

**SALT LAKE CITY HISTORIC LANDMARK COMMISSION**  
**Meeting Minutes**  
**451 South State Street, Room 326**  
**March 2, 2017**

A roll is 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 Charles Shepherd; Commissioners Thomas Brennan, Sheleigh Harding, David Richardson, Paul Svendsen Stanley Adams and Kim Wirthlin. Vice Chairperson Kenton Peters Commissioners Robert Hyde and Rachel Quist were excused.

Planning Staff members present at the meeting were: Nick Norris; Planning Director; Michaela Oktay, Planning Manager; Carl Leith, Senior Planner, Nora Shepard, Senior Planner, Lex Traughber, Senior 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 Commissioner present were Stanley Adams and Charles Shepherd. Staff members in attendance were Michaela Oktay, Carl Leith and Nora Shepard.

The following site was visited:

- **454-466 E. South Temple** – Staff gave an overview of the proposals.
- **663 E 2nd Avenue** - Staff gave an overview of the proposals

**MOTION [5:32:17 PM](#)**

**Commissioner Richardson moved to change the order of the agenda moving item 3 to the first of the agenda. Commissioner Wirthlin seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.**

**APPROVAL OF THE FEBRUARY 2, 2017 MINUTES. [5:32:44 PM](#)**

**MOTION [5:32:59 PM](#)**

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

**REPORT OF THE CHAIR OR VICE CHAIR [5:33:11 PM](#)**

Chairperson Shepherd stated he had nothing to report.

**DIRECTOR'S REPORT [5:33:20 PM](#)**

Mr. Nick Norris, Planning Director, reviewed the new bills being reviewed by the State Legislature regarding the appeals process, the Planning Manager position and possible changes to Staff in the future.

The Commission and Staff discussed the changes to the appeals process and the standards of review for appeals.

**PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD [5:43:16 PM](#)**

Chairperson Shepherd opened the Public Comment Period.

Ms. Cindy Cromer- read her statement regarding Trolley Square and the FBUN 1 zone as stated in her handout (attached to this record.)

Chairperson Shepherd closed the Public Comment Period.

[5:46:13 PM](#)

**Matt Dimick Solar Panels at approximately 663 E 2nd Avenue - Creative Energies, LLC, on behalf of property owner Matt Dimick is requesting approval to install roof mounted solar panels on the residence at the above listed address. This project requires review by the Historic Landmark Commission as a minor alteration as the solar panels are on a front facing roof plane and are readily visible from the street. The property is zoned SR-1A Special Development Pattern Residential District and is located in the Avenues Historic District, in Council District 3, represented by Stan Penfold. Staff contact: Nora Shepard at [nora.shepard@slcgov.com](mailto:nora.shepard@slcgov.com) or (801)535-7226. Petition number PLNHLC2017-00007.**

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, reviewed the proposal, the look and placement of the panels.

The Commission, Staff and Applicant discussed the following:

- The life of the panels.
- The slope of the roof and why other locations would not work for the panels.
- The tax credits for the home and how the location of the panels would change the amount of credits achievable.

**PUBLIC HEARING [5:54:38 PM](#)**

Chairperson Shepherd opened the Public Hearing.

The following individuals spoke to the petition: Ms. Cindy Cromer.

The following comments were made:

- Mounting solar panels on the garage was not a great idea as it was not heated to remove ice and snow.

- Trenching for the power should not be an issue.

Chairperson Shepherd closed the Public Hearing.

Staff reviewed the public comments received on the proposal.

**MOTION [5:56:58 PM](#)**

**Commissioner Harding stated regarding PLNHL2017-00007 – Solar Panels 663 E 2nd Ave - based on the analysis and findings 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 663 E 2nd Ave. Specifically, the Commission finds that the proposed project complies with the standards of review. Commissioner Richardson seconded the motion. Commissioners Brennan, Harding, Richardson, Svendsen, Adams and Wirthlin voted “aye”. The motion passed unanimously.**

**[5:57:48 PM](#)**

**New Apartment Building and Parking Structure at approximately 454-466 E. South Temple - Chris Huntsman, CRSA Architects, on behalf of owner Garbett Homes, is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness from the City to construct a new apartment building at the above listed address. The site is currently vacant. The proposed development would be six stories along the South Temple frontage and seven stories to the south, comprising 138 apartment units of which three are live-work units, and 186 parking stalls on two parking levels. The proposed development requires approval from the Historic Landmark Commission for new construction in an historic district. The site is zoned R-MU (Residential / Mixed Use) and is located in the South Temple Historic District in 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)) Case number PLNHL2017-00052**

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 difference in height, mass and scale from the previous proposals.
- The way the building related to the street in the new proposal.
- The overall improvements to the new proposed building.
- The front and side yard setbacks for the proposal.

Mr. Bruce Baird, Attorney, reviewed the proposal and the issues of concern. He asked

the Commission for a positive vote and to delegate the review of the final issues to Staff.

Mr. Chris Huntsman, CRSA Architects, reviewed the look of the South Temple façade, the feel of a base\podium and the design of the building.

The Commission, Staff and Applicant discussed the following:

- If the setbacks were appropriate for the design.
- If the cantilevered roof was a primary design feature.
- If the thickness of the roof was structurally sound.
- The design of the roof was to accommodate the mechanical for the structure.
- The grade of the site and how it impacted the building design.
- The depth of the balconies.
- The configuration of the live/work spaces.
- The look and use of the garage doors.
- The window openings on the garage and the glazing of those windows.
- How the building related to the Piccadilly in regards to height.
- Accentuating the primary entrance.
- The possible changes to the building façade that faced the Piccadilly.
- The access to the property.
- Parking for the structure.

#### **PUBLIC HEARING [6:46:24 PM](#)**

Chairperson Shepherd opened the Public Hearing.

The following individuals spoke to the petition: Mr. Kirk Huffaker, Mr. Luke Woodbury, Ms. Brenda Scheer and Ms. Cindy Cromer.

The following comments were made:

- The context of the South Temple Historic District and how the building addresses the street.
- The mass and scale were not a concern.
- The setback met the standards and were warranted to address the neighborhood.
- The building was still very close to the side walk and did not reflect the nature of the neighborhood.
- The materials should be
- Looking forward to building this project to the standards and expectations of the city.
- The setbacks are in keeping with the nature of the neighborhood.
- The experience of South Temple was unique for the city because of the variety of the architecture.
- The proposal fit with the changing architecture of the street.
- Greater density was a good thing for the city.

- The maps of the setbacks do not reflect the actual setbacks in the area.
- The need to acknowledge the mechanical on the roof of the proposed building.
- Need to make the Piccadilly façade more interesting.

Chairperson Shepherd read the following card:

- Ms. Ethal Black – where was the parking for those coming to the work spaces.

Chairperson Shepherd closed the Public Hearing.

The Commission, Staff and Applicant discussed the following:

- The parking for the proposal.
- The façade of the building facing the Piccadilly.
- The windows for the proposal.
- The materials for the building.
- The landscaping for the proposal.
- The construction of the balconies and their finishes.

The Commission stated and discussed the following:

- Pleased that no special exceptions were being requested.
- Overall it responded to the concerns of the Commission.
- Concerns over the massing, scale and relation to the street.
- For a positive approval depended on the details of the proposal.
- If the details were delegated to staff there needed to be an understanding that the details needed to be timeless.
- Cladding of the balconies was a concern.
- The guidelines were driving the developers to a boring look. Cutouts and setbacks detract from the facades of building.
- Requiring an upper level band would hinder the design.
- Would encourage the developer to put the corner back along the side of the Piccadilly.
- Scale and approach from fifth east was appropriate.
- North façade and how it related to South Temple – was some opportunity to setback the building to invite pedestrians into the building to reinforce the sense of entry.
- The setback on the west was a nice ode to the Piccadilly.
- The south façade was not appealing but the applicant could work with staff on a better solution.
- The west façade - was possible to do a fire lane with landscaping.
- North façade could be made more pedestrian friendly.
- The overall design has monumentality.

- The base should be more detailed and more vertical and horizontal to reinforce the podium.
- If the podium was reinforced and where it lacked detailing.
- The south façade at the two levels of parking wall needed to be addressed
- The setbacks at the entrance to create more of a court yard.
- The window materials for the proposal.

The Commission stated the following were the items Staff would need to address with the Applicant before final approval was granted:

- The south façade needed landscaping and architecture
- The design of the front entrance to give a sense of entrance to the building.
- The fire lane to the west needed to be softer than concrete such as turf or other landscaping.

**MOTION [7:27:01 PM](#)**

**Commissioner Richardson stated regarding New Apartment Building and Parking Structure at approximately 454-466 E. South Temple, PLNHLC2017-00052 - based on the analysis and findings listed in the Staff Report, testimony and the proposal presented, he moved that the Commission approve the application for a Certificate of Appropriateness for New Construction, subject to the following conditions:**

1. That the development proposals are revised to address the three following issues.
  - a. The blank south façade and that the applicant work with staff to find a solution to make that more pleasing to the neighborhood.
  - b. The main entrance on South Temple be set back to create a better pedestrian experience.
  - c. The west fire lane be landscaped with turf or soft landscaping.
2. That no mechanical systems/air conditioning units be located on the balconies.
3. That the revisions and design details are delegated to staff for subsequent review and approval.

Commissioner Adams seconded the motion. Commissioners Thomas Brennan, Sheleigh Harding, David Richardson, Paul Svendsen Stanley Adams and Kim Wirthlin voted “aye”. The motion passed unanimously.

**The Commission took a short break [7:31:12 PM](#)**

**Briefing [7:33:31 PM](#)**

**Work Sessions Expectation Template - As a follow-up to the briefing regarding “Land Use Ordinances Pertaining to Historic Preservation” (Case number PLNPCM2016-00330) presented to the Historic Landmark Commission on September 1, 2016, Planning Staff will brief the Commission on a “Work Session**

**Expectation Template”. This proposed template defines “Work Session”, outlines a typical work session structure, outlines expectations of all work session participants, and proposes desired work session outcomes. (Staff contact is 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 Work Session Memorandum (located in the case file). He stated Staff was recommending that the Historic Landmark Commission adopt the document as part of their Policies and Procedures.

The Commission and Staff discussed the following

- When a proposal should be brought before the Commission in the review process.
- How other cities review proposals and address issues.
- There is a balance between the Commission designing buildings and helping to make the building fit the ordinance.
- Risky to bring proposals to the Commission prior to a public hearing.
- A Work Session provides a time for the Applicant and Commission to work through big issues on complex petitions.
- There are no guarantees of approval at a Work Session.
- Could have different results depending on who was in attendance at a meeting.
- The pros and cons of Work Sessions.
- If Commissioners could submit written comments for Work Session items when they could not attend a meeting.
- Staff will bring this item to the March 16, meeting for approval.

**The meeting adjourned at [7:52:08 PM](#)**