

SALT LAKE CITY
HISTORIC LANDMARK COMMISSION
Minutes of the Meeting
Room 326, 451 South State Street
March 6, 2014

A roll is being kept of all who attended the Historic Landmark Commission Meeting. The meeting was called to order at [5:36:19 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; Commissioners Earle Bevins III, Thomas Brennan, Arla Funk, Robert McClintic, David Richardson and Charles Shepherd. Commissioner Heather Thuet was excused.

Planning Staff members present at the meeting were: Cheri Coffey, Assistant Planning Director; Michaela Oktay, Planning Manager; Carl Leith, Senior Planner; Michelle Moeller, Senior Secretary and Paul Neilson, City Attorney.

FIELD TRIP NOTES:

No field trip was held prior to this meeting.

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.

APPROVAL OF THE FEBRUARY 6, 2014 MINUTES [5:36:26 PM](#)

MOTION [5:36:44 PM](#)

Commissioner Bevins moved to approve the minutes from February 6, 2014. Commissioner McClintic seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

REPORT OF THE CHAIR OR VICE CHAIR [5:36:58 PM](#)

Chairperson Harding stated she had nothing to report.

Vice Chairperson Hart stated she had nothing to report.

DIRECTOR'S REPORT [5:37:08 PM](#)

Ms. Cheri Coffey, Assistant Planning Director, reviewed the request for the Historic Landmark Commission to delegate Special Exception approval authority to the Planning Director as provided in the Zoning Ordinance section 21A.52.040. She reviewed the history of the approval process, that the Planning Commission had recently delegated authority, and the type of items that would still require the Historic Landmark Commission's approval.

The Commission and Staff discussed the following:

- The fact that the proposed process had been followed over the past several months and that this proposal was to formally delegate the authority to the Planning Director to continue in the same manner as required by the zoning ordinance.
- The history of how Special Exception items had been reviewed and approved.
- The type of issues that would require the Commission's approval and the ones that could be administratively approved.
- The City Attorney had identified the need for the Commission to formally delegate to the Planning Director the authority to approve these items.
- The noticing procedure for administratively approved projects.
- The Commission was concerned that some projects may not be as minor as Staff determined and that not enough people are being noticed of the proposals.
- How Staff determined if something was minor.
 - Most of the Special Exception items that are approved by Staff are for additional height for fences, and reduced setbacks for inline additions,. Staff noted that they do not regularly approve additional height for buildings .
- The items that have been approved administratively would be listed on the spreadsheet that the Commission receives each month.
- Whether there was a need to be clearer about the definition of minor.
- How Staff evaluated the projects against the current ordinance.
- Having a trial run and having staff report back to the Commission to review what the Administrative approvals were given to determine whether the Commission would have approved the applications.
- Perhaps requiring Staff to bring evidence to the Commission, regarding all administratively approved special exceptions that otherwise would be required to be reviewed by the Commission for two months and then the commission could see what types of projects the Staff approves and determine if the Commission wanted to delegate all of the Special Exception requests as allowed by the zoning ordinance. .
- Could Staff be legally required to post a sign, in the same manner that is required for Public Hearings , to inform more people of what was being proposed.
 - There is no sign requirement for a notice of application in the ordinance and Staff was not required to post a sign on the property at present.
- Determining a number of cases rather than a time period may be more appropriate as it may take awhile to get enough cases to review.
- The Commission would like to see a copy of the applications for any administratively approved Special Exceptions during the trial period. They would like them attached to the administrative review report each month.

MOTION [5:58:48 PM](#)

Commissioner Hart moved that the Historic Landmark Commission delegate temporary authority of Special Exceptions to the Planning Director to consider ten applications, and that all signage for public notification requirements are followed as would be the case if the petitions were brought to the Commission and at the

meeting following staff's administrative approval, the Historic Landmark Commission be given the application drawings for review.

The Commission discussed if consideration meant approved cases. They determined it meant approved or denied cases so the Commission would have ten cases to review and determine if they agreed with Staff's decisions. It was stated that it would not slow the process for the applicants. The Commission stated at the end of reviewing the ten cases they would have to either approve or deny Staff's request for delegation. They discussed the process and steps for the Commission's review of the ten applications.

Staff reiterated that Staff could not administratively deny Certificates of Appropriateness as per the ordinance, and that any such cases are forwarded to the Commission if Staff cannot approve them as per the standards

Commissioner McClintic seconded the motion.

Commissioner Hart amended the motion to state ten cases plus any additional in the month that the tenth case occurs, so that Staff was able to approve through the end of the month.

Commissioner McClintic seconded the amendment to the motion. The motion and amendment passed unanimously.

[6:04:30 PM](#)

Ms. Coffey reviewed the request to remove the Brooks Arcade from the National Register of Historic Places. She stated Mr. Kirk Huffaker, Executive Director of the Utah Heritage Foundation and person who filed the request with the Division of State History was present for questions. She reviewed the process for delisting properties. Ms. Coffey stated the Commission could send comments regarding the delisting as they were the Certified Local Government over the area.

The Commission asked if there was an alternative designation that would regulate that the façade be kept. Ms. Coffey stated the Historic Landmark Commission did not oversee that, as it was not a city Landmark Site but was listed on the National Registry. The City does not have another program that would require keeping the façade.

Mr. Huffaker stated he had proposed keeping the two façades, not the entire building, on the registry but State History felt it was inappropriate to add it to the list as an object.

PUBLIC HEARING [6:08:49 PM](#)

Chairperson Harding asked for public comments seeing none, she closed the Public Hearing.

The Commission expressed the regret of the losing such a magnificent building when it was originally renovated and that all that currently remained was a shell of what once existed.

PUBLIC COMMENTS [6:10:12 PM](#)

Chairperson Harding opened the Public Comment period.

Ms. Cindy Cromer stated her comments referred to the Trolley Square drawings connecting to Liberty Park. She reviewed her issues with the proposal, discussed the traffic on Green Street and the homes being referred to as “in the way.” Ms. Cromer stated the proposal was a very bad idea and Trolley Square should be told it was a bad idea.

Chairperson Harding closed the Public Comment period.

WORK SESSION [6:13:14 PM](#)

Design Guidelines for Historic Apartments and Multi-Family Buildings in Salt Lake City - Draft 2 - The Historic Landmark Commission will review the Second Draft of the Design Guidelines for Historic Apartments and Multifamily Buildings in Salt Lake City. (Staff contact: Carl Leith at (801) 535 7758, or carl.leith@slcgov.com.) Case number: PLNPCM2012-00870

Mr. Carl Leith, Senior Planner, gave an overview of the Guidelines (copies available in the Planning Office). He stated this was a second draft and asked for corrections or revisions to the guidelines.

The Commission and Staff discussed the following:

- Remove the negative examples from the document.
- Indicate if the pictures were of historic buildings.
- The page numbering needed to be clarified and unified.
- Why there were sections and chapters not just page numbers.
- The next draft would be brought back to the Commission in April for a Public Hearing.
- The meaning and clarification of S.9.
- There are areas that still need to be polished and that in some sections it was difficult to find good examples.
- If Geo Thermal was realistic in residential neighborhoods.
 - Document will go along with commercial guidelines where Geo Thermal was appropriate.
- Gallery of examples could be built into the online version of the guidelines.

PUBLIC HEARING [6:41:24 PM](#)

Although the matter was not advertised as a public hearing, Chairperson Harding allowed a member of the audience who wished to speak to the matter to address the Commission.

The following person spoke to the petition: Mr. Warren Lloyd.

The following comments were made:

- This was an important document.

- As the City grows and there is pressure for more development with increased density, having guidelines for these developments was a must.
- Organization of the document was wonderful.
- Photos are of demolished buildings and should have details about the building included in the caption.
- The rehabilitation sections have repetitive dialog through the section about sense of scale and dimensions.
- Site features in rehabilitation section are confusing.
- Good to have reference materials in the document, websites etc.
- The document needed to move forward in the process sooner rather than later.

Chairperson Harding closed the Public Hearing.

Staff asked if the Commission felt the overall information and guidelines were appropriate. They discussed that more work needed to be done on the sustainability chapter, layout and visuals. The Commission stated the document was moving in the right direction and were comfortable moving forward. The Commission agreed that the design guidelines for multi-family development should be separated from the sustainability chapter.

Staff stated they would focus on the multi-family design guidelines for the April public hearing and return at a later date with the sustainability chapter when the final draft of that chapter was complete.

The meeting stood adjourned at [6:47:27 PM](#)