

SALT LAKE CITY HISTORIC LANDMARK COMMISSION
Meeting Minutes
451 South State Street, Room 326
December 7, 2017

A roll is kept of all who attended the Historic Landmark Commission Meeting. The meeting was called to order at [5:38:40 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 Kenton Peters; Commissioners Thomas Brennan, Sheleigh Harding, Robert Hyde, Victoria Petro Eschler and Paul Svendsen. Chairperson Charles Shepherd and Commissioners Stanley Adams, David Richardson, Rachel Quist and Esther Stowell were excused.

Planning Staff members present at the meeting were: Cheri Coffey, Assistant Planning Director; Lex Traugher, Senior Planner; Michael Maloy, Senior Planner; Amy Thompson, Principal Planner; Lauren Parisi, Associate Planner; Michelle Poland, 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 and Paul Svendsen. Staff members in attendance were Cheri Coffey, Michael Maloy, Lex Traugher, Lauren Parisi and Amy Thompson.

The following sites were visited:

- **1117 E South Temple** - Staff gave an overview of the proposal.
- **563/567 E 600 South** - Staff gave an overview of the proposal.
- **665 E. Ely Place** - Staff gave an overview of the proposal.
- **658 E. 600 South** - Staff gave an overview of the proposal.
- **613 E. 100 South** - Staff gave an overview of the proposal.

The Commission and Staff discussed the motion made at the November 2, 2017, meeting regarding the Other Side Academy Demolition request. They discussed the intention of the motion and how it could be clarified.

The Commission stated it was not their intention to make the Other Side Academy wait a year to conduct a bona fide effort. Once they have completed the requirements for a bona fide effort, they can return to the Commission to request a final decision on demolition.

MOTION [5:43:50 PM](#)

Commissioner Brennan made a motion to clarify last month's motion regarding The Other Side Academy demolition at approximately 46 S 700 East case number PLNHLC2017-00677 that the applicant was able to come back within a year, prior to the motion to ask the Commission to revisit their denial. Commissioner

Svendsen seconded the motion.

Commissioner Harding asked if public notice was required prior to taking action on the subject item.

Mr. Nielson explained the process and stated it was only to clarify the intent of the motion.

Commissioners Brennan, Harding, Hyde, Petro Eschler and Svendsen voted “aye”.

APPROVAL OF THE NOVEMBER 2, 2017, MINUTES. [5:45:57 PM](#)

MOTION [5:46:17 PM](#)

Commissioner Brennan moved to approve the minutes from the November 2, 2017. Commissioner Harding seconded the motion. Commissioners Brennan, Harding, Hyde, Petro-Eschler and Svendsen voted “aye”. The motion passed unanimously.

The Commission and Staff discussed if the agenda needed to be rearranged.

REPORT OF THE CHAIR OR VICE CHAIR [5:48:30 PM](#)

Vice Chairperson Peters stated he had nothing to report.

DIRECTOR’S REPORT [5:48:42 PM](#)

Ms. Cheri Coffey, Assistant Planning Director, reviewed the appeal of the Other Side Academy to the Mayor, the results of the Douglas Park Local Historic District ballots and the Planners that would be leaving the City in the next few weeks to take positions in other cities.

PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD [5:50:10 PM](#)

Vice Chairperson Peters opened the Public Comment Period, seeing no one wished to speak; Vice Chairperson Peters closed the Public Comment Period.

[5:50:19 PM](#)

Apartments at approximately 1117 E South Temple - Tariq Mughal is requesting approval from the City to develop a 12 unit apartment building at the above-listed address. Currently, the land is vacant and zoned R-MU-35 Residential/Mixed Use District and within the H Historic Preservation Overlay District. This project will require New Construction and Special Exception approval. The subject property is within Council District 3, represented by Stan Penfold. (Staff contact: Michael Maloy at (801)535-7118 or michael.maloy@slcgov.com)

- a. **New Construction - To build the project noted above, New Construction approval is required to allow development of a new principal building within the South Temple Local Historic District. The 12 unit apartment building will be approximately 35 feet high and have 12 parking spaces. Case number: PLNHLC2017-00560**

- b. Special Exception- To build the project noted above, a Special Exception approval is required to allow construction of a below-grade parking structure and grade changes up to 7 feet within the rear yard setback. Case number: PLNHLC2017-00763**

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

The Commission and Staff discussed the following:

- If underground encroachments were allowed in the rear yard without a Special Exception.
- If the rear retaining walls would be engineered.

Mr. Tariq Mughal, architect, reviewed the history of the property, the nature of the building, the desire for the roof garden and the use of the residential space.

Mr. Brian McCarthy, SH Architecture, reviewed the changes to the proposal since the Work Session. He reviewed the front elevation, height, the percentage of glazing and the landscaping for the proposal. Mr. McCarthy reviewed the exterior space for the residents, the details of the architecture and how the building would fit the area.

The Commission and Applicant discussed the following:

- If the front fenestration was addressed to resemble the neighborhood.
- The fence at the top of the retaining wall.
- The driveway for the proposal.
- If the tree in the park strip would be accommodated within the plan for the drive approach.
- The slope of the driveway.

PUBLIC HEARING [6:21:32 PM](#)

Vice Chairperson Peters opened the Public Hearing.

The following individuals spoke to the petition: Ms. Cindy Cromer, Mr. Charles Stormont, Mr. Joseph Bell, Ms. Kathryn Jones, Mr. MacKay Jones, Ms. Kim Bell and Mr. Bill Peterson.

The following comments were made:

- The RMU 35 zone was inappropriate for the lot as it led to inconsistent lot coverage for the South Temple Historic District development pattern.
- The project looked to be appropriate for a transit ordinated development not the subject area.
- The street tree needed to remain in the park strip.
- The three foot setback was not appropriate as there was no room to maintain the building.

- The grade of the sidewalk was a concern.
- Concerned over Special Exception for the grading.
- Ask that geological studies be conducted prior to approval.
- The underground parking was a benefit however, the sight distances were a concern and should be reviewed before approval.
- The slope of the driveway was a safety concern.
- The number of parking stalls would increase the parking problems in the area.
- The lot was originally owned by the Commodore and used for parking.
- Concerned it would devalue the surrounding properties.
- Concerned it would shadow the surrounding properties and not allow gardens to thrive.
- The noise from the mechanical units would be an issue.
- The removal of the existing trees would be a detriment to the area.
- The fence on the retaining wall was an issue.
- The neighbors have made enough accommodations.
- The proposal was trying to put too large of a building on the small lot.

Vice Chairperson Peters closed the Public Hearing.

Mr. Mughal thanked the neighbors for their comments. He stated they had been over and over the proposal and were asked to build the parking underground. He stated he did not want to add to the problem, he wanted to be part of the neighborhood. Mr. Mughal stated they were only required to provide one parking stall per unit.

Mr. McCarthy stated the shading concerns were addressed in the Staff Report and should not be an issue for surrounding gardens. He said the retaining walls would be engineered and would hold back the soil at no impact to the neighboring properties. Mr. McCarthy stated the mechanical equipment would not be a noise issue as they were created for roof mounting and would be shielded. He reviewed the pedestrian impact, how the safety concerns were addressed and stated they were open to more review of the egress and ingress for the proposal.

The Commission and Applicant discussed the following:

- If the driveway would be heated.
- The site lines when exiting the driveway.
- Transportation would review the drive approach before permits were granted.

The Commission discussed and stated the following:

- The building to lot ratio was a concern.
- The design was more of a commercial building not a residential building.
- The building was not appropriate in design for this portion of the city.
- Why it was a negative to max out the zoning.
- The Work Session discussion for the proposal and the concerns raised by the Commission at that time.
- The exterior of the building was great and looked like a modern take of the

apartments to the west.

- The issues with parking were difficult but was out of the Commission's purview.
- The Commission could not make a judgement on the safety issue but the Transportation Department would thoroughly review the proposal.
- The parts of the proposal that would be reviewed by other city departments before the project was constructed.
- The project fit the pattern of infill and the South Temple Historic District.
- Concerned there were no setbacks or distance between the driveway and the existing trees.
- The materials for the retaining walls along the driveway should match other retaining walls in the proposal.
- The existing tree had a limited life span, going forward, the building should not be compromised for the tree and there are programs in place to replace trees if needed.

MOTION [7:03:48 PM](#)

Commissioner Hyde stated based on the information contained in the Staff Report, and comments received, he moved the Historic Landmark Commission approve petitions PLNHLC2017-00560 and PLNHLC2017-00763 with the following conditions for new construction of a 12 unit apartment located at approximately 1117 E South Temple Street:

- 1. Approval of final design details including building materials and lighting, as well as any other direction expressed by the Commission, shall be delegated to Planning Division staff.**
- 2. Applicant shall submit additional documentation to demonstrate compatibility of façade window pattern and dimensions, or amend proposal, to ensure compliance with applicable regulations.**
- 3. To ensure mechanical services are acoustically screened from nearby properties, air conditioning units must be fully screened and may not be placed on balconies.**
- 4. The applicant will work with Staff to see what can be done, if anything to accommodate the tree without compromising the two way nature of the driveway.**

Commissioner Brennan seconded the motion. Commissioners Brennan, Hyde, Petro-Eschler and Svendsen voted "aye". Commissioners Harding voted "nay". The motion passed 4-1.

Commissioner Svendsen stated regarding petition PLNHLC2017-000555, his real estate broker was involved with the applicant's purchase of the property but he was not directly involved with the proposal or the applicant.

The Commission determined Commissioner Svendsen did not have a conflict of interest.

[7:06:53 PM](#)

New Construction at approximately 563/567 E 600 South - A request by Kristen Clifford, representing the property owner (Ernesto Gutierrez), for New Construction approval of a mixed use building with ground-floor commercial, one ground floor residential unit, and two upper stories containing 3 residential units at the above listed address. The proposal includes demolition of an existing noncontributing commercial building on the subject property. The subject properties are located in the RMU-35 (Residential Mixed Use District) and the H (Historic Preservation Overlay) zoning district within Council District 4, represented by Derek Kitchen. (Staff contact: Amy Thompson (801)535-7281 or amy.thompson@slcgov.com.) Case number: PLNHLC2017- 00555

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 approve the request as presented.

The Commission and Staff discussed the following:

- If Staff reviewed the lack of eaves on the proposed building.
- The deviations from the zoning and why the Planning Commission not the Historic Landmark Commission was reviewing those items.

Ms. Kristen Clifford, applicant, reviewed the history of the proposal, the proposed height, setbacks and how they tried to make the proposal fit the area.

Mr. Thomas Bath, architect, and Ms. Krista Dimick, architect, reviewed the overall design of the building and the aspects of the proposal that were changed since the Work Session.

The Commission and Applicant discussed the following:

- The building felt under detailed.
- The details that could be added to reflect the historic nature of the area while not replicating the historic buildings.
- The design of the gutters and eaves.
- How to keep the desired look and make it function over many years.
- The details needed to be reviewed and carefully added to make the structure stand out.
- The type of windows in the building.

PUBLIC HEARING [7:38:38 PM](#)

Vice Chairperson Peters opened the Public Hearing.

The following individuals spoke to the petition: Mr. Jack Davis and Ms. Cindy Cromer.

The following comments were made:

- Supported the proposal and it would positively impact the neighborhood.
- The proposal eliminated a street facing parking lot while protecting the historic

duplex.

- The gabled roof forms were unique to the modern design.
- The setbacks were responsive to the neighboring structures.
- The proposal fit the neighborhood as a whole.
- The subject proposal and the previous proposal were in the same zone but were totally different in massing.
- Glad to see the windows are more articulated than shown in the printed materials.
- The boldness was entirely appropriate for a property with the commercial use.
- It was important that the commercial building not fade into the background.
- The current proposal was a better project than presented at the Work Session.
- This was a model as to how to convey the impact of a new development on a Historical Street scape.

Vice Chairperson Peters closed the Public Hearing.

The Commission discussed and stated the following:

- The design was spot on and a fantastic addition to 600 South.
- Felt a little sleek, needed to reflect more of the details from the neighborhood to help it better fit the area.
- The proposal felt cold compared to the surrounding structures.
- The massing, scale and treatment between the residential and commercial portions was very appropriate.
- It was critical that even the smallest details were done successfully.
- The three story building in the rear was looming and there was no relation between the two structures to tie them together visually.
- Texturing of the surfacing needed to be considered.

MOTION [7:49:37 PM](#)

Commissioner Svendsen 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 approve petition PLNHLC2017-00555, a request for a certificate of appropriateness for New Construction of a mixed use building at approximately 563 & 567 East 600 South and associated demolition of the noncontributing commercial building with the following conditions:

- 1. Staff recommends modifications to the window design in regards to proportions, fenestration, and solid to void ratio. Window modifications and any other design details identified by the Commission shall be delegated to Planning Staff.**

Commissioner Hyde seconded the motion. Commissioners Brennan, Hyde, Petro-Eschler and Svendsen voted “aye”. Commissioners Harding voted “nay”. The motion passed 4-1.

The Commission took a short break. [7:51:28 PM](#)

The Commission reconvened. [7:56:48 PM](#)

Commissioner Harding stated she would not be participating in the discussion or decision for the next two petitions but would be present to make a quorum.

[7:57:14 PM](#)

Relocation of a structure at approximately 665 E. Ely Place - A request by Trolley Square Ventures, LLC, to relocate the structure located at the above listed address to 582 S. 600 East in the Central City Historic District. The property where the structure is currently located is zoned FB-UN2 (Form Based Urban Neighborhood District). The property where the structure is proposed to be relocated is zoned CN (Neighborhood Commercial District) and is located within City Council District 4 represented by Derek Kitchen. (Staff contact: Lex Traughber at (801)535-6184 or lex.traughber@slcgov.com.) Case number: PLNHLC2017-00850

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 approve the request as presented.

The Commission and Staff discussed the following:

- The neighboring structures.

Mr. Khosrow Semnani property owner, reviewed the history of the proposal and asked the Commission for their approval.

Mr. Warren Lloyd stated the petition was the best option for the structures.

Mr. Allen Roberts stated the move would be difficult but would allow the structure to remain on the historic register and was the best option for the building.

The Commission and Applicant discussed the following:

- The process to move the structure.
- The materials that would be used in the reconstruction of the structure.

PUBLIC HEARING [8:06:50 PM](#)

Vice Chairperson Peters opened the Public Hearing.

The following individuals spoke to the petition: Ms. Cindy Cromer and Mr. Jack Davis.

The following comments were made:

- Moving the structure was a great option.
- Would improve the structure and save an important historic building.
- Excellent proposal for a unique structure.
- Please approve the request.

Vice Chairperson Peters closed the Public Hearing.

MOTION [8:10:38 PM](#)

Commissioner Brennan stated based on the analysis and findings listed in the Staff Report, and that the standards for approval of a Certificate of Appropriateness for relocation have been substantially met, testimony and the proposal presented, he moved that the Historic Landmark Commission approve the request for relocation of the structure located at approximately 665 E. Ely Place. Specifically, the Commission finds that the proposed project substantially complies with Standards for a Certificate of Appropriateness for Relocation of Landmark Site or Contributing Structure. Commissioner Hyde seconded the motion. Commissioners Brennan, Hyde, Petro Eschler and Svendsen voted “aye”. Commissioners Harding abstained from voting. The motion passed unanimously.

[8:13:22 PM](#)

Relocation of a building at approximately 658 E. 600 South - A request by Trolley Square Ventures, LLC, to relocate the structure located at the above listed address to approximately 630 E. Sego Avenue in the Central City Historic District. The property where the structure is currently located is zoned FB-UN2 (Form Based Urban Neighborhood District). The property where the structure is proposed to be relocated is zoned SR-3 (Special Development Pattern Residential District) and is located within City Council District 4 represented by Derek Kitchen. (Staff contact: Lex Traughber at (801)535-6184 or lex.traughber@slcgov.com.) Case number: PLNHLC2017-00851

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 approve the request as presented.

The Commission and Staff discussed the following:

- The proposed new location for the structure.
- If a subdivision application would be required.
- Who would own the home after it was moved.

Mr. Semnani, applicant, stated the structure would be owned by a new entity after it was moved. He reviewed the process to move the structure.

Mr. Allen Roberts reviewed the relocation process and stated the building would continue to have contributing status after it was moved.

PUBLIC HEARING [8:16:46 PM](#)

Vice Chairperson Peters opened the Public Hearing.

The following individuals spoke to the petition: Mr. Wallace Wright, Ms. Cindy Cromer

and Mr. Jack Davis.

The following comments were made:

- Moving the home would add to the neighborhood.
- Would like to know who would be developing the home.
- The quality of the work needed to be reviewed to ensure it was done correctly.
- Supported the relocation of the structure.
- Thanked the Commission and Applicants for saving the two structures.
- The property values in Central City make it possible to move the structures.
- Fifty contributing historic buildings in the Central City Historic District were demolished and it was important to save the existing contributing structures.

Vice Chairperson Peters closed the Public Hearing.

Mr. Semnani stated he would be happy to address concerns with the neighbors.

The Commission discussed and stated the following:

- It was a great proposal and the process of saving historic structures was a result of the community's effort.
- The process to move the structures and how to ensure it was done properly.

Staff reviewed the financial guarantee the applicant would submit to the City to ensure the work was completed.

MOTION [8:26:18 PM](#)

Commissioner Brennan stated based on the information contained within the Staff Report, that the standards for approval of a Certificate of Appropriateness for relocation have been substantially met, testimony and the proposal presented, he moved that the Historic Landmark Commission approve the request for relocation of the structure located at approximately 658 E. 600 South. Specifically, the Commission finds that the proposed project substantially complies with Standards one through six as listed in the Staff Report. Commissioner Hyde seconded the motion. Commissioners Brennan, Hyde, Petro-Eschler and Svendsen voted "aye". Commissioners Harding abstained from voting. The motion passed unanimously.

[8:27:19 PM](#)

TAG Row House Development at approximately 613 E. 100 South - Jordan Atkin, property owner, is requesting approval from the City to construct a 3-unit row house on the vacant property located at the above listed address in the Central City Historic District. The development will be approximately 33 feet tall with a footprint of 3,798 square feet in area. The applicant is also requesting that the Historic Landmark Commission approve the development's site plan as proposed and dimensioned. The site is zoned RMF-45 (Moderate/High Density Multi-Family Residential), and is located in Council District 4, represented by Derek Kitchen.

(Staff contact: Lauren Parisi at (801)535-7226 or lauren.parisi@slcgov.com.) Case number: PLNHLC2017-00722

Ms. Lauren Parisi, 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 approve the request as presented.

Mr. Jordan Atkin, applicant, reviewed the application process and thanked Staff for the review that resulted in a better product.

Mr. Angelo Neofitos, Atlas Architects, stated it was great to be developing a project that would contribute to one of their favorite streets in Salt Lake.

The Commission and Applicant discussed the following:

- The screening of the air conditioning units.
- The materials for the proposal.
- The reasoning for the requested setbacks.

PUBLIC HEARING [8:42:28 PM](#)

Vice Chairperson Peters opened the Public Hearing.

Ms. Cindy Cromer stated everyone wanted to see the vacant lot redeveloped as this was a very challenged block. She encouraged the Historic Landmark Commission to provide input to the Planning Commission on the planned development request as the reduction in the rear yard setback was substantial. Ms. Cromer stated she was asking for a recommendation based on the abutting property owner to the north, the home on that property was a contributory structure with a substantial amount of reinvestment and it was important to consider the likelihood that the property would redevelop to the north and that property would be compromised by a reduction to the rear yard setback on the subject proposal. She stated the Commission needed to review what was in place and make sure the new development was not harming the neighboring historic buildings. Ms. Cromer stated the current proposal was better than previous proposals however, the applicants knew orientation to the street was a standard and they were not applying that feature. She said it was really inexcusable to put everyone through the process of having to coach them through orienting the building to the street and stated the planned development should result in a better project but that was not what she saw with the current proposal.

Vice Chairperson Peters closed the Public Hearing.

The Commission discussed and stated the following:

- The massing of the project was successful and reduced the impact to the neighborhood.
- The orientation to the street was not a concern.
- The rear setback could be reviewed with Staff.

- The alley to the rear of the property would increase the buffer to the surrounding properties.
- The entrances and how they did or did not address the street.

MOTION [8:50:05 PM](#)

Commissioner Harding stated regarding PLNHLC2017-00722 based on the information contained within the Staff Report, the information presented, and the input received during the public hearing, she moved that the Historic Landmark Commission approve the petition, a request for a certificate of appropriateness for New Construction of a 3-unit row house at approximately 613 East 100 South. Final design details are delegated to Planning Staff for review and in particular staff should review the entrance so it addresses the street in a more meaningful way. Commissioner Hyde seconded the motion. Commissioners Brennan, Harding, Hyde, Petro Eschler and Svendsen voted “aye”. The motion passed unanimously.

The meeting adjourned at [8:51:23 PM](#)