

**SALT LAKE CITY HISTORIC LANDMARK COMMISSION**  
**Meeting Minutes**  
**451 South State Street, Room 326**  
**March 16, 2017**

A roll is kept of all who attended the Historic Landmark Commission Meeting. The meeting was called to order at [5:34:52 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 Thomas Brennan, Sheleigh Harding, Robert Hyde and Rachel Quist. Commissioners Stanley Adams, David Richardson, Paul Svendsen and Kim Wirthlin were excused.

Planning Staff members present at the meeting were: Cheri Coffey, Assistant Planning Director; Michaela Oktay, Planning Manager; Carl Leith, Senior Planner, Nora Shepard, Senior Planner, Lex Traughber, Senior Planner; Anthony Riederer, Principal Planner; Kelsey Lindquist, Associate Planner; Michelle Moeller, Administrative Secretary and Megan DePaulis, Senior City Attorney.

**FIELD TRIP NOTES:**

A field trip was held prior to the meeting. Historic Landmark Commissioner present were Kenton Peters and Charles Shepherd. Staff members in attendance were Michaela Oktay, Carl Leith and Nora Shepard.

The following sites were visited:

- **169 E 4th Ave** - Staff gave an overview of the proposal.
- **941 E 500 South** - Staff gave an overview of the proposal.
- **454-466 E. South Temple** - Staff gave an overview of the proposal.
- **580 North 300 West** - Staff gave an overview of the proposal.
- **165 West 600 North** - Staff gave an overview of the proposal.
- **136 West 600 North** - Staff gave an overview of the proposal.

**APPROVAL OF THE MARCH 2, 2017 MINUTES. [5:36:06 PM](#)**

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

**Commissioner Brennan moved to approve the minutes from the March 2, 2017, meetings with amendments. Commissioner Harding seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.**

**REPORT OF THE CHAIR OR VICE CHAIR [5:36:49 PM](#)**

Chairperson Shepherd stated he had nothing to report.

Vice Chairperson Peters stated he had nothing to report.

## **PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD [5:37:13 PM](#)**

Chairperson Shepherd opened the Public Comment Period.

Ms. Cindy Cromer reviewed the issues with the FBUN 2 zone and public comments from the meeting regarding Trolley Square. She reviewed the future demolition applications that would be brought before the Commission, asked the Commission to focus on the plain language in the ordinance and that the City does the math to determine the economic hardship of structures.

Chairperson Shepherd closed the Public Comment Period.

## **DIRECTOR'S REPORT [5:40:11 PM](#)**

Ms. Cheri Coffey, Assistant Planning Director, reviewed the items that would be on the April 20, agenda and the proposed local historic district application that would be brought before the Commission in the near future.

The Commission asked to receive some simple summary information on the demolition policies and procedures for review prior to the April 20, meeting.

## **[5:42:15 PM](#)**

**Chetrit Minor Alteration for Solar Panels at approximately 537 N. Darwin Street - Nathan Chetrit, represented by Shanna Velasquez of Creative Energies LLC is requesting approval to install a solar system on a front facing roof plane of a single family residence located at the above listed address The property is zoned SR-1A and is in the H Historic Preservation Overlay (Capitol Hill Local Historic District). The subject property is within Council District 3, represented by Stan Penfold. (Staff contact: Nora Shepard at (801)535-7226 or nora.shepard@slcgov.com) Case number PLNHLC2017-00101**

Ms. Nora Shepard, Senior 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.

Mr. Nathan Chetrit, property owner, asked the Commission to approve the petition as presented. He stated the panels blended in to the roof and were an added value to the Community.

## **PUBLIC HEARING [5:46:22 PM](#)**

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

## **MOTION [5:47:02 PM](#)**

**Commissioner Harding stated regarding PLNHLC2017-00101 – Solar Panels 537 Darwin Street - based on the analysis and finding listed in the Staff Report, testimony and the proposal presented, she moved that the Commission approve**

the request for a minor alteration for the installation of a small solar energy collection system as proposed on the front facing roof plane, visible from the public right of way for the residence at 537 Darwin Street specifically the Commission found that the proposed project complies with the standards of review. Commissioner Peters seconded the motion. Commissioners Brennan, Harding, Peters, Hyde and Quist voted “aye”. The motion passed unanimously.

[5:47:58 PM](#)

**Barone Minor Alteration for Solar Panels at approximately 169 E 4th Ave - Mark Barone, represented by Shanna Velasquez of Creative Energies LLC, is requesting approval to install a solar system on the front facing roof plane of a single family home located at the above listed address The property is zoned SR-1A and is in the H Historic Preservation Overlay (Avenues Historic District). The subject property is within Council District 3, represented by Stan Penfold. (Staff contact: Nora Shepard at (801)535-7226 or nora.shepard@slcgov.com) Case number PLNHLC2017-00100**

Ms. Nora Shepard, Senior 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.

Mr. Scott Jones, Creative Energies LLC stated the panels would not be seen from the street from any direction. He asked the Commission to approve the petition.

The Commission and Applicant discussed the following:

- If other locations had been analyzed for panel placement.

#### **PUBLIC HEARING [5:53:19 PM](#)**

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

The Commission discussed and stated the following:

- The percentage of reduction with different placement of the panels and what was appropriate.
- The standards and guidelines for Solar Panels and where they are placed on roof tops.
- The history of solar panels in Historic Districts.
- The approval and denial rates for Solar Panels.
- As technology changes the panel use will grow and update.

#### **MOTION [6:00:10 PM](#)**

**Commissioner Brennan stated regarding PLNHLC2017-00100 – Solar 169 E 4<sup>th</sup> Ave - 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 request for a minor alteration for the installation of a small solar energy collection system as proposed on the front facing roof plane, visible from the public right-of-way for the residence at 169 4<sup>th</sup> Ave. Specifically, the Commission finds that the proposed project complies with the standards of review. Commissioner Hyde seconded the motion. Commissioners Brennan, Harding, Peters, Hyde and Quist voted “aye”. The motion passed unanimously.

[6:00:56 PM](#)

**Scott Solar Panels on a Local Historic Landmark at approximately 941 E 500 South**  
- Kathleen Scott, represented by Shanna Velasquez of Creative Energies LLC, is requesting approval to install a solar system on the front facing roof plane of a Landmark Building located at the above listed address. The property is zoned RMF-35 and is designated as a Local Landmark Site. The subject property is within Council District 4, represented by Derek Kitchen. (Staff contact: Nora Shepard at (801)535-7226 or nora.shepard@slc.gov.com) Case number PLNHLC2017-00102

Ms. Nora Shepard, Senior 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:

- Solar panels are thought to be removable and changeable therefore, what was the primary reason for denying the petition.

Mr. Scott Jones, Creative Energies LLC, stated the shingles were dark in color and would blend with the solar panels. The layout and look of the panels would blend with the uniqueness of the structure.

The Commission and Mr. Jones discussed the following:

- The weight of the Solar Panels.
- Why the panels could not be placed on the accessory structure.
- If other options were considered for the solar energy on the home.
- If there an ability to maximize the west side of the home or on the flat side of the home.

Ms. Kathy Scott and Mr. Ed Scott, property owners, discussed the history of the home and when it was added to the historic registry. They discussed the modifications to the home and the integrity of the accessory building. They reviewed the support system for solar panels in the home and that the panels were removable. They said it was important to be stewards of the environment and protect the historic home.

The Commission and Scott’s discussed the following:

- The replacement of the carport with a garage.
- The access to the home.

#### **PUBLIC HEARING [6:20:21 PM](#)**

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

The Commission and Staff discussed and stated the following:

- The standards of review pertaining to the petition.
- The public comments received for the proposal.

The Commission stated and discussed the following:

- It did not make sense to put solar panels on the east and west facing facades.
- When it was and was not appropriate to put solar panels on historic properties.
- Whether to deny or approve the petition.
- If there was area for the panels to be placed that was not on the front of the home then the petition should be denied but that was not the case with this home.
- Basing an approval on the removability aspect could be a slippery slope.

#### **MOTION [6:27:29 PM](#)**

**Commissioner Brennan stated regarding PLNHLC2017-00102 – Solar Panels 941 E 500 South - based on the analysis and findings listed in the Staff Report, testimony and the proposal presented, he moved that the Commission approve the request for a Certificate of Appropriateness for the installation of a small solar energy collection system as proposed on the front facing roof plane, visible from the public right-of-way for the residence at 941 E 500 South. Specifically, the Commission finds that the solar panels are a removable element to the home that would allow it to return to its current appearance in the future. Commissioner Peters seconded the motion. Commissioners Brennan, Harding, Richardson, Svendsen, Adams and Wirthlin voted “aye”. The motion passed unanimously.**

#### **[6:28:44 PM](#)**

**Marmalade Mixed Use Development at approximately 580 North 300 West - Kevin Blalock, on behalf of Clearwater Homes, is requesting to build a new mixed-use development adjacent to the Marmalade Branch library. The project, as currently designed, consists of three residential buildings set atop a two-level parking structure. The parking structure is wrapped in commercial and live/work spaces. In total the, project provides approximately 275 residential units and a similar number of parking stalls. The land is currently vacant, and zoned R-MU. This project requires New Construction and Special Exception approval. The subject property is located within Council District 3, represented by Stan Penfold. (Staff contact: Anthony Riederer: (801)535-7625 or [anthony.riederer@slcgov.com](mailto:anthony.riederer@slcgov.com).)**

- a. **New Construction** - In order to build the project noted above, the Historic Landmark Commission must approve the design according with the Standards for New Construction in a local historic district. The proposed design is approximately 515 feet long and 200 feet deep. The design consists of three separate residential buildings set atop a shared two-story parking structure. The maximum height of the design as proposed is 75 feet. **Case Number PLNHLC2016-00950**
- b. **Special Exception** - In order to build the project noted above, the Historic Landmark Commission must approve a Special Exception for the structure to encroach into a required rear yard. A portion of the design encroaches into a required rear yard along the northern extent of the eastern edge of the property. The required yard is 30 feet and the design allows for a rear yard of approximately 23 feet. **Case Number PLNHLC2017-00150**

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:

- The grade of the parking.
- How far the seven foot encroachment (on the northeast corner) extended north and south
- The access to the 300 West first floor level units.
- The landscaping plan for the building.
- Why the exception to the setback was being requested.
- If the residential were stepped back how the podium would be seen.
- The street level uses and if there was a need for more activation.
- The height of the north elevation and the viability of a vegetative screen along the north elevation.
- How the height was measured and what was calculated in the height, such as mechanical systems.

Mr. Micha Peters, developer, reviewed the history of the proposal and the reasoning behind the current design. He reviewed the access, landscaping, easements, parking, setbacks, the number of units in the building and why it was important to have the setback relief for the proposal.

Mr. Ed Butterfield, RDA reviewed the wall and its height along the neighboring single family home.

Mr. Kevin Blalock, Blalock Partners Architects, reviewed how the proposal met the concerns raised at the work session, the materials and layout of the units.

Mr. Peters reviewed the depth parcel and the impact of the building at different heights.

The Commission and Applicant discussed the following:

- If the applicant was present at the time of public comments for scoping and how those questions were incorporated in the design.
- If fruit trees would be part of the landscape design.
- The sight plan and elevation that included the adjacent house.
- The setbacks for the proposal.
- The overall benefit to the city when granting the requested Special Exception.
- How the proposal was enhancing the area.
- The parking and its circulation for the proposal.
- The impact of the building on 600 North.
- The question was if there was a design that met the thirty foot setback along the historic house.
- The definition of a Special exception and the purview of the Commission.
- The angled parking on 600 North and if Transportation had reviewed the proposal.
- If other options were studied for the stairs descending from the podium.

Staff reviewed the public comments received for the petition.

Mr. Peters reviewed the parking requirements and other transportation amenities in the proposal.

## **PUBLIC HEARING**

Chairperson Shepherd opened the Public Hearing.

The following individuals spoke to the petition: Mr. Phil Carol, Ms. Victoria Collard, Ms. Teresa Hebron, Mr. Paul Hanks, Ms. Nicole Zeigler and Ms. Barbara George

The following comments were made:

- There were issues with the property line currently being resolved.
- The public plaza should be retained as public space.
- Very frustrated with the lack of parking in the new developments around the city.
- Opposed to the project as proposed.
- Welcomed the development but it was too tall for the surrounding area.
- Concerned over having empty commercial spaces in the new building.
- Parking was an issue for the proposal as well as traffic flow.
- Thankful for an opportunity to see the proposal as they had not had the chance to.
- This was a piece of property that was left vacant because of the water table issues which should be addressed before construction.
- Needed to ensure the historic nature of the area was kept intact.
- Willing to deal with the additional traffic for the positive growth and development.
- The proposal should have been presented to the Community Council prior to a

public hearing.

- Why vinyl windows were allowed for this and no other buildings.
- The neighbors have not been notified of the proposal to have their concerns heard.

Chairperson Shepherd closed the Public Hearing.

Mr. Butterfield stated the public plaza would be owned by the city and would follow the same rules as other parks. He reviewed the public easements and access points in the area, the staircase and parking for the library.

Mr. Peters reviewed the easements and access to the park through the proposal. He reviewed the meeting with the Community Council. Mr. Peters stated the setback request would address the parking in a small way and there was a possibility to establish offsite parking for the development.

The Commission, Staff and Applicant discussed the following:

- The parking for the library and the proposal.
- The determining factor for the number of units in the proposal.
- The empty commercial units across the street from the proposal.
- If the other submissions for the development maximized the number of allowable units.
- If language could be included in the motion to reduce density if feasible.
- The current zoning for the property and allowable height limit.
- The surrounding zoning and the allowable height limits.

The Commission discussed and stated the following:

- The northwest perspective and the large blank wall should be addressed.
- Vegetative screens were not long term but short term solution.
- The scale along 600 North to the east and the relationship to the one and two story homes was a bit abrupt and overwhelming.
- The height scale and massing of the building from each view point.
- How to address the height and mass of the building
- Reducing the setback did not make that much of a difference.
- The size of the building relative to the surrounding structures.
- If the height was an issue and the passageway between the new building and the historic structure.
- Need a solution that respects the thirty foot setback and addresses the historic building.
- If the entire proposal should be reduced to accommodate the site and parking needs.
- How to balance the parking and the setback to address the historic building



- The twenty three foot setback can be addressed by the proposal and by height, whether that was losing the entire top floor or the east portion of the upper level it would be a benefit.
- If more information was needed to review a thirty foot setback option before approving the petition.
- The window openings for the building and the articulation of the sixty foot wall.
- Whether to approve or deny the petition.

**MOTION [8:25:20 PM](#)**

**Commissioner Harding stated regarding PLNHLC2016-00950 – Marmalade Mixed Use Development PLNHLC2017-000150 – Marmalade Mixed Use Special Exception, based on the analysis and findings listed in the Staff Report, testimony and the proposal presented, she moved that the Historic Landmark Commission approve the applications for Certificate of Appropriateness for New Construction and Special Exception, subject to conditions**

1. **The development proposals are revised to address the key issues as identified in issues two through four as listed in the Staff Report**
2. **That these revisions are delegated to Staff for subsequent review and approval**
3. **That no mechanical systems or air conditioning units be located on the balconies.**

**Commissioner Hyde seconded the motion.**

The Commission discussed the motion and conditions of the motion.

**Commissioner Harding amended her motion to include issues three and four as listed in the Staff Report. Commissioner Hyde seconded the amendment.**

The Commissioners discussed if the condition to lower the height as suggested by the application should be added to the motion

**Commissioners, Harding and Hyde voted “aye”. Commissioners Brennan, Quist and Peters voted “nay”. The motion failed 2-3.**

The Commission discussed the issues to include in the motion, those that they were not concerned with and if the issues needed to return to the Commission for approval.

**MOTION [8:35:13 PM](#)**

**Commissioner Hyde stated regarding PLNHLC2016-00950 – Marmalade Mixed Use Development PLNHLC2017-000150 – Marmalade Mixed Use Special Exception, 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 applications for Certificate of Appropriateness for New Construction and Special Exception, subject to conditions one, three and four as listed in the staff report.

1. That the development proposals are revised to address issues one and four identified in the Staff Report with the guidance:
  - a. On number one that Staff work with the Developer to soften the massing and height on the northeast corner of the project.
  - b. That the revisions are delegated to staff for subsequent review and approval.
2. That no mechanical systems or air conditioning units be located on the balconies
3. Introducing an appropriate hard treatment to address the lengths of blank wall in excess of fifteen feet.

Commissioner Peters seconded the motion. Commissioners Brennan, Quist, Peters, Harding and Hyde voted “aye”. The motion passed unanimously.

The Commission took a short break. [8:41:10 PM](#)

The Commission reconvened. [8:45:49 PM](#)

[8:45:51 PM](#)

**New Single Family Dwelling at approximately 165 West 600 North** - Angela Dean, AMD Architecture, representing owner Jack Rhinehart, is requesting approval from the City to construct a single family residence at the above address. The lot is currently zoned SR-1A (Special Development Pattern Residential) and lies within the Capitol Hill Historic District protected by the H Historic Preservation Overlay. The proposed development requires Certificate of Appropriateness approval from the Historic Landmark Commission for new construction in an historic district. It also requires Special Exception approval for height in excess of the SR-1A maximum and projection of the upper floor into the rear and corner side yard setback requirement. The subject property is within Council District 3 represented by Stan Penfold. (Staff contact: Carl Leith at (801)535 7758 or [carl.leith@slcgov.com](mailto:carl.leith@slcgov.com))

- a. **New Construction – Single Family Residence.** In order to construct the proposed residential building a Certificate of Appropriateness for new construction must be approved by the Historic Landmark Commission. Case number PLNHLC2017-00033
- b. **Special Exception Approval.** In order to construct the new single family residence as proposed within the area and configuration of this lot, and to reduce adverse effect upon neighboring mature trees, special exception approval is sought for the following departures from the base zoning dimensional standards. Case Number PLNHLC2017-00111

- I. **Construction of the building to a maximum height of 20 feet which is 4 feet in excess of the SR-1A requirement for a flat roof building.**
- II. **Construction of the building with a projection of up to 2 feet at the south west corner into the rear and corner side yard setback area.**

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 location of the front door.
- The components of the Special Exception approval.
- If there should be additional windows on the east façade.

Ms. Angela Dean, architect, reviewed the trees that would be saved and the design of the proposal.

The Commission, Staff and Applicant discussed the following:

- The trees that would be removed or stay on the property.
- The windows on the east elevation.
- The layout of the proposed home.
- The windows on the west façade.
- Adding shadow lines on the windows
- The window and door style on the proposal.

#### **PUBLIC HEARING [9:06:51 PM](#)**

Chairperson Shepherd opened the Public Hearing.

The following individuals spoke to the petition: Mr. Scott Christensen.

The following comments were made:

- Oppose the project as it was currently designed.
- The street currently consisted older homes with a harmonious feel.
- The roof treatment was not in character with the neighborhood.
- All of the structures on the street are one or one and a half stories with pitched roofs.
- Keeping the trees was not an issue as they were trash trees that need to be removed
- The additional height should not be granted.
- There was not enough evidence of the street being a legitimate street to allow the frontage of the home to be along Alameda Place.

Chairperson Shepherd closed the Public Hearing.

The Commission, Staff and Applicant discussed the following:

- The status of the Alameda Place as a street.

Ms. Dean reviewed the preference was for the flat roof, they had reviewed a pitched roof but the building would be taller than the proposed. She stated they would work with the neighbor regarding keeping or removing the trees. Ms. Dean stated the property owners would love Alameda Place to be paved and there were flat roof homes in the area.

The Commission, Staff and Applicant discussed the following:

- Adding a parapet at the roof line and why this design was chosen.
- The roof overhang.

The Commission discussed and stated the following:

- Reviewing the roof plan to make it fit the modern style but fit the character of the neighborhood.
- Address the window proportion and separation.
- A front porch and gambrel roof would help the design to better fit the area.
- This was a tough lot and a third of the home was underground to help with modern amenities.
- A front façade needed to be determined to help orientate the home to the lot.
- Would like the applicant to come back after the conversation with the neighbor regarding the trees and if the conditions could change.
- The language in the motion and issues that needed to be addressed prior to approval.
- A motion to table.
- There needed to be specific reasons for the petition to be tabled.
- There was a need to apply standards that were lacking without designing the building.
- The Commission needed to give specifics as to the issues they would like addressed.
  - Roof shapes/forms being visually compatible
  - Rhythm of entry porch and other projections.
  - Relationship to the street- directional expression of the principal elevation and streetscape.
  - Window openings.

The Commission, staff and Applicant discussed the following

- Reviewed the trees and the overall building height.
- The visual impacts of lowering the structure.
- The allowable height of a flat roof and a pitched roof.
- It was a small house that would not have a large impact if it were taller.

- The Applicant would like to work with Staff on the issues instead of coming back to the Commission.
- Review the proposal and architecture to see if there were better ways to address the design and make the proposal better fit the neighborhood.
- How the building height was measured.
- If the Applicant would like to table the petition and return to the Commission for approval.
- The entrance to the building which street the front door should be located on.
- The options for a pitched roof or flat roof.
- The need to focus on the compatibility of the project and identify where changes could support that compatibility.

**MOTION [9:50:17 PM](#)**

**Commissioner Harding stated regarding PLNHLC2017-00033 New Construction, Certificate of Appropriateness: based on the analysis and findings listed in the Staff Report, testimony and the proposal presented, she moved that the Historic Landmark Commission table the application until the applicant is prepared to return to address some of the concerns that were raised. Commissioner Peters seconded the motion. Commissioners Brennan, Harding, Quist, Hyde and Peters voted “aye”. The motion passed unanimously.**

**[9:51:28 PM](#)**

**Roofline Alteration at approximately 136 West 600 North - Ryan Rudd is requesting approval from the City for various exterior alterations made and proposed to the home located at the above listed address. Currently, the subject property is used as a four-plex. The project is the subject of a current enforcement notice and must be reviewed by the Historic Landmark Commission. The property is zoned SR-1A, and is located within the Capitol Hill Historic District in Council District 3, represented by Stan Penfold. (Staff contact: Kelsey Lindquist at (801)535-7930 or [kelsey.lindquist@slc.gov.com](mailto:kelsey.lindquist@slc.gov.com).) Case number PLNHLC2015-01031**

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 approve and deny the petition as presented.

Mr. Ryan Rudd reviewed the history of the property and the proposal. He reviewed why the changes were made to the structure, the issues with the windows and why the chimneys were removed. Mr. Rudd stated it was an issue of a half degree in pitch on the roof that was under review. He asked the Commission to approve the changes to the structure with the conditions listed in the Staff Report.

The Commission and Applicant discussed the following:

- The plans showed the roof with the three different pitches, why was the plan not followed.
- If Staff was notified when the roof issues were noticed.

- The changes, to the interior of the structure, that would be required if the roof pitch were changed.
- The roof pitch on various elevations of the structure.
- The front window setback, scale and height of the openings had been changed.
- The construction elements that had been added to the new windows.
- The original intent with the windows on the front façade.
- The original window openings versus what currently existed.

## **PUBLIC HEARING**

Chairperson Shepherd opened the Public Hearing.

The following individuals spoke to the petition: Mr. Nick Nero, Mr. Doug Wortham, Mr. Scott Christensen and Ms. Brooke Rupp

The following comments were made:

- The property owner was willing to improve the home and the neighborhood.
- The roofline was altered by the previous owner most likely without a permit.
- The roofline should be left and the focus should be the front of the home.
- The home was a complete teardown and overrun with meth prior to the improvements.
- It would be a huge detriment to have the project not finished just because of the roofline.
- Supported the staff findings and recommendations on everything but the roofline.
- This was a significant historic structure in the neighborhood that should be protected.
- Protect the home to ensure it could be returned to the historic red brick.
- The new roofline made the space useable and viable.

Chairperson Shepherd closed the Public Hearing.

Mr. Rudd presented a drawing of what the A frame would look like.

Mr. Joseph Billitteri reviewed the issues with restoring the home and the costs of the repairs. He reviewed the windows, roofline and the cost of not moving the project forward. He asked the Commission to work with him and approve the changes made to the building.

The Commission discussed and stated the following:

- The rear windows were not an issue
- There was not a reason to construct three chimneys on the new roof but the ridge chimneys should be replaced.
- The slope of the roof was not that great in the first place and the degree in slope was not going to change the look.
- The roof issue was at the rear of the home on an addition.

- The main concern was the process should have been followed.
- Concerned over setting a precedent to ask for forgiveness instead of permission.
- How to address the front windows to make them compatible with what originally existed.
- The lack of communication was prevalent with this proposal.
- The front of the home needed improvement.
- When the rear addition was originally constructed.
- The contributing status of the building in the 2006 reconnaissance level survey.
- How to address the front windows and make them more historically accurate.

**MOTION** [10:58:58 PM](#)

**Commissioner Peters stated regarding PLNHL2015-01031 Roofline and Exterior Alterations - 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 request for a certificate of appropriateness for the roofline alteration and approve the request to modify the installation of the north elevation windows, replacement of the south elevation windows with windows appropriate in size, dimension and detail to those that would be installed in a historical building in a historic manner, approve reconstruction the ridge line chimneys and the recently constructed retaining wall at 136 W 600 N. The basis for approving the roofline alteration is based upon standard four- which says that alterations or additions that have acquired historic significance in their own right shall be retained and preserved however, it has been shown that the alteration on which the roof in questions is located has little or no historical significance having been constructed subsequent to the construction of the original historic structure. With regard to the north windows the application of standard four also applies in that these are windows that were installed in an alteration or addition that does not have historic significance nor are they on a façade which directly faces the street. Standard eight would also apply to the approval of the rear addition stating contemporary design for alterations or additions should not be discouraged when such alterations or additions do not destroy significant cultural, historical, architectural or archeological, materials and such design is compatible with the size, scale, color material of the property neighborhood and environment.**

Chairperson Shepherd proposed two amendments one would be for the south windows to add the word profile and in regards to the roof the east and west elevations are very visible, incomplete, need to be trimmed out and finished with Staff having the final review.

**Commissioner Peters amended the motion to include the statements regarding the profile of the south façade windows and the east and west elevations of the roof line, with Staff giving the final approval. Commissioner Harding seconded the motion and the amendment. Commissioners Brennan, Harding, Quist, Hyde, and Peters voted “aye”. The motion passed unanimously.**

The meeting adjourned at [11:06:10 PM](#)