

**SALT LAKE CITY HISTORIC LANDMARK COMMISSION**  
**Meeting Minutes**  
**451 South State Street, Room 326**  
**October 5, 2017**

A roll is kept of all who attended the Historic Landmark Commission Meeting. The meeting was called to order at [5:33:08 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 Charles Shepherd, Vice Chairperson Kenton Peters; Commissioners Stanley Adams, Rachel Quist, David Richardson, Esther Stowell and Paul Svendsen. Commissioners Thomas Brennan, Sheleigh Harding and Robert Hyde were excused.

Planning Staff members present at the meeting were: Michaela Oktay, Planning Manager; Kelsey Lindquist, Principal Planner; Amy Thompson, Principal Planner; Deborah Severson, 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 Kenton Peters, Rachel Quist, Paul Svendsen and Charles Shepherd. Staff members in attendance were Michaela Oktay, and Amy Thompson.

The following sites were visited:

- **134 N C Street** - Staff gave an overview of the proposal.
- **1500 East and Fairview Avenue** - Staff gave an overview of the proposal.

**APPROVAL OF THE September 7, 2017, MINUTES. [5:33:47 PM](#)**

**MOTION [5:33:48 PM](#)**

**Commissioner Svendsen moved to approve the minutes from the September 7, 2017, meeting. Commissioner Quist seconded the motion. Commissioners Peters, Adams, Quist, Richardson, Stowell and Svendsen voted “aye”. The motion passed unanimously.**

**REPORT OF THE CHAIR OR VICE CHAIR [5:34:25 PM](#)**

Chairperson Shepherd stated he had nothing to report.

Vice Chairperson Peters stated he had nothing to report.

**DIRECTOR’S REPORT [5:34:32 PM](#)**

Ms. Michaela Oktay, Planning Manager, stated she had nothing to report.

**PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD**

Chairperson Shepherd opened the Public Comment Period.

Ms. Sylvia Nibley, Warm Springs Alliance, updated the Commission on the work to

protect the Warm Springs landmark site.

Chairperson Shepherd closed the Public Comment Period.

[5:36:55 PM](#)

**Special Exception & Minor Alterations at approximately 134 N C Street - Vincent Oles**, the architect representing Norman Waitzman, the owner of the property, is requesting Special Exception and associated Minor Alteration approval from the City for a new two-story accessory structure that is closer than 10 feet to a primary structure on an adjacent lot. This item was reviewed at the September 7, 2017, Historic Landmark Commission meeting, and the decision was to table the project to allow for revisions to the proposal. The base zoning for the property is RMF-35 (Moderate Density Multi-Family Residential). The Historic Landmark Commission has the authority to modify lot and bulk regulations through the Special Exception process. The subject property is within Council District 3, represented by Stan Penfold. (Staff contact: Amy Thompson at (801)535-7281 or [amy.thompson@slcgov.com](mailto:amy.thompson@slcgov.com).)

- a. **Special Exception - Modifications to bulk regulations for a new accessory structure located closer than 10 feet to a primary structure on an adjacent lot. Case number: PLNHLC2017-00604**
- b. **Minor Alterations - Request for a Certificate of Appropriateness for demolition of the existing accessory structure and the proposed new accessory structure. Case number: PLNHLC2017-00458**

Ms. Amy Thompson, 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 request as presented.

The Commission and Staff discussed the following:

- If the accessory building was within the allowable height under the ordinance.

Mr. Vincent Oles, architect, reviewed the revised proposal and how the project fit the area.

Mr. Norman Waitzman, applicant, thanked the Commission for revisiting the proposal and asked the Commission to grant approval. He stated he was trying to save the character of the neighborhood while improving his property. Mr. Waitzman Carson reviewed the public comments regarding the proposal.

The Commission and Applicant discussed the following:

- The height difference between the surrounding structures and the proposed structure.
- The new design of the roof.
- The view of the structure from the street.

The Commission and Staff discussed the following:

- The public comments for the petition.

- The diagram in the public comments.

### **PUBLIC HEARING [6:03:26 PM](#)**

Chairperson Shepherd opened the Public Hearing

The following individuals spoke to the petition: Mr. Jared Brown, Mr. Willy Littig and Ms. Cindy Cromer.

The following comments were made:

- The Staff Report was very thorough.
- The nature of the site did not allow for the proposal.
- The project should be denied as it would set a precedent for other structures to be built and take away from the integrity of the neighborhood.
- The subject structure was one of the few remaining historic garages in the area.
- The subject lot was small and the primary structure was larger than what was currently allowed therefore, adding an accessory structure was contradictory to historic standards.
- The structure did not meet the needs of the applicant for an office space and was more of an apartment space.
- The design did not represent the area or contemporary design, it was a compromise and did not fit the area.
- The subject section of C Street contained two block faces of intact historic structures.
- Adding the proposed structure would take away from the character of the neighborhood.
- Structures in the area were predominantly one story.
- The proposal increase the noncompliance of the property.

The Commission and Mr. Brown discussed the diagram he submitted in his written comments (contained in the case file).

Chairperson Shepherd closed the Public Hearing.

The Applicants stated the structure was not two story, it was on grade and similar to the existing home. They stated the proposal fit within the ordinance other than setbacks and added to the area. The Applicants reviewed other structures in the area similar to the proposal. They reviewed the fixtures in the proposed garage and why a bathroom was included in the space.

The Commissioners discussed and stated the following:

- The primary issue was the lack of the ten foot set back from the home to the east.
- Supported the proposal and it would enhance the applicant's experience with living in the area.
- Would not detract from the neighborhood.
- The history of historic surveys for garages.
- How the height affected neighboring properties.

- The changes made to the application and if it set a precedent.
- The setback was important to the character of the neighborhood.
- Did not support the proposal.
- The height was not an issue as it was allowed under the ordinance.
- The concern was the setback from the surrounding structures.

**MOTION [6:29:21 PM](#)**

**Commissioner Peters stated based on the analysis and findings listed in the Staff Report, the information presented, and the input received during the public hearing, he moved that the Historic Landmark Commission deny the request for a Special Exception to modify the bulk requirements for a new accessory structure located closer than 10 feet to a primary structure on an adjacent lot, petition PLNHLC2017-00604, and associated Minor Alterations, including demolition of the existing accessory structure, petition PLNHLC2017-00458. The proposal fails to comply with the standards of approval. Commissioner Quist seconded the motion. Commissioners Peters, Quist, Richardson and Stowell voted “aye”. Commissioners Adams and Svendsen voted “nay”. The motion passed 4-2.**

**[6:32:04 PM](#)**

**Yalecrest Douglas Park I Local Historic District at approximately 1500 East and Fairview Avenue - A request to create a new local historic district known as Yalecrest - Douglas Park I. The proposed boundaries of the Yalecrest Douglas Park I Local Historic District is located at the above listed address, including both the north and south side of Hubbard Avenue. As part of this request, the Historic Landmark Commission will also review the Yalecrest 2005 Reconnaissance Level Survey to consider forwarding recommendations to update the survey for the homes in the proposed 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: Kelsey Lindquist at (801)535-7930 or [kelsey.Lindquist@slcgov.com](mailto:kelsey.Lindquist@slcgov.com)) Case number: PLNHLC2017-00302**

Ms. Kelsey Lindquist, 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 forward a favorable recommendation to the Planning Commission regarding the petition.

Ms. Pennegh Gregersen, representative for the applicant, reviewed the purpose of the petition, history and importance of the area and asked the Commission to forward a favorable recommendation to the City Council.

**PUBLIC HEARING [6:41:27 PM](#)**

Chairperson Shepherd opened the Public Hearing.

The following individuals spoke to the petition: Ms. Lynn Pershing and Ms. Jennifer Edwards.

The following comments were made:

- Supported the proposed LHD as the area was an exceptional gem.
- The history of the area was notable and should be protected.
- Supported the proposal but was concerned over how it would affect future modification of homes.

The Commission and Ms. Edwards discussed the following:

- The review and approval process for front porches in historic districts.
- Allowing solar panels on historic homes.

Chairperson Shepherd closed the Public Hearing.

The Commissioners and Staff discussed the following:

- The pros and cons to a local historic district.
- If the property owners understood the restrictions of a historic district and the processes for updating homes in the LHD.
- The application process for a LHD.
- The notification process for applications.

The Commission discussed and stated the following:

- The Reconnaissance Level Survey seemed slightly over stated in suggesting the structures are all A rated.
- The constraints a local historic district put on properties should be considered closely by those voting.
- The A rating of the properties should be changed to a B and the C rating left as is.
- How surveys are conducted and who conducts them.
- The rating system for structures and making it consistent throughout the city.
- The requirements for the citizen vote and the language needed to be clarified.

#### **MOTION [7:01:14 PM](#)**

**Commissioner Richardson stated 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 the Yalecrest – Douglas Park I as proposed. Commissioner Adams seconded the motion. Commissioners Adams, Peters, Quist, Richardson, Svendsen and Stowell voted “aye”. The motion passed unanimously.**

#### **MOTION [7:02:51 PM](#)**

**Commissioner Richardson stated based upon the information presented, he move to forward a positive recommendation to the City Council to adopt the changes to the building ratings from the 2005 Reconnaissance Level Survey as attached in Attachment E. Commissioner Adams seconded the motion.**

The Commissioners discussed if the ratings could be adjusted.

**SUBSTITUTE MOTION [7:03:41 PM](#)**

**Commissioner Svendsen stated he would like to make a substitute motion that the properties be designated all B, with the exception of the one property identified as C which would remain as C. And forward a this recommendation to the City Council regarding the changes to the building ratings from the 2005 Reconnaissance Level Survey as attached in Attachment E. Commissioner Adams seconded the motion.**

The Commission discussed the following:

- The ratings should be left as is, as it did not make a difference in review process.
- If building status was changed it should be done by a professional.
- The context of the Yalecrest survey.

**Commissioners Svendsen and Adams voted “aye”. Commissioners Quist, Richardson, Peters and Stowell voted “nay”. The motion failed 2-4.**

**MOTION [7:06:53 PM](#)**

**Commissioner Richardson stated based upon the information presented, he moved to forward a positive recommendation to the City Council to adopt the changes to the building ratings from the 2005 Reconnaissance Level Survey as attached in Attachment E. Commissioner Adams seconded the motion. Commissioners Adams, Quist, Richardson, Svendsen, Peters and Stowell voted “aye”. The motion passed unanimously.**

The meeting adjourned at [7:07:42 PM](#)