

**SALT LAKE CITY**  
**HISTORIC LANDMARK COMMISSION**  
**Minutes of the Meeting**  
**Room 326, 451 South State Street**  
**March 1, 2012**

*This document along with the digital recording constitute the official minutes of the Historic Landmark Commission regular session meeting held on March 1, 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](http://www.slctv.com/vid_demand.htm),*

A regular meeting of the Historic Landmark Commission was called to order on Thursday, March 1, 2012, in Room 326 of the City and County Building, located at 451 South State Street, Salt Lake City, Utah, [5:34:33 PM](#). Commissioners present for the meeting were Chairperson Anne Oliver, Vice Chair Polly Hart, Sheleigh Harding, Earle Bevins III, Arla Funk and Bill Davis. Commissioner Stephen James and Dave Richards were excused.

Planning Staff members present for the meeting were Joel Paterson, Planning Manager, Carl Leith, Senior Planner, Janice Lew, Senior Planner, Elizabeth Buehler, Principal Planner, and Michelle Moeller, Senior Secretary. City Attorney Paul Nielson was also present.

**FIELD TRIP [5:35:11 PM](#)**

1533 Westmoreland- Love Addition- Staff described the proposed addition above the garage, the addition of an attached storage garage, window replacement, new fence and re-cladding the front gable. The Commission asked questions regarding the materials being proposed and when the garage was added.

1363 Filmore- Engeman Addition- the Commission drove by this house, Staff noted that at the work session the Applicant would propose a new design proposal with a much smaller footprint on the original roof.

**DINNER [5:35:16 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 [5:35:25 PM](#)**

Chairperson Oliver stated a couple Subcommittee meetings regarding the design guidelines had been held. She reported the Commission took a public field trip to the Filmore house to answer

the Applicants questions. Chairperson Oliver stated no suggestions or opinions were given in regards to how the project should be addressed. She stated Commissioner Hart and she had been invited to meet with the Chair and Vice Chair of the Salt Lake City Council on March 6<sup>th</sup> and asked if any Commissioner had items they would like to be addressed to please make her or Commissioner Hart aware of those items.

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

#### **REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR [5:36:57 PM](#)**

Mr. Paterson, Planning Manager, stated the May meeting date conflicted with the Utah Heritage Foundation Preservation Conference and, if Commissioners wanted to attend please contact Staff, would the Commissioners be willing to move the May meeting to the 17<sup>th</sup>. He stated the July meeting was scheduled for July 5<sup>th</sup> which might make it difficult, due to the holiday, for a quorum to be present. He stated Staff recommended moving the meeting to July 19<sup>th</sup>.

Mr. Paterson stated the Planning Staff was working on a Master Plan for the 400 South Transit Corridor and are requesting the Commission to consider holding a work session on the plan as there are some considerations regarding the boundaries of the Central City Historic District along the corridor. He stated the Work Session would be held on March 14<sup>th</sup> or at the April meeting.

Mr. Paterson reviewed the moratorium for the creation of Historic Districts created in 2011 and explained it was extended for an additional year. He stated the Commission's recommendations to modify the local historic district designation process were moving to the City Council.

Chairperson Oliver asked if there were any additions to the moratorium or any additional actions taken and what the purpose of the extension was.

Mr. Paterson stated the Legislature was aware that Salt Lake City was addressing the process and wanted to give the City a chance to make the needed changes before making suggestions or decisions.

Chairperson Oliver asked if Staff wanted the Commission to discuss the meeting date changes.

Mr. Paterson stated if it was more efficient an email could be sent to determine Commissioner's availability.

The Commissioners stated it would be more beneficial to have an email poll taken to determine the best date for the meeting and work session.

#### **APPROVAL OF February 2, 2012 MINUTES [5:42:00 PM](#)**

**MOTION** [5:42:19 PM](#)

Commissioner Hart moved to approve the minutes of February 2, 2012. Commissioner Harding seconded the motion. Commissioners Hart, Funk, Bevins, Harding and Davis voted Aye. The motion passed with a 5-0 vote Chairperson Oliver did not vote.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS** [5:42:45 PM](#)

No Public comment at this time.

**PUBLIC HEARINGS** [5:43:05 PM](#)

**PLNHLC2011-00716 1533 E Westmoreland Drive Certificate of Appropriateness for Major Alterations** – A request by Perrin and Jill Love, property owners, for major alterations for a rooftop addition, a new side shed, a new fence, and window replacement at approximately 1533 E Westmoreland Drive, Salt Lake City. The request is for the approval of a rooftop addition on the existing garage, a new side shed attached to the garage, a new fence to replace the existing and replacement of all the home's existing windows.

Ms. Elizabeth Buehler, Principal Planner, reviewed the petition as presented in the Staff Report. She reviewed the history of the property, details of the project and stated the project met the applicable standards. Ms. Buehler stated the Applicant was also asking for approval for the replacement of the siding on the front façade. She said Staff recommended approval of the project for the reasons listed in the Staff Report.

Chairperson Oliver asked if there were any historic photos of the house or if the Applicant knew what the original windows looked like.

Ms. Buehler stated she was unable to locate any historic photos during her research.

Mr. Perrin Love, Property Owner, stated the neighbors had indicated when the existing addition was done in the 70's or 80's the original windows were taken out and were not reinstalled.

Chairperson Oliver asked if the 1970's addition was on the back of the house.

Mr. Love stated as far as they knew the addition to the back of the house was done in the late 1980's due to dates in the driveway.

## **PUBLIC HEARING [5:50:44 PM](#)**

Chairperson Oliver opened the Public Hearing.

Ms. Cindy Cromer, Resident, stated she wondered why some of the issues in this case were brought before the Commission they could have been handled by Staff. She stated there was a home by the University that could possibly help determine what the windows looked like. She stated the addition to the garage should not be an issue although the amount of concrete was present was unfortunate.

Mr. Jon Dewey, Resident, stated he supported the addition and agreed that a Historic Landmark hearing was not necessary for some of the issues. He stated he was please with the sensitivity that was shown in the design of the addition as it was a good example how an addition could be added to a historic home.

Mr. Paterson explained the petition was brought before the Commission for review because it was considered significant and was visible from the street. He stated therefore, Staff determined it was a major alteration that required the Commission's review and the other items were included as part of the petition.

Chairperson Oliver closed the Public Hearing.

## **EXECUTIVE SESSION [5:54:41 PM](#)**

Chairperson Oliver asked for discussion or a motion. She explained it was easier for this addition to be approved versus the addition requested in the next item because of the nature of the home and the proposal. Chairperson Oliver stated it all came down to the character defining features of each house and the proposed changes. She stated the subject property was very rectangular and simple which made it easier to build an addition on the home that met the standards.

## **MOTION [5:56:26 PM](#)**

**Commissioner Funk moved in the case of PLNHLC2011-00716 that the Historic Landmark Commission grant a Certificate of Appropriateness for the proposed addition with the conditions outlined in the Staff Report. Commissioner Hart seconded the motion.**

Commissioner Harding stated the motion should be amended to state the approval was based on the findings in the Staff Report.

**Commissioner Funk moved to include the amendment. Commissioner Hart Seconded the amendment.**

**Commissioners Hart, Bevins, Harding, Funk and Davis voted Aye. The motion passed with a 5-0 vote Chairperson Oliver did not vote.**

[5:57:28 PM](#)

**PLNHLC2011-00604 1363 S Filmore Street Certificate of Appropriateness for Major Alterations** – A request by Warren Lloyd, Architect, for major alterations and a new garage at approximately 1363 S. Filmore Street. The request is for the approval of a rooftop addition on the home, and increasing the allowable height for a new garage.

Mr. Joel Paterson, Planning Manager, stated this was a work session item and a motion was not being requested. He reviewed the history the field trip taken to the property. Mr. Paterson turned the time over to the Applicant for a presentation.

Chairperson Oliver asked if a Certificate of Appropriateness was being requested or if the petition should have been listed as a work session item.

Mr. Paterson explained the petition was meant to be a work session item however, if the Commission wanted to take public comment they were welcome to make that decision.

Mr. Warren Lloyd, Architect, stated it was his understanding– that the meeting was a work session to discuss an alternative proposal without requesting action or approval. He thanked the Commission for taking the field trip to the site. Mr. Lloyd stated the purpose of the work session was to present revised drawings and explain what the Applicant felt was the critical issues for the Certificate of Appropriateness. Mr. Lloyd asked the Applicant if he wanted to speak.

Mr. Ken Engeman, Property Owner, stated Kurt Huffaker, State History, was present at a previous meeting with Staff. He reviewed the discussion after the field trip indicating it was his goal to create not only something that the Commission could be happy with but something that everyone would agree on. Mr. Engeman stated the significant changes to the plan should hopefully address anyone’s concerns and be more in line with what was requested.

Mr. Lloyd reviewed the petition as presented in the drawings (located in the case file). He gave the history of the proposal and the changes that had been made. He stated the proposal was for a smaller second story addition and an addition to the rear of the home. Mr. Lloyd reviewed the layout of the home with what was being proposed and explained the Applicant had always be proposing an addition that was visible from the street which may be one of the key issues to discuss. He reviewed each of the standards and how they felt the proposal met the standards.

Mr. Lloyd indicated what made the structure a contributing structure and what would change that status.

The following are a list of standards and his comments.

21A.34.020G

**Standard 1:** A property shall be used for its historic purpose or be used for a purpose that requires minimal change to the defining characteristics of the building and its site and environment

Mr. Lloyd stated there was no change in the use therefore the standard as met.

**Standard 2:** The historic character of a property shall be retained and preserved. The removal of historic materials or alteration of features and spaces that characterize a property shall be avoided.

Mr. Lloyd stated the scale of the addition might be relevant to the character of the property so this standard was applicable.

**Standard 3:** All sites, structure and objects shall be recognized as products of their own time. Alterations that have not historical basis and which seek to create a false sense of history or architecture are not allowed.

Mr. Lloyd stated this was also an area that needed to be discussed. He asked did an addition to a bungalow, that was visible, give a false sense of history or was there a way of creating an addition to be consistent with the character of the house.

**Standard 4:** Alterations or additions that have acquired historic significance in their own right shall be retained and preserved. The removal of historic materials or alterations of features shall be avoided

Mr. Lloyd stated the proposal did not intend for historical features to be removed or altered. He stated the addition would be done within the roof area and any material that was visible from the exterior was limited to the rear of the house.

**Standard 5:** Distinctive features, finishes and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a historic property shall be preserved.

Mr. Lloyd stated he understood this to primarily refer to the techniques, finishes and elements. He stated the current proposal differed from the previous proposals in regards to the roof line. He stated the argument of whether the perimeter of the roof structure could be realistically kept within the framing and the addition could go within the roof line. Mr. Lloyd stated enough of the roof would be retained that it would not constitute a degradation of the original finishes and techniques.

**Standard 6:** Deteriorated architectural features shall be repaired rather than replaced wherever feasible. In the event replacement is necessary, the new material should match the material being replaced in composition, design, texture and other visual qualities. Repair or replacement of missing architectural features should be based on accurate duplications of features, substantiated by historic, physical or pictorial evidence rather than on conjectural designs or the availability of different architectural elements from other structures or objects.

Mr. Lloyd stated they had tried to be clear throughout the process that everything on the house visible from the street would be repaired and restored; including the windows, eaves, trim, concrete finishes and etc.

**Standard 7:** Chemical or physical treatments, such as sandblasting, that cause damage to historic materials shall not be used. The surface cleaning of structures, if appropriate, shall be undertaken using the gentlest means possible.

Mr. Lloyd stated this standard did not apply as chemicals were not being used.

**Standard 8:** Contemporary designs for alterations and additions to existing properties shall not be discouraged when such alterations and additions do not destroy significant cultural, historical, architectural or archaeological material, and such design is compatible with the size, scale, color, material and character of the property, neighborhood or environment.

Mr. Lloyd stated this was relevant in terms to determine the appropriate character for the detailing of the eaves on an addition to the subject house. He asked what level of historical accurateness was appropriate and was the goal to replicate something that was indistinguishable or significant. Mr. Lloyd reported the main floor of the bungalow was a concrete stucco finish and the proposed material for the addition would be wood. He stated how modern or traditional the addition should be needed to be answered.

**Standard 9:** Additions or alterations to structures and objects shall be done in such a manner that if such additions or alteration were to be removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the structure would be unimpaired. The new work shall be differentiate from the old and shall be compatible in massing, size, scale and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.

Mr. Lloyd stated from a construction stand point, they felt like the standard could be met because the addition would be done in the roof plane. He stated the question was if that was what the standard meant, did it address construction technique and whether it could be repaired. He stated it would not be economically rational to remove an addition in some cases but it would be possible.

Mr. Lloyd stated standards ten to twelve did not apply to this project. He stated the above review of these standards was the best way he saw fit to help the Commission understand how the Applicant understood the standards to be applied to his project.

Chairperson Oliver asked the Commissioners if they wanted to take public comments.

The Commissioners discussed if it was better to take comments now or if it would be better to allow the public to hear the Commissioners discussion and then voice their concerns. It was decided to have the Commissioners discuss what they felt needed to be addressed in hopes to answer any possible questions and then allow the Public to come forward.

Commissioner Funk asked on page 2, of the Staff Report under alternative design options the statement was made regarding an addition at the rear of the home. She asked the Applicant to comment on why that option had not been considered or addressed.

Mr. Lloyd stated there were constraints with the setbacks at the rear of the property. He stated it was feasible to do an addition in the rear but in working with the Applicant the understanding was he would like a view of the front of his property from inside the house. Mr. Lloyd stated it would be hard to say that it was technically unfeasible to do a rear addition although it may be difficult to acquire the requested living space with a rear addition.

Mr. Lloyd stated it was unachievable with a single level addition but a two story rear addition could be done. He stated a two level structure in the rear would be visible from the public way although possibly less visible than the proposal because it is further back. Mr. Lloyd stated they had looked at other two story bungalows with rear two story additions and felt the additions were less harmonious with the single level craftsman bungalow that they sprung from. He stated it came down to the relationship of the single story roof with the roof line behind it. Mr. Lloyd said it was important for some architectural element of interest to be on the roof of the bungalow if an addition was being done. Mr. Lloyd reviewed the elements of bungalows in the area.

Commissioner Funk stated her concern was breaking the roof line at the front, with any kind of popup addition. She said she felt it destroyed the initial design of the house and she would not recommend the proposed addition. Commissioner Funk stated there were other bungalows in the area with additions to the rooflines that caused her concern and she suggested the integrity of the house should be kept.

Mr. Lloyd stated they took the neighboring houses into consideration and compared the subject house to those houses. He stated they felt the proposed addition fit with the others in the area.

Mr. Engeman stated a rear addition was explored in the beginning but the backyard restricted the size of the addition.

Commissioner Funk stated it would have to be a two story rear addition to accommodate the desired living space. She stated it may not be the ideal option or in keeping with the pattern of the neighborhood but it would be the best for this house.

Commissioner Hart stated Commissioner Funk's original question did not get answered in regards to why the basement excavation had not been explored.



Mr. Lloyd stated it had been explored and generally basement square footage was less desirable for living space. He explained the Applicant did not want to add to the basement.

Mr. Engeman stated it was a shelf basement that made it difficult to add on too.

Mr. Lloyd referred to the current design and layout of the basement and explained a crawl space could be captured but in order to get habitable bedrooms the code requirements would have to be met.

Commissioner Hart stated those could be in the rear first story addition and did not necessarily need to be in the basement.

Mr. Lloyd stated the bedrooms could be in the rear. He explained the code requirements for windows and ceilings in a basement that would be challenging and were not ideal.

Commissioner Bevins asked if the examples of the bungalows were part of the neighborhood or were they isolated buildings from all over the country.

Mr. Lloyd stated they were generally all neighborhood houses but not in the area of the subject property. He stated they gave examples of bungalows but an in-depth survey of the particular district regarding the predominant pattern had not been done. Mr. Lloyd stated that could be done if needed.

Commissioner Bevins asked if any of the examples were located in a local historic district.

Mr. Engeman stated yes the Gamble House and this style of home was not isolated to any one area of the county.

Commissioner Bevins asked if the examples were the original homes or if they depicted additions.

Mr. Lloyd stated his guess was the majority were built as one and a half story bungalows.

Chairperson Oliver stated her assumption was that those were almost all original without additions. She stated the main point was to preserve the character of the house. Chairperson Oliver reviewed the character defining aspects of the house and explained it was very difficult to add on to the house, in a significant way, without altering those characteristics. She stated her concern was that any sort of alteration to the roof line was something that would alter it instantly and irrevocably. Chairperson Oliver read the following standards and gave her comments:

21A.34.020G

**Standard 1:** A property shall be used for its historic purpose or be used for a purpose that requires minimal change to the defining characteristics of the building and its site and environment.

Chairperson Oliver stated she agreed this standard was not particularly relevant as the property would continue to be used for its purpose. She stated essentially the Applicant was looking to take a cottage and make it into a modern home which in this particular case it is very difficult.

Mr. Lloyd asked if the Commission could distinguish between the subject house and the house on the corner which shared similar characteristics.

Chairperson Oliver explained the difference between the home on the corner and the subject home was the layout of the original home and the placement of the addition. She stated the two were very different in style.

Mr. Lloyd stated he was under the impression that the home on the corner had an addition.

The Commission and Applicant discussed the existence of an addition to the home on the corner and its relativity to the subject house. They discussed the elements of the gable roof and airplane bungalow characteristics versus the subject house and the proposed addition.

**Standard 2:** The historic character of a property shall be retained and preserved. The removal of historic materials or alteration of features and spaces that characterize a property shall be avoided.

Chairperson Oliver stated this standard was the crux of the matter. She stated the first sentence said it all and asked would the character of the subject home be preserved with a roof top addition. Chairperson Oliver stated her feeling was that a roof top addition could not be done on the subject house without changing the contributing status of the house.

**Standard 3:** All sites, structure and objects shall be recognized as products of their own time. Alterations that have not historical basis and which seek to create a false sense of history or architecture are not allowed.

Chairperson Oliver stated she thought this standard applied at a lesser extent. She explained that the route the Applicant was taking to make the addition harmonious was appropriate however, the distinction between the addition and the original house needed to stay and not create an unusual building type. Chairperson Oliver stated Standards 4-7 would also be covered with those concerns.

**Standard 8:** Contemporary designs for alterations and additions to existing properties shall not be discouraged when such alterations and additions do not destroy significant cultural, historical, architectural or archaeological material, and such design is compatible with the size, scale, color, material and character of the property, neighborhood or environment.

Chairperson Oliver read the design guidelines listed in the ordinance under Standard 8 and explained how each guideline emphasized the importance of keeping the character of the house intact. She stated Standards 2 and 8, in regards to this design, would make any approach to a roof top design difficult to achieve and still maintain those standards. She stated the greater

difficulty with the proposal was the square footage of the addition which the subject house could not support.

Commissioner Davis stated as the Commission looked at the progression of the proposals, clearly the addition was not subordinate to the house. He reviewed the different proposals presented to the Commission regarding the subject addition and explained, as Chairperson Oliver was stating, it was not possible to have a second story addition small enough that it would not impact the historic character of the property.

Commissioner Funk stated she felt the roof line could not be impacted at all.

Chairperson Oliver stated with careful design a rear addition could be added, possibly a one story or one and a half story addition could be appropriate depending on the design.

Commissioner Funk agreed.

Commissioner Bevins stated Standard 5 regarding distinctive features, would apply because the roof line on that particular style of house was a distinctive feature.

Chairperson Oliver asked if the Commission wanted to take public comment at this time.

The Commissioners agreed to open the public hearing.

**PUBLIC HEARING [6:44:48 PM](#)**

Chairperson Oliver opened the Public Hearing.

Mr. George Kelner, 1000 Military Dr, stated he opposed the proposal as it did not meet the standards and the roof line would be significantly altered.

Ms. Cindy Cromer, Resident, stated she opposed the proposal and explained its similarity to a case in Yalecrest. She stated it came down to could a house be altered to look like another house in the neighborhood and no longer look like itself or like the house it used to be. She stated she felt this was a false sense of history. Ms. Cromer stated she was extremely fond of the subject house and would hate to see it altered to reflect anything but what it was currently. She said she felt there were other options to pursue.

Chairperson Oliver read the following statement from Ms. Kelly White,

“This is absolutely no way this bungalow can have a second story addition and remain contributory. It is one of the few remaining Westmoreland bungalows that have not been destroyed. The only appropriate addition would be off the back.”

Ms. Kathy Kelner, 1000 Military Dr, stated she was surprised this was being discussed and stated any second story addition would permanently disfigure the subject house no matter how small it was. She said the house should be left alone and remain contributing.

Chairperson Oliver closed the Public Hearing.

Mr. Lloyd stated they had requested the Work Session with the Commission for the purpose of reviewing the project and at he felt the discussion held at the meeting addressed their questions. He reviewed the meeting that was held with the Utah Heritage Foundation and Staff led him to believe they were pleased with the direction of the project and that the size of the addition needed to meet the guidelines. Mr. Lloyd stated after hearing the Commissioner's discussion he did not believe there was a way to make a roof top addition comply with the standards.

Mr. Engeman stated at the meeting with Staff- he believed the new revisions met their approval. He asked Mr. Paterson if that was correct.

Mr. Paterson stated support was not expressed at the meeting. He stated the interpretation of the standards was discussed and it was stated at the meeting that Staff was not in a position to take a position on the proposal.

Chairperson Oliver stated the interpretation of the standards were the crux of the decision. She asked if the Applicant felt like his questions were answered.

Mr. Lloyd stated he felt his questions were answered and he felt he had explained their interpretation of the standards.

Chairperson Oliver stated certainly the standards were open to different interpretations. She explained that the perception of what the character defining aspects of the house were determined the decision.

Mr. Lloyd stated they would take the comments into consideration and see what would be a viable mix for the homeowner.

Chairperson Oliver stated they would address the setback ordinance with the City Council and discuss how setbacks could prohibit flexibility for enhancement in preservation.

The Commission and Applicant discussed the setbacks and how they affected the possibilities for the subject property.

#### **EXECUTIVE SESSION [6:55:22 PM](#)**

Chairperson Oliver asked for discussion or a motion.

**MOTION**[6:55:23 PM](#)

**Commissioner Hart moved, in the case of PLNHLC2011-00604 that the Historic Landmark Commission continues the Public Hearing to a future meeting. Commissioner Davis seconded the motion. Commissioners Hart, Bevins, Harding, Funk and Davis voted Aye. The motion passed with a 5-0 vote Chairperson Oliver did not vote.**

[6:56:33 PM](#)

**PLNPCM2011-00471 Revisions to the Residential Design Guidelines for Historic Districts and Landmark Sites**

- A petition initiated by Mayor Ralph Becker to revise the Design Guidelines for Residential Historic Districts in Salt Lake City regulated by the H Historic Overlay Zone. The design guidelines have been used since 1999 providing advice to owners and applicants, and serving as review and decision-making criteria for the public, the Commission and Staff. They will be revised to reflect historic preservation design guidelines best practice in organization, clarity, and current issues.

Mr. Carl Leith, Senior Planner reviewed the background and updates to the guidelines as presented in the Staff Report.

Commissioner Bevins stated he felt the title of the document could be changed to be more general as it was a good reference guide for regular home owners. He asked what Staff's plans were for disseminating it.

Mr. Leith stated it was really more of a how-to-guide and as stated helped individuals address the standards. He explained it would be available in hard copy and on the web.

Commissioner Harding stated there were areas that still needed editing to address grammatical errors and language. She stated overall the document was great but it needed to be cleaned and clarified.

Chairperson Oliver stated she agreed with Commissioner Bevins and suggested that it be called the Salt Lake City Preservation Handbook as it reached a broader audience. She suggested making sections of the document available that would pertain to individual projects and using bits and pieces as they were needed. Chairperson Oliver referenced some of the pictures and suggested changing them to reflect what would be allowed in most areas. She stated there were areas that needed to be clarified and having someone that had not read the document would help clean up the errors.

Commissioner Davis asked if a motion passing on a favorable recommendation was in order.

The Commissioners stated a Public Hearing was needed prior to a motion.

**PUBLIC HEARING [7:26:30 PM](#)**

Chairperson Oliver opened the Public Hearing.

Ms. Cindy Cromer, Resident, stated she was excited to tell people their homes were included in the document. She stated the document needed to be sent to the City Council sooner than later in order to be addressed appropriately and not over looked. Ms. Cromer asked about guidelines for multiple unit buildings that were not included in the document and whether they belonged in the Residential or the Commercial guidelines. Ms. Cromer asked the Commission to think about the process for forming Historic Districts and stated she thought the guidelines should be ready at the time the district was adopted. She said property owners should have all of the relevant information before them before they make their decision about whether to support something or not and before the City Council votes. She stated there was of course the risk that guidelines would be prepared and then the district would fail but by the time it was to reach the City Council it should be known whether it had sufficient support to pass.

Mr. John Dewey, Resident, thanked Staff for a job well done. He stated citizens concerns had been addressed and a document that would be efficient and usable was created.

Mr. George Kelner, Resident, stated he agreed with Mr. Dewey and congratulated Mr. Leith on a job well done. He stated he would agree to changing the name and making it accessible to everyone regardless if they were in a historic district

Chairperson Oliver closed the Public Hearing.

**EXECUTIVE SESSION [7:32:34 PM](#)**

Chairperson Oliver asked for discussion or a motion.

Commissioner Harding asked if a positive recommendation could be forwarded if changes still needed to be made.

Mr. Paterson stated it was up to the Commission, as it was not unlike other decision where Staff was directed to make changes or allowed to make modifications. He said if the Commission felt there was substantive information they would like added and they would like to review it again then it could be brought back and addressed. Mr. Paterson stated if the Commission was comfortable with Staff editing the document and forwarding it to the City Council that could be done as well.

Chairperson Oliver stated the multi-family dwelling issue was complicated and it should be a standalone document that linked to the appendices of this document. She stated there was a picture book published by the Utah Heritage Foundation that expanded on additions and new construction depicting examples. She stated coming up with something similar would be an asset to the process.

Commissioner Funk

**MOTION [7:35:27 PM](#)**

**Commissioner Funk moved in the case PLNPCM2011-00471 that the Historic Landmark Commission close the Public Hearing and forward a favorable recommendation for the adoption of these guidelines to the City Council with alteration and editing. Commissioner Hart seconded the motion. Commissioners Hart, Bevins, Harding, Funk and Davis voted Aye. The motion passed with a 5-0 vote Chairperson Oliver did not vote.**

Commissioner Funk asked the Commission to stand and applaud Mr. Leith for a job well done.

**The meeting stood adjourned at [7:36:41 PM](#)**