measure and losing the qualitative details. He said how to manage the qualitative was critical and needed to be thought out. He said traditional neighborhoods were preferred because they were beautiful but when they were adapted they cease to be beautiful.

Commissioner Richards stated Commissioner James had a good point that altering and dealing with the entire roof line often resulted in a better result.

Chairperson Oliver stated not always and said there were plenty of examples of things going wrong. She said she thought Commissioner James was right in that there needed to be room for the potential of radical changes if it resulted in a better solution and it may be something for a later discussion. Chairperson Oliver asked if a working group was in place and if they had met.

Mr. Leith stated they had not met as of yet but would soon and he would contact the members of the group in the next few days.

Commissioner Bevins stated he heard Mr. Gray say other city departments would be involved in the review of the guidelines because there were overlapping issues like park strips, park ways street lighting, and sidewalks that other city departments oversaw. Commissioner Bevins stated that some of those departments are egregious in terms of not paying attention to what was in the guidelines.

Chairperson Oliver asked for any further questions for Mr. Leith and stated the document was looking great and moving along in the right direction.

Ms. Coffey thanked Mr. Leith and Ms. Lew for their hard work on the documents.

REPORT OF THE CHAIR OR VICE CHAIR [6:58:57 PM](#)

Chairperson Oliver and Vice Chairperson Hart noted they had nothing to report.

APPROVAL OF OCTOBER 6, 2011 MINUTES [6:59:13 PM](#)

Commissioner James moved to approve the minutes of October 6, 2011 with the corrections. Commissioner Bevins seconded the motion. Commissioners Bevins, Hart, James, and Davis voted Aye. Commissioner Richards abstained from voting. The motion passed with a 4-0 vote. Chairperson, Anne Oliver did not vote.

Chairperson Oliver asked if a changed copy of the fine tuning document would be brought before the Commission.

Ms. Coffey explained it would not be but a copy could be sent to the Commission.

PUBLIC COMMENTS [7:03:08 PM](#)

No public comment was given at this time.

PUBLIC HEARINGS [7:03:44 PM](#)

PLNHLC2011-00500, 724 East 4th Avenue, Certificate of Appropriateness for Rear Addition - A request by Larry Rowe, representing property owner Austin Wallace, to build an upper story rear addition to the existing single-family residence that exceeds the height limit of the district.

Ms. Elizabeth Reining, Principal Planner, reviewed the petition as presented in the Staff Report. She explained the addition and the replacement windows were issued a Certificate of Appropriateness and the petition was before the Commission for approval of the additional height. She stated the building height standard in the SR-1A district was 23 feet and the house was currently 28 feet at the front and increased to 29 ½ feet at the rear simply because of the slope of the lot. Ms. Reining said the rear addition, at its end point, would actually be 30 feet

and 4 inches. She stated it was Staff's recommendation to approve the additional height because not only did it continue the roof line but considering that the addition was only 10 feet, forcing the applicant to drop to height of the addition 6 feet would be quite noticeable. She present pictures of the site and reviewed the layout and plans for the addition.

Commissioner James stated the drawings did not seem to work from front elevation to side elevation, for example the side elevation showed the balcony midway up the gable and it did not line up on the sides

Ms. Reining asked if that was the second floor balcony.

Chairperson Oliver stated the balcony should line up with the base of the roof and asked if there would be doors from the second floor onto the balcony and not two windows.

Ms. Reining stated the applicant could explain those items further.

Commissioner James asked about the level of detail in terms of how it was composed as it was not architectural. He said he wondered what the process was to translate it into the actual design or what if the balcony was really going to be held up with a 4 x 4 post as shown. Commissioner James asked if the design would go through another review process to ensure the design was usable.

Ms. Reining stated it would go through the building permit process but as for the architectural review it was finished.

Commissioner James reviewed the areas, on the presented design, where it did not look like the design would work, such as the columns, and asked if those items were actual indications of the finished look or if they were just an idea of what would be constructed.

Ms. Reining stated the applicant would need to answer those questions.

Mr. Joel Paterson, Planning Manager, stated once the Landmark Commission granted approval to a project like this the architect or the applicant would finish the drawings, the building permit staff would then review the drawings upon submission for the building permit review and the applicant would be required to get a sign off from the Planning Division before permits would be issued.

Mr. Larry Rowe, Professional Home Improvements, thanked the Commission for being there and thanked Ms. Reining for all her help. He asked the Commission for their questions.

Commissioner James referred to his questions he asked Ms. Reining.

Mr. Rowe stated Mr. Paterson was correct in that the drawings were done by an engineer and more detailed drawings would be submitted. He stated there would be a door leading out to the deck where the window was currently. He said the structure had been engineered and the building department was reviewing it from a structural standpoint and how it was going to be built with the post and beam attached to the house. Mr. Rowe stated the deck height would be adjusted to match the lower deck on the back.

Commissioner Richards stated the Commission looked at the detailing because that was what made up the character on historic buildings. He asked about the exposed I-beam and asked if the drawing represented how this detail was finished or if it was just to depict what was being used for construction.

Mr. Rowe stated there were aspects shown in the drawings that the Planning Department had addressed with the engineer and he was not sure whether the I-beam was shown as one of the requests. He stated the finish would match what was in place on the house currently. Mr. Rowe stated their intent was to create the same fabric and feel on the back addition as the existing home had.

Commissioner Richards stated if the petition was approved conditions stating details, such as the finish, could be approved by staff so the applicant would not have to come back to the Commission.

Ms. Reining stated the issued Certificate of Appropriateness said specifically that the addition had to include the same materials that existed.

Chairperson Oliver asked if that included the material on the eaves.

Ms. Reining stated yes the same material had to be used for everything.

Commissioner James asked about the placement of the columns since the extension of the roof did not cover a porch across the entire extension.

Commissioner Richards stated that was a question he had as well.

Mr. Rowe stated there would be a free standing column and the other two posts would go to the grade below the deck as the deck would not support the extension on its own.

Commissioner Richards asked if the Commission was only ruling on height.

Ms. Reining stated yes.

Commissioner James stated he thought the roof line was fine and the simplicity of extending the rear gable was the simplest way to do it. He said he thought the roof move was fine but it was one of those approaches where one wondered what to expect.

Commissioner Hart asked if a Certificate of Appropriateness was all ready given for the whole project.

Ms. Reining stated a Certificate of Appropriateness had been given for the rear addition as well as the vinyl windows. She stated the additional height in historic districts could exceed the maximum height limit if approved by the Commission.

Commissioner Hart asked how the Certificate of Appropriateness was given without the approval of the additional height.

Ms. Reining stated the height issue did not come up at the time that the Certificate of Appropriateness was issued; it became an issue after the fact.

Commissioner Hart said so Staff didn't realize it exceeded the height until after the Certificate of Appropriateness was issued.

Ms. Reining stated that was correct.

Mr. Paterson stated that the proposed addition was considered to be a minor alteration which the ordinance allowed staff to approve administratively.

PUBLIC HEARING [7:18:10 PM](#)

Chairperson Oliver opened the Public Hearing seeing as there were no persons in attendance to speak on the issue the Public Hearing was closed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION [7:18:19 PM](#)

Chairperson Oliver asked for discussion or a motion.

MOTION [7:18:29 PM](#)

Commissioner Richards stated in the case of PLNHLC2011-00500 he moved that the Historic Landmark Commission approve the application based on the Staff's finding in the Staff Report. Commissioner Davis seconded the motion. Commissioners Bevins, Hart, Richards, James, and Davis voted Aye. The motion passed with a 5-0 vote. Chairperson, Anne Oliver did not vote.

Chairperson Oliver read the appeals process.

[7:19:19 PM](#)

PLNHLC2011-00466 Ronald McDonald House, 925 & 935 E South Temple Certificate of Appropriateness for New Construction and Additional Height - A request by Ronald McDonald Charities represented by Casey McDonough, to remodel an existing building and build a new four story building at approximately 925 E South Temple. As part of the review, the applicant is requesting Commission approval of an additional 15 feet of height over the allowed 35 feet.

Mr. Ray Milliner, Principal Planner, reviewed the application as presented in the Staff Report. He stated the Applicant was requesting design review as well as a height exception for a new building. Mr. Milliner stated the Applicant was not requesting that a decision be made during the meeting but was coming to the Commission for feedback as to whether or not the design and requested height exception were appropriate for the location. He stated it was Staff's opinion that it was difficult for the Commission to grant approval, regarding the height, based on the ordinance requirements. He stated the Commission would need to make a finding that the design, with the height, would be more compatible to the surrounding area of the historic district than leaving limiting it to 35 feet in height. Mr. Milliner stated the Applicant was currently requesting feedback on the issues after which the findings and recommendation for the project would be determined. He stated the project would then be brought to the Commission at a later date for approval.

Commissioner Hart asked if the white lines behind the drawing were for a future addition.

Mr. Casey McDonough, Applicant representing the Ronald McDonald House, stated that was correct, it was so the Commission could see the future plans for the Ronald McDonald house. He stated the renderings presented to the Commission represented a 50 foot height at the corner where the drawings in the packet had a 42 foot height at the corner. He reviewed the history of the home and the size and needs of the occupants of the home. Mr. McDonough explained the need for more space due to the amount of families that use the services. He reviewed the remodel of the existing building and the proposed use for the new building. He explained the work would be done in Phases and in the end would be a great addition to the original. Mr. McDonough reviewed the design and layout, use, location, access to the building and the needs of the building. He said what was presented was the ideal for the project and could be adjusted if needed. He reviewed the neighborhood and how the proposed building would fit in with the area. Mr. McDonough stated the project was presented to two Community Councils, whose concerns were parking and connecting the building to South Temple. He stated the reasoning for not having an entrance on South Temple was for privacy, safety and control of the individuals entering the building. He stated if they planned for the total number of guest rooms, which was 93, they would be required to have 32-33 total stalls and 40 stalls currently existed for the property. He said parking may be an issue down the line and discussed the bus and shuttle

services as well as the agreement with Primary Children's Medical Center that would help accommodate parking. Mr. McDonough said the community concerns had been thought through and addressed. He reviewed the possible plans for the area along South Temple to make it look like an entry. He asked the Commission how they thought the building fit into the neighborhood in terms of height and context and explained the use of masonry to match other buildings on South Temple.

Commissioner Richards stated the building was fairly massive along South Temple as well as along M Street. He said it seemed more logical to step the height to reduce the massing but usable space would be lost. Commissioner Richards stated in regards to the access to South Temple, anyone using public transportation would have to come out the east end of the building and around to the street making it difficult to use public transportation.

Chairperson Oliver reviewed the different development patterns in the neighborhood and the orientation of buildings in the area. She said the Ronald McDonald House would not fit the pattern due to the orientation and size of the structure. Chairperson Oliver stated a building built on the lot would need to be something monumental as it was a high traffic area and an important site in Salt Lake City. She spoke to the importance of having an entrance on the South Temple side as well as on M Street.

Mr. McDonough stated he understood Chairperson Oliver's comments and agreed the buildings in the area were built differently than what was proposed. He stated it was important to design the building to make it fit in the neighborhood.

Chairperson Oliver stated something needed to be done to address the massing of the building whether re-orienting it, adding green space or breaking the façade up in a manner to diminish the appearance of size was very important.

Mr. McDonough asked if the Commission would prefer the look of something similar to the Maryland apartments and if that would help. He said it was important to the client to have a homey feel rather than an institutional feel to the building.

Chairperson Oliver reviewed the colors and details of other buildings in the neighborhood that could be incorporated in the proposed building to help minimize the scale of the building.

Mr. McDonough stated he agreed something could be done with the finishes to help break up the scale. He reviewed different architectural aspects that could be added such as a cornice without a parapet to help tie the building into the neighborhood. He stated this was the kind of input he was looking for. Mr. McDonough stated the site was unique in the fact that it was surrounded by different uses on each side as well as all types of buildings. He said it was a good aspect that if the building were higher than the 35 feet it was not facing single family homes or historic homes.

Chairperson Oliver stated that was correct and she thought South Temple could accommodate a big building. She stated it needed to meet the design guidelines and should fit the mass, scale and rhythm of adjacent building and the neighborhood. She stated the current design did not fall into place easily within the guidelines.

Commissioner James said if one looked at Salt Lake City from a distance they would notice that most arterial streets end at a monumental building. He stated as he thought of the evolution of Salt Lake City there are certain intersections where something ought to happen that could become monumental over time. Commissioner James stated the subject property was one of those areas that could support a monumental building. He stated the building should be a landmark and as a landmark site the Commission should be able to consider alternative criteria for the site. He said it was important to have the right architecture for the building and access points to the surrounding streets from the building.

Mr. McDonough stated it could be a landmark because 9th East lined right up with the corner of the proposed building and the property was definitely prominent.

Commissioner James stated the courtyard needed to be higher than the access point to make it stand out rather than be overseen from the sidewalk.

Chairperson Oliver asked if the terrace was low and not raised.

Mr. McDonough stated it was at grade at the corner but dropped below the grade of the sidewalk as it progressed to the east. He showed how the grade changed around the building to line up at a point of entry.

Commissioner James stated that architecturally he liked that there were five bays but the idea that the five bays became almost like a series of town homes didn't work. He stated the enclosed stairs on the roof would be the most prominent aspect.

Mr. McDonough stated some sort of equipment would have to be on the roof so a staircase was necessary but did not have to look like it did in the presented drawings.

Commissioner James stated if it was going to be a landmark it deserved special treatment, but things should not be left to be after thoughts.

Mr. McDonough stated it was a place holder so it wouldn't be forgotten.

Mr. McDonough stated the impression he was getting was that it was not necessarily that more height is bad but it would have to be very specific in how it they dealt with the height and the frontage and the grades on South Temple.

Chairperson Oliver stated that was correct and the overall design of the building as a monumental structure and not something trying to hide or turn its back on the street but really to acknowledge the South Temple frontage and the 900 East corridor.

Commissioner Richards stated the long horizontal bands made it look monolithic.

Mr. McDonough stated the main issue in creating a courtyard and the look of the grounds was to give the sense of security and safety to the people staying at the house.

The Commission and Applicant talked about how it was critical to make the building fit into the neighborhood in style, layout, size and orientation. The applicant told of the discussions with the Client and the issues they expressed about meeting the client's needs as well as the look and feel of the building being right for the area. They discussed the importance of the front façade and the "front door" being a prominent fixture.

Mr. McDonough stated the ideals of the client needed to be managed to fit the standards. He stated the comments given at the meeting were what he was looking for.

Chairperson Oliver stated she felt the site allowed for the additional height as well as offered flexibility to do more articulation and maybe more rearranging of the facades. She said that was not a guarantee that the 50 foot height would be approved.

Commissioner Davis stated the 50 foot height did not bother him because he was hearing that this was the termination of a major street and there should be a monumental or significant building there, so from that stand point it allowed flexibility to make a more monumental building. He said however, the buildings needed to look as though they belonged together visually.

Mr. McDonough reviewed the details of the building such as the columns that would help to tie the buildings together.

Mr. Milliner summarized the discussion by stating the potential finding to support an increase in height would be due to the fact that this site is the termination of the 900 East arterial street which was a common urban design feature seen throughout the city in regards to landmark sites therefore, it warranted the construction of a monumental building that would be higher than what was allowed under the ordinance.

Commissioner James stated that the building also needed personality.

Mr. Milliner stated the finding would come with the condition that the design and architecture be that expected of a landmark building with an entrance onto South Temple. A significant design feature would be required as an element centered on the termination of 900 East and breaking up

the width of the building to approximate the pattern on South Temple. Staff will work with the Applicant to come up with something appropriate for the site.

The Commission stated they agree with Mr. Milliner's summary.

Commissioner Hart stated she would like to add that the South Temple entrance be visible from 900 East as well.

The Commission stated they were not sure where the entrance should be located but it needed to be prominent. The Applicant may wish to explore a way to break up the volume of the building. One example could be the design of the Mayflower Apartment's courtyard.

Mr. McDonough asked if he could give updates to the Commission outside of an official meeting that they could comment on.

Chairperson Oliver stated to get feedback it would need to be addressed at a meeting or subcommittee. However, the Applicant could meet with Staff.

PUBLIC HEARING [8:24:24 PM](#)

Chairperson Oliver opened the Public Hearing seeing there was no one in the audience to speak on the issue the Public Hearing was closed.

MOTION [8:26:20 PM](#)

Commissioner Hart stated regarding PLNHLC2011-00466, Ronald McDonald House, she moved that the Historic Landmark Commission continue the Public Hearing to a future date to allow the applicant to come back to the Commission with updated plans per the discussion. Commissioner Richards seconded the motion. Commissioners Bevens, Hart, Richards, James, and Davis voted Aye. The motion passed with a 5-0 vote. Chairperson, Anne Oliver did not vote.

The meeting stood adjourned at [8:27:34 PM](#)

Michelle Moeller, Historic Landmark Commission Secretary