

**SALT LAKE CITY HISTORIC LANDMARK COMMISSION**  
**Meeting Minutes**  
**451 South State Street, Room 326**  
**April 20, 2017**

A roll is kept of all who attended the Historic Landmark Commission Meeting. The meeting was called to order at [5:33:45 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, Thomas Brennan, Sheleigh Harding, Robert Hyde, Paul Svendsen and Rachel Quist. Commissioners David Richardson was excused.

Planning Staff members present at the meeting were: Nick Norris, Planning Director; Michaela Oktay, Planning Manager; Carl Leith, Senior Planner; Lex Traughber, Senior Planner; Anthony Riederer, Principal 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 Rachel Quist, Paul Svendsen and Charles Shepherd. Staff members in attendance were Michaela Oktay, Carl Leith, Lex Traughber and Anthony Riederer.

The following site was visited:

- **717 South (previously identified as 715) 500 East** – Staff gave an overview of the proposal.
- **Bishop Place** - Staff gave an overview of the proposals.
- **Trolley Square** - Staff gave an overview of the proposals.

**APPROVAL OF THE MARCH 16, 2017 MINUTES.** [5:34:36 PM](#)

**MOTION** [5:34:40 PM](#)

**Commissioner Peters moved to approve the minutes from the March 16, 2017, meeting. Commissioner Harding seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.**

**REPORT OF THE CHAIR OR VICE CHAIR** [5:34:56 PM](#)

Chairperson Shepherd stated he had nothing to report.

Vice Chairperson Peters stated he had nothing to report.

**DIRECTOR'S REPORT** [5:35:04 PM](#)

Ms. Michaela Oktay, Planning Manager, reviewed the study on the Historic Landmark Commissions processes and the results of that study. She reviewed the economic hardship panel that would need to be formed to review demolition petitions.

Mr. Carl Leith, Senior Planner, reviewed the windows workshops that would be held May 24-26.

**PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD** [5:39:32 PM](#)

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

[5:40:13 PM](#)

**New Single Family Dwelling at approximately 717 South (previously identified as 715) 500 East** – Jordan Atkin, Fifty-Fifty Real Estate, LLC, is requesting approval from the City to construct a single family residence at the above listed address. The lot is currently vacant and is zoned RMF-30 (Low Density Multi-Family Residential) and lies within the Central City Historic District protected by the H Historic Preservation Overlay. The proposed development requires approval from the Historic Landmark Commission for new construction in an historic district. The subject property is within Council District 4 represented by Derek Kitchen. This project was tabled at the January 5, 2017 meeting. (Staff contact: Carl Leith at (801)535-7758 or [carl.leith@slcgov.com](mailto:carl.leith@slcgov.com)) Case number PLNHLC2016-00800

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 parking access for the neighboring properties.
- The wheel strips for the drive and the material around the strips.

Mr. Robin Flintchba, Fifty-Fifty Real Estate, asked the Commission for questions or comments. She reviewed the landscaping for the proposal.

The Commission, Staff and Applicant discussed the following:

- If the landscaping strips worked for the plan or were only to satisfy the Commission's comments at the previous meeting.
- The parking and access for the neighboring. Triplex.

**PUBLIC HEARING** [5:53:54 PM](#)

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

The Commission discussed the following:

- The landscaping for the proposal.

**MOTION** [5:55:36 PM](#)

Commissioner Harding stated regarding 717 South (previously identified as 715) 500 East, PLNHLC2016-00800 - based on the information in the Staff Report, the information presented, and the input received during the public hearing, she moved that the Historic Landmark Commission approve PLNHLC2016-00800 Single Family Residence at approximately 717 South 500 East with the conditions listed in the Staff Report. Commissioner Svendsen seconded the motion. Commissioners Peters, Adams, Brennan, Harding, Hyde, Svendsen and Quist voted “aye”. The motion passed unanimously.

The Commission discussed how the next agenda items would be addressed. They determined it would be beneficial to the flow of the meeting to discuss the Bishop Place applications as a whole, hold public hearings for each item and make the necessary motions for the applications. The Commission stated they would then follow the same process for the Trolley Square applications.

[5:56:25 PM](#)

**Demolition of a Historic Structure at approximately 241 W Bishop Place** - Don Armstrong is requesting approval for the demolition of the historic structure located at the above listed address. City surveys indicate that the building in question is a contributing property within the Capitol Hill Historic District. The subject property is located within Council District 3, represented by Stan Penfold. (Staff Contact: Anthony Riederer at (801)535-7625 or [anthony.riederer@slcgov.com](mailto:anthony.riederer@slcgov.com)) Case number PLNHLC2017-00014

**Demolition of a Historic Structure at approximately 245 W Bishop Place** - Don Armstrong is requesting approval for the demolition of the historic structure located at the above listed address. City surveys indicate that the building in question is a contributing property within the Capitol Hill Historic District. The subject property is located within Council District 3, represented by Stan Penfold. (Staff Contact: Anthony Riederer at (801)535-7625 or [anthony.riederer@slcgov.com](mailto:anthony.riederer@slcgov.com)) Case number PLNHLC2017-00015

**Demolition of a Historic Structure at approximately 249 W Bishop Place** - Don Armstrong is requesting approval for the demolition of the historic structure located at the above listed address. City surveys indicate that the building in question is a contributing property within the Capitol Hill Historic District. The subject property is located within Council District 3, represented by Stan Penfold. (Staff Contact: Anthony Riederer at (801)535-7625 or [anthony.riederer@slcgov.com](mailto:anthony.riederer@slcgov.com)) Case number PLNHLC2017-00021

**Demolition of a Historic Structure at approximately 259 W Bishop Place** - Don Armstrong is requesting approval for the demolition of the historic structure located at approximately 259 West Bishop Place. City surveys indicate that the building in question is a contributing property within the Capitol Hill Historic District. The subject property is located within Council District 3, represented by Stan Penfold. (Staff Contact: Anthony Riederer at (801)535-7625 or [anthony.riederer@slcgov.com](mailto:anthony.riederer@slcgov.com)) Case number PLNHLC2017-00023

**Demolition of a Historic Structure at approximately 265 W Bishop Place** - Don Armstrong is requesting approval for the demolition of the historic structure located at the above listed address. City surveys indicate that the building in question is a contributing property within the Capitol Hill Historic District. The subject property is located within Council District 3, represented by Stan Penfold. (Staff Contact: Anthony Riederer at (801)535-7625 or [anthony.riederer@slcgov.com](mailto:anthony.riederer@slcgov.com)) Case number PLNHLC2017-00028

**Demolition of a Historic Structure at approximately 432 North 300 West** - Don Armstrong is requesting approval for the demolition of the historic structure located at the above listed address. City surveys indicate that the building in question is a contributing property within the Capitol Hill Historic District. The subject property is located within Council District 3, represented by Stan Penfold. (Staff Contact: Anthony Riederer at (801)535-7625 or [anthony.riederer@slcgov.com](mailto:anthony.riederer@slcgov.com)) Case number PLNHLC2017-00031

**Demolition of a Historic Structure at approximately 262 W Bishop Place** - Don Armstrong is requesting approval for the demolition of the historic structure located at the above listed address. Capitol Hill Historic District. The subject property is located within Council District 3, represented by Stan Penfold. (Staff Contact: Anthony Riederer at (801)535-7625 or [anthony.riederer@slcgov.com](mailto:anthony.riederer@slcgov.com)) Case number PLNHLC2017-00027

**Demolition of a Historic Structure at approximately 258 W Bishop Place** - Don Armstrong is requesting approval for the demolition of the historic structure located at the above listed address. City surveys indicate that the building in question is a contributing property within the Capitol Hill Historic District. The subject property is located within Council District 3, represented by Stan Penfold. (Staff Contact: Anthony Riederer at (801)535-7625 or [anthony.riederer@slcgov.com](mailto:anthony.riederer@slcgov.com)) Case number PLNHLC2017-00022

**Demolition of a Historic Structure at approximately 248 W Bishop Place** - Don Armstrong is requesting approval for the demolition of the historic structure located at above listed address. City surveys indicate that the building in question is a contributing property within the Capitol Hill Historic District. The subject property is located within Council District 3, represented by Stan Penfold. (Staff

**Contact: Anthony Riederer at (801)535-7625 or [anthony.riederer@slcgov.com](mailto:anthony.riederer@slcgov.com))  
Case number PLNHLC2017-00018**

Mr. Anthony Riederer, Principal Planner, gave an overview of the proposals as outlined in the Staff Reports (located in the case files). He stated Staff was recommending that the Historic Landmark Commission deny the petitions as presented.

The Commission and Staff discussed the following:

- The findings in the ordinance and how economic hardship effected the decision of the Commission.
- How the ordinance addressed economic hardship.
- The pros and cons of having the economic review prior to the public hearing.
- The next steps for the proposal.
- The language in the ordinance relating to economic hardship.
- The standards of review for the applications and how economic hardship applied.

**MOTION**[6:14:58 PM](#)

**Commissioner Svendsen moved to table the petitions until a hardship application was completed and presented to the Commission. Commissioner Svendsen held his motion.**

The Commission and Staff discussed the following:

- The reuse and landscaping plans for the proposal.
- If a landscaping plan was an acceptable reuse plan.
- The condition of the buildings and their integrity.
- The RDA loan and if the loan was granted.
- The prior plan and why the plans changed for the property.
- The evolution of the property.

Mr. Bob Springmier stated they would like to move into the economic hardship phase.

The Commission, Staff and Applicant discussed the following:

- If there was money in the RDA loan.
- The proposal and why it changed from rehabilitation to demolition.
- The specific repairs or maintenance that had been done to the buildings.
- What relief the applicant wanted from the Commission.
- The letters from the engineering companies and if the companies had experience with historic structures.

**PUBLIC HEARING** [6:41:26 PM](#)

Chairperson Shepherd opened the Public Hearing.

The following individuals spoke to the petition: Mr. Thomas Carter, Mr. David Scheer and

Ms. Cindy Cromer.

The following comments were made:

- Please resist the demolition request as the properties are important historically and architecturally.
- The buildings are an important part of the neighborhood fabric of and one of the last remaining courts in the city.
- The buildings are distinctive in their construction and have interesting architecture.
- The buildings were in rough shape but could be rehabbed and become habitable.
- Require the developer to conduct a historic survey and gather historic documentation prior to demolition approval.
- The loss of the homes would be a huge negative to the Capitol Hill Historic District.
- The community council was against the demolition of the structures.
- Did not want to see the homes removed however if allowed at least the brick homes should remain as they were salvable.
- The proposal was similar to that of the demolition of Veneer Court which was a huge loss to the city.
- The layout of the court, shielded the interior properties from the noise and was a benefit that not many properties had in the area.
- Meth, lead and asbestos were not an issue base a determination for demolition on.
- Bishop place would be negatively impacted by any demolition of structures.
- A rezoning should be factored into the economic hardship analysis to protect the density of the area.

Chairperson Shepherd closed the Public Hearing.

Mr. Springmier stated a compromise to maintain the brick homes was amendable and agreeable.

The Commission and Staff discussed the following:

- The landscaping ordinance and how it related to the reuse plan.

The Commission stated and discussed the following:

- The discussion and motions for the properties.
- The ordinance and how it applied to the petitions.

**MOTION [7:01:02 PM](#)**

**Commissioner Svendsen moved to table the Bishop Place petitions as they were incomplete in respect to requirements L1D and L1G dealing with the reuse plan and the lack of an economic hardship review. Commissioner Adams seconded the motion.**

The Commission discussed the following:

- Requiring the Applicant to return with a reuse plan.

The Commission and Staff discussed the following:

- The standards of the ordinance and how they applied to the petitions.
- If the petitions could be tabled in the manner suggested.
- If the approval could be based on the reuse plan alone.
- Whether to approve, deny or table the petition.

**Commissioners Peters, Adams, Brennan, Harding, Hyde and Svendsen voted “aye”. Commissioner Quist voted “nay”. The motion passed 6-1.**

[7:15:17 PM](#)

Commissioner Harding recused herself from the meeting.  
Commissioner Adams recused himself from the meeting.

The Commission discussed the next steps for the tabled petitions and how the economic hardship panel was formed.

The Commission took a short break. [7:18:43 PM](#)

The Commission reconvened. [7:27:04 PM](#)

[7:27:07 PM](#)

**Demolition of a Historic Structure at approximately 652 E. 600 South - Trolley Square Ventures, LLC, is requesting approval for the demolition of the historic structure located at the above listed address. City surveys indicate that the building in question is a contributing property within the Central City Historic District. The subject property is located within City Council District 4, represented by Derek Kitchen. (Staff Contact: Lex Traughber at (801)535-6184 or [lex.traughber@slcgov.com](mailto:lex.traughber@slcgov.com)) Case number PLNHLC2016-00915**

**Demolition of a Historic Structure at approximately 658 E. 600 South - Trolley Square Ventures, LLC, is requesting approval for the demolition of the historic structure located at the above listed address. City surveys indicate that the building in question is a contributing property within the Central City Historic District. The subject property is located within City Council District 4, represented by Derek Kitchen. (Staff Contact: Lex Traughber at (801)535-6184 or [lex.traughber@slcgov.com](mailto:lex.traughber@slcgov.com)) Case number PLNHLC2016-00918**

**Demolition of a Historic Structure at approximately 664 E. 600 South - Trolley Square Ventures, LLC, is requesting approval for the demolition of the historic structure located at the above listed address. City surveys indicate that the building in question is a contributing property within the Central City Historic District. The subject property is located within City Council District 4, represented by Derek Kitchen. (Staff Contact: Lex Traughber at (801)535-6184 or [lex.traughber@slcgov.com](mailto:lex.traughber@slcgov.com)) Case number PLNHLC2016-00919**

**Demolition of a Historic Structure at approximately 632 S. 700 East (665 E. Ely Place) - Trolley Square Ventures, LLC, is requesting approval for the demolition of the historic structure located at the above listed address. City surveys indicate that the building in question is a contributing property within the Central City Historic District. The subject property is located within City Council District 4, represented by Derek Kitchen. (Staff Contact: Lex Traughber at (801)535-6184 or [lex.traughber@slcgov.com](mailto:lex.traughber@slcgov.com)) Case number PLNHLC2016-00920**

Mr. Lex Traughber Planner, gave an overview of the proposals as outlined in the Staff Reports (located in the case files). He stated Staff was recommending that the Historic Landmark Commission deny the petitions as presented.

The Commission and Staff discussed the following:

- The standards the proposal met.

The Commission and Staff discussed the following:

- If the properties were willfully neglected.
- How long the current owner had owned the buildings.
- The physical integrity of the site and the criteria applied.
- How willful neglect was determined.
- When the last survey was conducted regarding integrity.
- The motions for the petitions and the standards for review.
- When economic hardship was determined.

Mr. Khosrow Semnani, Trolley Square Ventures, reviewed the history, support, the cost of construction and the options for approving demolition of all or some of the buildings. He stated the current proposal included everything the Historic Landmark Commission reviewed at the previous meeting.

Mr. Alan Roberts, architect, gave the history of the historic districts and stated the subject properties should not be included in those districts. He reviewed what it meant to be a contributing structure, what constituted a historic street, the demolition ordinance and how the proposal did and did not meet the criteria for demolition approval.

Mr. David Valgardson, home mover, reviewed the difficulty in moving the subject homes and if the homes were salvageable.

Mr. Scott Howell, attorney, reviewed the current viability of the subject buildings and the issues with keeping the homes. He stated the new construction proposal would be economically viable and benefit the city. Mr. Howell asked the Commission to approve the demolition petitions.

Mr. Doug White, attorney, reviewed their understanding of the hardship ordinance, asked the Commission to approve the demolition petitions and allow the project to move forward.



The Commission and Applicant discussed the following:

- When the parking lot was installed.
- The physical integrity of the site was under review, not the physical integrity of the buildings.
- When the building at 664 East 600 South home was moved to the current location.
- Was the acquisition of the buildings a surprise or was it known that they were part of the property.
- What to do with the parking lot without affecting the homes.
- The number of projects proposed for the area that never came about.
- The contributory and noncontributory buildings.
- The definition of a contributory and noncontributory building.
- If there were demolition guidelines for a noncontributory structure.
- Which structures could be moved or not moved.
- Where the structures could be moved to.
- The survey information on the properties and if prior ownership was known.
- The impact demolition would have on the area.
- The criteria the homes did not meet.
- The impact demolition would have on the Stokes residence.
- CRSA's involvement in moving historic buildings.

The Commission took a short break. [9:00:00 PM](#)

The Commission reconvened. [9:09:27 PM](#)

**PUBLIC HEARING** [9:09:55 PM](#)

Chairperson Shepherd opened the Public Hearing.

The following individuals spoke to the petition: Mr. Warren Lloyd, Mr. James Miska, Mr. Michael Iverson, Mr. Theodore Cowan, Ms. Cindy Cromer, Ms. Elizabeth Totterer, Mr. Rick Plewe and Mr. Nicholas Rupp.

The following comments were made:

- The notion that the Central City Historic District was a mistake or misguided was not correct.
- Buildings could be retrofitted from dilapidated buildings to usable structures.
- Carefully consider the unsuitable future use of these buildings.
- It was important to consider the existing street scape.
- The buildings could be relocated along Ely Place and used.
- It was clear that these proposals were not economic hardship issues.
- Opposed to the demolition because of the historic character of the neighborhood.
- The character was evident and dominated by single family homes.

- The streetscapes contribute to the character of the area.
- The proposal was not in line with the Central City Master Plan and preservation of the area.
- The statement that the applicant had neighborhood support was false.
- Something needed to be done with the property but not to this extent.
- A vote was not taken at the Community Council meeting however, a poll was taken of the neighborhood that stated 19 people wanted the buildings demolished, 8 were in opposition and 40 did not care what happened to the buildings.
- If the buildings needed to be demolished to allow the parking lot to be developed then let it happen.
- The buildings should be incorporated in the new design.
- The new design was not desirable.
- The building should be of high quality and respect the neighborhood.
- The current condition of 652 East 600 South was due to neglect from the previous owners and lack of enforcement by the City.
- A pier system could be used to stabilize the buildings.
- The survey information for these building was up to date.
- 600 South is the edge of consistent residential use and contributory structures in the Central City Historic District.
- The fact that there are other buildings similar to the subject buildings in the city was irrelevant, as the subject homes are unique to the city.
- The developer did not have to maximize the potential build out in the FBUN-2 zone.
- These homes are valuable and could be sold for top dollar.
- Meth, lead and asbestos have to be dealt with regardless if the structures stay or are demolished.
- Would be in the best interest of the neighborhood to rehab the structures for the future.
- The City would be missing a great opportunity for growth if the structures stayed.
- Property values increase with these developments.
- Please permit the project to proceed.
- Support the redevelopment of the parking lot but the homes should be included in the new design.

Chairperson Shepherd closed the Public Hearing.

The Applicants stated they agreed that unreinforced buildings could be renovated but that was not the issue. They stated certainly the buildings were reusable but the question was practicality for the use of the site. They stated the survey information was not based on research and therefore irrelevant as to when the survey was conducted. The Applicants stated it was a matter of the practical use of the property not if the buildings could be saved. They discussed the cost of moving the buildings, the benefits of the redevelopment, the need for having a hotel in the area, the community outreach of the project and that the Preservation Utah supported the redevelopment of the property. The Applicants asked the Commission to approve the petition as presented.

The Commission and applicants discussed the following

- The dates and activities of when they obtained the properties and the maintenance that had been done to the white and red buildings.

The Commission stated and discussed the following:

- Reviewed the comments from Kirk Huffaker (contained in the case file).
- The contributing and non-contributing structures.
- The historic nature of the site had been lost and filling in the lot would help improve the streetscape not take away from it.
- The standards for approval and how the proposal met or did not meet the standards.
- It was not appropriate to change the boundaries of the district.
- The zoning for the area and what was allowed to be constructed in that zoning.
- What constituted normal maintenance and repair.
- The physical integrity of the structures.
- Whether to relocate or allow demolition of the buildings.
- The loss of historic buildings in the Central City Historic District made it hard to allow for more demolition.
- The redevelopment plan, scale and compatibility of the proposed new buildings was not the issue.
- Needed to find a compromise that would promote significant preservation and continued effort to preserve the existing and original character of the structures and still accommodate the redevelopment.
- The language for the motions and next steps for the proposal.

The Commission and Applicant discussed the following:

- The buildings that could and could not be moved.
- The importance to move the proposal forward.

**MOTION [10:42:13 PM](#)**

**Commissioner Hyde stated regarding 652 East 600 South – based on the analysis and findings in the Staff Report that six of the standards for approval of a Certificate of Appropriateness for demolition have been met, testimony and the proposal presented, he moved that the Planning Commission approve the request for demolition located at 652 E. 600 South. Specifically, the Commission finds that the proposed project substantially complies with the following Standards:**

- 1. Standards for Approval of a Certificate of Appropriateness for Demolition:**
  - a. The physical integrity of the site as defined in subsection C15b of this section is no longer evident;**
  - b. The streetscape within the context of the H historic preservation overlay district would not be negatively affected;**

- c. The demolition would not adversely affect the H historic preservation overlay district due to the surrounding noncontributing structures;
- d. The demolition would not adversely affect the H historic preservation overlay district due to the surrounding noncontributing structures;
- e. The base zoning for the site is incompatible with the reuse of the structure;
- f. The reuse plan is consistent with the standards outlined in subsection H;
- g. The site has not suffered from willful neglect.

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

**MOTION [10:44:56 PM](#)**

Commissioner Brennan stated regarding 658 East 600 South – based on the analysis and findings in the Staff Report that two or less of the standards for Certificate of Appropriateness for demolition have been met, testimony and the proposal presented, he moved that the Historic Landmark Commission deny the demolition request for the structure at 658 East 600 South. Commissioner Quist seconded the motion.

Commissioner Svendsen asked if Commissioner Brennan would consider tabling the petition to allow for economic hardship review.

Commissioner Brennan stated no.

Commissioners Quist, Peters, Brennan and Hyde voted “aye”. Commissioner Svendsen voted “nay”. The motion passed 4-1.

The Commission and Staff discussed the following:

- The building at 664 East 600 South was over fifty years old and significant.
- The period of significance for the Central City Historic District.

**Motion [10:49:38 PM](#)**

Commissioner Svendsen stated regarding PLNHLC2016-00919, 664 East 600 South – based on the analysis and findings in the Staff Report, he moved that the Historic Landmark Commission approve the demolition applications as it complied with the following standards:

- a. The physical integrity of the site as defined in subsection C15b of this section is no longer evident;
- b. The streetscape within the context of the H historic preservation overlay district would not be negatively affected;

- c. The demolition would not adversely affect the H historic preservation overlay district due to the surrounding noncontributing structures;
- d. The demolition would not adversely affect the H historic preservation overlay district due to the surrounding noncontributing structures;
- e. Because the base zoning is incompatible with reuse of the existing structures;
- f. The reuse plan is consistent with the standards outlined in subsection H of this section;
- g. The site has not suffered from willful neglect.

**Commissioner Peters seconded the motion.**

Commissioner Quist stated the Commission needed to be consistent with their view as to whether or not the streetscape was intact.

**Commissioners Peters, Hyde and Svendsen voted “aye”. Commissioner Quist Brennan and Shepherd voted “nay”. The motion failed.**

The Commission discussed the following:

- The standards of approval.
- The next steps for the proposal.
- Who made the original motion for PLNHLC2016-00915 and if they wanted to change the motion.
- The inconstancy with the motions and how to clarify the Commission’s point of view.
- The options for the motions and how to make the decision consistent.

**REVISED MOTION [11:10:08 PM](#)**

**Commissioner Brennan restated regarding 658 East 600 South – based on the analysis and findings in the Staff Report that two or less of the standards for Certificate of Appropriateness for demolition have been met, testimony and the proposal presented, he moved that the Historic Landmark Commission deny the demolition request for the structure at approximately 658 East 600 South however, the streetscape (standard b) was not a valid concern. Commissioner Peters seconded the motion. Commissioners Peters, Hyde, Brennan and Svendsen voted “aye”. Commissioner Quist voted “nay”. The motion passed 4-1.**

**MOTION [11:14:24 PM](#)**

**Commissioner Svendsen stated regarding PLNHLC2016-00919 at 664 East 600 South – based on the analysis and findings in the Staff Report that six of the standards for approval of a Certificate of Appropriateness for demolition have been met, testimony and the proposal presented, he moved that the Commission approve the request for demolition located at approximately 664 E. 600 South demolition applications as it complied with the following standards:**

- a. The physical integrity of the site as defined in subsection C15b of this section is no longer evident;
- b. The streetscape within the context of the H historic preservation overlay district would not be negatively affected;
- c. The demolition would not adversely affect the H historic preservation overlay district due to the surrounding noncontributing structures;
- d. The base zoning was incompatible with the reuse of the structure.
- e. The reuse plan is consistent with the standards outlined in subsection H of this section;
- f. The site has not suffered from willful neglect.

**Commissioner Hyde seconded the motion.**

The Commission discussed the following:

- The recommendation of Staff pertaining to the motion.
- The other applications for approval/denial and the surrounding structures.
- The structure at 664 East 600 South was significantly altered and not a significant building to begin with.

**Commissioners Peters, Hyde, Brennan and Svendsen voted “aye”. Commissioner Quist voted “nay”. The motion passed 4-1.**

#### **MOTION**

**Commissioner Brennan stated regarding PLNHLC2016-00920 at 632 South 700 East Ely Place – based on the analysis and findings in the Staff Report that two or less of the standards for Certificate of Appropriateness for demolition have been met, testimony and proposal presented, he moved that the Historic Landmark Commission deny the demolition request located at approximately 632 South 700 East.**

- a. The physical integrity of the site as defined in subsection C15b of this section is still evident;
- b. The demolition would adversely impact the streetscape and context of Ely Place.

**Commissioner Quist seconded the motion. Commissioners Peters, Hyde, Brennan and Quist voted “aye”. Commissioner Svendsen voted “nay”. The motion passed 4-1.**

**The meeting adjourned at [11:22:16 PM](#)**