

**SALT LAKE CITY HISTORIC LANDMARK COMMISSION**  
**Meeting Minutes**  
**451 South State Street, Room 326**  
**January 7, 2016**

A roll is being kept of all who attended the Historic Landmark Commission Meeting. The meeting was called to order at [5:31:24 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 Charles Shepherd; Commissioners Sheleigh Harding, Kenton Peters and David Richardson. Commissioner Heather Thuet and Rachel Quist were excused.

Planning Staff members present at the meeting were: Nora Shepard, Planning Director; Michaela Oktay, Planning Manager; Carl Leith, Senior Planner; Michael Maloy, Senior Planner; Lex Traughber, Senior Planner; Anthony Riederer, Principal Planner; Tracy Tran, Principal Planner; Kelsey Lindquist, Associate Planner; Michelle Moeller, Administrative Secretary and Paul Nielson, Senior City Attorney.

**FIELD TRIP NOTES:**

A field trip was held prior to the meeting. Historic Landmark Commissioners present were Thomas Brennan and Kenton Peters. Staff members in attendance were Michaela Oktay, Carl Leith, Tracy Tran, Anthony Riederer, Michael Maloy and Kelsey Lindquist.

The following sites were visited:

- **454-466 E. South Temple** – Staff gave an overview of the proposal.
- **205 E 1st Avenue** - Staff gave an overview of the proposal.
- **683 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue** - Staff gave an overview of the proposal.
- **279 North J Street** - Staff gave an overview of the proposal.
- **Harvard Heights Local Historic District**- Staff gave an overview of the proposal.

**REPORT OF THE CHAIR OR VICE CHAIR** [5:31:48 PM](#)

Chairperson Brennan stated he had nothing to report.

Vice Chairperson Shepherd stated he had nothing to report.

**DIRECTOR'S REPORT** [5:32:00 PM](#)

Ms. Michaela Oktay, Planning Manager, reviewed the location of the Yalecrest Hillside Park Open House and the Utah Heritage Foundation and RDA competition for a house on Arctic Court.

**APPROVAL OF THE DECEMBER 3, 2015, MINUTES** [5:33:55 PM](#)

**MOTION** [5:34:20 PM](#)

**Commissioner Harding moved to approve the minutes from December 3, 2015. Commissioner Peters seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.**

**PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD [5:34:32 PM](#)**

Chairperson Brennan opened the Public Comment Period,

Mr. Kirk Huffaker, Utah Heritage Foundation, reviewed the Utah Heritage Competition for Arctic Court and the rehabilitation project for the area.

Chairperson Brennan closed the Public Comment Period.

**PUBLIC HEARINGS**

**[5:36:19 PM](#)**

**Utah Division of State History Request for Comment – A request by the Utah Division of State History for comment from the Historic Landmark Commission for the removal of Hotel Albert from the National Register of Historic Places, due to its recent demolition. Hotel Albert (Arrowpress) was located at approximately 121 S. West Temple. The subject property is within Council District 4, represented by City Council member Derek Kitchen. (Staff contact: (801)-535-7930 or [kelsey.Lindquist@slcgov.com](mailto:kelsey.Lindquist@slcgov.com).)**

Ms. Kelsey Lindquist, 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 forward a favorable recommendation to the Board of State History to remove the Hotel Albert from the National Register of Historic Places.

**PUBLIC HEARING [5:38:34 PM](#)**

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

**MOTION [5:38:50 PM](#)**

**Commissioner Richardson stated in the case of Hotel Albert, based on the analysis and findings listed in the memorandum and public testimony, he moved that the Historic Landmark Commission forward a favorable recommendation to the Board of State History to remove the Hotel Albert from the National Register of Historic Places. Commissioner Shepherd seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.**

**[5:39:34 PM](#)**

**New Apartment Building at approximately 454-466 E. South Temple - A request by Chris Huntsman, CRSA, on behalf of owner Garbett Homes, for a Certificate of Appropriateness from the City to construct a new apartment building at the southwest corner of 500 East and E. South Temple. The property is currently vacant. The proposed development would be approximately six stories and include 5,000 SF of commercial space, 166 apartment units and provision for parking 212 vehicles. The site is zoned R-MU (Residential/ Mixed Use) and is located in the South Temple**

**Local Historic District and City Council District 4, represented by Derek Kitchen. (Staff contact: Carl Leith, (801) 535-7758 or [carl.leith@slcgov.com](mailto:carl.leith@slcgov.com).)**

- a. New Construction – In order to build the proposed apartment building a Certificate of Appropriateness for the building must be approved by the Historic Landmark Commission. Case Number PLNHLC2015-00930.**
- b. Special Exception – In order to construct the proposed development, special exception approval is sought for an encroachment of 20 feet into the required rear yard setback on the west side of the development to accommodate part of the building, two stair ways and an ADA ramp that are greater than 4 feet in height. In conjunction to the encroachment, the applicant is seeking a special exception for approximately 6 feet 8 inches in additional building height for a portion of the west elevation and a portion of the south elevation at the southwest corner of the site. A grade change greater than four feet is also requested in order to accommodate the parking access ramp. Case Number PLNHLC2015-00931**

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 changes to the balconies.
- If the flag lot was historically associated with the main parcel.
- The concerns over the vinyl windows.

Mr. Bryson Garbett reviewed the changes to the plan and how the design was improved. He asked the Commission to approve the petition as presented and allow the project to move forward.

Mr. Wally Cooper reviewed the elevations of the building and how it would impact the surrounding area. He reviewed the grade changes for the property and the issues those changes created for the pedestrian views of the building.

The Commission and Applicant discussed the following:

- If the balconies were increased in size
  - Yes the balconies were increased from three to five feet wide and in some places thirteen feet long.
- The building materials and where each type of material would be used on the façade.
- The windows for the proposal.
- The parapet height versus the solar panel height.
- The style of solar panel proposed for the project.
- If other considerations were given to the building height adjacent to the Piccadilly Apartments.
- Applying the guidelines for Multifamily Buildings to the proposal.

- How to entice retail businesses to the area.
- The issues with parking for businesses in the area.

## **PUBLIC HEARING [6:27:09 PM](#)**

Chairperson Brennan opened the Public Hearing.

Ms. Cindy Cromer stated the changes to the windows, and court yard on the front were great improvements. She stated the 500 South side needed more attention and asked what the “boxes” along the street would look like. Ms. Cromer stated the frontage on the southwest corner was awkward and language restricting mechanical systems on balconies should be included as a condition.

Mr. Kirk Huffaker stated it was great to see progress on the proposal but this was a missed opportunity, as any design on South Temple should reflect the greatness of the street. He stated there were also missed opportunities on E Street as it was a terminal vista that would now end at a building. Mr. Huffaker stated the building had a classical form but did not communicate with the street like other buildings in the area. He stated the plaza helped with the design, but could be better; the viability of the commercial spaces should be reviewed and addressed as there was too much uniformity and consistency.

Mr. Scott Anderson stated he agreed with Kirk Huffaker that this was a missed opportunity. He asked the Commission why they were so afraid of classic architecture that would make the building match the existing structures in the area. Mr. Anderson asked if the retail spaces would be viable and why should the street level space not be a lobby or open space that was more inviting.

Mr. Bradford Houston stated the building should reflect the area at a higher level. He said the reason the area businesses died was the lack of design and detailing in the ground levels.

Chairperson Brennan closed the Public Hearing.

The Commission made the following comments:

- The proposal was greatly improved but there were still areas that needed improvement.
- The height on the southwest corner was an issue.
- Need to make sure there are no missed opportunities to make the building reflect the area.
- There was a need for a greater level of refinement and some prominence given to aspects of the proposal such as the entrance and street level openings.
- South Temple is one of the great streets in the US and it is the responsibility of the Commission to help protect that status.
- The “H” design of the proposal fit with the area but the additional height on the southwest corner took away from the symmetry of the building.

- Mechanical on balconies should not be allowed and should be included in the motion.
- Vinyl windows are not appropriate for South Temple.
- Corten Steel was out of character for the street.
- The building should be monumentary.

The Commission discussed the following:

- The façade design on 500 East, the openings to the parking and commercial areas.
- The items of the proposal that could be changed to better fit with the area.
- The mass of the Southwest tower and options for lessening its impact.
- The Commission’s purview over the design of the building.
- How to further development the Plaza, 500 East frontage and retail space.
- Moving the height of the south tower to the center of the building to reduce the massing.
- The setbacks of the building and making them better fit with the area.
- If the proposal was ready to be approved or needed to be tabled to allow the Applicant to make further improvements.

The Commission, Staff and Applicant discussed the following:

- If the petition should be tabled, denied or approved with the conditions.
- The massing of the Southwest corner and if a Special Exception was required for that corner of the building.
- The conditions of approval listed in the Staff Report.

**MOTION 7:01:02 PM**

**Commissioner Peters stated in the case of PLNHLC2015-00930 and PLNHLC2015-00931, New Apartment Building at approximately 454-466 E. South Temple, based on the analysis and findings listed in the Staff Report, testimony and the proposal presented, he moved that the Historic Landmark Commission approve the application for a Certificate of Appropriateness for New Construction, and the application for associated Special Exception approvals, subject to the following conditions:**

- 1. That the design for the façade of the ground levels facing 500 East be revised to address concerns as identified in this report and/or defined by the commission.**
- 2. That the design of the façade walls facing the Piccadilly Apartments be revised to address concerns as identified in this report and/or defined by the commission.**
- 3. That the materials and their detailed design are defined and/or revised as identified in this report and/or defined by the commission.**
- 4. That the approval of all design details in accordance with commission conclusions are delegated to staff for approval.**
- 5. That the height of the Southwest block of the building be consistent with the standards set in the Multifamily Design Standards.**

**Commissioner Shepherd seconded the motion. Commissioners Harding, Richardson and Brennan voted “nay”. Commissioners Shepherd and Peters voted “aye”. The motion failed 3-2.**

The Commissioners and Staff discussed the next steps for the proposal and how to move forward with the petition.

**MOTION [7:10:05 PM](#)**

**Commissioner Peters stated in the case of PLNHLC2015-00930 and PLNHLC2015-00931, New Apartment Building at approximately 454-466 E. South Temple, based on the analysis and findings listed in the Staff Report, testimony and the proposal presented, he moved that the Historic Landmark Commission approve the application for a Certificate of Appropriateness for New Construction, and the application for associated Special Exception for setbacks, subject to the following conditions:**

- 1. That the design for the façade of the ground levels facing 500 East and South Temple be revised to address concerns as identified in the Staff Report and/or defined by the Commission.**
- 2. That the design of the façade walls facing the Piccadilly Apartments be revised to address concerns as identified in the Staff Report and/or defined by the Commission.**
- 3. That the materials and their detailed design are defined and/or revised as identified in the Staff Report and/or defined by the Commission.**
- 4. That the approval of all design details in accordance with the Commission’s conclusions are delegated to staff for approval.**

**The Special Expectation for the height would be denied subject to standard one-scale and form subsection “A” height and width as the proposed height of the proposed southwest section of the building appears too high in relation to the surrounding structures and the streetscape, the height of the proposed development does not accord with the objectives of this standard as per the findings of the Staff Report.**

**Commissioner Shepherd seconded the motion.**

Chairperson Brennan asked that the Staff work with the Applicant on the materials as outlined in the design guidelines for multifamily buildings.

**Commissioner Peters amended his motion to state the South Temple and 500 East façade should be considered in the detailed design, that the materiality of the building should be in keeping with the standards as outlined in the design guidelines for Multifamily Buildings and the mechanical units are not allowed on balconies. Commissioner Shepherd seconded the motion. Commissioners Harding, Richardson and Brennan voted “nay”. Commissioners Shepherd and Peters voted “aye”. The motion failed 3-2.**

The Commission discussed the next steps for the proposal. It was stated that the Applicant had requested to have an approval or a denial that evening, and to not table the petition.

**MOTION [7:17:40 PM](#)**

**Commissioners Harding stated in the case of PLNHLC2015-00930 and PLNHLC2015-00931, New Apartment Building at approximately 454-466 E. South Temple, she moved that the Historic Landmark Commission deny the petition based on the following:**

- 1. Standard 1 -The proposed height and width should be visually compatible with surrounding structures and streetscape.**
  - The proposal did not meet this standard due to the fact that it would be built to the sidewalk, the massing of the structure was not compatible with the area and the building did not decrease in size as it went further into the interior of the block.**
- 2. Standard 1D- The size and mass of the structure shall be visually compatible with the size and mass of surrounding structures and streetscape.**
  - The proposal loomed far above the smaller buildings on either side, although there are larger buildings further out on the block, the proposal was on a corner and therefore the massing was more problematic.**

Commissioner Richardson seconded the motion. Commissioners Harding, Richardson and Brennan voted “aye”. Commissioners Shepherd and Peters voted “nay”. The motion passed 3-2.

**[7:21:08 PM](#)**

**Erbin Hall Chimney Removal at approximately 205 E 1st Avenue - A request by Brian McCarthy, architect, for a Certificate of Appropriateness for the removal of two (2) original brick chimneys at the above listed address. Currently the building is used by the Madeleine Choir School and the property is zoned I-Institutional. This type of property must reviewed by the Historic Landmark Commission. The subject property is within Council District 3, represented by Stan Penfold. (Staff contact: Tracy Tran at (801)535-7645 or [tracy.tran@slc.gov](mailto:tracy.tran@slc.gov).) Case number PLNHLC2015-00815**

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 deny the petition as presented.

Mr. Brian McCarthy, applicant, thanked Staff for their help with the proposal and reviewed the safety issues with the chimneys prior to their removal. He reviewed the upgrades to the buildings and history of the school. Mr. McCarthy reported on the requirements to reinforce the chimneys and to make the buildings structurally sound. He stated the chimneys were not character defining but contributed to the character of the structure.

## **PUBLIC HEARING [7:32:00 PM](#)**

Chairperson Brennan opened the Public Hearing.

Ms. Cindy Cromer stated removing the subject chimneys was inexcusable. She stated the argument that any character defining feature on a structure would need to be called out in the historic nominations was absurd besides the authority in this case was the city registered status not the national register nomination therefore, those comments were irrelevant. Ms. Cromer stated using the presence of children, in an adaptive reuse, as an excuse to justify removing elements, which are obviously important to the historic character of the structure, was manipulative. She stated the chimneys did not need to be functional as chimneys and could be stabilized and the children could remain safe.

Chairperson Brennan read the comment from Mr. Kirk Huffaker stating he was in favor of Staff's recommendation to deny the application.

Chairperson Brennan closed the Public Hearing.

Ms. Jill Baillie stated they apologize for removing the chimneys however; it was for the safety of the children that use the buildings. She reviewed the report of the seismic expert who stated the chimneys were unsafe.

The Commission discussed the following:

- The status of the chimneys on the neighboring building and if there were plans to remove those.
- What would happen if the petition were denied.
  - The property owner would be required to reconstruct the chimneys as close as possible and to current code.

The Commission made the following comments:

- The recommendation of the Staff was correct.

## **MOTION [7:39:13 PM](#)**

**Commissioner Shepherd stated in the case of PLNHLC2015-00815 Erbin Hall Chimney Removal, based on the analysis and findings listed in the Staff Report, testimony received and the proposal presented, he moved that the Commission deny the request for Certificate of Appropriateness for removal of two chimneys at Erbin Hall, located at approximately 205 E 1st Avenue and that the chimneys be reconstructed to match visual characteristic of the original chimneys. Specifically, the Commission found that the proposed project did not comply with the review standards. Commissioner Peters seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.**

## **[7:40:57 PM](#)**

**New Rear Addition to Single Family Residence at approximately 683 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue – Ken Pollard, on behalf of owner James Williamson, is requesting approval of a two story addition to the rear of the existing house. The house is a contributing building**



**in the Avenues Historic District, is on a corner lot and the addition will face onto J Street. The subject property is zoned SR1-A (Special Development Pattern Residential District) and is located in City Council District 3, represented by Stan Penfold. This proposal is being referred to the Historic Landmark Commission for decision because it is a substantial addition to this residence and because special exception approval is required for proposed setbacks and height. (Staff contact: Carl Leith, (801) 535-7758 or [carl.leith@slcgov.com](mailto:carl.leith@slcgov.com).)**

- a. Proposed Addition – The proposed addition is situated to the rear of this original dwelling on a corner lot, and faces onto J Street. Case Number PLNHLC2015-00586**
- b. Special Exceptions – Special exception approval is sought for an inline addition which continues the existing side yard setback lines exceeding the interior side yard by 2’6”, and exceeding the maximum roof height by 4’6”, and to provide parking space for one car in the side yard. Case Number PLNHLC2015-00587**

[7:40:58 PM](#)

Commissioner David Richardson recused himself from the meeting.

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 Special Exceptions for the proposal.
  - Special Exceptions were for height, setbacks and the overall lot coverage.
- The parking for the proposal.

Mr. Ken Pollard, Pollard Architects, stated the intent was to enhance the block and the historic nature of the house. He reviewed the proposal and the reasoning for the color and materials of the proposed addition.

The Commission and Applicant discussed the following:

- The outside staircase on the lower level of the structure.
- The side yard encroachments and why it was necessary.
- The floor heights of the addition versus the original home.
- The window forms and shapes for the addition.
- The exterior materials and fenestration materials for the addition.
- The glazing of the new canopy.
- If windows or doors in the original home would be replaced.
- The height of the addition and options for reducing it.

**PUBLIC HEARING [8:07:10 PM](#)**

Chairperson Brennan opened the Public Hearing.

Comment from Mr. Kirk Huffaker submitted a comment card stating he supported the

project and addition however, he was concerned about retaining character of the historic structures windows, doors, transoms and the importance to reveal of details and lintels that could be hidden from view by proposed new awnings.

Chairperson Brennan closed the Public Hearing.

The Commission made the following comments:

- The height was a concern as the trees would not block the mass forever.
- The glass awning would need to be resolved with Staff and made to better fit the historic nature of the home.
- Historically additions have been smaller and more compatible with the design of the main structure leaving the original structure as the main focus.
- The proposal was not compatible in design, size and scale.
- The house was small and any addition will look large on the home.
- The rear yard setback would make the backyard small.
- The addition was a clear statement of its time and fit the house nicely.
- The number of exceptions being requested for the proposal.
- The lot coverage was not noticed therefore, it would need to be brought back to the Commission at a future date.
  - The Commission could review the lot coverage and a letter could be sent to the neighbors notifying them of the option to appeal.
- Concerns over the large façade of glass.
- Creative proposal but the number of exceptions needed was a concern.
- Would like to allow other Departments to submit comments on proposed parking.

The Commission discussed the following:

- How the addition and the original home fit and did not fit together.
- Are there other options that would make the home better fit with the area.
- The parking impacts for the proposal.
- Whether to table or deny the petition.

The Commission and Applicant discussed the following:

- If tabling the petition would be acceptable to the Applicant.
- Standard 8.2 listed in the Staff Report.

#### **MOTION [8:27:06 PM](#)**

**Commissioner Harding stated in the case of PLNHLC2015-00586 and PLNHLC2015-00587 New Rear Addition to Single Family Residence at approximately 683 6th Avenue, she moved that the Historic Landmark Commission table the discussion to allow the Applicant time to make changes to the proposal and the proper public notice could be sent. Commissioner Peters seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.**

[8:27:47 PM](#)

Commissioner Richardson returned to the meeting.

**New Construction at approximately 279 North J Street - A request by Jeseca Cleary**

**and Campbell Dosch, property owners and developers, for a Certificate of Appropriateness for new construction of a single-family residence at the above address in Avenues Historic District. The subject property is currently vacant. The property is in the SR-1A (Special Development Pattern) zoning district, located in City Council District 3, represented by Stan Penfold. This application must be reviewed by the Historic Landmark Commission because it is for new construction in a local historic district. (Staff contact: Anthony Riederer, (801)535-7625, or [anthony.riederer@slcgov.com](mailto:anthony.riederer@slcgov.com).) Case number PLNHLC2015-00845**

Mr. Anthony Riederer, Principal 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:

- If Special Exceptions were requested for the petition.
  - No the petition met the requirements for the lot and the height was the average of the block face.

Ms. Jeseca Cleary, Mr. Cambell Dosch and Mr. Jordan Bangeter asked the Commission if they had any comments or concerns.

The Commission and Applicant discussed the following:

- The roof slope for the structure and if a non visual slope was explored.
- How the house improved the neighborhood and the aspects of the design that contributed to the neighborhood.
  - Using the suggested materials, front porch and double doors made it compatible with the area.
  - The design fit with the streetscape.
- How the scale of the home compared to the homes around it.
  - The frontage of the lot was narrow and would not appear large.
- The square footage of the surrounding homes.

#### **PUBLIC HEARING [8:39:25 PM](#)**

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

The Commission made the following comments:

- The home lacked the articulation of character.
  - The north and south facades are stucco and are large flat plains.
  - It was a big rectangular box that lacks character defining features.
  - The solid to void treatment and organization of the openings on the north and south sides were random and did not help provide any sort of scale or coherence.
- The roof was rather flat and not in character with the traditional forms nor was it particularly strong in a contemporary statement.

- Great example of a home that pushed the limits of the zoning.
- Concerned with the height and form as outlined in standard one of the Staff Report.
- The proposal was out of scale and form with the neighborhood.
- The size and the mass of the proposal were not compatible with the surrounding houses.
- Drafted streetscape was needed to see how the home would fit with the neighborhood.
- The stucco facades were prominent and out of character for the neighborhood.
- Historic materials needed to be used on all facades.

The Commission discussed the following:

- The makeup of the neighborhood and block face.
- Similar proposals that better addressed their neighborhoods.
- If the petition should be tabled or denied.

**MOTION [8:48:09 PM](#)**

**Commissioner Richardson stated in the case of PLNHLC2015-00845 New Construction at approximately 279 North J Street, he moved that the Historic Landmark Commission deny the request based on the following:**

- **Specifically the Historic Landmark Commission found that the project did not substantially comply with Standard 1 regarding Scale and form, height and width- the proposed height and width shall be visually compatible with the surrounding structures and streetscape,**
- **The proportion and principal façade - the relationship of the width to the height, the principal elevations shall be in scale with the surrounding structures and streetscape,**
- **Roof shape -the roof shape of a structure shall be visually compatible with the surrounding structures and streetscape.**
- **Scale of the structure - the size and mass of the structure shall be visually compatible with the size and mass of the surrounding structures and streetscape.**

**Commissioner Peters seconded the motion.**

Commissioner Harding asked to table the petition rather than deny it.

The Commission asked the Applicant if they were willing to table the petition and further review the design of the structure.

The Applicant stated they were willing to work through the Commission's concerns and return for review and approval.

**[8:51:24 PM](#)**

**Commissioner Richardson withdrew his motion and moved to table the petition. Commissioner Harding seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.**

[8:52:08 PM](#)

The Commission took a five minute break.

Commissioner Richardson recused himself from the meeting.

[9:00:35 PM](#)

The Commission reconvened.

**Henderson Deck, Stair & Door Minor Alteration at approximately 674 N. 200 West -**  
A request by Pete Henderson, property owner, to remove a stairway & deck structure that has been built into the required side yard without a Certificate of Appropriateness nor building permit, and install a new stairway and deck has been redesigned to meet zoning requirements. The property is located at the above listed address, is zoned SR-1A (Special Development Pattern Residential District), and in City Council District 3, represented by Stan Penfold. (Staff contact: Lex Traughber at (801) 535-6184 or [lex.traughber@slcgov.com](mailto:lex.traughber@slcgov.com).) Case number PLNHLC2015-00577

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:

- The history of the doorway and nonconforming stairs.
- If the second story was an apartment.
- The stairs did not meet zoning as they encroached in the setback however, the applicant proposed similar stairs closer to the building that would meet code.
- The stairs are not historically accurate/appropriate for the building and did not meet the standards in the ordinance.
- The standards for approval.
- What would happen if the petition were denied.

Mr. Pete Henderson, property owner, stated he was sad that Staff did not recommend approval for what he thought was a good compromised solution for the architectural challenge. He stated the door was there historically and there was no evidence that suggested it did not exist originally. Mr. Henderson stated he agreed the current stairs were inappropriate because they were in the side yard. He stated there needed to be stairs to the door and the compromise was sufficient. Mr. Henderson stated the window may have been converted to a door but was done prior to 1950 and read a statement from the previous owner of the home. Mr. Henderson stated the fire department approved the proposed door and stairs.

The Commission and Applicant discussed the following:

- If the Sanborn Maps were checked for reference to a staircase.
- If access from the rear gable was considered.

- The door was already in place so the stairs were installed in the current location.
- It was not possible to put a door in the rear gable as the ceiling was too low.
- Design options for the deck and stairs.

**PUBLIC HEARING [9:22:14 PM](#)**

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

The Commission made the following comments:

- The stairs and door did not appear to be original elements of the home.
- A more reasonable option should be explored.
- The incompatible addition was removed and another incompatible addition should not be installed.

The Commission discussed the following:

- The options for a more compatible solution.
- Whether to table or deny the petition.

**MOTION [9:29:46 PM](#)**

**Commissioner Harding stated in the case of PLNHLC2015-00577 Henderson Deck, Stair & Door Minor Alteration, based on the findings 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 the stair and deck on the north facade of the home located at approximately 674 N. 200 West in the Capitol Hill Historic District. Commissioner Shepherd seconded the motion. Commissioners Harding, Shepherd and Brennan voted “aye”. Commissioner Peters voted “nay”. The motion passed 3-1.**

**[9:31:04 PM](#)**

Commissioner Richardson returned to the meeting.

**Contributing Status of Building at approximately 35 S 900 E - This site is included in the South Temple Historic District, but no formal determination has been made as to the contributing status of the structure on site. Staff will present findings relative to contributory status for consideration by the commission. The property is currently zoned RMF-35 Residential Multi-Family and is located within Council District 4, represented by Council Member Derek Kitchen. (Staff contact: Anthony Riederer at (801)535-7625 or [anthony.riederer@slcgov.com](mailto:anthony.riederer@slcgov.com).)**

Mr. Anthony Riederer, Principal 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 make a determination that the building was noncontributing as outlined in the Staff Report.

The Commission and Staff discussed the following:

- If the structure was in its original state would Staff recommend contributing status.
- Why the Commission could not require the building owner to return the building to its historic nature.

Mr. Heath Gregory, property owner, reviewed the proposal, history and the plans for the property.

**PUBLIC HEARING [9:38:19 PM](#)**

Chairperson Brennan opened the Public Hearing.

The following individuals spoke to the petition: Ms. Cindy Cromer and Mr. Ken Kraus.

The following comments were made:

- The building was noncontributory however, the developers should not be allowed to up zone the property.
- The future plans for the property.
- Development on the property needed to keep with the character of the neighborhood.

Chairperson Brennan read the comment from Mr. Kirk Huffaker supporting Staff's recommendation.

Chairperson Brennan closed the Public Hearing.

**MOTION [9:44:19 PM](#)**

**Commissioner Shepherd stated in the case of Contributing Status of Property at Approximately 35 S 900 E, based on the analysis and findings listed in the memorandum and public testimony, he moved that the Historic Landmark Commission express their sentiment that the existing structure at approximately 35 S 900 E is non-contributing to the South Temple Local Historic District. Commissioner Peters seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.**

**[9:45:13 PM](#)**

**Yalecrest-Harvard Heights Local Historic District - A request to create a new local historic district known as Yalecrest-Harvard Heights. The proposed boundaries of the Yalecrest-Harvard Heights Local Historic District are generally along the north and south sides of Harvard Avenue from 1300 East to 1500 East except homes within the Yalecrest-Normandie Heights Local Historic District. Any owner of real property that is proposed to be rezoned may file a written objection to the inclusion of their property in the proposal within 10 days following the public hearing with the Historic Landmark Commission. All written objections will be forwarded to the City Council. The subject district is located in Council District 6 represented by Charlie Luke. (Staff contact: Michael Maloy at (801) 535-7118 or [michael.maloy@slcgov.com](mailto:michael.maloy@slcgov.com).) Case number PLNHLC2015-00032.**

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 Historic Landmark Commission forward to the City Council a recommendation to approve the request. Planning staff also recommends the Historic Landmark Commission approve changes to the Yalecrest Neighborhood Reconnaissance Level Survey 2005 as proposed.

Mr. Cory Reed and Ms. Reed reviewed the history of the neighborhood and the importance in keeping the historic nature of the area. They asked the Commission to forward a favorable recommendation to the City Council for the proposed local historic district.

**PUBLIC HEARING [9:53:58 PM](#)**

Chairperson Brennan opened the Public Hearing.

Ms. Lynn Pershing, Yalecrest Neighborhood Council, reviewed the importance of Yalecrest and the nature of the real estate in the area. She reviewed the history of the area and stated the Neighborhood Council supported the Local Historic District and asked the Commission for a favorable recommendation.

Chairperson Brennan read a comment from Mr. Kirk Huffaker stating his support of the Local Historic District

Chairperson Brennan closed the Public Hearing.

**MOTION [9:56:07 PM](#)**

**Commissioner Richardson stated in the case PLNHLC2015-00032 Yalecrest-Harvard Heights Local Historic District, based on the findings listed in the Staff Report, testimony and information presented, he moved to forward a positive recommendation to the City Council to designate a new local historic district for Yalecrest-Harvard Heights (as described in Attachment B - Proposed District Boundary) and approve changes to building ratings in the Yalecrest Neighborhood Reconnaissance Level Survey 2005 (as described in Attachment C - Survey Amendments 2015). Commissioner Peters seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.**

**[9:56:55 PM](#)**

**University Reconnaissance Level Survey Update - Salt Lake City has engaged Beatrice Lufkin to evaluate the buildings in the University Historic District and the Historic Landmark Commission will consider accepting the final report of the survey. The district is roughly bound by South Temple, 500 South, 1100 East to University Street. (Staff contact: Lex Traughber at (801) 535-6184 or [lex.traughber@slcgov.com](mailto:lex.traughber@slcgov.com))**

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 accept the survey with the rating modifications.



**PUBLIC HEARING [9:58:30 PM](#)**

Chairperson Brennan opened the Public Hearing.

Chairperson Brennan read a comment from Mr. Kirk Huffaker stating he supported Staff's recommendation.

The following individuals spoke to the petition: Mr. Jeff Taylor and Ms. Cindy Cromer.

The following comments were made:

- Thanked Staff for the work on the proposal.
- Need to notify the property owners by mail of changes to contributing status on structures.
- The State database needed to be fixed.
- The house on Thistle was contributory and should be protected.

Chairperson Brennan closed the Public Hearing.

The Commission discussed the following:

- Notifying property owners of changing status of their properties.
  - Staff did notify property owners, people called and clarifications were given.
  - Surveys can be addressed at anytime and status can be updated if need be.

**MOTION [10:04:27 PM](#)**

**Commissioner Harding stated in the case of University Reconnaissance Level Survey Update, based on the review of the 2015 University Historic District reconnaissance level survey, the analysis, findings listed in the Staff Report and public testimony, she moved that the Historic Landmark Commission accept the survey with the listed rating modifications and corrections. Commissioner Shepherd seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.**

**The meeting adjourned at [10:05:17 PM](#)**