

SALT LAKE CITY
HISTORIC LANDMARK COMMISSION
Minutes of the Meeting
Room 326, 451 South State Street
December 6, 2012

This document along with the digital recording constitute the official minutes of the Historic Landmark Commission regular session meeting held on December 6, 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.slcgov.com/slctv/slctv-videos-demand>.

A regular meeting of the Historic Landmark Commission was called to order on Thursday, December 6, 2012 in Room 326 of the City and County Building, located at 451 South State Street, Salt Lake City, Utah, at [5:33:40 PM](#). Commissioners present for the meeting were Chairperson Sheleigh Harding, Vice Chair Polly Hart, Earle Bevins III, Bill Davis, Stephen James, Charles Shepherd, and Heather Thuet. Commissioners Robert McClintic, Thomas Brennan and Arla Funk were excused.

Planning Staff members present for the meeting were Joel Paterson, Planning Manager; Janice Lew, Senior Planner; Michaela Oktay, Principal Planner; Elizabeth Buehler, Principal Planner; Katia Pace, Principal Planner and Courtney Benson, Senior Secretary. Senior City Attorney Paul Nielson was also present.

FIELD TRIP [5:33:48 PM](#)

The Commissioners present on the field trip were Vice Chair Polly Hart, Earle Bevins III, and Charles Shepherd. The Staff present were Joel Paterson, Katia Pace and Michaela Oktay. Commission and Staff visited the following properties:

505 East Third Avenue – Staff and Commissioners discussed recommendations that had been made.

268 West 600 North – Commissioners and Staff discussed the location of the alley. Commissioners and Staff discussed the house and the importance of the design being compatible with other homes in the neighborhood.

669 South 500 East – Commissioners asked questions about the fence height, opacity and whether the applicant had built the fence himself. Commissioners and Staff discussed a fence built on the property across the street (which is not located in the historic district).

DINNER [5:33:50 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 [5:34:00 PM](#)

Vice Chair Hart stated there was some confusion when the City Council approved the fine tuning of the Historic Landmarks Ordinance. She stated the motion has been re-worded to clarify that all major alterations will come before the Commission.

Chairperson Harding stated she was glad the issue had been worked out.

REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR [5:35:01 PM](#)

Mr. Joel Paterson, Planning Manager, stated the Revision to the Residential Design Guidelines, the new Commercial Design Guidelines, and the Sign Guidelines have been under consideration by the City Council. A public hearing was held earlier this week and the Council will make a decision next week.

APPROVAL OF November 1, 2012 MINUTES [5:35:40 PM](#)

MOTION [5:35:50 PM](#)

Vice Chair Hart moved to approve the minutes of November 1, 2012. Commissioner James seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

PUBLIC COMMENTS [5:36:00 PM](#)

No one wished to speak at this time.

PUBLIC HEARINGS [5:36:26 PM](#)

PLNHLC2012-00795 Tracy Aviary Holding Building - A request by Tracy Aviary for a Certificate of appropriateness involving new construction for a new holding building that will house birds when not on display. The Aviary is located at approximately 589 East 1300 South in Historic Liberty Park and the OS (Open Space) zoning district, in City Council District 5, represented by Jill Remington-Love. (Staff contact: Ray Milliner, ray.milliner@slcgov.com)

Ms. Michaela Oktay, Principal Planner, reviewed the petition as presented in the Staff Report (located in the Case File). She stated Staff recommends approval of the petition pursuant to the conditions listed in the Staff Report.

[5:39:40 PM](#)

The Applicant stated the wall facing the pedestrian pathway will now be metal panels similar to what was used on the entry building. He stated the building is 25% smaller and no longer contains a bird quarantine area. He stated a contractor has been selected and construction will begin in January.

Commissioner Bevins asked if the area between the sidewalk and the building will be landscaped.

The Applicant stated the plan is to continue the turf buffer around the building.

PUBLIC HEARING [5:42:30 PM](#)

Chairperson Harding opened the Public Hearing. Seeing no one wished to speak, Chairperson Harding closed the Public Hearing.

COMMISSION DISCUSSION [5:42:47 PM](#)

Commissioner James stated in the case of PLNHLC2012-00795 the Commission approves the request to construct a new holding building based on the findings listed in the Staff Report and with the following conditions: 1) The final approval of exterior materials and windows will be delegated to staff. 2) The building must meet all applicable zoning ordinance requirements including setbacks, maximum footprint and lot coverage. 3) The applicant will continue to work with the city arborist to ensure all trees are appropriate for the site and as many trees as possible are preserved. 3) The location of the sheds and veterinary building currently on site should be reviewed and approved by Staff.

Vice Chair Hart seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

Chairperson Harding reviewed the appeals process

[5:44:40 PM](#)

PLNHLC2012-00384 - Meck Accessory Structure Addition and Additional Garage Square Footage - A request by Kimble Shaw, architect, for major alterations to a property located at approximately 505 E. Third Avenue in the Avenues Historic District. The request is to demolish an early addition to a "contributing" accessory structure and to construct a new two-car garage addition. As part of the review, the applicant is requesting Commission

approval of an additional 45 square feet of garage area over the allowed 600 square feet. The property is zoned SR1-A, Special Development Pattern Residential District and is located in City Council District 3, represented by Stan Penfold. (Staff contact: Janice Lew, 801-535-7625, janice.lew@slcgov.com)

Ms. Janice Lew, Senior Planner, reviewed the petition as presented in the Staff Report (located in the Case File). She stated Staff recommends approval of the petition pursuant to the conditions listed in the Staff Report.

Vice Chair Hart asked how standard 2 was met.

Ms. Lew stated the original portion of the building is being maintained.

Vice Chair Hart stated the addition is historically significant especially since it matches the house.

Ms. Lew stated the Commission is free to disagree with the Staff Report.

[5:49:19 PM](#)

Mr. Kimble Shaw, architect, and representative of the Applicant, stated he agreed with the Staff Report.

Commissioner Shepherd asked about using salvaged brick on the west face of the garage. He stated it would look like an applied veneer.

Mr. Shaw stated the idea to reuse the brick was suggested by Staff.

Commissioner Shepherd stated if the bricks cannot be used to cover an entire wall he is not sure it is a benefit.

Commissioner James asked if there is more brick that could be used to wrap the corner.

Mr. Shaw stated the brick is in poor condition and he is not sure how much would be available.

Commissioner Shepherd asked if the proposed garage doors are available.

Mr. Shaw stated the door might need to be custom made.

Commissioner Shepherd asked if the proposed door is an overhead door.

Mr. Shaw stated it is an overhead door.

PUBLIC HEARING [5:51:45 PM](#)

Chairperson Harding opened the Public Hearing. Seeing there was no one who wished to speak she closed the Public Hearing.

COMMISSION DISCUSSION [5:52:03 PM](#)

Vice Chair Hart made the following comments:

- The Commission had previously decided that demolition should not be allowed.
- Standard 4 states that alterations and additions that have acquired historical significance should be retained and preserved.
- The portion of the contributing structure that is being considered for demolition is significant.
- Large garages are rare in the Avenues and this structure adds to the character of the neighborhood.

Commissioner Shepherd stated the existing garage is interesting and has some significance, but he is not sure it has a connection to the house other than its material and paint color. He stated he does not feel the Commission has the information it needs to understand demolition of accessory structures.

Commissioner James stated he is not opposed to demolishing the garage if its replacement is well designed and will eventually become significant in its own right. He stated he does not like the reuse of the brick on the front façade or the metal garage door.

Commissioner Davis stated the garage is in poor condition and trying to retain it is not reasonable. He stated he thought it was the Commission's suggestion to reuse the original brick.

Commissioner Shepherd asked about lot coverage of the accessory structures.

Ms. Lew stated the Applicant is requesting a special exception. She stated the zoning ordinance allows a 480 square foot principal accessory structure and an additional 120 square foot structure. She stated the proposed garage is 480 square feet and the existing summer kitchen is greater than 120 square feet.

Commissioner Bevins stated this proposal maintains the summer kitchen and the chimney, which helps maintain the original character. He stated the current structure is unusable.

Commissioner James stated he would be willing to support the project if he better understood the quality of the construction materials. He asked the Applicant if he would consider other materials for the garage door.

Mr. Shaw stated he would consider other options.

Commissioner Bevins asked if an overhead door was the only option.

Mr. Shaw stated a swinging door would also be an option.

MOTION [6:04:26 PM](#)

Commissioner James stated in the case of PLNHLC2012-00384 the Commission approves the petition based on the findings listed in the Staff Report. He stated the petition complies with standards 1, 2, 3, 5, 8, 9 and 12. Commissioner James stated the petition conflicts with standard 4, but the Commission believes the Applicant will construct a garage that will take on significance over time. He stated standards 6, 7, 10 and 11 do not apply. He stated the following conditions apply:

- 1. The approval of the final details of the design will be delegated to Staff based on directions given by the Commission, specifically reexamination of the garage door so that metal is not used. The Commission does not require the brick be reused on the façade, but requests that the Applicant find an alternative way to use the brick.**
- 2. The project must meet all applicable City requirements unless otherwise modified within the authority of the Historic Landmark Commission and/or Hearing Officer.**
- 3. The Historic Landmark Commission allows a modification to the maximum garage square footage.**
- 4. The approval will expire if a permit has not been taken out or an extension granted within 12 months from the date of approval.**
- 5. The applicant will provide archival quality photographs necessary to record the accessory structure as it appears today.**
- 6. The property owner shall make efforts to salvage or reuse any architectural features and building materials that will be removed.**

Commissioner Bevins seconded the motion.

Commissioner Shepherd amended the motion to state that the garage door replacement should provide appropriate reference to the original door.

Commissioner James accepted the amendment

Commissioner Bevins seconded the amendment.

Commissioner James stated the door is the primary feature of the existing garage and replacing the door with a historically appropriate door is important.

Commissioners Davis, Shepherd, Bevins, James and Thuet voted *aye*. Vice Chair Hart voted *nay*. The motion passed 5-1.

Chairperson Harding reviewed the appeals process.

[6:09:46 PM](#)

PLNHLC2012-00626 Carrillo Fence - A request by Bogar Carrillo for a Certificate of Appropriateness and a Special Exception to retroactively approve a fence installed in the front yard of the property located at 669 South 500 East in the Central City Historic District. The property is located in the RMF-30 Low Density Multifamily Residential Zoning District in Council District 4, represented by Luke Garrott. (Staff Contact: Katia Pace at (801) 535-6354 or katia.pace@slcgov.com)

Ms. Katia Pace, Principal Planner, reviewed the petition as presented in the Staff Report (located in the Case File). She stated Staff recommends denial of the petition.

Commissioner Davis asked if the house is a contributing structure.

Ms. Pace stated the house is a contributing structure.

Commissioner Harding asked how old the fence is.

Ms. Pace stated the fence was built earlier this year.

Chairperson Harding stated she was not clear how Staff responded to the Applicant's proposal to remove boards and reduce the fence height to 36 inches.

Ms. Pace stated picket fences and wrought iron fences are typically allowed in historic districts. She stated opening the fence up by removing boards would be a good solution, but the lattice design on the top of the fence is not typical of this historic district.

Commissioner James asked if the neighbor's fence was in compliance.

Ms. Pace stated the neighbor's fence is in compliance.

[6:23:02 PM](#)

Mr. Bogar Carrillo, Applicant, stated he placed the fence to enhance the beauty and safety of the home. He stated the home does not have a backyard and there is no place for children to play. He stated he was not aware a permit was required to build a fence. Mr. Carrillo stated the height of the fence is not greater than the adjacent neighbor's fence, or the fence located across the street. He stated he is willing to remove the lattice and open the panels. He stated he would like to request an exception for the height of the north and south portions of the fence.

Commissioner Bevins asked the Applicant to describe the fence that was replaced.

Mr. Carrillo stated there was a chain link fence that was removed in 2002.

Commissioner Thuet asked about the adjacent driveway.

Mr. Carrillo stated he shares the driveway with an apartment complex to access the rear parking lot.

Commissioner Thuet asked if there were a number of vehicles coming in and out of the driveway.

Mr. Carrillo stated that was correct.

Commissioner Thuet asked Mr. Carrillo if he was willing to take back a corner of the fence in addition to reducing the height in order to improve the line of sight.

Mr. Carrillo stated he is willing to do that.

PUBLIC HEARING [6:28:08 PM](#)

Chairperson Harding opened the Public Hearing. Seeing no one wished to speak, Chairperson Harding closed the Public Hearing.

COMMISSION DISCUSSION [6:28:25 PM](#)

Commissioner James stated tall fences placed at the edge of a public space hurt the neighborhood. He stated the fence does not meet the character of the historic neighborhood. He stated he is not sure removing panels will help improve the character.

Chairperson Harding stated removing panels would make the fence more similar to other picket fences in the neighborhood.

Commissioner Shepherd stated removing every other panel would only result in a 25-35% open fence which is not enough. He stated he understands the need for the side fence and it is the front of the fence that needs to be addressed. He stated an open fence along with a corner removed to improve traffic safety would go a long way to help solve the problem.

Chairperson Harding stated it seemed clear that the current fence would not work. She stated the Commission can either reject the fence as Staff has recommended or come up with a compromise.

Commissioner James stated he would prefer a compromise if it resulted in a fence that contributed to the neighborhood.

The Commission discussed what changes would need to be made to the fence to keep it in compliance with district requirements. The Commission discussed lowering the height, opening up the front of the fence, removing a corner of the fence to improve the line of sight issue and removing the lattice design.

Commissioner James asked if zoning allowed the fence to be up against the sidewalk.

Ms. Pace stated it is allowed if the Applicant has received a permit from the City.

Commissioner James stated it is important for a fence to be open if it is located directly adjacent to a sidewalk. He stated he recognizes the fence provides a sense of security, but it is visually jarring and does not contribute to the neighborhood.

Chairperson Harding asked Mr. Carrillo if he was willing to table the application and work with Staff to reach a compromise.

Mr. Carrillo stated he was willing to do this.

Commissioner Bevins stated other zoning requirements would need to be taken into consideration.

Commissioner Davis asked if the south side of the fence complies with zoning requirements.

Ms. Pace stated both the north and south portions of the fence need to be four feet high to comply with zoning requirements.

Commissioner Davis asked if the entire portion of the fence located between the house and the sidewalk would need to be four feet.

Ms. Pace stated that was correct. She asked if the Commission was willing to allow additional height on the north and south portions of the fence.

Mr. Paterson stated any portion of the fence located between the leading edge of the home and the sidewalk needs to be four feet tall. He stated any portion of the fence located where the building is stepped back further than the front face of the building could be six feet tall.

MOTION [6:40:26 PM](#)

Commissioner James stated in the case of PLNHLC2012-00626 the Commission moves to table the petition in order to allow Staff and the Applicant to resolve the zoning ordinance and design compatibility issues.

Commissioner Davis seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

[6:42:06 PM](#)

PLNHLC2012-00538 Newhouse Apartments - A request by Strategic Capital Group for a certificate of appropriateness involving new construction of a multi-family structure. The property is located at approximately 540 East 500 South in the Central City Local Historic District and the RO Residential Office and RMF-35 Moderate Density Multi-Family Residential Districts, in City Council District 4, represented by Luke Garrott. (Staff contact: Elizabeth Buehler, at 801-535-6313 or elizabeth.buehler@slcgov.com)

Ms. Elizabeth Buehler, Principal Planner, reviewed the petition as presented in the Staff Report (located in the Case File). She stated Staff recommends approval of the petition pursuant to the conditions listed in the Staff Report.

Commissioner James asked what zoning clarifications would need to be made in order to have the parking garage extend to the sidewalk.

Ms. Buehler stated a special exception would be required and the Applicant is looking at redesigning the parking garage. She stated approval of a new parking garage design could be made by Staff.

[6:49:10 PM](#)

Mr. Eric Tuttle, Architect and representative of the Applicant, made the following comments:

- The proposed parking garage does not extend to the sidewalk. There is landscaping between the parking garage and the sidewalk.
- A large portion of the back of the building has been removed since the original proposal.
- Emphasis has been placed on the pedestrian entrance which is now in the center of the building.
- The driveway that was originally in the center of the building has been moved to the east side.
- Two shades of brick have been proposed.
- The windows are no longer single hung. The windows are now fixed and recessed.
- The parapets have been lowered to reduce the massing of the building.
- He felt stepping back the fourth floor did not add anything, but is willing to do so if the Commission recommends it.

Commissioner Shepherd asked what material would be used for the planter retaining walls between the sidewalk and the building.

Mr. Tuttle stated the retaining walls would be plaster with vegetation growing over them.

Commissioner Shepherd asked what materials would be used on the sides and rear of the building.

Mr. Tuttle stated hardie panel would be used. He discussed a building on the corner of 500 East and 600 South that uses only one material.

Commissioner Shepherd and Mr. Tuttle discussed the lack of windows and the height of the south façade of the building.

Vice Chair Hart asked if the south end of the building facing Hawthorne Avenue had been stepped back.

Mr. Tuttle stated that had not been considered since the entire building has been pulled back from the homes on Hawthorne Avenue.

Mr. Paterson stated the Commission was discussing stepping back the original proposed building which extended to within 30 feet of the rear property line. He stated he does not believe the Architectural Subcommittee discussed stepping back the building once the Applicant proposed pulling the building back 130 feet from the rear property line.

Commissioner Shepherd stated the blankness of the rear wall needs to be addressed.

Commissioner James stated he likes the simplicity of the rear wall.

PUBLIC HEARING [7:06:28 PM](#)

Chairperson Harding opened the Public Hearing.

Mr. Mark Shanbrun, resident, asked how many apartment units will be in the building.

Mr. Tuttle stated there will be 61 units.

Mr. Shanbrun stated he likes that the building will be 130 feet from the rear property line He stated he would prefer the south wall to be stepped or have balconies added. He stated he would like to know how many parking spots there would be per unit.

Commissioner Shepherd asked about the emails that were received from the public on this project.

Ms. Buehler stated she had received an email from the property owner at 543 South 500 East who did not believe the height of the building would fit in with the character of the neighborhood.

Mr. Adam Paul, representative of the Applicant, stated the number of parking units meet code requirements for a building that size.

Chairperson Harding asked how many parking units there would be in the parking lot.

Mr. Tuttle stated there are 20 units in the parking lot and 40 in the parking garage.

Commissioner Shepherd asked how the elevation of the south end of the building compares to the nearby three story brick building.

Mr. Tuttle stated the elevations are similar.

Chairperson Harding closed the Public Hearing.

COMMISSION DISCUSSION [7:13:42 PM](#)

Mr. Paterson stated multi-family dwellings require one parking stall for every one bedroom apartment and two stalls for every apartment that is two bedrooms or larger.

Ms. Buehler stated the parking is shown on the area floor plans. She stated there are 40 spaces in the parking garage and 20 spaces in the rear parking lot.

Mr. James asked if there is a reduced parking requirement based on the building's proximity to Trax.

Mr. Buehler stated there is not a reduction in parking requirements in this zoning district.

Vice Chair Hart asked if parking requirements are not yet met since there are 61 apartments and 60 parking spaces.

Ms. Buehler stated the Applicant would be required to meet minimum parking requirements.

Commissioner James made the following comments:

- The deck in the front is not a good design.
- Stepping back would add additional complexity and does not help the project.
- The design appears to be three separate projects combined into one. He would like the design to be more harmonious.
- Some elements such as the front door appear to be re-creations of a historical motif and don't work.

Chairperson Harding asked Commissioner James if he felt the design was finished or if more changes needed to be made.

Commissioner James stated that although the architect present in the Architectural Subcommittee believed the project was done, he did not agree.

Vice Chair Hart stated when she left the second Architectural Subcommittee meeting she felt that there was not an agreement that the project was done.

Commissioner Shepherd stated the minutes from the second Architectural Subcommittee meeting indicate that a step back on the northwest corner was a preferred option.

Commissioner James stated a building of this scale makes sense as this neighborhood begins to grow and evolve, but it might seem abrupt in the short term.

Vice Chair Hart stated she thinks the door and the cornice help the building tie in to the historic neighborhood.

Chairperson Harding stated the Commission will need to decide if the project is substantially completed.

Commissioner Davis stated he feels the project is done.

Commissioner Bevins stated it is important that the building has been moved away from the homes on Hawthorne Avenue and the entrance to the parking garage has been moved to the side of the building. He stated stepping back the building is not as important.

Chairperson Harding stated you do not see step backs in traditional historic apartment buildings.

Commissioner Shepherd stated a step back would be a positive addition. He stated he would like Staff to explore options for the south wall, but feels the project is mostly done.

MOTION [7:29:31 PM](#)

Commissioner Davis stated in the case of PLNHLC2012-00538 the Commission approves the request based on the findings and conditions listed in the Staff Report. He stated the Applicant will work with Staff to find a way to break up the south wall and make it more interesting.

Commissioner Thuet seconded the motion.

Commissioner James stated he supports the project and believes there is opportunity for the architect to refine the plans and create harmony in the design.

Commissioner Bevins proposed the motion be amended to state that the Applicant will direct lighting away from the homes on Hawthorne Avenue.

Commissioner Davis accepted the amendment.

Commissioner Thuet seconded the amendment.

The motion passed unanimously.

Chairperson Harding reviewed the appeals process.

[7:29:31 PM](#)

PLNHLC2012-00624 and PLNHLC2012-00696 - Stevig Residence - A request by Dave Robinson of City Block for construction of a new single-family residence located at approximately 268 West 600 North. PLNHLC2012-00624 is for the new residence and PLNHLC2012-00696 is a request for a special exception to increase the height of the residence by an additional three feet than what is allowed in the zoning district. The subject property is located in the Special Development Pattern Residential District (SR-1A) and the Capital Hill Historic District and is located in Council District 3, represented by Stan Penfold. (Staff contact: Maryann Pickering at (801) 535-7660 or maryann.pickering@slcgov.com)

Ms. Michaela Oktay, Principal Planner, reviewed the petition as presented in the Staff Report (located in the Case File). She stated Staff recommends denial of the petition.

Commissioner Thuet asked if the history of the structure that was previously located on the lot is known.

Ms. Oktay stated she does not know the history of the structure that was previously located on the lot.

[7:34:51 PM](#)

Mr. Dave Robinson, representative of the Applicant, discussed the history of the lot and made the following comments:

- He felt several items in the Staff Report are incorrect.
- He is surprised that the lot is zoned SR-1A.
- He had not received any resistance from staff regarding the height of the building.
- The Staff Report states the surrounding homes are 23 feet tall. He measured the buildings and found they are 31 feet tall.
- 3-D renderings and other supporting documents were not included in the Staff Report.
- The lot has an existing right-of-way for a 10 foot alley.
- The building was moved over five feet because the adjacent home has an eave that overhangs the property line.

- The west side of the home has minimal windows in order to reduce the impact from the bright lights of the adjacent gas station.
- There are many examples of porches in the neighborhood that have the sides screened in.
- There are many examples of metal roofs in the Marmalade area.
- A photo included in the Staff Report was meant to show an example of cropped eaves. It was not meant to be an example of the proposed home.

Commissioner Shepherd asked for the ceiling height of the first story.

Mr. Robinson stated the ceiling height on the main floor is 10 feet. He stated the height of the proposed home is slightly less than 28 feet.

Commissioner Shepherd asked if the homes immediately to the east were 23 feet tall.

Mr. Robinson stated that was correct. He stated these homes are one story.

Commissioner Shepherd asked why there was a recommendation to not construct a basement.

Mr. Robinson stated there are several areas on the lot with water. He stated the homes to the east are one story with a crawl space. He stated if he knew Staff would be resistant to the height of the home he would have met with neighbors and proposed a zone change so the lot would be consistent with surrounding areas. He stated there are several homes in the Marmalade area that are taller than 28 feet.

PUBLIC HEARING [7:51:16 PM](#)

Chairperson Harding opened the Public Hearing.

Mr. Robinson presented a petition with signatures from neighbors showing support for the proposed building.

Chairperson Harding closed the Public Hearing.

COMMISSION DISCUSSION [7:52:46 PM](#)

Commissioner James stated he agrees with the Staff Report's findings that the design goes too far and is stark.

Vice Chair Hart stated she feels the porch is closed off from the neighbors.

Commissioner James stated a porch should serve as a transitional space from a public realm to a private realm. He stated an enclosed porch does not serve that purpose. He stated the proposed porch does not contribute to the historic context of the district.

Commissioner Davis stated he likes that the home is a product of its own time and feels it is a contemporary rendering of historic homes in the neighborhood.

Commissioner Shepherd stated he recognizes this is a transitional lot. He stated there are compatibility issues such as the lack of eave. He asked if metal roofing is allowed on a residential building. He stated he questions the extension of the metal down the side of the building.

Chairperson Harding stated it looked like the Commission is moving in the direction of an Architectural Subcommittee. She stated she agreed the building is stark.

Commissioner Bevins stated he felt the building was utilitarian and did not appear to be a residential building. He stated he does not like the cladding on the building.

Chairperson Harding asked Mr. Robinson if he would like to table the petition or work with an Architectural Subcommittee.

Mr. Robinson stated there are openings on the porch looking towards the east.

Chairperson Harding stated she does not think that resolves the issues with the porch.

Mr. Robinson stated he would like to keep the porch solid to the west but is willing to look at changes to the east.

Chairperson Harding stated many of the Commissioners had issues with the design and asked Mr. Robinson if he would like to work with an Architectural Subcommittee.

Mr. Robinson discussed the shadow box, the metal roof and the metal siding.

Chairperson stated an Architectural Subcommittee could help work out the design issues.

Mr. Robinson asked if he would be able to return to the Commission next month.

Mr. Paterson stated he can't guarantee the petition will be on the January agenda, but an Architectural Subcommittee meeting would be scheduled as soon as possible.

Mr. Robinson stated he is comfortable with an Architectural Subcommittee meeting.

Mr. Stevig stated he would be comfortable with an Architectural Subcommittee.

MOTION [8:14:53 PM](#)

Commissioner Davis stated in the case of PLNHLC2012-00624 the application will be tabled and an Architectural Subcommittee will be formed to help give the Applicant more direction.

Commissioner Shepherd seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

Commissioners Davis, James and Bevins volunteered to serve on the Architectural Subcommittee.

Mr. Robinson stated he appreciates the discussion and suggestions of the Commission.

Commissioner Davis moved to postpone case PLNPCM2012-00531 and the Rules of Procedure discussion to the January 3, 2013 meeting.

Commissioner Bevins seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

The meeting stood adjourned at [8:24:53 PM](#)