

# SALT LAKE CITY HISTORIC LANDMARK COMMISSION

Minutes of the Meeting  
Room 326, 451 South State Street  
September 1, 2011

*This document along with the digital recording constitute the official minutes of the Historic Landmark Commission regular session meeting held on September 1, 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, September 1, 2011, at [5:41:07 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 Dave Richards, Earle Bevins III, Bill Davis, Arla Funk, Stephen James, Chairperson Anne Oliver. Commissioner's Sheleigh Harding and Polly Hart were excused.

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

## **FIELD TRIP [5:41:49 PM](#)**

The Field Trip was canceled due to the postponement of item PLNHLC2011-00466 Ronald McDonald House.

## **DINNER [5:08:48 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 [5:42:06 PM](#)**

**Residential Design Guidelines** – Mr. Carl Leith, Senior Planner, briefed the Commission on the proposed changes to the Residential Design Guidelines.

He explained the purpose of the review was to

- highlight primary issues and objectives, briefly outlining some of the content of the new guidelines, as currently envisioned by Staff,
- provide an initial opportunity for the Commission to review, discuss, highlight and/or agree on primary objectives and content of the forthcoming document,
- discuss a continuum from this point through to the end of the review and revision process, with scope to review and refine the guidelines at various stages until December.

Mr. Leith stated that City Council was concurrently reviewing the range of urban character and preservation tools which are envisioned as part of the forthcoming Preservation Plan and program. The adoption of the series of updated and new historic design guidelines, and new provisions for conservation districts, are regarded as key elements in this program. He asked the Commissioners to recall the Memorandum presented during a work session on May 5, 2011 (Attachment A of this Memo). He said the

subject memo summarized the anticipated revision and approval process for the three sets of design guidelines Commercial, Signs and Residential.

Mr. Leith stated these were key components of the range of design tools available to the Commission to implement the preservation program. He explained the May Memo also introduced the review of the Residential Design Guidelines and briefly explained the proposed 'format of a design guideline' as a design reasoning and review tool. Mr. Leith explained the detailed review of the Commercial and Signs guidelines would be relatively straight forward as the Commission have already agreed most of these guidelines over the last eighteen months. For the Residential Design Guidelines he explained the need to clarify the language in the guidelines to alleviate confusion with the more prescriptive language used in the ordinance standards; Mr. Leith reviewed the history of the guidelines and explained their use across the country. He stated there were consequently several areas of the current Residential Design Guidelines that would benefit from revision and refinement to better serve as advice and review guidance for the community, the commission and the city.

Mr. Leith briefly reviewed the following points that would help improve clarity in several areas, including the document, the page design, enhanced graphics, and the form of a design guideline. He explained that the interchangeability of the terms, 'standard' and 'guideline', in the existing residential design guidelines causes confusion with the design standards in the ordinance and implies a rigidity which was counter-productive to the effective flexibility of design guidelines and their application. Mr. Leith stated that the guidelines will be rewritten to remove all language referring to the guidelines as standards, and such terms as "shall" and "not allowed", which appear periodically in the present document. He explained that the benefits and rationale of historic preservation associated with the guidelines could be enhanced with stronger background covering such areas as the role of community and city identity, the importance of safeguarding the integrity and authenticity of our historic resources, and the expression of time and maturity in our historic buildings and neighborhoods.

Mr. Leith briefly reviewed the primary objectives of the revisions. These included enhanced Information, Clarity, Flexibility, Rationale and Benefits, Coverage, Architectural Style & Character, New Construction and Restoration, and Process and Procedure as outlined in the Memo. He explained the next stages were as follows:

1. Confirmation of the Residential Design Guidelines HLC Work Group
2. Public Open House Sept. 12, 2011 – Residential Design Guidelines
3. Public Hearing, Historic Landmark Commission October 6, 2011

#### **COMMISSIONER COMMENTS [5:57:37 PM](#)**

Commissioner Richards asked what groups were notified of the Open House. He explained it would be beneficial for the individuals directly affected to be notified of the proposed changes.

Mr. Leith stated Open House notices were mainly posted on the web and Listserv.

Ms. Cheri Coffey, Assistant Planning Director, stated a notice was not sent to individuals for Open Houses. She explained to whom the Listserv reached and how the Open House notices were posted.

Commissioner Richards asked if all of the districts had fairly active Community Councils that would notify the residents.

Ms. Coffey said the Community Councils are active. She stated some of the Councils send notices to everyone in their areas.

Commissioner Davis asked if it would be posted on Open City Hall.

Mr. Leith stated yes it would be.

The Commission expressed their concerns about notifying individuals, contractors and home/property owners directly affected by the changes to the guidelines in order to give everyone a chance to express opinions and give suggestions.

Staff agreed it would be beneficial to notify those individuals and would do so in time for the upcoming Open House.

Commissioner Funk stated she was concerned that the information presented was not adequate for an Open House. She felt it needed to be developed further so people could clearly consider it.

Mr. Leith stated the focus would be on a revised draft that was in the works.

Commissioner Funk asked if the representative layout would be completed at that point, as it was necessary for a proper evaluation.

Mr. Leith stated the layout would be available.

Ms. Coffey stated in terms of the schedule, it was to receive feedback early on and continue the discussion. Staff anticipated that the Landmarks Commission would make a final decision by December. She explained this was just the first step in the process.

Mr. Leith referred to the timeline provided as Attachment B of the Staff Memo.

Commissioner James asked if the guideline in its proposed form would have a strong point of view about what was good or perceived to be good. He asked if it was objective or subjective and how was Staff working with the notation of the purpose of a design guideline.

Mr. Leith stated the main focus of each design guideline was based upon a premise of best practice within that topic area, so the precise wording of the guideline itself should give a clear indication of where one might go. He stated the application bullet points that follow each design guideline provide additional information in terms of how one might apply the guideline. Mr. Leith said however, given the variety of the cases, and the individuality of the buildings and their settings, the precise wording was not going to fit in more than a portion of occasions. He said the idea of the character and context description and the design objective that precedes the design guideline or perhaps a number of guidelines, for that topic, should give an indication of the overall direction in terms of appropriate response and action.

Commissioner James asked if it provided flexibility and an array of opportunities did it also note those things that should be avoided. He asked how Staff planned to manage that aspect.

Mr. Leith stated it did but in trying to keep the wording of the design guideline positive, a number of the application points frequently addressed things to avoid in that context.

Commissioner James stated Mr. Leith remarked there were going to be later architectural periods turning fifty years old that thus might be considered historic. He said it seemed that during the 1960's and 1970's the whole perspective of planning really had a direct impact on community livability. He wondered how or whether the Commission started to protect some of the characteristics that may have had an unexpected impact on community such as automobile access or materials and craftsmanship that as a community we may not want to preserve.

Mr. Leith stated those were good points. He felt that most of the city neighborhoods likely to be looked at, over the course of maybe the next ten years as possible future historic districts, were not areas where the pattern would be loose or open.

Commissioner James identified one thing that came to mind regarding the influence of non-contributing structures. He gave the example of new homes in the Avenues that are still compatible with the traditional look but might still have the 20 feet of house and 40 feet of garage. Commissioner James stated home owners are catching on to the look of the traditional character but the overarching function of the neighborhood starts to alter. He said he wondered how, in the development of a guideline, through either infill development or adaptation of non-contributing structures, the sense of livability and community cohesiveness could be retained.

Mr. Leith stated those were essential points and certainly design criteria might be enhanced.

Chairperson Oliver expressed her concern about limiting the amount of information in the documents to individual areas. She felt it was better to keep the guidelines as one document in order to help address all questions one might have.

Commissioner James stated the preservation movement was set up to protect against what was coming.

Commissioner Funk asked if fifty years was a character defining aspect of a historic district. She said she thought it was a national requirement but wondered if it was something that could be eliminated from historic preservation while including other means for determining what was worth preserving and what was not.

Commissioner James stated that was where he thought the idea of performance based community making came into play. He said determining what a community actually consists of, what its material make up is and how it looks are more important than how old it was.

Mr. Leith stated age was only one of the criteria for historic district designation.

Commissioner James stated he agreed with the comments and thought there were more factors to look at when determining the historical value of a property.

Commissioner Bevins asked how big the umbrella would get that would cover all this, because now historic districts have to be either national or local. He said he felt it was unrealistic because of the amount of buildings that could be included within this 50 year category.

Mr. Leith stated it raised the question of whether fifty years was long enough to actually evaluate the resources in that context.

Commissioner Funk asked what should come first, the district or the guidelines.

Chairperson Oliver stated the guidelines would be revised again in ten years so it would be addressed.

Mr. Leith stated, if possible, staff could use the current guidelines as the process moves forward. He said there should be links included so people were potentially informed on current debate though other preservation websites, such as the National Trust website.

Ms. Coffey stated Staff was working with the Council regarding the draft preservation plan. She said Staff was working with the Council to make adjustments as part of the ongoing dialog but one of the

things that was anticipated was after the preservation plan is adopted the ordinance would be updated as well. Ms. Coffey explained one of the things that Staff would look at was the designation criteria and at that time the fifty year criteria would be addressed as well as how big a district should be. She stated currently the ordinance reflected the national ideas and may need to be more tailored for Salt Lake City. Ms. Coffey said a discussion on that topic would be addressed after the preservation plan was adopted which would likely be at the first of 2012.

Mr. Leith stated it was probably fair to say that at the national level there was quite a bit of debate running about the same issues.

Chairperson Oliver asked who volunteered for the subcommittee to review the guidelines.

Mr. Leith stated it was Commissioners James and Richards.

Commissioners James, Oliver and Richards agreed to be on the subcommittee.

Chairperson Oliver asked about the “links” reference in the information section of the memo. She stated in this day and age there was potential for information overload, and an annotated list was needed to prepare people and introduce and summarize the information. She stated there didn’t need to be a list with infinite amounts of information as people would be confused. Chairperson Oliver stated her other concern was if things are not looked at carefully there might be mild contradictions in what is referenced. She said information needed to be clear regarding what took precedence.

Mr. Leith suggested that links to additional resources confirmed that additional information was for reference purposes only and not part of the guidelines.

Chairperson Oliver stated under the rationale and benefits section of the Memo that she wanted to strongly agree that wherever possible the “why” needed to be explained and stated. She said there was a reason for guidance and she thought that was great especially to address items that usually come to the Commission.

Commissioner Richards stated he also thought that including the “why” was a really good idea. Chairperson Oliver agreed that it does help. People need to know the “why” to make it more understandable. She asked about the coverage regarding the different historic districts and it needed to be considered that some of them have slightly different mandates, e.g. Central City was more about form and shape and less keyed into details. Chairperson Oliver stated it needed to be clear with a set of general guidelines linked back to specific neighborhoods. She was not sure how that could be solved but it was something that was discussed previously and she would like to address it again.

Mr. Leith suggested that Central City might be reappraised at some point in time. The thinking when it was initially designated may not be as appropriate now.

Commissioner Richards asked whether Staff could identify the critical characteristics of a historic district. He said a document would need to include everything that was relevant for the area and not bother with everything else for the other districts.

Chairperson Oliver asked if multiple design guidelines for each district were the ideal solution. She was of the opinion if that was the case there would be much duplication.

Commissioner James said if each one ended up being eight pages it would be manageable for people. He said there was nothing more intimidating then a big document and having to flip back and forth to

reference it. Commissioner James stated if he could just look at something and know it was relevant to him that would make it easier.

Chairperson Oliver stated if they did that there was also the danger of catering to the least common denominator. She said in one district people may not have to worry about details where in another district it would be important to focus on the details. She explained it was her opinion that when push comes to shove it was better to keep the information instead of worrying about needing it later.

Mr. Leith suggested there were not enough cross reference links currently. He said there are district guidelines available but after reading the main body of the document the district guidelines are less apparent. Mr. Leith stated it would be a lot easier to actually dovetail the two and end up with an interactive digital form with cross-reference “buttons” that would take a reader to the correct areas.

Commissioner Funk stated when historic districts were first established, each district had an area specific pamphlet and taking into account what Commissioner James said maybe this was another approach that could be used. She said there could be a general document that would be inclusive for all of the districts and then an individual one for each district.

Mr. Leith stated that would certainly work with the idea of it being available online in PDF form. He said Staff would be breaking it down so the PDFs themselves would be designed to be lifted out and actually operate as a separate pamphlet. He said he didn’t know how best to actually link it back to the main body of the information in this context, but it certainly had potential.

Commissioner James stated that the community patterns would need to be identified so that the essential elements at a district scale were addressed and then a separate piece to address architectural patterns because there might be an architectural approach that exists in all of the districts. He explained the documents might have community levels, architectural levels, landscape level and it would all be addressed around what was essential to the district. Commissioner James said he was sure Staff had thought through how to make it all work.

Commissioner Richards referred to the last section of the memo entitled Summary. Under the questions raised that windows are missing and he thought there needed to be clear guidelines for the application decisions regarding windows, especially when it comes to historic repair/replacement standards. He said he would like to see more of an outreach program so home owners understand the benefits. Commissioner Richards stated a great example was the section about caring for an historic home and building. He said it would be nice if home owners and districts received something like that, because if they understood how to care for those windows then the Commission would see fewer issues with people coming to replace ones that have deteriorated. Commissioner Richards said he liked the idea about better graphics coverage as some of the language gets abstract and if an example was available it would be easier to follow.

Commissioner James asked for clarity on windows. He thought there should be a discussion of the hierarchy of importance of the character-defining elements of a building. He said it seemed in some instances the debate about windows went on and on, but there was no consideration about the look of the rest of the house and it seemed that preservation was really finding ways to balance all the aspects of home building.

Commissioner Richards stated it was holistic, but the window issues have come up a lot recently. He gave an example of when a Staff Report may say the windows are ‘repairable’, but that was sort of a vague statement for most people to interpret. He said it would be beneficial to have someone like Phil Kearns talk to the Commission and help to better grasp what was really reasonable when repairing a

window and what really wasn't. He said that the purview was strictly not to look at a cost basis, but he thought there was a need to be sensitive, and that at some point it was throwing good money after bad money when trying to repair a window.

Mr. Leith stated the next stage of the windows work sessions would focus on window condition and repair, with a much more hands on approach.

**ADMINISTRATIVE BUSINESS [6:28:00 PM](#)**

**Report of the Chair and Vice Chair [6:28:04 PM](#)**

Chairperson Oliver noted she had nothing to report. She asked Ms. Coffey to report on the agenda for the mid month meeting.

Ms. Coffey raised a question to the Commission about whether a proposed garage should be included agendas an item for the September 15, meeting. She stated the only reason the item needed to be addressed by the Commission was it was over 600 square feet. She explained the previous decision to have the second monthly meeting strictly for the purpose of discussing items such as the design guidelines. Ms. Coffey asked for Staff to be given the ability to administratively approve the application as it met the criteria for a Certificate of Appropriateness and did not violate the size limitation of the zoning ordinance. She stated there was language in the Commission's policy document that referred to building size which prohibited Staff from administratively approving the application. Ms. Coffey explained she did not know why the issue of size was put into the policy because usually anything besides a demolition could be approved by Staff unless Staff did not feel comfortable with the proposal.

Chairperson Oliver stated the issue was that the mid month meeting was to discuss policy and design guideline items and to not hear any cases. She stated the option was to let Staff approve the case administratively or to hear the case in two weeks.

Commissioner Richards stated based on the size it was within the normal zoning requirements so he did not see any point in the Commission reviewing the application.

Mr. Paul Nielson, Salt Lake City Senior Attorney, stated it was more of an amendment to the policies and procedures and he felt that should be noticed as something that happened in the work session.

Commissioner Funk stated she was concerned about not notifying the neighbors.

Commissioner Richards stated he was less concerned if it met the typical zoning requirements for the area.

Commissioner Funk asked for clarification on the size.

Ms. Coffey stated it was 714 square feet and a garage up to 720 square feet could be approved over the counter.

Commissioner Richards stated if it was over the limit he would definitely agree to hear the case.

Mr. Neilson stated it was really more of an internal policy so the public did not have the right to provide feedback. He stated it was more of a question of putting it on the agenda so there was a record of what happened and when. Mr. Neilson stated it was typical practice, when the policy and procedures for the Commission were being amended, to have it listed on the agenda.

Chairperson Oliver stated she did not feel it was a permanent amendment; it was just making an exception to the general rule on that case.

Mr. Neilson stated the policy documents stated 600 square feet so it would be a policy change.

Chairperson Oliver asked even if it was a onetime exception.

Mr. Neilson stated the Commission was talking about making a decision about something that was not on the agenda.

Chairperson Oliver stated she would be more comfortable seeing the garage. She stated the issues did not seem time consuming so the Commission would continue to abide by the written policies.

Commissioner Richards stated it would be interesting to have some discussion as to where the 600 number came from at a future meeting.

Mr. Nielson stated that the design guidelines replaced the policy document.

It was agreed that the garage case would be heard at the September 15, 2011 meeting.

**APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES from August 4, 2011. [6:35:08 PM](#)**

**Commissioner James moved to approve the minutes of August 4, 2011. Commissioner Davis seconded the motion. Commissioners Bevins, Davis, Funk, James and Richards all voted, "Aye". The minutes stand approved unanimously.**

**PUBLIC COMMENTS [6:35:42 PM](#)**

Commissioner Richards stated he recently was made aware that out buildings did not qualify for tax credits. He expressed his frustration about the cost that went into fixing the building and if tax credits were not given to individuals then people would stop restoring out buildings.

Ms. Coffey stated that was why Salt Lake City tried to make sure all of the local districts were nationally listed as well. She stated she did know that out buildings were not included.

Chairperson Oliver stated she would assume it was federal money that they receive so that was a national standard.

Commissioner Richards explained it was a State Tax Credit program.

Chairperson Oliver stated the State Tax program was managed by the National Secretary of the Interior and the National Park Service she thought.

Ms. Coffey explained the federal tax credit and state tax credit programs. She said there may be something the Utah Heritage Foundation could do to help with low interest loans for renovating an out building.

The Commission talked about what they could do to help address this issue.

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



## **PUBLIC HEARINGS [6:38:41 PM](#)**

Chairperson Oliver reviewed the process for the presentation and discussion of the presented applications.

**PLNHLC2011-00214, 545 East 900 South, Certificate of Appropriateness for Major Alterations (Unfinished Business)** –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.

## **Staff Presentation [6:40:54 PM](#)**

Ms. Michaela Oktay, Principal Planner, reviewed the revised proposal for the Commission. Ms. Oktay reviewed the Staff comments from the previous meeting noting in the first site plan the addition was set closer to the street than the actual historical home, the massing and the bulk of the addition was in conflict, massing length did not help to break up the mass of the structure, and overall the addition's cumulative effect of a few conflicts really did make the addition more prominent than the historic building. She reviewed the new site plan noting the porch was extended 124 square feet along the new addition, the addition was now set back equal distance as the historic house, the connector was extended three feet to break up the massing with a porch effect and changes in the garage layout were made to accommodate the proposed three stalls. Ms. Oktay explained the proposed brick siding would help break up the elevation and improve the general look of the home from the street. She stated the roof line was also reduced to 30 feet. Ms. Oktay stated it was Staff's recommendation to approve the application with the proposed changes, with the possible addition of more windows on the addition's Park Street side, and that final building materials and other minor details be delegated to staff for final approval.

Commissioner Richards stated the window condition was not listed in the Staff Report. He asked if a motion was made would the conditions need to be listed.

Mr. Neilson stated the motion could state with the conditions as outlined in the Staff Report.

Chairperson Oliver asked if the use of Hardi-Siding or Hardi-Shingles would be for the projecting garage section only.

Ms. Oktay stated it would be used for the connector section.

Chairperson Oliver asked what the material on the Park Street garage would be.

Ms. Oktay stated she believed it was to be brick.

Chairperson Oliver asked if the fence around the pool met the guidelines for height.

Ms. Oktay stated it did.

Commissioner Davis asked for clarification on the fence height and if the brown markings represented the finished grade or a retaining wall.

Ms. Oktay stated the fence could be six feet from the grade in the side and rear yard. She said currently the applicant could add up to two feet before he would need special approval.

Chairperson Oliver stated it could be an eight foot fence altogether.

Ms. Oktay stated yes it would have an effect of eight feet.

**Applicant Presentation [6:48:58 PM](#)**

Mr. Loewen stated the pool deck was raised less than two feet from the existing grade with a retaining wall and the fence was six feet high in that part of the yard. He explained the section around the garage would be brick unless the Commission did not want brick and then it would be changed.

Chairperson Oliver asked if the two windows, as shown in the presentation, were the preferred number on the Park Street side.

Mr. Loewen stated he would be open to putting a larger window on the top floor toward the rear of the addition but would prefer not to put windows on the first floor for security reasons. He stated he was planning to plant aspen trees to cover the building façade but he was open to anything.

Commissioner Richards stated one of the challenges was if a window was put in the first floor the concept of a split level still existed, but if a window was put in at the level, where it looked like it should go; the window may not be functional for the interior space.

Mr. Loewen stated it was for security purposes as well and it would cut through the foundation. He explained with the Hardi-shingles he was trying to use World War I battleship camouflage to minimize the connector.

Commissioner Bevins asked if the Applicant had considered lowering the roof above the porch to be used as a covering over the door.

Mr. Loewen stated he would have to extend past the brick to do that but he was willing to do it if the Commission requested it. He explained the roof was designed to overhang three feet currently, so it covered most of the porch. He explained the connector was doubled making it 10 feet instead of five feet. Mr. Loewen stated he reduced the drip line by two feet to reduce the overall height.

Chairperson Oliver asked about installing windows in the connector to help break up its mass.

Mr. Loewen stated the lower level would be the back of a pantry and he does not really need a window there but will add one if required. He stated putting a window in the upper level would locate it in a closet along the floor. Mr. Loewen asked the Commission to remember it was set back, so with the porch and the setback he was hoping to minimize the perceived size of the connector.

Commissioner Bevins asked if the eave on the connector was as deep as the rest of the house.

Mr. Loewen stated all of the eaves were three feet except a small area above the porch that connected to the roof line which measured at 1 ½ feet to match the front porch. He explained the use of two garage doors on the rear of the garage; he would have preferred to have one door although he likes the look of the two doors. He explained that one door would be smaller than two doors.

Commissioner Funk stated she did not have a problem with two garage doors at the rear of the addition as it was not the street face. She asked Mr. Loewen to look at the entrance on the west side. Commissioner Funk stated she was troubled with the appearance of the garage door. She expressed her concern regarding the look of the west garage door versus the two garage doors at the rear. Commissioner Funk stated if the roof line were removed from the west garage entrance then it would have more of an accessory structure appearance and not compete with the main structure. She explained the roof line just above the single garage door did not look like it fit into the design.

Mr. Loewen asked if it was more preferable for the façade to continue to the top of the structure and tie in with the roof.

Commissioner Funk stated she did not like the gable over the garage door because it gave the appearance of a house and the addition was an accessory structure. She said she would like to see a larger window at the top rear of the addition.

Commissioner Richards stated the problem was the carved out section at the top of the gable for the balcony floor.

Commissioner Funk stated she would prefer for the balcony to be the only protruding feature on the west side.

Mr. Loewen stated the presentation depicted the minimum footprint to accommodate his needs. He explained the rest of the features are cosmetic and he was open to adjusting anything as long as it was compatible to the historic home.

Commissioner Richards stated he agreed with Commissioner Funk on the gable roof line.

Mr. Loewen stated he would prefer to have the outcropping run the height of the structure on Park Street and then it would just have a small section of roof which tied into the main roof line. He explained that would mirror the layout of the roof line on the historic section of the home.

Commissioner Richards asked to look at the possible window composition.

Mr. Loewen presented the different options for window placement and explained the architectural features that would help minimize the amount of brick seen.

Commissioner Bevins stated, in the Architectural Review meeting conducted a number of weeks ago there was another standing that indicated the Park Street approach broke the scale down but added the same prominence to the garage as the front of the home. He explained it almost looked like a traditional door that swung open rather than a garage door.

#### **Public Comment [7:00:50 PM](#)**

**Chairperson Oliver opened the Public Hearing. Seeing no one was in the audience to comment on the issue the Public Hearing was closed.**

#### **Executive Session [7:00:58 PM](#)**

Commissioner Richards complimented the Applicant on a job well done and his willingness to make the home fit in with the nature of the area.

Commissioner Bevins stated there were vast improvements from the previous meeting such as the additional footage in the connector which helped to make the addition look more like a garage. He stated he would like to remove the gable above the single garage and only have the balcony there, on the Park Street side of the house. He would like the Applicant to add more windows to the upper level. Commissioner Bevins stated the roof line was more balanced than before.

Chairperson Oliver stated she agreed that the little garage projection on the west was not resolved and she would also like to see the addition of larger windows on the upper left side of the west elevation.

Commissioner Funk stated the Applicant had proposed landscaping and she felt that could help solve the problem with the blank wall. She stated she thought if the landscaping was added it should be part of the specifications that are made.

Chairperson Oliver stated she thought the building needed to be resolved in and of itself. She said if the Commission was to rely on landscaping and the plants died in the future, the building would still be as is. Chairperson Oliver stated a plan to make the structure compatible without landscaping needed to be in place.

Commissioner James asked if there was a requirement for landscaping such as the size and caliper of the plants.

Chairperson Oliver stated she did not think it was their purview at all. She said she thought the house needed to be its own solution and the landscaping was icing on the cake.

Commissioner Funk gave the example of a home on 1300 South with an addition that did not fit into the neighborhood by itself but the landscaping had mitigated it to be very acceptable

Commissioner James stated he agreed with everyone on the balcony above the Park Street side garage. He said the two story version presented worked well in terms of breaking up the overall mass of the addition, but it also started becoming a large mass in itself and competed with the house. Commissioner James said he would prefer to see it stay a single story level.

Chairperson Oliver asked if Commissioner James felt turning the gable feature into a flat roof and having the porch extend out to the edges would resolve the issue of the projecting garage.

Commissioner James stated he thought so, especially if the detailing was similar to the front porch and the new deck in the back. He said it depended on how the fascia board was handled with the trim and the flashings which could pick up the same details.

Commissioner Richards stated he thought the connector length made a huge difference. He said it was a larger project than the Commission usually sees but it was also a large house.

#### **MOTION [7:06:07 PM](#)**

**Regarding Petition PLNHLC2011-00214, Commissioner Funk moved that the Historic Landmark Commission approve the proposed changes as outlined in the Staff Report with the addition of a larger window, on the Park Street side, on the upper left portion of the addition, and with putting a flat roof over the garage rather than the gabled roof. The Commission delegates the final changes to the Staff for final approve.**

Mr. Nielson stated, for clarification when referring to the flat roof over the garage the Commission was referring to the western side of the addition.

Commissioner Funk stated that was correct.  
**Commissioner Richards seconded the motion.**

Chairperson Oliver called for discussion on the motion

Commissioner Davis stated he thought that the Staff should revisit, with the Applicant regarding the material and whether or not maintaining the water table line was critical.

Chairperson Oliver stated the water table line was a little curious because it was in line with the main building but it looked high due to the building having a lower roof line. She suggested maintaining it proportionately rather than literally.

Commissioner Davis suggested applying this to the location where it related more to the garage door, where it entered a grade versus the house that angled up.

Chairperson Oliver stated she thought decreasing the height of the foundation wall would help correct the proportions.

Commissioner Richards ask if that was an amendment to the motion.

Chairperson Oliver stated it was discussion but could be added to the motion. She stated the motion could be amended to say that the foundation wall be in proportion.

Commissioner Davis stated the motion would state that the height of the foundation wall be address by Staff.

**Commissioner Funk accepted the amendment.**

Chairperson Oliver asked if she was allowed to make an amendment to a motion.

Mr. Nielson stated the chair was not allowed to make a motion or an amendment however, the proposed motion, as discussed, was accepted by Commissioner Funk so in a sense she was making the motion. He asked if the Commissioner that seconded the motion agreed to the amendment.

**Commissioner Richards stated he accepted the amendment.**

Chairperson Oliver asked for further discussion on the motion, hearing none she called for a vote on the motion.

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

Commissioner Funk stated she thought the Commission needed to commend the Applicant for his willingness to comply with the requests of the Commission.

Chairperson Oliver thanked the Applicant for his time and effort with the project and stated the appeals process for the record.

Ms. Coffey announced Staff had a work session with the City Council on August 23<sup>rd</sup>. She said the Council had tentatively schedule a meeting for September 20<sup>th</sup> but the main focus was on the overall way preservation was handled in Salt Lake City. Ms. Coffey stated the Council asked Staff to revise the philosophy vision statement which was in the process. She explained once the vision statement was revised it would be sent to the Commission as notification of what Staff was asked to do by the City Council.

The next Historic Landmark Commission meeting will be September 15, with the field trip starting at 4:30 p.m.

**Commissioner Funk moved to adjourn.**

**There was no objection.**

**The meeting stood adjourned at [7:13:01 PM](#)**

---

Michelle Moeller, Historic Landmark Commission Secretary