

SALT LAKE CITY
HISTORIC LANDMARK COMMISSION
Minutes of the Meeting
Room 326, 451 South State Street
April 5, 2012

This document along with the digital recording constitute the official minutes of the Historic Landmark Commission regular session meeting held on April 5, 2012.

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, April 5, 2012, in Room 326 of the City and County Building, located at 451 South State Street, Salt Lake City, Utah, [5:36:47 PM](#) Commissioners present for the meeting were Chairperson Anne Oliver, Vice Chair Polly Hart, Earle Bevins III, Arla Funk, Sheleigh Harding, Stephen James and Dave Richards. Commissioner Bill Davis was excused.

Planning Staff members present for the meeting were Cheri Coffey, Assistant Planning Director, Janice Lew, Senior Planner, Michaela Oktay, Principal Planner, Maryann Pickering, Principal Planner, Katia Pace, Principal Planner, and Michelle Moeller, Senior Secretary. City Attorney Lynn Pace was also present.

FIELD TRIP [5:37:09 PM](#)

The Commissioner visited the subject properties. The Commission had no substantive business to discuss.

DINNER [5:37:15 PM](#)

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

REPORT OF THE CHAIR OR VICE CHAIR [5:37:34 PM](#)

Chairperson Oliver stated she and Commissioner Hart met with City Council members regarding the Commission and its activities.

Vice Chairperson Hart stated she did not have anything to report at this time.

REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR [5:38:05 PM](#)

Ms. Cheri Coffey, Assistant Planning Director, stated there were a number of Historic Landmark items being considered by the City Council and Staff would keep the Commission updated on the progress. She stated all of the design guidelines needed to go to the Planning Commission for review prior to going to the City Council therefore, those will take a little longer to be approved.

APPROVAL OF March 1, 2012 MINUTES [5:39:13 PM](#)

MOTION [5:40:07 PM](#)

Commissioner Hart moved to approve the minutes of March 1, 2012 with the corrections. Commissioner Funk seconded the motion. Commissioners Hart, Funk, Bevins, and Harding voted Aye. Commissioners James and Richards abstained from voting. The motion passed unanimously.

PUBLIC COMMENTS [5:40:36 PM](#)

Ms. Cindy Cromer, resident, stated she was concerned with the proposal for 600 East Medians because the existing medians are beautifully maintained and do not need to be changed. She stated the medians were significant to the Historic District and the continuity from the Governor's Mansion to Liberty Park was critical to tie the areas together. Ms. Cromer stated regarding the proposal for 400 South it must not be easy to eliminate blocks from a Historic District as there is a challenging process to initiate the process and it should be just as difficult to eliminate blocks.

Ms. Esther Hunter, resident, commented on the landscaping proposal for 600 South medians. She stated they are more than landscaping as they are a significant part of the historical fiber that was established early on in Salt Lake when there were not enough opportunities for people to get to parks and green spaces. Ms. Hunter stated these medians are important green spaces that need to remain useful.

BREIFING [5:45:58 PM](#)

PLNHLC2012-00647 - Landscaping the 600 East Medians from South Temple to 600 South - A request by Salt Lake City Parks and Public Lands Director, Emy Maloutas, to create low water use landscaping on the islands. The intent is to upgrade the irrigation system and replace existing turf with water-wise plant choices, preserving existing trees. The project is located in City Council District 4 represented by Luke Garrott. (Staff contact: Michaela Oktay at 801-535-6003 or michaela.oktay@slcgov.com).

Ms. Michaela Oktay, Principal Planner, reviewed the petition as presented in the Staff Report, (located in the case file). She stated the applicant had a presentation for the Commission. Ms. Oktay stated the purpose of the work session was for the Commission to raise any concerns or issues and to ensure the changes were compatible with the historic context of the neighborhood.

Commissioner James asked what the impetus was for the landscape proposal from the City's prospective.

Ms. Oktay stated the impetus was changes to the irrigation system and the Applicant would go into more detail about the proposal.

Ms. Emy Maloutas, Director of Salt Lake City Parks and Public Lands, reviewed the Division and what they oversaw. She stated the purpose for the proposal was to specifically address the significant issues with the irrigation system. Ms. Maloutas stated after the application was submitted, Mayor Becker recommended considering the addition of low water use plants. She reviewed the irrigation system that would allow the trees and grass to be irrigated per their individual needs.

Ms. Nancy Monteith, EPG Landscape Architect, reviewed the project and what plants/grasses could be used in the medians. She reviewed the use of the areas and how the plants could be incorporated to enhance the use of the medians while saving water. Ms. Monteith asked the Commissioners for their direction and/or comments.

The Commissioners and Applicant discussed the diagrams and location of grass, meadow grass and plantings in the medians. The following comments were made by the Commissioners:

- Meadow grass in high traffic areas would be less durable than regular grass.
- Was research on the history of the medians done and what were the results.
- Patterns of use and foot traffic in the area needed to be researched to help place durable turf and plants in those areas.
- What were the maintenance requirements for the different turfs and plants? Did some require less maintenance than others?
- There should be continuity from South Temple to Liberty Park.
- Water efficiency was a priority but keeping with the history was important.
- Areas are not used regularly but could be made more inviting with the changes.
- The medians were a major link for the Historic District.

- The medians along the entire length of 600 East should be included in the plans.

Ms. Maloutas stated at this time they were looking for the Commission's direction or support on the submitted proposal. She stated the particulars would be decided at a later date. Ms. Maloutas stated the history was briefly researched and showed that most of the medians were grass with perennials on the ends. She stated she understood making the medians fit with the entire district was important. Ms. Maloutas stated they had joined the Planning Department's Open House meetings to reach the largest number of people. She stated the emphasis of the public comments indicated the trees should not be removed. Ms. Maloutas stated it was important to keep all of the medians and explained the Parks Department had discussed expanding the project to include all of the medians on 600 East after the conceptual process was determined. She explained there would be potentially less mowing but the areas would still be maintained to remove garbage, weeds and debris.

The Commissioners and the Applicant discussed the proposed irrigation systems for the trees and the other plants. They discussed how the system would work to maximize efficiency, the requirements for different types of turf and the maintenance requirements for the turf.

Ms. Coffey stated the Historic Landmark standards are catered more toward buildings and not landscaping as there are not specific landscaping regulations. She explained the Commission had purview over the issue in the sense that the historic character of the area should be retained and preserved. Ms. Coffey explained when this issue came back to the Commission for a decision those were the guidelines the project needed to be weighed against as the Commission did not have purview over the actual species of the plants and efficiency of the irrigation system. She stated it was the Commissions' duty to decide if the historic character of the property would be retained.

Chairperson Oliver stated she would like more research done on the history of the medians and their original intent. She suggested the Applicant contact Ms. Esther Hunter as it seemed she had some useful information. Chairperson Oliver stated those factors may play into the final decision for the petition.

Commissioner Bevins stated the Residential Guidelines, recently approved, indicated the medians provide a unique and well used recreational, leisure space and remarkably enhance the character of the street. He stated it specifically identified the meridian strip along the center of the subject area. Commissioner Bevin stated he was concerned over the long term look of the xeriscaped areas and their maintenance.

Ms. Maloutas stated the meadow grass was sod and weeds only became an issue when bare ground was present. She stated the intention was not to create a maintenance issue but to create a more water efficient area.

Commissioner Funk stated she felt changing the plants would result in the loss of continuity of the medians. She stated in her neighborhood the islands were continuously used for neighborhood functions and gatherings. Commissioner Funk stated the proposed changes would affect that use.

Ms. Maloutas stated a study had been done on changing areas, such as the subject property, where turf was replaced with shrubs and perennial plants that indicated a decrease in water, maintenance and amount of green waste. Ms. Maloutas stated currently there was a high effort maintenance program and with the proposal the green look and feel of the medians would remain because the proposed plants are low growing.

Mr. Lynn Pace, Attorney stated it would be interesting to understand to what extent these corridors were intended to tie the turf look on South Temple with the turf look at Liberty Park and whether or not it was in fact a turf corridor that tied it all together. He stated Staff needed direction as to whether or not the Commission wanted the issue to be brought back to them for a vote or if an Administrative Decision could be made.

Commissioner Hart clarified the Commission could not vote as there had not been a Public Hearing on the issue.

Ms. Coffey stated the issue was not noticed for vote or Public Hearing therefore, the Commission could state this was something that Staff could administratively approve or the Commission could request to vote at which time it would need to be scheduled for a Public Hearing.

The Commissioners and Applicant discussed the need for research to be completed and presented regarding the historical importance and intent for the medians. They decided this would be done prior to the next presentation of the proposal. The Commission decided the issue should be addressed and approved by them and not by Staff.

MOTION [6:30:04 PM](#)

Commissioner Funk moved in the case of PLNHLC2012-00647 that the Historic Landmark Commission continue the issue to a later meeting at which time the Petitioners could

present additional information and a Public Hearing would be held. Commissioner Hart seconded the motion.

Commissioner James stated he did not see why Staff could not review and approve the petition.

Commissioner Bevins stated the long term implications of the proposal were quite significant.

Commissioner Harding stated she agreed with Commissioner James that Staff could handle the issue.

Commissioners Hart, Bevins, Richards and Funk voted *aye*. Commissioners James and Harding voted *nay*. The motion passed 4-2.

[6:31:48 PM](#)

PLNPCM2010-00647 – 400 South Livable Communities Station Area Plans - A request by Salt Lake City Mayor Ralph Becker for an amendment to the Central Community Master Plan, Salt Lake City Zoning Ordinance and Zoning Map regarding transit station area plans along the 400 South transit corridor. The intent of the project is to implement livability goals for the corridor including land use policies and zoning that support mixed use development and transportation choices for current and future residents and workers. The project is located in City Council District 4 represented by Luke Garrott. (Staff contact: Maryann Pickering at 801-535-7660 or maryann.pickering@slcgov.com).

Ms. Maryann Pickering, Principal Planner, reviewed the petition as presented in the Staff Report (located in the case file).

Commissioner Hart stated Ensign Floral was a contributing building and asked if the grey apartment building located at 318 South 600 East was going to be in the Historic District or not as it was not clear.

Ms. Pickering stated it was on the proposed block therefore, it would be removed.

Commissioner Hart stated it should be added to the list of contributing buildings.

Ms. Pickering stated she would recheck the area and make sure the historic buildings were left within the district.

Commissioner James asked Staff to summarize the core characteristics of the intent for zone

and what was the zone would accomplish in the particular area.

Ms. Pickering reviewed the zoning and core specifications for each area as outlined in the TSA Zoning Ordinance.

Commissioner James asked what the zone yielded in terms of streetscape character and potential compatibility with the traditional context.

Ms. Pickering stated the overall intent of the TSA district would encourage more mixed use development and push buildings up to the street to create a pedestrian environment with parking in the rear making it more of a pedestrian core.

Commissioner James stated the idea was the functional urbanism that was established through the new zone actually reflected the traditional urbanism of the original neighborhoods eroded over time.

Ms. Pickering stated that was correct.

Commissioner Funk stated she was concerned with the height allowance and asked why seventy five feet was determined to be an appropriate height. She stated if a seventy five foot building was placed on the face of the block what would it do to the residential area behind the TSA zone.

Ms. Pickering stated part of the requirement was that any core area, adjacent to a single family residential zone, would have to step back from the residential zone so the highest buildings would be allowed along 400 South or any other major street. She stated the minimum setback would be twenty five feet and the higher the building the larger the setback. Ms. Pickering stated through the design standards the residential areas would be protected by pushing the intensive height away from the residential areas.

Commissioner Funk asked if North Temple and 400 South were considered comparable.

Ms. Pickering stated with the Trax line they were but, there were different components involved on 400 South.

Commissioner Funk stated she had concerns, because of past planning, that the City may be currently over building and not thinking what the City's needs would be in the future.

Ms. Pickering stated the predictions show the City's population would probably double in the next fifty years and instead of sprawling out to the edges the City was trying to concentrate the development. She stated last summer, Staff met with the individual community groups where many people expressed a need for more apartments in this area therefore, the goal would be mixed use with retail on the first and second floors and apartments above.

Commissioner Funk asked how the height limit was determined.

Ms. Pickering stated it was currently seventy five feet including the TC-75 Zoning District that is in the area.

Commissioner Funk asked what drove that height allowance.

Ms. Pickering stated it was a standard used throughout the country.

Chairperson Oliver stated maybe the question was if the height should be allowed or if it was too high for the area. She asked by removing the historic overlay how would it impede the proposal and could both exist at the same time or could the height be lowered in the section to help reunite the two sections of the Historic District. Chairperson Oliver stated the question could be asked if the historic overlay would even need to be removed.

Ms. Pickering stated the historic resources remaining in the identified areas were extremely limited.

Chairperson Oliver stated she agreed but by removing the historic overlay requirement there would be less control over what was allowed. She stated if it were kept more direction could be given. Chairperson Oliver stated it seemed there was a danger in splitting up the historic district.

Commissioner Funk expressed her concern on the impact of the zoning around the stadium neighborhood and setting a precedent in the area.

Ms. Pickering stated currently the TSA zone did not reach the University and if it was to expand it most likely would be towards downtown.

Commissioner James stated he felt the compact development around transit stops would ultimately be a tool to help preserve traditional neighborhoods because there would be a lot less development pressure to expand horizontally. He stated the seventy five feet in context

to the width of the right of way was a good thing because in space and scale it was proportionate. Commissioner James said in order to achieve the sense of community and walkability there needed to be a bit of enclosure to the space. Commissioner James stated he likes the idea but the area should retain its historic character.

The Commissioners discussed the ideal height in respect to the neighborhood and 400 South.

Ms. Coffey stated the areas being discussed were only those in the historic district. She said as Staff stated there was not a lot of historic fabric left in the area. Ms. Coffey explained Staff and the Commission needed to see how well the zoning guidelines worked with the preservation guidelines in the area.

Chairperson Oliver stated the careful consideration of what is allowed in the TSA zoning and the compatibility with the Commercial Design Guidelines needed to be considered.

Ms. Pickering stated the guidelines would be sent to the Commissioners before the next meeting.

Chairperson Oliver stated the proposal referred to the parking lot south of Trolley Square and asked Ms. Pickering to discuss what was being proposed.

Ms. Pickering stated the property was currently zoned RMF and the owners of the parking lot have requested expansion which is not permitted because it would expand a non-conforming use. She stated because of the property's location to 400 South Staff decided to add it to the proposed project as it would be an ideal time to rezone the parcel. Ms. Pickering stated Staff had received negative feedback indicating the RMU zoning would be too intense and possibly cause disregard for the existing historic structures. She stated this could be addressed at the Public Hearing if the Commission wanted or it could be removed from the proposal.

Commissioner Hart asked if this was a transit orientated zone why Staff would want to expand the parking lot.

Ms. Pickering stated the subject section was not transit orientated development. She stated it was just in the area and under the same historic district therefore, Staff included it in the proposal.

Chairperson Oliver stated there was a clear delineation between residential and commercial on the street and she would agree that it would not be a good idea to rezone the parcel and

add mixed use in the area.

Commissioner James stated it didn't make sense to change the zoning for the parcel.

Commissioner Bevins asked if parking was part of the Trolley Square expansion requirements.

Ms. Pickering stated it may have been part of the requirements but due to the store vacancies in Trolley Square the parking lot was not currently utilized. She explained if Trolley Square were to be fully leased the parking would be utilized more frequently.

Commissioner Bevins asked if the parking would have been a condition to the expansion of Trolley Square.

Ms. Pickering stated no not under the current zoning because it was a non-conforming use.

Commissioner Hart asked if the owners of the lot requested the zoning change or was it the City's suggestion.

Ms. Pickering stated the owner approached the City a few years ago and it was something that had been put on the back burner. She explained the owner had not come forward as part of the current proposal.

Commissioner Hart asked if a zoning change had been previously requested.

Ms. Pickering stated no.

Ms. Coffey stated over the years the development of the parcel had been reviewed and with the start of the proposed project it seemed like the time to look at the idea of changing the zoning and possibly sparking the use of the boarded up buildings.

Chairperson Oliver asked Staff to give their thoughts on rezoning the parcel and what the benefits would be.

Ms. Pickering stated development in the parking lot and on the vacant corner lot with other development in years to come would most likely be the result.

Commissioner James asked if the City was providing to many development opportunities at once and would it not make sense to focus on one area.

Commissioner Hart stated she did not understand why the City would offer up a zoning change to a parcel when other property owners have asked for rezoning and been denied. She stated if the owner wanted a zoning change they should go through the process.

PUBLIC HEARINGS [7:02:12 PM](#)

PLNHLC2011-00760 – Boyington Garage - A request by Steven Boyington, for additional height on an accessory structure on the property located at approximately 633 Victory Road in the Capitol Hill Historic District. The proposed height is 17 feet and 6 inches, the SR-1A allows for accessory structures that are 14 feet tall. The subject property is located in the SR-1A (Special Development Pattern District) in City Council District 3, represented by Stan Penfold. (Staff contact: Katia Pace, 801 535-6354 or katia.pace@slcgov.com)

Commissioner Funk recused herself due to a friendship with the Applicant.

Ms. Katia Pace, Principal Planner, reviewed the petition as presented in the Staff Report (located in the case file). She stated Staff recommended the Historic Landmark Commission approve the petition as presented.

Commissioner Hart asked the elevation of the house next to the garage.

Ms. Pace stated it was twenty six feet high.

Commissioner Hart asked if the garage would be subordinate to the house.

Ms. Pace stated yes it would be.

Commissioner James asked if the property was bisected with a right of way or private lane.

Ms. Pace stated a property was located behind the subject property and current access was retained.

Commissioner James asked if the lot was one continuous lot.

Commissioner Hart explained the property was formally two lots but was combined.

Commissioner James stated it resulted in a strange site plan and was not something that would normally be expected.

Ms. Pace stated that was true and explained the reason for the combination of the lots was due to the lack of parking on the street.

Commissioner James stated due to the fact that any required variances have all ready been approved the Commission was in a sense only reviewing the architecture of the garage.

Ms. Pace stated that was correct.

Chairperson Oliver clarified the reason the garage was set so close to the neighboring house to the north was to accommodate the grade.

Ms. Pace stated it was ten feet from the neighboring house which was what was required by the zoning ordinance. She stated the site plan was a little misleading but she had double checked the measurements and it was in fact ten feet.

Mr. Steven Boyington, property owner, reviewed the process he had gone through to help with the parking problems in the area. He explained he wanted to build a garage that was complimentary to the house because currently the property looked like it belonged to the neighbor. Mr. Boyington explained the design was to keep in character with the area and enhance the street view.

Ms. Paula Carl, Architect, stated the grade on the property was a challenge and played a part in the placement of the garage.

Chairperson Oliver asked if the height exception was a function of the design.

Mr. Boyington stated the height was added to make the roof line match the house and be aesthetically pleasing.

Ms. Carl stated the upper floor of the garage would be used for storage purposes.

Mr. Boyington stated the neighbors were in favor of the proposal. He stated the additional height would help tie the garage to the home and keep with the character of the Historic District.

Commissioner Richards asked if the slope of the garage roof was the same as the house's.

Ms. Carl stated it would be the same as the house.

Commissioner Bevins asked if utilities would be installed in the garage.

Mr. Boyington explained the only utilities that would be installed in the garage would be electrical and water for the lawn.

Commissioner Bevins said the intent was not to make the second floor, of the garage, a living space.

Mr. Boyington stated that was correct it was not intended to be a living space.

Commissioner James stated one thing that was uncharacteristic of the garage was the way it addressed the main street. He stated normally in districts the garage was off a rear lane or set back behind a house therefore, the driveway would be seen from the street. Commissioner James stated there were alternatives to the proposed location such as addressing it to the existing house to the south and building it into the hillside.

Mr. Boyington stated he did not think it was possible and asked if Commissioner James had seen the picture on page 10, of the Staff Report.

Commissioner James stated he had and did not agree that no other solutions were available.

Ms. Carl stated the suggestion was an expensive solution.

Commissioner James stated yes, as it buried the garage in the hill side.

The Commissioners and Applicant discussed moving the garage and the requirements that would have to be met to fit the garage behind the house. They agreed it would not be the most ideal placement due to expenses.

Chairperson Oliver asked how double width driveways were approached in the past, as that would be the only questionable thing.

Ms. Coffey stated there was not a lot of opportunities for wide driveways as most historic lots are narrow. She stated therefore, there was nothing to go off of for this proposal.

Commissioner James stated it was a normal characteristic of Historic Districts to not have a wide driveway and so if this was allowed would it be setting a precedent.

Ms. Carl stated the driveway could be flared if need be.

Chairperson Oliver stated the Commission had always tried to minimize the amount of concrete used for driveways.

Ms. Carl stated they would be willing to make the drive narrow at the entrance and flare out toward the garage.

The Commissioners and Applicant discussed the layout and width of the driveway.

PUBLIC HEARING [7:21:48 PM](#)

Chairperson Oliver opened the Public Hearing. Seeing there was no one in the audience to speak for or against the proposal Chairperson Oliver closed the Public Hearing.

COMMISSION DISCUSSION [7:21:49 PM](#)

MOTION [7:22:06 PM](#)

Commissioner Richards moved in the case of PLNHLC2011-00760 that the Historic Landmark Commission concurred with Staff's findings and approved the petition with the conditions outlined in the Staff Report. Commissioner Hart seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

[7:23:08 PM](#)

PLNHLC2012-00009 – Powell Addition - A request by Kelly Anderson, builder, on behalf of the property owner, John Powell, to build a rear addition on the home located at approximately 24 West 500 North in the Capitol Hill Historic District. The subject property is zoned R-2 (Single and Two-Family Residential District) and is located in City Council District 3, represented by Stan Penfold. (Staff contact: Lex Traughber, (801) 535-6184 or lex.traughber@slcgov.com)

Ms. Katia Pace presented the case in Mr. Lex Traughber's absence.

Ms. Pace reviewed the petition as presented in the Staff Report. She stated Staff was recommending approval of the petition.

Commissioner Hart asked if the proposed windows were going to be vinyl or compatible with the historic windows.

Ms. Pace stated being that the windows were in the rear of the property, vinyl windows would be appropriate.

Chairperson Oliver stated all of the other windows in the house had been altered in type therefore, there were no historic windows.

Commissioner James stated the proposed windows did not have much of a frame around them and were not traditional in context. He stated the windows should be similar to what was in the home.

Ms. Pace stated she would make Mr. Traughber aware of that concern for the Certificate of Appropriateness.

Ms. Coffey stated the Commission could make that a condition of approval.

Mr. Kelly Anderson, General Manager Iron Wood Custom Builders representing Mr. Powell asked if the Commission had any questions for him.

Commissioner Richards stated the Staff Report mentioned it would be more appropriate to have a panel door on the garage and asked if the Applicant had addressed that concern.

Mr. Anderson stated Mr. Powell had agreed to make the change.

Commissioner Richards stated that condition would need to be part of the approval. He asked if the Applicant knew what the existing window construction was.

Mr. Anderson stated they looked like they were a composite but were relatively old.

Commissioner Richards stated they may have been early fiberglass replacement. He asked if the entire frames were taken out of the structure or if they were sash replacement kits.

Mr. Anderson stated he was not aware of how the windows were replaced.

Commissioner Richards asked if any of the windows were original.

Mr. Anderson stated no, the windows were not original.

Commissioner James asked if the exterior trim around the windows was it a Hardi XLD type of material.

Mr. Anderson stated that was correct about twelve inches wide.

The Commissioners and Applicant discussed the windows and molding around the windows. The Commission asked about the double window and if there was a molding in the center.

Mr. Anderson stated Mr. Powell would not be against using a higher grade vinyl window or splitting the two to satisfy the Commission's concerns.

Commissioner Richards stated it was important to keep with the traditional window moldings.

PUBLIC HEARING [7:35:24 PM](#)

Chairperson Oliver opened the Public Hearing.

Mr. Stan Olsen, Neighbor, stated he supported the proposal and it would be a wonderful addition to the neighborhood.

Chairperson Oliver closed the Public Hearing.

COMMISSION DISCUSSION [7:36:31 PM](#)

Chairperson Oliver stated the garage door and window details needed to be added to the conditions of approval.

Commissioner James stated if vinyl windows were going to be used in the Historic Districts there should be clarification on the standards that the windows should meet. He stated how the windows are framed or molded can have a dramatic impact on the character of places and some of the trim is so slim that one does not get a sense of the window frame which is critical to the Historic Districts.

Commissioner Richards stated he agreed the frame was important to the look of the structure.

Chairperson Oliver asked if vinyl windows were generally allowed at the rear of houses.

Ms. Coffey stated yes they have been allowed in the rear of structures. She stated this was part of the philosophy adopted by the City Council allowing more flexibility on secondary elevations.

Chairperson Oliver stated for this proposal it was not the material that was questionable but the design details that needed to be addressed.

MOTION [7:40:54 PM](#)

Commissioner Hart moved in the case of PLNHLC2012-00009 that the Historic Landmark Commission approve the application with the two conditions outlined in the Staff Report and ask that the Applicant work with Staff to ensure that the profile of the new windows are compatible with the existing windows.

Commissioner Harding stated and they do so based on the findings listed in the Staff Report.

Commissioner Funk asked if more than just the profile of the window should be address

Commissioner Hart stated to work with Staff to ensure that the new windows are set compatibly with the historic windows. Commissioner James seconded the motion.

Commissioner Richards asked for clarification on the setback of the windows due to the stud wall width.

The Commissioners discussed the inset of the windows and the detailing it would provide.

The motion passed with unanimously.

[7:43:45 PM](#)

PLNPCM2009-00628 – Commercial Design Guidelines - The Salt Lake City Planning Division has drafted a new section for the design guidelines use by the Historic Landmark Commission to make design review decisions for properties with local historic designation. This supplemental information will provide guidance for commercial properties. The petition requires the Historic Landmark Commission to forward a recommendation to the City Council. This document would affect areas City-wide. (Staff contact: Janice Lew, 801-535-7625 or janice.lew@slcgov.com)

Ms. Janice Lew, Senior Planner reviewed the petition as outlined in the Staff Report (located in

the case file). She stated Staff was recommending the Historic Landmark Commission forward the Design Guidelines to the City Council with a favorable recommendation.

The Commissioners discussed the following items:

- The layout of the document was great
- The document needed to be reviewed and edited to clean up spelling and grammar
- The overall look of the document was wonderful
- Making the pictures reflect the ideal standards and best examples in the areas
- Adding more photos to the neighborhood areas through a range of years for further visual aid and to emphasize the diversity of commercial building within each district
- Eliminating repetitive text throughout the guidelines
- Reference the Sign Guidelines in sections pertaining to the use of signs
- Making the numbering system consistent throughout the document
- Part 2- guideline 9.5, regarding elevators and using glass as a framing material- this section needed to be clarified.
- Take out the word consider and reword sentences to be more directional
- 2-13.13, New Construction- regarding parking garages needs to be expanded on what is allowed on street level to activate the space.
- Paragraph on how to start with new construction and how to use the guidelines.

Mr. Pace stated the Attorney's office will be looking to ensure future Boards and Applicants understand that these are guidelines, meaning that they are advisory only. He stated the Attorney's office would be asking for the word consider to be added into the document.

Commissioner James stated the guidelines were what clarified the understanding of the standard.

Mr. Pace stated that was correct but if the guidelines were to be binding they needed to be called standards not guidelines. He stated it needed to be clear if these were standards or guidelines.

Ms. Coffey stated the Planning Division has always operated on a case by case basis. She explained if the Commission made it a standard that every elevator had to be glass and there was a time where it was not appropriate for a glass elevator the Commission would be bound to a glass elevator because it was a standard.

Chairperson Oliver stated if the guidelines where to be standards the process would have to start over entirely.

Commissioner Richards stated that was his reasoning for pushing for the Standards to be referenced and clarity on what is a standard and what is a guideline.

PUBLIC HEARING [8:08:48 PM](#)

Chairperson Oliver opened the Public Hearing.

Ms. Cindy Cromer, Resident, stated the pictures needed to be reviewed and be ideal examples in all aspects. She stated her concern at this point was how to use the guidelines and how the all of the guidelines would be integrated together. Ms. Cromer reviewed the need to remove redundancy throughout the guidelines. She stated a shared glossary where all the definitions are combined would be beneficial.

Chairperson Oliver closed the Public Hearing.

COMMISSION DISCUSSION [8:12:31 PM](#)

Chairperson Oliver stated the documents will be updated frequently which will hopefully address some of the concerns.

Ms. Coffey stated it was the overall goal to make the documents easy to use both online and in printed version.

MOTION [8:16:13 PM](#)

Commissioner Hart moved in the case of PLNHLC2009-00628 that the Historic Landmark Commission forward a favorable recommendation to the City Council, based on the findings and analysis in the Staff Report and taking into account the comments made by the Commission. Commissioner James seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

The Commission thanked Ms. Janice Lew for a job well done.

The meeting stood adjourned at [8:19:14 PM](#)