

SALT LAKE CITY
HISTORIC LANDMARK COMMISSION
Minutes of the Meeting
Room 326, 451 South State Street
July 19, 2012

This document along with the digital recording constitute the official minutes of the Historic Landmark Commission regular session meeting held on July 19, 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, July 19, 2012 in Room 326 of the City and County Building, located at 451 South State Street, Salt Lake City, Utah, at [5:41:02 PM](#). Commissioners present for the meeting were Chairperson Anne Oliver, Vice Chair Polly Hart, Earle Bevins III, Arla Funk, Sheleigh Harding, Dave Richards, Charles Shepherd and Robert McClintic. Commissioners Thomas Brennan, Bill Davis and Stephen James were excused.

Planning Staff members present for the meeting were Wilf Sommerkorn, Planning Director, Cheri Coffey, Assistant Planning Director; Janice Lew, Senior Planner and Courtney Benson, Senior Secretary. Senior City Attorney Paul Nielson was also present.

FIELD TRIP [5:41:19 PM](#)

The Commissioners present on the field trip were Chairperson Anne Oliver, Vice Chair Polly Hart, Earl Bevins III, Arla Funk, Dave Richards, Charles Shepherd and Robert McClintic. The Staff present were Cheri Coffey and Janice Lew.

The Commissioners visited the Meck Property at 505 E. Third Avenue and the Becker property at 282 N. Canyon Road.

DINNER [5:41:27 PM](#)

Dinner was served to the Commission and Staff at 5:00 p.m. Two new Commission members, Charles Shepherd and Robert McClintic introduced themselves and discussed their backgrounds.

REPORT OF THE CHAIR OR VICE CHAIR [5:42:00 PM](#)

Chairperson Oliver and Vice Chair Hart stated they had nothing to report.

REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR [5:42:13 PM](#)

Ms. Cheri Coffey, Assistant Planning Director, discussed preservation related petitions that will be reviewed by the City Council in the near future.

APPROVAL OF June 7, 2012 MINUTES [5:43:00 PM](#)

MOTION [5:43:59 PM](#)

Commissioner Hart moved to approve the minutes of June 7, 2012 with the corrections identified. Commissioner Harding seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously. Commissioners Funk, McClintic and Shepherd abstained due to their absence at the previous meeting.

PUBLIC COMMENTS [5:44:31 PM](#)

No one wished to speak.

PUBLIC HEARINGS [5:45:29 PM](#)

PLNHLC2012-00384 – Meck Additions and New Garage - 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 construct rear and upper level additions on the principal building, demolish an existing "contributing" garage and construct a new detached garage. The property is zoned SR-1A, 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 recommended approval of the petition as presented with the exception of the garage demolition which will be discussed at a later date.

[5:50:33 PM](#)

Commissioner Harding asked if the 75% requirement for glass windows would be similar to the windows located to the south in the gable on the east elevation of the house.

Mr. Kimble Shaw, Architect, stated the space will be a bathroom and he will do what he can to make the fixtures work with the windows.

Commissioner Richards asked if placing two windows on either side of the dual vanities was considered.

Mr. Shaw stated that is probably something he would do.

Commissioner Richards stated it would be difficult to have a lot of glass and have a functional bathroom.

Commissioner Oliver stated the addition of the second window would lighten the impression.

Commissioner Shepherd asked if a narrow transom clerestory installation was considered.

Mr. Shaw stated he will consider that option.

Commissioner McClintic and Mr. Shaw discussed the architecture of the proposed roof relating to drainage.

Commissioner Oliver asked about the first floor addition and the lack of fenestration.

Mr. Shaw stated the addition will be used as a kitchen and the placement of appliances prevented the addition of a window.

Commissioner Oliver asked if there was a door on the west and north sides of the addition.

Mr. Shaw confirmed the location of the doors.

Commissioner Shepherd stated he realized one of the goals with the roof form and pitch of the addition was to tie it into the building below the historic frieze. He stated the slope of the proposed roof is low and out of character. He stated it would be better if it tied into the extension of the eave.

Commissioner McClintic asked if the Applicant designed the roof on the addition in order to avoid any conflict with cornice work and stated if so, that was a valid reason to have the roofline of the addition where it is proposed.

Mr. Shaw confirmed that was the reason for the design of the addition roof.

Commissioner Oliver stated the existing roof is a hip roof that comes up under the eave and covers a portion of the frieze. She asked the Applicant if he knew how the original roof met the eave detail.

Mr. Shaw stated he did not know.

PUBLIC HEARING [5:59:59 PM](#)

Chairperson Oliver opened the Public Hearing. Seeing no one wished to speak to the issue, she closed the Public Hearing.

COMMISSION DISCUSSION [6:00:18 PM](#)

The Commission discussed architectural details of the proposed roof.

Commissioner Richards stated he is less concerned about the mass and size of the proposed dormer due to its location.

Commissioner Bevins asked if it was common to mix gable dormers and shed dormers.

Commissioner Richards stated it was.

Commissioner Funk stated transom windows in the bathroom would be a good idea for privacy.

Commissioner Shepherd stated corner boards and some expression of cornice would relieve the amount of shingles and the massing of the proposed dormer.

Commissioner Richards stated the frieze panel is a strong feature and wrapping it up over the eave would be worse than leaving it as shown in the proposed drawing. He stated dropping the eave line down would be uncommon for a house built in that time period. He stated a thicker eave line on the addition would be helpful.

Commissioner McClintic stated corner boards and cornice eave lines tended to be larger and became smaller over time. He also stated the cornice of the building makes a powerful statement and following that precedent would be a good thing to do.

Commissioner Shepherd stated corner boards and other treatments would help integrate the dormer with the original house. He stated increasing fenestration would also be a plus.

Commissioner Richards stated he does not agree with the Staff recommendation of 75% window coverage on the dormer.

Commissioner Oliver stated she doesn't believe the motion needs to include the 75% requirement and adding architecture detail such as corner boards or deeper eaves on the dormer would help reduce the need for more window area.

Commissioner Richards asked Mr. Shaw if he would be comfortable if the Commission approved a motion where certain details were left to Staff to work out.

Mr. Shaw stated he would.

Chairperson Oliver stated it seemed the Commission was fine with the proposed rear addition without needing to move the top of the roof into the frieze.

MOTION [6:08:39 PM](#)

Commissioner Richards stated in the case of PLNHLC2012-00384 the Commission approves the proposal with the condition that the Applicant work out detailed eave conditions and increased window changes in the dormer with Staff.

Commissioner Harding asked if the architectural details on the eaves were included in the motion.

Commissioner Richards stated that was correct.

Mr. Paul Nielson, City Attorney, stated the motion should table the garage portion of the application.

Commissioner Richards amended the motion to state that the proposed demolition of the garage and construction of a new garage will be tabled. Commissioner Hart seconded the motion.

Commissioner Bevins asked if the corner boards were included in the motion.

Commissioner Richards stated that yes, it was included in the detailing of the eaves and the Applicant would work out the details with Staff.

The motion passed unanimously.

[6:11:28 PM](#)

PLNHLC2012-00350 – Becker Walkway - A request by Nancy Becker, represented by David Garcia, for alterations to a property located at approximately 282 N. Canyon Road. The request is for approval to replace an existing walkway in the front and side yards, which is an historic site feature to the property and the streetscape, with landscaping. The property is located in the Avenues Historic District and the SR1-A (Special Development Pattern Residential), in City Council District 3, represented by Stan Penfold. (Staff contact: Janice Lew, 801-535-7625, janice.lew@slcgov.com)

Commissioner Hart stated she is friends with the Applicant but has no interest in this case and does not feel it will be a conflict of interest.

Mr. Nielson stated it would be up to the Commission to decide if Commissioner Hart needed to recuse herself.

The Commission decided Commissioner Hart could be impartial in this case.

Ms. Janice Lew, Senior Planner, reviewed the petition as presented in the Staff Report (located in the Case File). She stated Staff recommended the petition as presented be denied.

The Commission and Staff discussed the proposed site plan.

Commissioner Shepherd asked if the replacement of the driveway was included in the proposal.

Ms. Lew stated the driveway will be replaced.

Commissioner Oliver asked if the new driveway would also be made of concrete and in the same location.

Ms. Lew stated it will be.

Commissioner Oliver asked if the front sidewalk connecting the house to the street will remain.

Ms. Lew stated it will remain.

Commissioner Bevins asked if the driveway would remain the same width.

Ms. Lew stated it was her understanding that it would.

Commissioner McClintic and Staff discussed the lack of parallelism between the driveway and the walkway.

Commissioner Richards asked if standards two and five can be interpreted to include site features such as walkways.

Ms. Lew stated she believed the standards can be applicable to both site and building features. She stated that discussions of alterations of features also include spaces.

Ms. Coffey stated the Secretary of the Interior standards are applicable to everything and are general.

[6:22:18 PM](#)

Mr. David Garcia, representative of Applicant, handed out a prepared document to the Commission and made the following comments:

- The primary requests are to replace the driveway, replace the city sidewalk and eliminate 180 square feet of existing concrete in the side yard.
- There are three different segments of the walkway that need to be considered.
- Eliminating the proposed concrete sections would allow more rainwater to flow into the ground.
- Less cement would make the area cooler and more landscaping would be more pleasing to the eye.
- Similar houses in the neighborhood that have walkways do not have driveways.
- Neighbors unanimously support the proposed changes.

Commissioner Hart asked if exchanging the walkway for a driveway with two concrete strips was considered.

Mr. Garcia stated he had not considered this but it would be a viable option.

Commissioner Richards asked if there was more information about different segments of the walkway and if segments B and C were historical.

Mr. Garcia stated segments B and C, as well as the driveway, appeared to be the work of amateurs and did not believe they were original.

Commissioner Richards asked if the configuration was original and had been replaced with poor quality materials.

Mr. Garcia stated he did not believe the configuration was original.

Commissioner Shepherd asked if the proposed driveway was a full-width driveway.

Mr. Garcia stated the proposed driveway matches the existing width. He stated he is willing to entertain the idea of a ribbon driveway.

Commissioner McClintic stated the preservation of bad design is a fear we should all have. He stated the examples Mr. Garcia gave of similar houses with ribbon drives were more appealing from a historic standpoint. He stated the hook walkway connections to the front entries add to the historic character of the neighborhood and should be preserved. He stated the other segments are not historical and are not worth preserving.

Commissioner Bevins asked if segment C was part of an addition on the back.

Mr. Garcia stated it was not.

PUBLIC HEARING [6:39:43 PM](#)

Chairperson Oliver opened the Public Hearing.

Mr. Craig Ogan, resident, stated the residents of Canyon Road have a strong desire to protect the look of the street and make sure it is welcoming. He stated the Applicant is very meticulous about restoring her property and the neighbors trust her to make appropriate additions to the neighborhood.

Mr. Lance Weekley, abutting property owner to the north, stated his property is identical and he never had a sidewalk around the side of the property, he had a driveway. He stated that the walkway causes the area to become very hot.

Ms. Tommie Knight, resident, stated the walkway is a heat trap and she supports the Applicant's proposal to landscape the area.

Mr. Nathan Thesing, resident, submitted a comment card stating he supports the project.

Ms. Nancy Becker, Applicant, stated she has worked hard on restoring the home and does not believe the sidewalk adds to the house. She stated the sidewalk is hot and unattractive and she would like to plant trees to provide shade and improve the look of the house.

Chairperson Oliver closed the Public Hearing.

COMMISSION DISCUSSION [6:48:01 PM](#)

Commissioner Shepherd stated he recognizes the hook form to the sidewalk has some precedence in the neighborhood, but he finds its compromised integrity limits its significance. He stated as a standalone feature, its significance is limited.

Commissioner Oliver made the following comments:

- While the Commission can agree it would be better to have landscaping that is not the Commission's purview.
- The Commission must look at the issue through the lens of historic preservation.
- She doesn't believe removing the sidewalk would create a false sense of history and therefore disagrees with Staff's findings on standard three.
- Standard four does not apply and it is a stretch to apply standard eight since there is no intent to replace the sidewalk with something new or contemporary.
- It is problematic to talk about the removal of a sidewalk as an alteration as it is difficult to apply the Secretary of the Interior's standards to landscape features.
- The removal of the sidewalk would leave the essential form and integrity of the structure unimpaired.
- Standard nine does not apply.
- There needs to be leeway when applying historic preservation to modern living.
- The significance of the walkway is it connects the front and back of the house.
- The driveway will provide that same sense of connection.

The Commission discussed the possibility of maintaining the hooked part of the walkway.

Commissioner McClintic stated that if the guidelines were strictly applied, only section A of the walkway would be discussed. He stated it might be worth saving that section as an archival element.

Commissioner Shepherd stated the proposed replacement of the driveway will have more impact than the walkway.

Commissioner McClintic stated he would propose the retention of a parking pad in the front, keeping section A and connecting it to a ribbon walk. He stated he would approve reconnecting the front section even if it didn't match.

Commissioner Oliver asked if ribbon driveways are encouraged.

Ms. Coffey stated the design guidelines state that they are. She stated she is not sure if the guidelines state you should put in a ribbon driveway, but that they do state you should retain one that's already there.

Commissioner Richards stated there is a pattern but it is not as consistent as the Staff report alludes to. He stated most of the configurations shown are those without driveways. He stated he believes it is compromised enough that it is no longer significant.

Commissioner McClintic stated there is a pattern in the neighborhood and the Commission needs to determine if it is a significant contribution.

Commissioner Hart stated the pattern is with homes that do not have driveways. She stated the one other home nearby that does have a driveway does not have a walkway.

Commissioner Oliver stated the history of the driveway is not known, but it is known that section A of the walkway is historic.

Commissioner Oliver stated more attention needs to be given to the design of the new driveway which can mitigate any impacts of losing some or all of the existing sidewalk. She stated perhaps section A can be retained and reconnected to the front sidewalk and sections B and C can be replaced with landscaping.

Commissioner Funk stated she would like to suggest section A is left as a feature of the old home and not be reconnected and that the ribbon driveway be patterned with small squares.

Commissioner Oliver stated it does not need to be required that the sidewalk is connected although it would make more sense visually and functionally.

Commissioner Funk stated she believed it would be an interesting feature on its own.

Commissioner Hart asked if that would be a hazard.

Commissioner Funk stated she did not believe it would be.

Ms. Coffey stated the main issue is to decide if the historic material needs to be retained. She stated if a Certificate of Appropriateness has not been issued for the driveway the Commission can suggest that a ribbon driveway be considered.

Mr. Garcia stated he is supportive of a ribbon driveway. He stated that if section A of the walkway was reconnected to the front sidewalk a color match could be made, however it would be difficult to match the material that was used. Mr. Garcia suggested the hook feature end where the porch ends and the foundation begins.

Commissioner Shepherd and the Applicant discussed the location of the porch stairs.

Commissioner Oliver stated the City recently completed a major restoration project on the Fourth Avenue stairs and might be a good resource for attempting to match historic concrete.

Commissioner Hart stated she agreed with Commissioner Richards that section A is attached to an addition and seems lost in its current location.

Commissioner Oliver stated that in order for section A to make any sense it needs to be reconnected to the section of sidewalk that goes between the sidewalk and front steps, otherwise it's a decorative feature that has no use. She stated the shape and pattern is something that needs to be preserved. She stated she does not object to stopping the section where the Applicant proposed. She stated the ribbon driveway with detailing to match the joints and rhythm of the sidewalk will do a great deal to enhance the property.

Commissioner Bevins stated that in the site plan the hook ends just past the porch.

Commissioner Oliver stated there needs to be enough walkway to give a sense that it extends along the side of the house.

Commissioner Hart asked it was being suggested the walkway is preserved to the rear of section A.

The Commission stated the Applicant suggested the walkway be terminated where the porch and foundation meet.

MOTION [7:13:19 PM](#)

Commissioner Funk moved in the case of PLNHLC2012-00350 to approve the replacement of

the missing sidewalk from the original sidewalk to the porch, with a connection on the other end of the driveway. The driveway will be a ribbon driveway with a design that replicates the features of the concrete hook which will meet standards two and five. The Commission finds that standards three, four, eight and nine are not applicable.

Ms. Lew stated the driveway is not part of the proposal.

Ms. Coffey stated the Applicant will need to return to get a Certificate of Appropriateness to replace the driveway and Staff understands what the Commission is looking for.

Commissioner Funk withdrew her motion.

Commissioner Funk moved in the case of PLNHLC2012-00350 to deny the removal of the original portion of the sidewalk. The portion meets the design standards of two and five. It does not meet the criteria of standard three because it does not have historical significance and is not a contemporary design. The Commission would like to suggest to Staff that they take into consideration the Commission's suggestion on the driveway.

Commissioner Richards asked which section of the sidewalk was being referred to.

Commissioner Funk stated the historic portion of the sidewalk is the hook.

Commissioner Richards stated that needs to be defined in the motion.

Commissioner Oliver asked if Commissioner Funk was stating that the portion of the walkway from the sidewalk to the front steps be retained and that all of Section A, as defined in the Applicant's handout, be retained. She asked if Commissioner Funk was suggesting that the Applicant restore a portion to reconnect Section A with the front walk.

Commissioner Funk agreed this is what she was saying. She stated in addition she would like the Applicant to make a connection from Section A to the driveway and it would be left to Staff to determine how that would occur.

Commissioner Oliver stated the final thought is that the driveway be designed to be compatible with the historic portion of the sidewalk and leave the details to Staff.

Commissioner Harding asked how Section A would connect to the driveway.

Commissioner Funk stated it would be a lateral pad between Section A and the driveway.

Mr. Nielson asked if it is the Applicant's proposal to reconstruct the sidewalk.

Commissioner Funk stated the Commission is denying the demolition of the sidewalk.

Mr. Nielson asked if the Commission was telling the Applicant to reconstruct the sidewalk. He stated the denial of the demolition ends the conversation.

Commissioner McClintic stated the Commission can deny the demolition of only the historic portion. He stated the Commission has the option of allowing demolition beyond the face of the house.

Commissioner Oliver stated the Commission is left with denying demolition of Section A as defined in the Applicant's handout. She stated the Applicant and Staff have heard the comments made by the Commission and will hopefully take those comments under consideration.

Commissioner Funk withdrew her motion.

Commissioner Hart asked Commissioner Funk if her motion was approving or denying the petition.

Commissioner Funk stated she was denying the petition.

Commissioner Hart moved in the case of PLNHLC2012-00350 to approve the demolition of the historic sidewalk with the exception of the original portion, which is defined as Section A in the Applicant's handout. The Commission agrees with Staff findings that standards two and five are relevant, and finds that standards three, four, eight and nine are not relevant.

Commissioner Funk seconded the motion.

Commissioner Harding stated the Commission regularly adds additional requirements similar to requesting the Applicant add a section to connect to the sidewalk in front of the house.

Mr. Nielson stated the difference is that is the absolute contrary to what is being proposed.

Commissioner Hart amended the motion to add that the Commission would like to encourage the Applicant work with Staff on adding connections with Section A based on Commission discussion.

Mr. Nielson asked if the Commission was approving the demolition of everything except for Section A.

Commissioner Hart confirmed this.

Mr. Nielsen asked if the missing piece would be an extension of Section A.

Commissioner Hart stated her motion would leave a floating piece of concrete and she would like to encourage the Applicant to make a connection with the ends of Section A.

Mr. Nielson the Commission can encourage the connections.

Commissioner Funk seconded the amendment to the motion.

Commissioners Hart, Harding, Bevins, Funk and McClintic voted *aye*. Commissioners Shepherd and Richards voted *nay*. The motion passed 5-2.

Ms. Coffey reviewed the appeal process regulations.

The meeting stood adjourned at [7:26:58 PM](#)