

SALT LAKE CITY HISTORIC LANDMARK COMMISSION
Meeting Minutes
451 South State Street, Room 326
January 15, 2015

A roll is being kept of all who attended the Historic Landmark Commission Meeting. The meeting was called to order at [5:34:50 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: Vice Chairperson Sheleigh Harding; Commissioners Kenton Peters, Rachel Quist, David Richardson and Charles Shepherd. Chairperson Thomas Brennan and Commissioner Heather Thuet were excused.

Planning Staff members present at the meeting were: Nora Shepard, Planning Director; Cheri Coffey, Assistant Planning Director; Joel Paterson, Zoning Administrator; Carl Leith, Senior Planner; Tracy Tran, 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 Commissioners present were Rachel Quist and Kenton Peters. Staff members in attendance were Cheri Coffey, Joel Paterson, Carl Leith, Tracy Tran and Amy Thompson.

The following sites were visited:

- **168 N H Street** – Staff gave an overview of the proposal. The Commission asked questions about the proposed cladding, if there would be any work on the chimney and the work to be done on the fascia.
- **1120 W 400 S** - Staff gave an overview of the proposal. The Commission asked questions about the work that had been completed on the rear of the building, the cement installation in the west side yard, fence issues along the west property line, concrete work on site and the changes to the existing windows opening and exterior treatments.
- **Orange Theory at Trolley Square**- Staff gave an overview of the proposal. The Commission asked questions about the sign materials and illumination.

APPROVAL OF THE DECEMBER 4, 2014, MINUTES [5:35:02 PM](#)
MOTION [5:35:19 PM](#)

Commissioner Shepherd moved to approve the minutes from December 4, 2014. Commissioner Quist seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

REPORT OF THE CHAIR OR VICE CHAIR [5:35:32 PM](#)

Vice Chairperson Harding stated she had nothing to report.

DIRECTOR'S REPORT [5:35:40 PM](#)

Ms. Cheri Coffey, Assistant Planning Director, introduced the new Planning Director, Nora Shepard, and Commissioner Kenton Peters. She reviewed the new members of the Planning Division Staff. Ms. Coffey stated the State Board of History forwarded a favorable recommendation to the National Park Service for the 29th Ward House and the Western Macaroni building to be listed on the national registry of historic places. She reviewed the status of the proposed Local Historic Districts.

PUBLIC COMMENT [5:37:32 PM](#)

Vice Chairperson Harding opened the Public Comment Period.

Ms. Cindy Cromer discussed the process for changing/updating the contributing structure status as was done with the update to Central City Historic District reconnaissance level survey. She suggested directly contacting property owners regarding any changes to a building's contributing status when the surveys are conducted.

Commissioner Richardson asked if it should be recorded with the County or tied to the title.

Ms. Coffey stated Planning did not list the contributing status on the title. She stated the title reflected if the property was located in a Historic District and that it was a good idea to let the property owner know of any status changes.

Vice Chairperson Harding closed the Public Comment period.

PUBLIC HEARINGS [5:40:21 PM](#)

Vice Chairperson Harding stated the Terrace Falls petition had been postponed.

[5:40:55 PM](#)

Orange Theory Fitness Sign-Trolley Square at approximately 602 East 500 South - A request by Impact Signs, representing Orange Theory Fitness the tenant of the property, for a Minor Alteration for two internally illuminated signs on a building located within the Trolley Square site at the above listed address. Trolley Square is an individually listed landmark site on the City Register, and located in the Central City Historic District. The subject property is in the CS (Community Shopping) zoning district and is located in City Council District 4, represented by Luke Garrott. (Staff contact: Amy Thompson, 801-535-7281, or amy.thompson@slcgov.com.) Case number PLNHL2014-00496

Ms. Amy Thompson, Associate Planner, 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 deny the petition as presented.

The Commission and Staff discussed the following:

- The use of plastic and if there were other items Staff did not approve or did not meet the standards.
 - Staff discussed the lighting for the proposed sign and what had been discussed with the Applicant.
- If the lettering or font on the sign met the standards.
 - The concern was the material not the context of the sign.

Mr. Kevin Anderson, Impact Signs, reviewed the history of the proposal and basis for the request. He reviewed the design, lighting, and material for the sign. Mr. Anderson stated the metal could be painted to look like plastic and most people would not know there was a difference in material.

The Commission and Applicant discussed the following:

- The design of the Orange Theory Fitness sign.
- The rationale for having a plastic sign versus a metal sign.
 - The property owner stated the plastic would be back lit where the metal would be halo lit.
- If the lights were LED.
 - Yes, the lights were LED.
- How the sign would look during the day and at night.
- If the sign had been fabricated.
 - Yes, the work on the sign had begun.
- Could the sign have been changed if it was not already started.
 - Yes it could have been changed.
- The reasoning for the sign design and Trolley Square's proposal.
- If the brick would be seen through the letters.
- The fabrication process to change the letters from plastic to metal.
- If there were durability issues between the two materials.
 - No the plastic would hold up as well as the painted finish on the metal.

PUBLIC HEARING [5:56:29 PM](#)

Vice Chairperson Harding opened the Public Hearing.

Ms. Cindy Cromer stated she is a property owner in the District. She encouraged the Commission to require a sign master plan for Trolley Square. Ms. Cromer stated the lack of a plan was costing everyone time and money. She stated the subject building may not be historic but was part of a historic site and faced the main part of the Central City Historic District. She raised concerns over the color of the sign being seen against the orange brick.

Vice Chairperson Harding closed the Public Hearing.

The Commissioners and Staff discussed and made the following observations:

- If the sign didn't look any different, plastic versus metal, then what were the functional issues with the material.

- It may set a precedent for other signs within Trolley Square if the proposed sign is allowed.
- Staff is working with Trolley Square on a sign master plan for the site.
- If other plastic signs had been denied in Trolley Square.
- The guidelines state plastic is not a material that should be used.
- The color of the sign was not an issue as it was part of the logo.
- Staff met with Orange Theory in August regarding the relevant standards and guidelines, at which time the sign had not been fabricated.
- Need to adhere to the sign standards in the historic districts.
- The things that had been done to help make the sign fit with the design of Trolley Square.
- Could the Commission make this a one-time pass for Trolley Square.
- When Trolley Square issues the master plan does that become law.
 - Staff stated they are guidelines and read the sign standards in the ordinance.
- What would happen in the future, if the Commission approved the proposed sign.
- The materials other signs at Trolley Square were made of.
- Would it be reasonable to postpone this petition pending the review of the master plan for Trolley Square.
 - Staff stated this petition could not be table for that reason.

MOTION [6:07:52 PM](#)

Commissioner Quist stated regarding PLNHLC2014-00496, based on the analysis and findings of fact listed in the Staff Report, testimony and plans presented, she moved that the Historic Landmark Commission deny the request for a Certificate of Appropriateness for 2 new signs located on the Orange Theory lease space located at approximately 602 E 500 South within the Trolley Square Landmark Site and in the Central City Historic District. Commissioner Shepherd seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

[6:09:03 PM](#)

[Alterations and Repairs at approximately 1120 East 400 South](#) - A request by Andrew Nielson for approval from the City to for various exterior alterations made and proposed to be made to the home located at the above listed address. Currently, the land is used as a single family residence and the property is zoned as R-2 (Single- & Two-Family Residential). The property is located within the University Historic District. This type of project must be reviewed by the Historic Landmark Commission since it is the subject of a current enforcement notice. The subject property is within Council District 4, represented by Luke Garrott. Staff contact: Tracy Tran at 801-535-7645 or tracy.tran@slcgov.com.) Case number PLNHLC2014-00884

Ms. Tracy Tran, Principal Planner, 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 approve the petition as presented.

The Commission and Staff discussed the following:

- If Staff was requesting that the petition be tabled to allow changes to be made to the proposal.
 - Staff could administratively approve some of the changes and work out issues with the Applicant.
- What was meant by uncovering the two original windows.
 - To remove the covering that was placed over two original windows.
- If there was a proposal for the rear deck, window and door configuration.
 - The current design was not approved in March and the issues needed to be addressed by the Commission.
- The items that were originally approved and not constructed per the approval.
- The items that were constructed but were not part of the original approval.
- The square footage of the home.
 - 4800 square feet.
- The total building coverage of the lot.
 - Staff did not have that figure.

[6:18:20 PM](#)

Vice Chairperson Harding reviewed how the meeting was structured and when the public would be able to speak to the issue.

Mr. Andrew Nielson, property owner, stated he rehabs homes for a living and gave a history of the project. He reviewed the issues with the contractor and the wording in the guidelines that did not specifically require some of the items being reviewed.

Vice Chairperson Harding asked the Applicant to speak to the issues Staff was requesting denial for and to give reasoning why the things should be approved.

Mr. Nielson stated the following:

- Foundation
 - The foundation was partially painted and therefore, the remainder of the foundation was painted.
 - It would be more detrimental to remove the paint then to just leave it painted.
 - The Commission stated the issue was not the color of the paint but the fact that the foundation had not been painted before.
- Basement windows
 - The windows were casement windows and were only replaced.
 - The gaps in the sandstone - the sandstone was crumbly and replacing it may be more of a detriment.
 - Adding new casement windows may cause more damage to what is there.

- Window wells
 - There are no guidelines for window wells.
 - They met egress standards and should not have to be resized.
- Kitchen replacement window
 - A sun window was previously in the location with trim board underneath it.
 - The window was replaced with double hung window.
 - The original window was smaller.
 - The backsplash would be seen from outside if the window was replaced as suggested.
- The rear addition
 - Was not historic and had no historic value therefore; the changes do not fall under Historic Landmark Commission jurisdiction.
 - The French doors were replaced to meet the design and match up to the foundation.
 - Relocating the door does not make the structure look like a duplex as one door leads to the hall and the other to a bedroom.
- Deck
 - The addition of the new deck was not regulated under the historic guidelines.
 - It met the standards and looked like what was there before.
 - Wood balusters are more historic than metal balusters.
 - Approval was granted and a permit was issued for the back deck, fence and the siding.
 - All the fees were paid for the permit.
- Railings
 - The front porch railings were originally wrought iron.
 - Staff provided pictures and they were replaced with the same material.
- Concrete work
 - Concrete is not specifically addressed in the standards regarding front steps that are not part of the porch.
- Other
 - Legally there are no standards to deny the petition.
 - Work was done without the Applicant's knowledge after the stop work order was put in place.

The Commission and Applicant discussed the following:

- If the work completed on site was consistent with the Certificate of Appropriateness.
 - Yes, but the contractor messed up between two properties and installed the wrong basement windows.
- The rationale for doubling the width of the basement windows

The Commission and Staff discussed the following:

- The language in the ordinance and guidelines.

- There is a difference between the standards in the ordinance and the guidelines.

PUBLIC HEARING [6:37:27 PM](#)

Vice Chairperson Harding opened the Public Hearing.

The following individuals spoke to the petition: Ms. Ann Eckman, Mr. Larry Eckman, Ms. Cindy Cromer, Ms. Karren Nickclaisen and Ms. Meghan Sprecher.

The following comments were made:

- The runoff water from the property was flowing onto the neighboring property.
- The retaining wall issues and the concrete on the west side of the home created a drainage problem for the neighboring property.
- The drainage for the property needed to be addressed.
- The concrete on the west side of the property needed to be reduced to reflect the historical nature of the home.
- The stop work order prohibited the issues with drainage from being addressed.
- The updates to the property were not all negative.
- The contractor should have consequences for the work done without a permit.
- The paint could be removed from the sandstone foundation with proper knowledge and procedure.
- Kitchen window did not fit with the design of the home.
- Rear porch looked awkward.
- Window wells and mechanical equipment along the west side setback was dangerous.
- Concrete on west side created a dangerous situation for the neighbors.
- The backyard had become a concrete jungle and should be changed back to what it was previously.
- Sandstone was only painted because of overspray from painting the brick.
- Siding on rear of home was in bad repair, and did not fit.
- Just because the work was done did not make approval relevant.
- Don't approve the "as-built" on the rear addition.
- The new deck impacted views from neighboring properties.
- Plans should reflect what was approved and be in character with the neighborhood.

Vice Chairperson Harding stated the drainage issues were not the purview of the Commission and would be addressed with the City in another manner.

Ms. Coffey stated the Commission did not have purview over drainage on the property. She stated the concrete was done without a permit and could be requested to be removed as part of the application. Ms. Coffey reviewed the next steps for the project and how the

issues with the drainage could be resolved.

Commissioner Shepherd asked if the stop work order could be lifted for portions of the property to help things move forward.

Ms. Coffey stated Staff could request that the portion of the stop work order, for the west side of the property, be lifted to allow the applicant to begin working on a drainage plan.

The Commission and Staff discussed how to address the drainage and concrete for the proposal.

Mr. Nielson, applicant, stated they were denied lifting part of the stop work order to fix the drainage problem. He stated the concrete was installed because the neighbor requested it and was willing work to address the drainage issues. Mr. Nielson stated the sandstone issues would be addressed as requested. He stated they meet the standards for the other portions of the project.

Vice Chairperson Harding closed the Public Hearing.

The Commissioners discussed the following issues:

- The purview and standards for the kitchen window replacement.
- How the standards applied to the rear of the home.
- The sidewalk on the west side of the property.
- The items that were part of the original Certificate of Appropriateness.
- The window openings on the structure and which ones were altered.
- The items Staff recommended for approval.
- The details and visible appearance of the fence.
- The materials for the rear siding.
- If the drainage issues were something the Commission could address
 - Staff stated the Commission could put a condition on the motion stating, the fence could not be constructed until the drainage issues for the subject property were resolved.
- If the Commission could approve the landscaping boulders as presented.
 - Staff stated the Commission could approve the boulders as presented.
- If the Commission could request further plans and drawings from the Applicant.
 - Staff stated yes the item could be tabled and more information requested.
- How best to approve, deny or table the items in the petition allowing for portions of the stop work order to be lifted, which in turn would allow the applicant to fix the drainage issues.
- If there were items Staff could address or if the Commission needed to review them.
- Which items to approve and which to table or deny.

The Commissioners made the following observations:

- The foundation could be returned to its original un-painted state.
- Windows should be replaced with ones similar to what was removed and fit the openings.
- The basement windows were problematic in size and how they fit the openings.
- Concrete work should not be approved in its entirety.
- The handrails were clearly metal to begin with.

MOTION [7:19:40 PM](#)

Commissioner Shepherd stated consistent with Staff recommendations, based on the analysis and findings listed in the Staff Report, evidence, testimony and pursuant to the plans submitted, he moved that the Historic Landmark Commission approve the following items for the property at 1120 East 400 South:

- **The uncovering but not repair/replacement of two original windows and restore the original windows underneath,**
- **Removal and installation of a new six foot cedar fence based on the example shown on page 38 of the Staff Report and,**
- **The front yard landscaping boulders as installed.**

Commissioner Richardson seconded the motion.

Staff asked for clarification regarding adding a condition stating the fence could not be installed until the drainage issues were resolved.

Commissioner Shepherd stated the drainage was a water management issue that needed to be addressed but was not under the purview of the Commission.

The motion passed unanimously.

MOTION [7:23:20 PM](#)

Commissioner Richardson stated consistent with Staff recommendations, from the evidence and testimony presented and pursuant to the plans submitted, he moved that the Historic Landmark Commission deny the following items for the property at 1120 East 400 South:

- **The painting of the original sandstone foundation.**
- **The basement windows and window wells.**

Commissioner Quist asked if there was anything else.

Commissioner Richardson stated he was open to additions or amendments.

Commissioner Quist stated she was inclined to deny the remaining bullet points including the two that were originally recommended for approval regarding the rear addition siding

with hardie board and the concrete, per item two.

The Commission discussed the portions of the concrete to approve or deny.

MOTION WITHDRAWN [7:24:53 PM](#)

Ms. Coffey asked if the hardie board issue was that the existing siding should remain or if the Commission would like other materials to be used.

Commissioner Quist stated based on the architectural discussions it seemed there may be more appropriate materials to use and that should be explored. She said this did not necessarily preclude the use of hardie board.

Ms. Coffey stated then maybe the siding should not be denied but delegated to Staff to work with the Applicant to come up with an appropriate siding material.

MOTION [7:26:13 PM](#)

Commissioner Richardson stated inconsistent with Staff recommendations, from the evidence and testimony presented and pursuant to the plans submitted, he moved that the Historic Landmark Commission deny the following items for the property at 1120 East 400 South:

- **The painting of the original sandstone foundation.**
- **The basement windows and window wells as installed.**
- **The concrete work, repairs to the front steps, as mentioned in the Staff Report.**

Commissioner Shepherd asked to amend the motion to include the kitchen window replacement consistent with Staff.

Commissioner Richardson accepted the amendment

The Commission and Staff discussed which standard best described the reasons for denying the concrete on the property.

Commissioner Shepherd suggested an amendment to the motion regarding the concrete to state - the denial of the concrete on the west side is incompatible with the historic materials and based on standard two in the ordinance.

The Commission discussed if they wanted to deny all of the concrete or just portions.

Staff asked if the denial was for the concrete on the west side or the entire concrete proposal.

MOTION WITHDRAWN [7:31:02 PM](#)

MOTION [7:31:06 PM](#)

Commissioner Richardson stated inconsistent with Staff recommendations, from the evidence and testimony presented and pursuant to the plans submitted, he moved that the Historic Landmark Commission deny the following items for the property at 1120 East 400 South:

- **The concrete work and repairs to the west side and south side of the building based on standard two, of the ordinance, not being met.**

Commissioner Shepherd seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

The Commission discussed if the rear siding should be approved, denied or if it should be delegated to Staff.

MOTION [7:33:35 PM](#)

Commissioner Richardson stated consistent with Staff recommendation, from the evidence and testimony presented and pursuant to the plans submitted, he moved that the Historic Landmark Commission deny the following items for the property at 1120 East 400 South:

- **The painting of the original sandstone foundation.**
- **Basement windows and window wells as installed**

Commissioner Peters seconded the motion.

Commissioner Shepherd asked to amend the motion to include the kitchen window. He asked to discuss the issues with window wells.

Commissioner Richardson stated the window wells were made out of an inappropriate material and denial was consistent with Staff recommendation. He stated he would not accept the kitchen window as Staff should review it with the Applicant.

Commissioner Quist asked to amend the motion to include denying the front stair design as per Staff's recommendation. She stated this would be the stairs between the front yard and the public sidewalk and be reinstalled using a fanned design consistent with the original design.

Commissioner Richardson accepted the amendment. Commissioner Peters seconded the amendment. The motion passed unanimously.

The Commission and Staff discussed if Staff should be delegated to approve the remaining items.

MOTION [7:37:50 PM](#)

Commissioner Richardson moved to delegate the following four issues to Staff:

- **The rear addition with hardie board to match**
- **The rear addition alterations and deck**

- Kitchen window replacement
- Front porch and front yard handrails

He stated in the case of the rear addition and siding, Staff needed to decide if it should be consistent or acceptable to have two different types of siding on the home. Commissioner Richardson stated the changes to the rear addition, although inconsistent with what was originally approved, Staff can.....

MOTION WITHDRAWN [7:38:41 PM](#)

The Commission and Staff discussed if portions of the remaining items should be approved or denied. They discussed the standards the project would need to meet for approval.

MOTION [7:44:01 PM](#)

Commissioner Richardson stated inconsistent with Staff recommendation, from the evidence and testimony presented and pursuant to the plans submitted, he moved that the Historic Landmark Commission approve the following items for the property at 1120 East 400 South:

- Rear addition and siding, not the deck, based on standards two, three, five, six, eight and nine including the doors and windows.

Commissioner Shepherd seconded the motion.

Commissioner Richardson stated the deck would be addresses separately.

Commissioners Richardson, Shepherd and Peters voted “aye”. Commissioner Quist voted “nay”. The motion passed 3-1.

The Commissioners discussed the kitchen window and handrails.

MOTION [7:48:48 PM](#)

Commissioner Richardson stated consistent with Staff recommendation, from the evidence and testimony presented and pursuant to the plans submitted, he moved that the Historic Landmark Commission deny the following items for the property at 1120 East 400 South:

- The deck as built.
- The kitchen window as installed.

Commissioner Shepherd seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

MOTION [7:50:08 PM](#)

Commissioner Richardson stated inconsistent with Staff recommendation, from the evidence and testimony presented and pursuant to the plans submitted, he moved that the Historic Landmark Commission approve the following items for the property at 1120 East 400 South:

- **The handrails from the front porch to the side walk and sidewalk to the street consistent with standard six listed in the Staff Report.**

Commissioner Peters seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

The Commission and Staff discussed the items left to review.

MOTION [7:52:23 PM](#)

Commissioner Richardson stated consistent with Staff recommendation, from the evidence and testimony presented and pursuant to the plans submitted, he moved that the Historic Landmark Commission approve the following items for the property at 1120 East 400 South:

- **The concrete steps and walkway between the front porch and the stairs leading to the city sidewalk.**

Commissioner Quist seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

The Commission and Staff discussed the next steps for the items that were denied.

[7:54:32 PM](#)

[Alterations and Repairs at approximately 168 North H Street](#) - A request by Charlyn Oyler, representing North American Construction, to approve and carry out alterations and repairs comprising of a stucco coat to exterior brickwork, repair and replacement of windows, rehabilitation and repair of soffit and fascia. The house located at the above listed address and is a single family structure within the Avenues Historic District. This type of project must be reviewed by the Historic Landmark Commission since it is the subject of a current enforcement notice. The subject property is within Council District #3, represented by Stan Penfold. (Staff contact: Carl Leith, (801) 535-7758 or carl.leith@slcgov.com.) Case Number PLNHLC2014-00855

Mr. Carl Leith, 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 petition as presented.

The Commission and Staff discussed the following:

- The materials in the gable end and if they would be changed.
- The windows and door way of the structure.
- Staff's recommendation for the window that is not historical in nature.

- Staff stated the aluminum framed windows were proposed to be replaced.

Ms. Charlyn Oyler, Applicant, reviewed the need to clean and repair the outside of the structure. She explained the water damage and issues with the brick. She reviewed the soffit and fascia, gutters and windows for the proposal.

The Commission and Applicant discussed the following:

- The way the stucco wrapped the window on the front of the structure.
 - The Commission stated they would like all of the windows to be wrapped in a similar way.
- The other updates planned for the home.
 - The Applicant stated it was a work in progress and she would work with Staff to make sure the right process was followed.

PUBLIC HEARING [8:13:53 PM](#)

Vice Chairperson Harding opened the Public Hearing.

The following individuals spoke to the petition: Mr. Jonathan Genzen and Ms. Cindy Cromer.

The following comments were made:

- Home needed work and as long as it was done to code the changes to the home were supported.
- Changes have been disturbing because they are irreversible.
- The stucco dramatically changed one of the oldest structures in the City from a textured exterior to a smooth surface.
- The brick cannot be restored now that stucco had been installed.
- Need to address the chimney and protect it from further changes or removal.

Ms. Oyler stated the chimney would remain as is and be repaired. She stated there was nothing she could say to the stucco on the home.

Vice Chairperson Harding closed the Public Hearing.

The Commissioners made the following observations:

- There was an overlay or tile that was covering the foundation and brick at the base of the home that should be addressed.
- Stucco was not out of place as other historic homes have it.
- Stucco was the only option for repair once the siding was removed.
- There are very small things that could be done to the exterior of the home to further restore it to its historic nature.

- Staff would work with the Applicant to make the proper changes.

MOTION [8:21:18 PM](#)

Commissioner Richardson stated regarding PLNHL2014-00855, based on the testimony and plans presented, he moved that the Historic Landmark Commission grant the request for a Certificate of Appropriateness for the alterations and repairs as proposed in this application, including a 'stucco' coat applied to the brickwork, repair and replacement of windows and the repair and rehabilitation of the soffit and fascia, subject to approval with the final details delegated to Planning Staff with the following recommendations:

- **The stucco should wrap into the window in the same manner that the original masonry did.**
- **The existing four wood windows should be restored and not replaced.**
- **The original soffit, fascia and frieze should be restored including that on the front porch.**
- **The wood siding at the rear of the building should be restored.**

Commissioner Peters seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

The Commission discussed the appeal process.

Ms. Coffey stated the decision the Commission made regarding the property on 3rd Ave, entry door and the rear, was appealed and the Appeal's Hearing Officer upheld the Commission's decision. She stated Staff really appreciated how the Commission addressed each item and clearly reviewed the petitions before them tonight.

The meeting adjourned at [8:25:04 PM](#)