

**SALT LAKE CITY**  
**HISTORIC LANDMARK COMMISSION**  
**Minutes of the Meeting**  
**Room 326, 451 South State Street**  
**June 7, 2012**

*This document along with the digital recording constitute the official minutes of the Historic Landmark Commission regular session meeting held on June 7, 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, June 7, 2012, in Room 326 of the City and County Building, located at 451 South State Street, Salt Lake City, Utah, [5:37:34 PM](#). Commissioners present for the meeting were Vice Chair Polly Hart, Earle Bevins III, Bill Davis, Sheleigh Harding, Stephen James and Dave Richards. Chairperson Anne Oliver and Commissioner Arla Funk were excused.

Planning Staff members present for the meeting were Joel Paterson, Planning Manager; Carl Leith, Senior Planner; Ray Milliner, Principal Planner; Katia Pace, Principal Planner; Courtney Benson, Senior Secretary and Michelle Moeller, Senior Secretary. City Attorney Paul Neilson was also present.

**FIELD TRIP [5:37:47 PM](#)**

The Commissioners present on the field trip were Vice Chair Polly Hart, Earl Bevins III and Bill Davis. The Staff present were Joel Paterson, Ray Milliner and Carl Leith.

The Commissioner visited the following properties:

**206 E Street**-Staff explained the proposed project. The Commission asked about the design of the driveway, the proposal to remove the fence and the staff recommendation. The Commission asked for details about the front addition over the exterior basement stairs and the proposed fence.

**1204 1<sup>st</sup> Avenue**-Staff described the proposed addition, garage and fence. The Commission asked for clarification on the size of a garage allowed by SR-1A (480 s.f. primary accessory

structure and 120 s.f. secondary accessory structure). The Commission asked for clarification about the design of the driveway. The Commission asked about enforcement actions against the property. The Commission asked about the special exception approval required for the addition to the house. The Commission asked for clarification regarding the recommendation.

**DINNER [5:37:58 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 [5:38:13 PM](#)**

Vice Chairperson Hart stated she had nothing to report at this time and excused Chairperson Oliver.

**REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR [5:38:26 PM](#)**

Mr. Joel Paterson, Planning Manager, welcomed Courtney Benson as the new Senior Secretary for the Historic Landmark Commission and discussed a Zoning Ordinance fine-tuning amendment proposal regarding the Appeals Hearing Officer.

**APPROVAL OF May 17, 2012 MINUTES [5:42:36 PM](#)**

**MOTION [5:43:13 PM](#)**

**Commissioner James moved to approve the minutes of May 17, 2012. Commissioner Bevins seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously. Commissioner Harding abstained from voting due to her absence at the subject meeting.**

**PUBLIC COMMENTS [5:43:47 PM](#)**

No one wished to speak at this time.

**PUBLIC HEARINGS [5:44:17 PM](#)**

**PLNHLC2011-00648 Tracy Aviary 589 East 1300 South - A request by the Friends of Tracy Aviary to modify a previous Historic Landmark Commission approval for a Certificate of appropriateness involving new construction to build a holding building with an amphitheater, the purpose of which is to house birds in preparation for shows held in the amphitheater. The Aviary is located 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](mailto:ray.milliner@slcgov.com)).**

Mr. Ray Milliner, Senior Planner, reviewed the petition as presented in the Staff Report (located in the case file). He stated Staff recommended approval of the petition as presented.

Commissioner Bevins asked if the pre-engineered buildings were like modular buildings and if they could be moved.

Mr. Milliner stated the buildings would be cemented to the ground and that pre-engineered buildings are assembled on site.

Commissioner Richards asked about the exclusion of the keeper building in the recommendation for approval.

Mr. Milliner stated this was an oversight and that the keeper building is also recommended for approval.

[5:49:58 PM](#)

Mr. Paul Svendsen, on behalf of Tracy Aviary, Applicant, stated that the reason for bringing the case back to the Commission included receiving a higher than expected estimate from the project's contractor, the hiring of a new Director of Bird Programs who wanted a larger amphitheater and a recent donation of \$200,000 from a local foundation.

The Applicant stated he would like to remove the wall behind the stage from the current petition.

The Applicant stated the new proposal was for three smaller buildings and that the cost of construction has been decreased significantly.

The Commission and the Applicant discussed what materials would be used on the exterior of the buildings.

Commissioner Harding asked the Applicant if he was certain he wanted to proceed with the plan even after receiving the additional grant money.

Mr. Svendsen stated he is ready to begin construction and that only the plans for the wall that backs the stage might change.

The Commission asked Mr. Milliner to clarify where the wall was located.

[5:59:34 PM](#)

**PUBLIC HEARING**

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

### **COMMISSION DISCUSSION**

The Commission had no comments on the issue.

### **MOTION [6:00:33 PM](#)**

**Commissioner Richards stated that in the case of PLNHLC2011-00648 the Commission finds that they concur with Staff's findings and moved to approve the proposal as presented with the omission of the stage show wall which will be approved at a later date. Commissioner Harding seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.**

The Commission discussed delegating the wall decision to staff.

**Commissioner Richards amended the motion to state that the stage show wall approval will be handled by Staff. Commissioner Harding seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.**

### **[6:02:49 PM](#)**

**PLNHLC2012-00139 – Wright Addition and New Garage - A request by Merrick Wright, for major alterations to a single family residence located at approximately 1204 East First Avenue in the Avenues Historic District. The request is for an addition to the rear of the home, a new detached garage proposed to be 528 square feet and 14 feet high, new fence and landscape. 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: Katia Pace, 801 535-6354, or [katia.pace@slcgov.com](mailto: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 recommended approval of the petition as presented.

The Commissioners and Staff discussed the availability of off-street parking in the neighborhood.

Vice Chair Hart asked about having two single doors on the garage rather than a double door.

Ms. Pace stated that the angle of the driveway would make it difficult to maneuver a car into a garage with single doors.

Commissioner James asked if it would be simpler to change the curb cut.

Ms. Pace stated that she would need to check with the Transportation Department.

Mr. Paterson stated that there would be an ability to move the drive approach to the west. Driveways on two adjoining properties require spacing between them if a new drive approach is put in, but the city could approve moving this drive approach to the west to straighten it out.

Commissioner James asked for clarification on the ten foot offset.

Ms. Pace stated that this is a zoning ordinance requirement.

Commissioner James asked for clarification of the recommendation.

Ms. Pace stated that the recommendation is for approval with the condition that they pursue an in-line addition.

Commissioner Bevins asked if standards four and five, which were found negative, didn't have enough weight.

Ms. Pace stated the decision was up to the Commission. She stated the standards were brought up as issues, but that the issues were not strong enough to deny the project.

The Commissioners and Staff discussed how yards are defined on corner lots. Staff stated that in this case the east yard is considered to be the rear yard and that a six foot high fence would be allowed on the property line.

Vice Chair Hart asked if the Commission was legally required to view U Street as the front yard because First Avenue is clearly the front of the house.

Mr. Paterson stated that the Commission will need to decide if the Applicant will be allowed to build a six foot fence along the property line on First Avenue. He stated the Commission could also decide to require the six foot fence be in-line with the north façade of the house.

Vice Chair Hart asked if the Commission can decide that a six foot tall fence is not appropriate even if zoning standards allow it.

Mr. Paterson stated the Commission has the authority to do that.

Commissioner James asked if there was any flexibility on demolishing the staircase.

Mr. Paterson stated that Staff determined that the stairs on the east side of the house are a contributing element but that it would be appropriate to remove the southern portion. Staff is asking the Commissioners for a resolution on this issue.

[6:33:04 PM](#)

Mr. Wright, Applicant, stated that only the area east of the home could serve as a yard and that he would like to build a fence parallel to the sidewalk that would be a mix of iron fencing, hard surface and plantings. Mr. Wright discussed the garage that previously existed on the site. He stated the proposed garage and driveway would capture runoff water and drain it away from the adjacent adobe structure. The Applicant would like to be historically consistent and build a garage where the original was historically located, however zoning code requires a ten foot setback from the adjacent property. Mr. Wright discussed the addition of a sunroom and the removal of the south section of the stairway. He stated that removing the stairway was not only an architectural issue, but also a safety issue as the stairway is currently blocking a basement window that he would like to use as an emergency egress. Mr. Wright discussed the sunroom and second level addition. Mr. Wright presented photographs of fences in his neighborhood and discussed the style of fence he would like to build.

Commissioner James asked if the plans for the fence along the sidewalk would be altered by the requirements that the gate be set back.

The Applicant stated he would like to keep the plans for the fence as presented, but would set the gate further back.

Commissioner James asked the Applicant to discuss the design plans for the fence.

Mr. Wright stated he had not yet procured the fence and is looking to make a historical purchase.

Vice Chair Hart expressed concerns with the three foot concrete section of the fence and asked the Applicant if that was something he was willing to negotiate.

Mr. Wright stated the concrete section would allow him to create a planter box behind the fence. He stated the concrete wall is not inconsistent with what is already found in the neighborhood and that his design is aesthetic, but he is willing to make modifications.

Commissioner James asked the Applicant how he planned to deal with the slope.

Mr. Wright stated the fence may need to be stepped once or twice at the columns.

Commissioner James asked about architectural detail in the drawings of the sunroom addition, noting that there was nothing about them that indicated they are reflective of the historic character of the home.

Mr. Wright presented a photograph of a nearby property that he is using as a model for what he would like to do with his addition.

Commissioner James noted that the example was of a Colonial house and asked about design elements of the Eclectic Victorian style.

Mr. Wright stated he is not trying to match the house exactly and that he believed the addition is supposed to look like an addition, and not part of the original structure. He presented more photographs with examples of building details he would like to use.

Commissioner James asked about door and window building material.

Mr. Wright stated the proposed material is metal clad wood with a grid over a double paned window.

Commissioner James asked if the lights in the soffits are critical.

The Applicant stated they are not critical but would be nice for lighting the patio and for security.

Vice Chair Hart asked if pervious concrete is an option for the driveway.

Mr. Wright stated that he believed that it would be better for the adobe structure if water was collected and drained away from the house.

Vice Chair Hart stated the concern is that the water will drain off the concrete to the east and that with pervious concrete the water would drain straight down.

Mr. Wright stated that the adobe structure to the east is higher in slope than his property and that all the water generated on his property would be conveyed to the west and south away from the adobe structure.

Vice Chair Hart stated it is not in the Commission's purview to choose driveway materials, but would like to suggest the pervious concrete.

The Applicant stated the property never had a drainage system before and his drainage plan will convey all water away.

[7:07:13 PM](#)

**PUBLIC HEARING**

Vice Chairperson Hart opened the Public Hearing.

Ms. Cindy Cromer, resident, stated she would like to see the “boxy” character of the house maintained after the addition. Ms. Cromer stated she visited the property and noticed that there were topographic issues and that the site slopes away from the public sidewalk. She believes the drawings were rendered without regards for the topography. Ms. Cromer stated the fence will be tall and higher than the base of the additions. Ms. Cromer expressed concern that there is not a resolution on the sight line issue coming out of the driveway. She also noted that the profile of the windows and the doors in the wall plane of the garage and sunroom are omitted, as well as the manufacturer’s specifications of the French doors and windows. Ms. Cromer believes there needs to be an overhang on the addition.

Mr. Barney Gesas, resident, is concerned with protecting the integrity of the adobe home and would like the ten foot setback to be committed to. Mr. Gesas believes that with a larger garage, more water will be drained towards the east.

Mr. Ken Shaw, resident, is concerned with the size and scale of the project.

Ms. Genevieve Atwood, resident, submitted photographs and information documenting the historical importance of 1216 1<sup>st</sup> Avenue. She stated that Mr. Merrick was incorrect and runoff from the previous garage had caused foundation problems. Ms. Atwood stated the property has been re-graded and asked the Commission to be skeptical of the elevations that had been shown, stating that topography had not been taken into account. She asked that the ten foot setback requirement be put into writing.

Mr. Thure Cerling, resident, urged the Commission to take into account the historic nature of the Avenues and supports the ten foot setback.

Anthony Wright, son of the Applicant, stated the overhang on the addition is a coding issue and needed to be flat. He stated the grade has not significantly changed and the garage will not be sixteen feet. Mr. Wright stated snow will not be shoveled off the garage and that heat cables will make sure that water will flow off into the rain gutters. He stated they do care about the adobe structure and have already placed drainage systems on the property. He stated he is aware of the ten foot setback and discussed the proposed concrete wall.



Mr. Stephen Snow, resident, stated that as long as there is adequate protection for the historic structure to the east he has no objection to the Wright's plans.

Lee White, resident, stated she believes there are systems in place to take care of drainage. She stated she would like to welcome the Wrights to the neighborhood.

Don Mabey, resident, stated there is off-street parking for the property on U Street.

Gwen Springmeyer, resident, submitted a Public Meeting Comment card stating that she is in opposition to the project.

Mr. Wright, Applicant, commented that it is legal to park on U Street, but its proximity to the University of Utah made parking difficult. He stated he believes the proposed plans do not increase any risk of damage to the adobe structure and he was not aware of previous damage. He stated he would like off-street parking because of limited parking on U Street and because of the metered parking on First Avenue. He stated that there would be no drainage to the east from the proposed garage. Mr. Wright stated that a six foot fence is appropriate because the frontage along First Avenue is the side yard.

Vice Chairperson Hart closed the Public Hearing

#### **COMMISSION DISCUSSION [7:31:54 PM](#)**

Commissioner Davis stated that he did not see an issue with the adobe structure because of the drainage system and ten foot setback. He stated that it seemed obvious that the property drained south and southwest, not east, and that the project would not impact the adobe house.

Commissioner Harding stated she agreed with Commissioner Davis and that her concern was with the fence. She stated that examples of nearby fences eased her concerns.

Commissioner James discussed the design of the fence and the fact that the concrete section does not serve a retaining function. He stated he did not like the fact the proposed wall terminates into a six foot cedar fence at the corner. Commissioner James asked if the Commission had the ability to overrule Transportation and the decision to set the gate back 17 feet. He stated that the garage should have two doors.

Vice Chair Hart stated she would be more comfortable with a two foot wall and four feet of wrought iron.

Commissioner Richards stated that the ten foot setback is a zoning requirement and will be enforced.

Vice Chair Hart stated that if the Commission approved a design with the ten foot setback it will be difficult for the Applicant to ask for a variance.

The Commissioners and Staff discussed the driveway gate setback. Staff stated the Commission does not have the authority to modify that requirement.

Commissioner Davis stated he would like to see two doors on the garage.

Commissioner Richards stated cutting off half of the stairway would destroy it.

Commissioner Bevins asked how important the basement window is.

The Commissioners discussed the historical significance of the stairway and if it was possible to modify the addition and leave the stairway intact. The Commissioners stated once the proposed fence was built the stairway will not be visible and that the Commission has a different standard for historic elements that are not visible.

The Commission discussed the roof and eaves of the addition.

**MOTION [7:59:00 PM](#)**

**Commissioner Davis moved in the case of PLNHLC2012-00139 to approve the project as proposed based on staff findings with the exceptions that are listed in the Staff Report and to allow Staff to resolve details of the design.**

Commissioner Hart asked if language regarding the ten foot setback could be added to the motion.

**Commissioner Davis amended the motion to add that the Commission would like to emphasize that the project meet code in terms of setback of the garage, and the ten foot distance between the garage and the house to the east must be maintained.**

Commissioner Harding asked if the exceptions were referring to conditions one and two.

Commissioner Davis confirmed this.

**Commissioner Harding seconded the motion.**

Commissioner James asked about the garage doors and the possibility of discussing the gate setback with Transportation.

Commissioner Bevins asked if the existing cedar fence will be extended.

Mr. Wright stated there would not be a meeting between the cedar fence and the proposed fence unless a gate was built.

The Commissioners and the Applicant discussed what will be done with the ten foot setback.

The Applicant stated he did not have a plan for that space.

Ms. Pace stated the Applicant wanted a sliding gate. She stated Transportation said a sliding gate would not require a setback.

The Commissioners discussed the gate setback and stated that negotiating with Transportation can be left to Staff.

Vice Chair Hart asked if the motion could be amended to add the requirement that the Applicant work with Staff to resolve the issue of the setback of the gate.

**Commissioner Davis amended the motion to state that the Commission recommends Staff contact the Transportation Department to resolve the issue of the setback of the gate. Commissioner Harding seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.**

The Commission discussed adding the second story addition roof to the things the Applicant should work through with Staff.

[8:14:37 PM](#)

**PLNHLC2012-00277 206 North E Street Certificate of Appropriateness for Major Alterations**  
– A request by Adam and Jessica Collings, represented by Renovation Design Group, for major alterations to a single family residence located at approximately 206 E Street, Salt Lake City. The request is for the approval of a second floor addition above a previous addition to the side towards the rear of the property, the addition of a new section of porch on the façade facing 4<sup>th</sup> Avenue, the removal of the existing fence and retaining wall and their replacement with new fencing and retaining wall, and alterations to the landscaping to widen the driveway to the existing garage. The property is located in the Avenues Historic District and the SR-1A (Special Development Pattern Residential) zoning district, in City Council District 3, represented by Stan Penfold. (Staff contact: Carl Leith, 801-535-7758, [carl.leith@slcgov.com](mailto:carl.leith@slcgov.com))

Mr. Carl Leith, Senior Planner reviewed the petition as presented in the Staff Report (located in the case file). He stated Staff recommended approval of the second floor addition, new section of porch and the widening of the driveway. Staff is recommending that the proposal to

remove and replace the historic iron fence and supporting retaining wall, and the proposal to build a six foot fence and gate both be denied.

Commissioner Harding asked if it was possible to replace the iron fence with something similar.

Mr. Leith stated the fence is a defining feature of the property and should be repaired and maintained. He stated that the Applicant was concerned with safety and that there are various ways of addressing this problem without replacing the fence.

The Commissioners and Staff discussed the history of the window on the west facade of the home.

Commissioner Richards asked if there were any details on replacing the retaining wall.

Mr. Leith stated he did not have any details on replacing the wall. He stated that the wall, along with the iron fence, had a major role to play in the context of the character of this site and the Avenues.

Commissioner Bevins asked about the setback of the gate.

Mr. Leith stated that he does not have details on what is being proposed.

[8:36:06 PM](#)

Mr. Adam Collings, Applicant, stated the fence is a combination of two different fences and that 40-50 percent of the decorative fleur-de-lis are missing. The Applicant stated his original plan was to cut the fence and use it as a decorative railing on the second floor addition. Mr. Collings stated he would like to keep the fence but it will require significant effort to repair. Mr. Collings stated the Transportation Division confirmed that the fence line is more than 17 ½ feet back from the street and that he is within city guidelines to have a motorized gate without blocking the sidewalk. The Applicant would like a fence for safety reasons and is willing to design a fence that meets guidelines.

Ms. Annie Schwemmer, architect, stated that the south porch was designed to mimic the design of the porch on the west façade, doesn't obscure any original architectural elements, and could easily be removed. Ms. Schwemmer discussed the existing water and sun damage in the south facing windows and would like to cover them and try to preserve them. She discussed the second floor addition and the plans to stay consistent with the original style of

the home. Ms. Schwemmer stated the planned six foot fence will not obscure any part of the home and that the wrought iron fence is in serious disrepair and needs fixing or replacing.

The Commission and Ms. Schwemmer discussed plans and building material for the proposed fence.

Commissioner James asked if the porch would be able to keep water out.

Ms. Schwemmer stated that it will not keep water out of the stairwell, but the concern is the main floor windows.

Commissioner James asked if that would be better served with flashing.

Ms. Schwemmer stated that flashing would not help with the windows' direct exposure to wind, rain and sun.

The Applicant stated that the window headers will need to be replaced if they cannot be protected with the porch. He stated that flashing would only be a temporary solution.

Commissioner Richards asked if it was possible to replace the missing fleur-de-lies.

The Applicant stated he has not had a professional look at the fence and did not know what the cost would be to repair it. He stated that the existing fence does not cover the majority of the property and stated he believes using a six foot wood privacy fence would be detrimental.

Commissioner Davis asked if the balusters of the existing fence were cast into the retaining wall.

The Applicant stated that it appears the fence was there originally and that cement was cast around it to level out the yard.

Commissioner Davis stated it would be difficult to replace the wall and get a similar look.

The Applicant stated the gates are not the same style as the rest of the fence and are not functional.

[8:56:41 PM](#)

**PUBLIC HEARING**

Vice Chairperson Hart opened the Public Hearing.

Cindy Cromer, resident, asked the Commission to not allow the removal or alteration of the fence and stated the roof shape, frame construction and fence were distinguishing characteristics of the home. Ms. Cromer stated she is against the blank wall and the proposed placing of the old fence on the roof. Ms. Cromer is also opposed to the widening of the driveway and stated if the driveway is widened, there should be a requirement for double doors on the garage.

Scott Anderson, resident, would like the roof line of the addition to be lower or to replicate the existing roof. Mr. Anderson suggested the addition have more windows and that the shiplap not extend to the second floor. Mr. Anderson stated he does not approve of the placement of the fence on the addition. He also stated he does not approve of the proposed south porch and suggested that a Victorian awning would serve the purpose and not be so structural. Mr. Anderson stated he does not like that the posts are longer than the porch posts. He suggested that the fence be repaired.

Ms. Schwemmer stated the idea of continuing the mansard roof line was explored but she believes there is architectural integrity to having the new section be distinguishable from the original house.

Mr. Collings stated the proposed roof would aid in water drainage.

Ms. Schwemmer discussed the building materials and appearance of the second floor addition roof.

Vice Chairperson Hart closed the Public Hearing.

**COMMISSION DISCUSSION [9:04:30 PM](#)**

Commissioner James stated he believed the plans for the porch do not feel compatible and that it is not temporary in character. He stated the proposed fence has a disruptive feel and asked if a shorter fence would be better. He stated the second story addition meets standards. He stated he has misgivings of removing the fence and placing it on top of the proposed addition.

Commissioner Richards stated he is hesitant to approve the fence and the retaining wall without any drawings to show what the intentions are. He stated this could be handled by Staff.

Vice Chair Hart stated the fence is an important part of the character of the property.

The Commissioners discussed the widening the driveway and if it would negatively impact the neighborhood. The Commissioners stated that it is important to consider the impact on the area and not just the individual property.

Vice Chair Hart stated the second story addition seemed large and is not subordinate to the original structure.

Commissioner Davis stated he did not have a problem with the second story addition and that it is subordinate to the original structure.

Commissioner Harding stated the proposed porch does not match the style of the house.

The Commissioners discussed alternatives to the proposed porch and if there are other options to prevent overexposure on the south side of the home. The Commissioners proposed that the Applicant work with Staff on this issue.

The Commissioners and the Applicant discussed the need to widen the driveway and the grade shift. The Applicant stated that he would like to widen the driveway because a car cannot get into the garage when another car is already in it. He also stated he is willing to use pavers or strips.

Vice Chair Hart stated the wrought iron fence and retaining wall are an integral part of the property.

Commissioner Harding stated the fence is falling apart and that she is bothered by the patchwork of different styles.

Vice Chair Hart stated things are expected to be old and imperfect and that is part of the charm of the Avenues.

Commissioner James stated the style, design and character of the fence are significant and it doesn't make sense to make a judgment without knowing what the solution is. He suggested the Commission table the decision regarding the fence.

Commissioner Bevins agreed and stated that much of the fence is salvageable.

Commissioner Davis stated the fence is a significant design feature of the house but understands how difficult it will be for the Applicant to renovate the fence.

Commissioner Richards stated the fence is an important part of the structure and agrees with the suggestion to table the decision.

Commissioner Davis stated he would like to table the fence decision so that research could be made into the cost of repairing the fence.

The Commissioners discussed other wrought iron fences in the area. The Commission stated that the fence is about security.

Vice Chair Hart asked if the new fence would run along E Street.

Mr. Leith stated the current proposal is for the six foot fence to run along the north side of the property, run down E Street, connect with the motorized gate, then come back to meet the corner of the property and enclose the rear of the property. He stated if the current fence were to stay, there would be a gap between the new fence and the old fence.

The Commissioners discussed if there would be any problems with the proposal for a wood fence along the east side of the property.

**MOTION [9:39:12 PM](#)**

**Commissioner Harding stated that in the case of PLNHLC2012-00277 the Commission finds that they concur with Staff's findings and approve the recommendation of the second story addition and the widening of the driveway. Commissioner Harding moved that the Applicant work with Staff to come up with a solution for the south porch that is consistent with the Commission's discussion. The proposal for the new six foot fence and for the removal of the wrought iron fence will be tabled in order to explore options with Staff. Commissioner Davis seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.**

**The meeting stood adjourned at [9:40:44 PM](#)**