

SALT LAKE CITY HISTORIC LANDMARK COMMISSION
Meeting Minutes
451 South State Street, Room 326
December 4, 2014

A roll is being kept of all who attended the Historic Landmark Commission Meeting. The meeting was called to order at [5:44:30 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 Thomas Brennan, Vice Chairperson Sheleigh Harding; Commissioners Robert McClintic, Rachel Quist, David Richardson and Charles Shepherd. Commissioner Heather Thuet was excused.

Planning Staff members present at the meeting were: Cheri Coffey, Acting Planning Director; Michaela Oktay, Planning Manager; Doug Dansie, Senior Planner; Michael Maloy, Senior Planner; Lex Traughber, Senior Planner; Katia Pace, Principal Planner; Amy Thompson, Associate Planner; Michelle Moeller, Administrative Secretary and Paul Neilson, Senior City Attorney.

FIELD TRIP NOTES:

A field trip was held prior to the work session. Historic Landmark Commissioner present was: Rachel Quist. Staff members in attendance were Cheri Coffey, Michaela Oktay, Lex Traughber and Amy Thompson.

The following sites were visited:

- **2nd Avenue Front Door Replacement and Rear Siding Replacement** - Staff gave an overview of the proposal.
- **29th Ward House** - Staff gave an overview of the proposal.
- **Terrace Falls Balconies** - Staff gave an overview of the proposal.

Chairperson Brennan announced this was Commissioner McClintic's last meeting. He thanked Commissioner McClintic for his service to the City of Salt Lake and stated he would be missed.

APPROVAL OF THE NOVEMBER 6, 2014, MINUTES [5:46:24 PM](#)

Commissioner Shepherd asked what information was considered the most pertinent part of the minutes.

Ms. Cheri Coffey reviewed the use, reasoning for the layout and context of the minutes.

Commissioner Shepherd asked for wording clarification on page nine regarding the Commission's discussion.

Commissioner Harding suggested making the sentence state various comments and observations were made by the Commissioners as not all opinions are unanimous commentary.

MOTION [5:54:56 PM](#)

Commissioner Shepherd moved to approve the minutes from November 6, 2014 as amended. Commissioner McClintic seconded the motion. Commissioner Harding abstained from voting as she was not present at the subject meeting. The motion passed unanimously.

REPORT OF THE CHAIR OR VICE CHAIR [5:55:29 PM](#)

Chairperson Brennan suggested, if there was an interest by the Commission, would it be possible to tour examples of Historic preservation/modifications that have occurred recently.

The Commission stated they would find it helpful.

Ms. Coffey stated Staff would discuss opportunities for a tour.

Vice Chairperson Harding stated she had nothing to report.

DIRECTOR'S REPORT [5:57:14 PM](#)

Ms. Cheri Coffey, Acting Planning Director, stated Yalecrest-Harvard Park was approved as a new historic district and would go into effect when the ordinance was published. She reviewed the progress of the other proposed districts. Ms. Coffey stated the Historic Landmark Commission would meet on January 15, instead of January 2, due to the holiday and would also allow for time to appoint a new member to the Commission. Ms. Coffey reviewed the RDA grant for a National Registry District and survey for the warehouse national district.

PUBLIC COMMENT [6:00:00 PM](#)

Chairperson Brennan opened the Public Comment period.

Ms. Kristy Porucznik reviewed the issues with a property at 1120 East 400 South, stating there was disconnect between planning and building enforcement regarding the permitted remodeling that was done to the structure.

Ms. Coffey stated Staff was aware of the issues, was working with Enforcement, the Building Permit Office and the Building Official to address the problems. She stated the final approval would require the Commission to review the proposal.

The Commission asked if the case was approved administratively or by the Commission.

Ms. Michaela Oktay, Planning Manager, stated the original permits were approved administratively but the issue was that the work being done did not match what was permitted and went beyond the scope of the Certificate of Appropriateness. She stated

there were multiple issues with the site and Staff was working with the Property Owner.

Chairperson Brennan closed the Public Comment period.

PUBLIC HEARINGS [6:03:54 PM](#)

Front Door Replacement and Rear Siding Replacement at approximately 323 E. 2nd Avenue - A request by Jadon Wagner, representing Pivitol Properties LLC, to allow the replacement of the front door on the subject home and T1-11 siding on the rear of the home located at approximately the property listed above. The request is currently under enforcement as the front door and rear siding have already been installed. The subject property is zoned RMF-35 (Moderate Density Multifamily Residential) within the Avenues Historic District and is located in City Council District 3 represented by Stan Penfold. (Staff contact: Lex Traughber at (801)535-6184 or lex.traughber@slcgov.com.) Case number PLNHLC2014-00725

Mr. Lex Traughber, Senior Planner, gave an overview of the proposal as outlined in the Staff Report (located in the case file). He stated Staff was recommending that the Historic Landmark Commission deny the petition as presented.

The Commission and Staff discussed the following:

- Which permits were applied for and those that were not.
 - The Applicant applied for the windows, was granted approval, but the but the siding or the front door were done without permits.

Mr. Jadon Wagner, property owner, stated the intent was to keep the original features and materials of the home. He reviewed the remodeling of the structure, window replacement and the issues with the siding. Mr. Wagner stated the siding was no longer available and he didn't think he would need a separate permit for the siding as it was not historical. He stated the front door was beyond repair and rotted through therefore, it was replaced.

The Commission and Applicant discussed the following:

- The front door configuration and if the side lights were part of the door installation.
- If any research was done for photos of the original house.
 - The Applicant stated he did not research the original house.

PUBLIC HEARING [6:18:14 PM](#)

Chairperson Brennan opened the Public Hearing, seeing no one in the audience wished to speak; Chairperson Brennan closed the Public Hearing.

The Commissioners discussed the front door stating the following observations:

- It would have been nice to see the original door surrounding assembly as the repair was probably feasible with the right contractors.
- If the door was irreparable, then replacement was the only option.

- It would have been easy for the door to be replicated had the right people been involved.
- The entire art features of the front door assembly were removed, when simply the door alone could have been replaced.
- Unfortunately bad advice was given to the Applicant regarding the door.
- The door was significantly bigger without the transom, the proportions were more contemporary and out of place.
- The Commission was precluded from considering the existing door and the options for replacement.

The Commissioners discussed the rear siding stating:

- The siding that was originally on the home was a standard product, Western Woods product number 107, which may not be available immediately but could be ordered within a few days.

MOTION [6:23:40 PM](#)

Commissioner Richardson stated regarding PLNHL2014-00725, based on the analysis and findings listed in the Staff Report, testimony and the proposal presented, he moved that the Historic Landmark Commission deny the request for a Certificate of Appropriateness for T1-11 siding on the rear of the home located at approximately 323 E 2nd Avenue in the Avenues Historic District. The following conditions shall be met within three months of Historic Landmark Commission action:

- 1. The Applicant shall replace the front door and side lights with materials that more closely resemble the items recently removed.**
- 2. The applicant shall remove all the T 1-11 siding and make repairs to the horizontal wood siding underneath as warranted, or an historically appropriate horizontal lap siding shall be used.**
- 3. The Historic Landmark Commission delegates oversight of required alterations to Planning Staff.**

Mr. Paul Nielson, City Attorney, asked the Commission to remove the conditions as the motion was for denial and the Commission did not have purview over enforcement issues.

Mr. Traugher stated he felt it was important to have a time limit requiring action be taken.

Mr. Nielson stated that was not something the Commission could do as it was an enforcement issue.

Ms. Coffey stated Staff was asking for the Commission to deny the siding and the changes to the front door entry area.

[6:26:01 PM](#)

Commissioner Richardson withdrew his motion

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

Commissioner Richardson stated regarding PLNHL2014-00725, based on the analysis and findings listed in the Staff Report, testimony and the proposal presented, he moved that the Historic Landmark Commission deny the request for a Certificate of Appropriateness to replace the front entry way and to allow T1-11 siding on the rear of the home located at approximately 323 E 2nd Avenue in the Avenues Historic District. Commissioner McClintic seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Ms. Coffey stated the case would be turned over to the Enforcement Division and the enforcement processes would be followed.

[6:27:20 PM](#)

Western Macaroni Manufacturing Company Factory at approximately 244 S South 500 West - The Utah's State Historic Preservation Office is soliciting comments from the Historic Landmark Commission regarding listing the Western Macaroni Manufacturing Company Factory on the National Register of Historic Places. The subject property is within Council District 4, represented by Luke Garrott. (Staff contact: Cheri Coffey at (801)535-6188 or cheri.coffey@slcgov.com.)

Commissioner Charles Shepherd recused himself from the meeting for this item as his company was directly involved with the restoration of the property.

Ms. Korral Broschinsky, State History, gave an overview of the proposal as outlined in the Staff Report (located in the case file). She stated Staff was recommending that the Historic Landmark Commission forward a favorable recommendation to the State Historic Preservation Office regarding the request.

The Commissioners discussed the application stating:

- The challenge with the district was the amount of neglect it had seen over the years.
- The effort to recognize and successfully preserve the building was important to the heritage of the area.

Commissioner Harding stated she did not think the building met 8a, being that it was not associated with events that made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of Utah history. She stated it was more of a utilitarian building.

Commissioner Quist stated she thought the ethnic heritage and immigration was significant. She stated the building was a representation of the Italian-American experience especially for the periods of significance.

Ms. Broschinsky stated it was significant in context because the other buildings that had

been used for pasta manufacturing had been demolished and this was the last one in the City. She stated it had significance because the business dominated the city in the 20's and 30's.

PUBLIC HEARING [6:44:17 PM](#)

Chairperson Brennan opened the Public Hearing. Seeing no one in the audience wished to speak for or against the petition; Chairperson Brennan closed the Public Hearing.

MOTION [6:44:30 PM](#)

Commissioner Quist stated regarding the Western Macaroni Manufacturing Company Factory at approximately 244 South 500 West , based on the findings listed in the Staff Report, testimony and plans presented, she moved that the Historic Landmark Commission forward a favorable recommendation to the State Historic Preservation Office regarding the request. Commissioner Richardson seconded the motion. Commissioner McClintic, Shepherd and Richardson voted "aye". Commissioner Harding voted "nay". The motion passed 3-1.

[6:46:23 PM](#)

[29th Ward House at approximately 1102 W 400 North](#) - The Utah's State Historic Preservation Office is soliciting comments from the Historic Landmark Commission regarding listing the 29th Ward house on the National Register of Historic Places. This city-owned property is located at the above listed address. The subject property is within Council District 1, represented by James Rogers. (Staff contact: Amy Thompson at (801)535-7281 or amy.thompson@slcgov.com.)

Ms. Korral Broschinsky, State History, gave an overview of the proposal as outlined in the Staff Report (located in the case file). She stated Staff was recommending that the Historic Landmark Commission forward a favorable recommendation to the State Historic Preservation Office regarding the request.

The Commission and Staff discussed the following:

- What became of the stain glass windows.
 - There was no record as to what happened to the windows.

PUBLIC HEARING [6:59:45 PM](#)

Chairperson Brennan opened the Public Hearing. Seeing no one in the audience wished to speak for or against the petition; Chairperson Brennan closed the Public Hearing.

Commissioner Harding stated there was no question as to the significance of the structure.

Commissioner Shepherd stated it was a very interesting transitional building, obviously it had lost its luster over the years but it had a history that communicated itself well.

MOTION [7:00:35 PM](#)

Commissioner Shepherd stated regarding the 29th Ward House at approximately 1102 W 400 North, based on the findings listed in the Staff Report, testimony and plans presented, he moved that the Historic Landmark Commission forward a favorable recommendation to the State Historic Preservation Office regarding the request. Commissioner McClintic seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Ms. Coffey gave the history of the use of the building.

Unfinished Business [7:03:12 PM](#)

Yalecrest Reconnaissance Level Survey – Review and finalize a determination by the Commission to update the 2005 Yalecrest Reconnaissance Level Survey relating to properties located on Harvard Avenue (approximately 1335 E 1155 South) between 1500 East and 1700 East. This area is proposed as a local historic district. The Commission received the ratings but did not hold any discussion at the public hearing on September 4, 2014. Staff is requesting the Commission review and approve the proposed updates/changes to the survey. (Staff contact: Michael Maloy at (801)535-7281 or michael.maloy@slcgov.com)

Mr. Michael Maloy, Senior Planner, gave an overview of the proposal as outlined in the Staff Report (located in the case file). He stated Staff was recommending that the Historic Landmark Commission approve the changes to the survey as presented.

MOTION [7:08:01 PM](#)

Commissioner McClintic stated regarding Yalecrest Reconnaissance Level Survey, he moved that the Historic Landmark Commission approve the changes to the Yalecrest Reconnaissance Level Survey. Commissioner Harding seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

[7:08:28 PM](#)

Landscaping Ordinance - Doug Dansie, Senior Planner, will facilitate a discussion regarding a request by the City Council to amend the water wise/park strip landscaping ordinance. Staff is seeking input from the Historic Landmark Commission with regard to treatment of park strips within local historic districts. (Staff contact: Doug Dansie at (801) 535-6182 or doug.dansie@slcgov.com).
PLNPCM2014-00194

Mr. Doug Dansie, Senior Planner, gave an overview of the proposal as outlined in the Staff Report (located in the case file). He stated Staff was looking for direction and comments regarding the new ordinance.

The Commission and Staff discussed the following:

- The meaning of specimen plant.
- The types of plants that were preferred in park strips and types that thrived without a lot of water.
- The types of plants that were not allowed in park strips.
- If retaining structures were allowed as part of the park strip development.
- Why concrete would be allowed if one purpose of the park strip was to allow access to utilities.
 - Concrete was generally approved in narrower park strips that could not adequately facilitate plants.
- The Commission should be making strong recommendations on what was planted or allowed in the park strips and not just making suggestions.
- If planter boxes should be allowed in the park strip.
 - The proposed ordinance stated that planter boxes would not be allowed unless a garden space was not available in another location on the property.
 - If a planter box was located in the park strip it should be held to the same height limit as the plants.
- The issues with letting one property owner have planter boxes and not the neighbors.
- The property management division issues revocable permits for the planter boxes allowing for enforcement and removal of the boxes.
- This was a city wide ordinance.
- How the planter boxes changed historic areas and could change the fabric of those areas.
- Encouraging turf in Historic Districts, because it is the characteristic of the districts.
- Issues with grass in the park strip where large amounts of shade are prevalent.
- Discouraging anything, plant or box, above grade.
- The size of park strip that allowed for rock.
- Need to educate the public on the water wise grasses.
- The importance of protecting the park strip trees.
- Outline what is allowed and not allowed in the park strips in Historic Districts.
- The safety issues of having raised planter boxes in the park strip
- Implementing setbacks for the planter boxes.
- Did the Commission feel that planter boxes were appropriate for the park strip as a whole.
 - Park strips are part of the character of the historic districts, they may be able to evolve but the ordinance should emphasize continuity and simplicity.
- Need to make sure the park strip does not detract from the home.

[7:58:06 PM](#)

Terrace Falls Balconies at approximately 171 E. Third Avenue - A request by

Fernando Silva, a Terrace Falls condo unit owner, to create an sun deck on each of the two penthouse units, 601 and 602, on the west end of the building. The Terrace Falls Condominium building is located at the above listed address. It is a noncontributing structure in the Avenues Historic District. This request will require a special exception for additional height because the roof will need to be raised approximately two feet to create an access to the balcony. The subject property is located in the RMF-35 (Moderate Density Multifamily Residential) zoning district in City Council District 3, represented by Stan Penfold. (Staff contact: Katia Pace, 801 535-6354 or katia.pace@slcgov.com .) Case number PLNHLC2014-00576 and PLNHLC2014-00823

Ms. Katia Pace, Principal Planner, gave an overview of the proposal as outlined in the Staff Report (located in the case file). She stated Staff was looking for direction and comments regarding the petition.

The Commission and Staff discussed the following:

- What would happen if the approval was granted but did not require the neighbor to build at the same time or if the second proposal was never built.
 - The Commission would be approving the single project.
 - Staff stated it was important that the building stay symmetrical and if the Commission approved the petition without the requirement that the neighbor construct the same structure the building would become asymmetrical.
- If the building was a contributing structure.
 - No, it was built in 1980.
- Why was the symmetry a main issue. Some felt it not to be.
- The standards for review.
 - The project was appropriately reviewed under the standards for new construction or alterations to non-contributing structure.
 - A Special Exception was being requested for additional height.
- Why the height would be considered as acceptable for this application when the height of the original structure was an issue.
 - The individuals who were concerned with the height lived on A Street and felt it would take away their views, but due to the slope of the property the additional height did not impact the properties on A street.
 - The building on the east was much higher than the subject building.

Mr. Tim Boss, architect, reviewed the proposal, the design and layout for the sun deck and the issues with requiring the neighbor to construct a sun deck, on their side, at the same time. He stated the building as it currently stood was asymmetrical on the west end.

Mr. Nielson asked if the Home Owners Association had authorized the addition.

Mr. Boss stated yes, the Home Owners Association had approved the proposal.

Mr. Craig Calder, condo owner, reviewed the Home Owners Association's view on the proposal. He stated the proposal would be an asset to the building.

The Commission made the following observations

- The building was quite symmetrical if the entire façade was considered but it was not relevant to the proposal.

The Commission and Applicant discussed the following:

- The different elevations of the building.
- The location of the subject unit on the back of the building.
- The materials for the proposal.
- The glass railing and visibility issues with items that may be stored on the deck.
- The Applicant agreed to use the recommended bay window if the Commission requested it.

Commissioner McClintic stated the height not the symmetry should be the main concern.

Ms. Oktay summarized that the Commission overall felt symmetry of the west elevation was not an issue.

The Commission agreed and stated they felt the overall height was an issue and more options needed to be proposed for the railing treatment, other than glass. They asked Staff to provide additional photos of the north perspective in the revised information.

The meeting adjourned at [8:32:49 PM](#)