

**SALT LAKE CITY
HISTORIC LANDMARK COMMISSION
Minutes of the Meeting
Room 326, 451 South State Street
November 7, 2013**

A roll is being kept of all who attended the Historic Landmark Commission Meeting. The meeting was called to order at [5:45:21 PM](#) . Audio recordings of the Historic Landmark Commission meetings are retained in the Planning Office for an indefinite period of time.

Present for the Historic Landmark Commission meeting were: Chairperson Sheleigh Harding; Vice Chairperson Polly Hart, Earle Bevins III, Thomas Brennan, Robert McClintic, and Charles Shepherd. Commissioner Heather Thuet and Arla Funk were excused.

Planning Staff members present at the meeting were: Cheri Coffey, Assistant Planning Director; Michaela Oktay, Planning Manager; Joel Paterson, Planning Programs Coordinator, Janice Lew, Senior Planner; Katia Pace, Principal Planner; Michelle Moeller, Senior Secretary and Paul Neilson, City Attorney.

FIELD TRIP NOTES:

A field trip was held prior to the work session. Historic Landmark Commissioners present were: Earle Bevins, Robert McClintic, Thomas Brennan and Polly Hart. Staff members in attendance were Joel Paterson, Michaela Oktay, Janice Lew and Katia Pace.

The following locations were visited:

- **Marmalade Block-** Staff gave an overview of the project. The Commission asked if new trees would be added. Staff explained the design guidelines and promenade.
- **Arctic Court-** The Commission and Staff discussed the design for the proposed town homes and if they could be stepped back from the street. Staff explained the conceptive plan and that RDA would need to be notified of the Commission's concerns regarding limits on heights and comments on guidelines. Staff explained the RDA's guidelines would be followed in addition to the Historic Guidelines. They discussed if the water feature would utilize the springs onsite.
- **South Temple-** Staff gave an overview of the survey in 2007 and stated the petition was to update the National Register nomination.
- **1204 First Avenue-** Staff gave an overview of the project.

DINNER

Dinner was served to the Commission and Staff at 5:00 p.m. in room 126 of the Salt Lake City and County Building.

REPORT OF THE CHAIR OR VICE CHAIR [5:45:48 PM](#)

Chairperson Harding stated she had nothing to report.

Vice Chairperson Hart stated she had nothing to report.

REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR [5:45:56 PM](#)

Ms. Cheri Coffey, Assistant Planning Director, introduced and welcomed Michaela Oktay as a new Planning Manager. She stated Joel Paterson will be the new Zoning Administrator and his role in bringing forward new historic district applications. Ms. Coffey reviewed the applications for new Historic Landmark Commission members.

APPROVAL OF THE OCTOBER 3, 2013 MINUTES [5:47:58 PM](#)

MOTION [5:48:16 PM](#)

Commissioner Hart moved to approve the minutes of October 3, 2013. Commissioner Bevins seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

PUBLIC COMMENTS [5:48:41 PM](#)

Chairperson Harding opened the Public Comment period.

Ms. Cindy Cromer reviewed the Planning Open House regarding changes to the zoning ordinance and initiating petitions. She stated the Historic Landmark Commission needed to have the authority to initiate petitions relating to preservation. Ms. Cromer reviewed the history of the Commission and their authority to initiate petitions. She stated there were a number of petitions she would like to see the Historic Landmark Commission initiate pertaining to preservation.

Chairperson Harding closed the Public Comment period.

WORK SESSION [5:51:06 PM](#)

The Redevelopment Agency of Salt Lake City (RDA) will present a brief overview of the Marmalade Block, an RDA project located along the east side of 300 West between 500 and 600 North. The total size of the project is approximately four acres. The southwestern corner of the site will be occupied by the new Salt Lake City Public Library Marmalade Branch (0.5 acres) the remainder of the site will be occupied by 2.8 acres of mixed-use residential and commercial development and 0.7 acres of public open space.

Ms. Katia Pace introduced Mr. Ed Butterfield and Mr. Ben Davis from the Redevelopment agency. She gave an overview of the proposal (located in the case file).

Mr. Ed Butterfield and Mr. Ben Davis, RDA, reviewed the RDA project for Marmalade Block. They reviewed the history of the block and the direction the City wanted to take the area. The Applicants discussed the community comments and outreach for the proposal. They stated the library was acting as the anchor for the project, reviewed the landscape plan the time line for the projects. They stated the presentation was to help the Commission better understand developments that would be presented in the future.

The Commission and Applicants discussed the townhomes on Arctic Court. They discussed the height and possible stepping back of the structure. The Commission stated the homes were too tall for the area and many Community Council meetings addressed this issue. The Applicant explained they would take the concerns under consideration and discuss them with the developer however, there were large setbacks which helped to move the units back from the street.

The Commission asked if there was a plan for transitioning the library's use due to the changes in technology. The Applicant stated libraries are used more as meeting spaces and places where people can use the internet versus acquiring books. They stated a very open and minimal floor plan was proposed with flexible meeting spaces.

The Commission asked how the proposed open space was paid for. The Applicant explained the process of paying for the open spaces. They discussed the guidelines that would be used for the project.

The Commission and Applicant discussed the parking for the library. It was stated there was no parking for the library other than what was available on street however; there were options for mid block parking in the future. The Applicant stated there would be parking structures for the townhomes and other developments in the area. The Commission stated they would need to make sure this was not a negative impact on the neighborhood.

The Commission asked if the water feature would be sourced from the spring. The Applicant stated the ground water quality was an issue so it would not be used and they did not own the ground water rights to the spring.

PUBLIC HEARINGS [6:14:23 PM](#)

Wright Major Alterations at 1204 First Avenue - Merrick Wright is requesting approval from the City to retroactively approve a basement window opening and stairs on the west front yard elevation. He is also requesting approval to place a new

basement door opening on the west elevation or front yard, to change the basement window opening on the south side yard elevation and to have one foot of additional height for the driveway gate. The property is located in the Avenues Historic District, in the SR-1A (Special Development Pattern Residential) zoning district and in City Council District 3, represented by Stan Penfold. (Staff contact: Katia Pace, (801) 535-6354, or katia.pace@slcgov.com) Case number PLNHLC2013-00744)

Ms. Katia Pace, Principal Planner, reviewed the petition as presented in the Staff Report (located in the Case File). She stated Staff was recommending the Historic Landmark Commission deny the petition as presented.

The Commission and Staff discussed the size of the proposed window and its proximity to the property line. Staff explained the proposed window was not an egress window as it did not meet the standards for egress nor did it match the other basement windows of the home.

Mr. Merrick Wright, Applicant reviewed the proposal and how it fit with the surrounding neighborhood. He discussed the limitation of the lot due to the placement of the home. Mr. Wright stated he would like to make the basement a livable space rather than having to add onto the home and it needed to have an egress option for safety reasons. Mr. Wright stated the gate did not detract from the fence but added to the look because it was ornamental in nature. He gave examples of fences in the area that were taller and had decorative features. Mr. Wright discussed the features of the windows that made them appropriate for the structure, reviewed the basement door and stairwell stating other homes in the area have similar features and how the proposal met the standards. He asked the Commission to consider each item on the petition individually and allow him to make needed adjustments.

The Commission and Applicant discussed the examples of windows in the presentation and whether or not they were historic in nature. Mr. Merrick stated he was making an assumption that they were historic. The Commission and the Applicant discussed if the existing bay window was original to the home. Staff stated the bay window was shown in pictures from 1935.

PUBLIC HEARING [6:51:58 PM](#)

Chairperson Harding opened the Public Hearing.

The following people spoke in opposition of the petition: Ms. Gwen Springmeyer, Ms. Peg Alderman and Ms. Cindy Cromer

The following comments were made:

- The height and design of the fence was a generous approval to start with but the height of the gate was pushing the mark.
- Additional height of the proposed gate was out of character for the area and dwarfed the neighboring home.
- Other homes in the area have large basement spaces for entertaining and do not need basement doors or large windows.
- Need to have conditions of approval that obligate the Applicant to comply with them.
- Property is prominent and inappropriate changes should not be made
- The Applicant should have asked what was allowed prior to changes being made to the basement.

Chairperson Harding reviewed the submitted public comments (located in the case file) and closed the Public Hearing.

Mr. Wright stated the gate was in character with the neighborhood and a Special Exception could be given for the decoration on top. He stated the west entrance to the home was functionally the side yard but was considered the front yard because of the City standards. He stated the door and windows were not visible from the street, were hidden with landscaping and were not negative to the area. Mr. Wright asked the Commission to approve the exits to allow for safe egress from the home if there was ever an accident.

DISCUSSION [7:01:31 PM](#)

The Commission discussed the new window on the West elevation.

The following comments were made:

- Design was inconsistent with the other windows on the home
- Architectural elements should be taken into consideration
- Should match other windows on the same side of the home
- Not the look of the window that was the issue, the design guidelines state new windows could not be added where there was not a window before (chapter 8 and 3)
- Size orientation and elevation of the window was a consideration
- With the two existing windows they are a prominent location and the proposed windows would take away from the look of the structure
- Alignment of the window needs to be addressed and stone work framing the new window opening must be consistent with the stone work around other windows
- Guidelines say the window should be consistent with the design of existing windows

- The design guidelines allow some flexibility for new windows if they are compatible with the overall design of the structure
- The Commission discussed the options of working with the Applicant on an appropriate design of the window or denying the request to install the window
- There is a hierarchy with the windows on the west elevation and changing the basement window would change the overall look of the elevation
- Proposed window should relate to the other basement windows
- Windows need to be compatible with the historic character of the all features of the home

The Commission discussed the proposed stairs and door on the west Façade and the following comments were made:

- Appreciated the basement use and access but not on this elevation of the home
- Is not a code compliance feature and not necessary to the use of the structure
- Handrails and guard rails would be required for the stairs and therefore the entrance would be more prominent than suggested by the applicant

The Commission discussed the window on the south façade and the following comments were made:

- Current window was a strong architectural feature and the overall window opening and window pane size should not be changed
- If the proposed window is wider than six feet a variance for the width of the window well located in a required yard would be required
- Is very visible and should be compatible with the design of the other historic windows

The Commission discussed the request to allow additional height for the proposed gate across the driveway. The following comments were made:

- Some consideration should be given because other gates in the area exceed the height
- What was the scale of the buildings with larger gates and did those gates fit those properties
- The setback of the gate may help to mask the size
- The gate was ominous, imposing and too large for the property
- Gates are not strong features in the neighborhood
- Two of the gate examples are on South Temple which has a different development scale
- What is the historic nature of the larger gates found in the vicinity and when were the gates installed

- The Commission approved a six foot gate, in line with the fence, in the prior approval of this project

Staff stated the gate in the previous approval was limited to six feet in height.

MOTION [7:23:43 PM](#)

Commissioner Hart stated regarding PLNHLC2013-00744, based on the evidence and testimony presented and pursuant to the plans submitted for the property at 1204 First Avenue, she moved that the Historic Landmark Commission deny the application based on zoning ordinance standards 2, 5 and 6.

Commissioner Shepherd asked if Commissioner Hart was open to changes on the west window.

Commissioner Hart stated she would rather a new motion be made.

The motion died due to the lack of a second.

[7:24:58 PM](#)

Commissioner Shepherd stated regarding the proposal at 1204 First Avenue, PLNHLC2013-00744, based on the evidence and testimony presented and pursuant to the plans submitted, he moved that the Historic Landmark Commission support the Staff recommendation and deny the requests for approval of the door and west entry stairwell, the replacement of the south window and the Special Exception requested for the additional height of the gate. For item number one regarding the egress window on the west elevation he moved that the Historic Landmark Commission ask that the Applicant work with Staff to modify the proposed opening to better align with the windows above and to propose a basement window that is more compatible with the adjacent basement windows.

Chairperson Harding clarified that the motion was based on Staff's findings and that findings needed to be made for approving the west window.

Commissioner Shepherd stated the basis would be that while noting that it was not a primary elevation the modification of a basement window seems acceptable given its secondary and partially concealed location relative to the existing porch, it is essential that the replacement window relate to the other basement windows and the current proposed window was not compatible or acceptable.

Commissioner Hart asked if the Commission wanted to review the changes to the petition prior to approval.

The Commission asked Staff if they felt they could make the needed adjustments.

Staff stated that in order to comply to meet egress window standards the proposed window would be larger and not match the original window size. Staff asked if the larger size would be something the Commission approved.

The Commission and Staff discussed the location and size of the window. The Commission stated the masonry opening needed to center on the windows above and needed to match the other basement windows. Staff stated she would be willing to work with the Applicant on the window. The Commission stated the stone work needed to be reworked to match that of the other openings.

Commissioner McClintic seconded the motion.

Commissioner Shepherd amended the motion to add in that the return of the sandstone to the window opening should be dressed to look finished as per the other basement windows. Commissioner McClintic seconded the amendment.

Commissioner Bevins, Brennan, McClintic and Shepherd voted "aye". Commissioner Hart voted "nay" The motion passed 4-1.

[7:33:47 PM](#)

Central City Reconnaissance Level Survey Update - Salt Lake City has engaged Certus Environmental Solutions, LLC to evaluate the buildings in the Central City Historic District and the Historic Landmark Commission will consider accepting the final report of the survey. The district is roughly bounded by South Temple, 900 South, 500 East and 700 East. (Staff contact: Janice Lew at (801) 535-7625 or 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 was recommending the Historic Landmark Commission accept the survey as presented.

The Commission and Staff discussed the code difference between this area and the South Temple area depicting what is contributing. They determined the resurvey was not an amendment to the nomination as there is no change of boundaries but just a reevaluation

of the properties themselves. Staff stated there was a second part which was recommendation to amend the district nomination as well. The Commission asked if there was follow up on the recommendation made in the previous application regarding splitting the district. Staff stated the survey was being addressed and then the nomination would be brought forward at a later time.

The Commission discussed the tour taken by Staff and Commissioner Hart to clarify the contributing or non-contributing status of buildings, specifically of some buildings located on 300 South. The Commission discussed the contributing status noted in the Survey and the reasons for their status. Staff will look at those buildings again to determine if the Survey rating is supported by the existing data.

PUBLIC HEARING [7:43:12 PM](#)

Chairperson Harding opened the Public Hearing.

Ms. Cindy Cromer stated she had always been in favor of the study and had given constructive comments at the last meeting but was listed as speaking in opposition to the Survey, which she was not. She reviewed the impact to changing the boundaries of the district and that there was more to the area than what was covered in the study. Ms. Cromer reviewed the significant status of some of the structures some may be listed wrong but should not hold up the acceptance of the survey. Ms. Cromer stated the property at 223 (225) South 600 East should be listed as significantly contributing because of the social and culture history. She stated she was thankful for the care in which the Consultant took in reviewing the area. Chairperson Harding closed the Public Hearing.

DISCUSSION [7:51:10 PM](#)

The Commission discussed if they should hold off on making a motion to allow for more input from Ms. Cromer and some of the buildings reviewed. Staff asked Commissioners to email her lists of any questionable buildings and she will have them reviewed

MOTION [7:54:04 PM](#)

Commissioner Hart stated regarding the Central City Historic District Reconnaissance Level Survey, she moved to table the issue, close the public hearing, give Staff one more month to address questionable properties and the Survey be brought back to the Commission for approval at the December meeting. Commissioner McClintic seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

[7:54:52 PM](#)

South Temple National Register Historic District - Utah's State Historic Preservation

Office is soliciting comments from the Historic Landmark Commission regarding amendments to the National Register of Historic Places Registration Form for the South Temple Historic District. The historic district extends along South Temple from approximately 100 East to 1350 East. The subject property is within Council District 3, represented by Stan Penfold and Council District 4, represented by Luke Garrott. (Staff contact: Janice Lew at (801) 535-7625 or janice.lew@slcgov.com)

Commissioner Hart stated the Applicant is a personal friend but she did not feel that it would prohibit her ability to hear the case. The Commission agreed to allow Commissioner Hart to hear the case.

Ms. Janice Lew, Senior Planner, stated Staff was recommending the Historic Landmark Commission approve the South Temple Historic District as amended.

Ms. Bea Lufkin reviewed the history of the district, the proposed amendments to the nomination and the percentage of contributing buildings within the district.

The Commission and Ms. Lufkin discussed the loss of the buildings in the area. The Commission would like to know why the buildings were demolished and why there were so many changed to non-contributing. The Commission clarified that they were discussing amendments to the the South Temple National Register nomination and not amendments to the local historic district. Ms. Lufkin stated the boundaries depicted on the website needed to be adjusted to properly show the boundaries of the South Temple National Register district.

Staff stated the Commission was being asked to forward a favorable recommendation to the National Park Service and to the Board of State History.

PUBLIC HEARING [8:08:46 PM](#)

Chairperson Harding opened the Public Hearing, seeing no one wished to speak on the issue. Chairperson Harding closed the Public Hearing.

MOTION [8:08:56 PM](#)

Commissioner Hart stated regarding the South Temple National Register Historic District amendment, based on the evidence and testimony presented, she moved that the Historic Landmark Commission forward a positive recommendation to the Board of State History and to the National Park Service. Commissioner Bevins seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

The meeting stood adjourned at [8:09:49 PM](#)