

SALT LAKE CITY
HISTORIC LANDMARK COMMISSION
Minutes of the Meeting
Held at 451 South State Street
January 4, 2006

A field trip preceded the meeting and was attended by Pete Ashdown, Warren Lloyd, Noreen Heid, Scott Christensen, Janice Lew and Elizabeth Giraud.

Present from the Historic Landmark Commission were: Pete Ashdown, Vice Chair; Noreen Heid, Scott Christensen, Warren Lloyd, David Fitzsimmons and Paula Carl.

Present from the Planning Staff were Alex Ikefuna, Planning Director; Cheri Coffey, Deputy Planning Director; Joel Paterson, Planning Programs Supervisor; Elizabeth Giraud, Senior Planner; Janice Lew, Principal Planner; and Louise Harris, Senior Secretary.

The meeting was called to order by Pete Ashdown, Vice-Chair, at 4:05 p.m. Mr. Ashdown announced that each item on the agenda would be followed in the order as written. At this time he asked the audience if anyone wanted to address the Commission on matters not on the agenda. With no response, he moved to the next item.

The report of the Planning Director would come later as he had not yet come into the meeting.

Approval of Minutes

Mr. Scott Christensen moved to approve the minutes of December 7, 2005. Seconded by Ms. Heid. Mr. Lloyd, Mr. Christensen, Mr. Fitzsimmons, and Ms. Heid all voted "Aye". There was one abstention by Ms. Carl. The motion passed.

Public Hearings

Case No. 033-05 at 269 North "N" Street, by Alex Steckel to install roof mounted solar collector panels to the existing single family dwelling. This property is located in the Avenues Historic District.

Ms. Lew presented the findings and facts and Staff's recommendation as outlined in the Staff Report. This request was submitted subsequent to the Historic Landmark Commission discussion of December 7, 2005, regarding solar energy technology. At that time the Commission established a subcommittee to assist staff with developing City policy and guidelines regarding the use of solar panels in historic districts. These new guidelines and policies would then be submitted to the full Commission for their consideration. New technologies have introduced mechanical equipment into historic areas where they were not traditionally seen. Rooftop solar heating systems are among these that may intrude upon the visual appearance of the historic structures and change the character of historic districts. The visual impacts of such systems should be

minimized such that one's ability to perceive the historic character of the context is maintained. Thus, the appropriateness of rooftop equipment depends upon location, visibility, size, number and design.

Since the City's general standards for the treatment of rooftop equipment are limited, Staff has incorporated principles set out in the *Secretary of the Interiors Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties*, in the analysis that was included in the Staff Report.

The applicant is proposing to retrofit the building with an active solar-energy heating system for domestic hot water and radiant heat purposes. In this case collectors with solar glass front panels would be mounted flat on the roof. The submitted plans show an eight paneled system with each panel measuring 45" (w) x 94" (h) x 4" (d). The panels would cover the south roof slope of the rear addition and a portion of the roof of the original structure extending along the ridge of the roof for a total length of thirty-two feet. The roof is approximately fifty-six feet long.

Based on the analysis and findings, Planning Staff does not support the proposed design for the installation of solar collector panels to the existing house at 269 North "N" Street. If the Historic Landmark Commission decides to approve the request to install solar collector panels, Planning Staff recommends the following conditions:

1. Approval of the final details of the design of the proposed project, including location, size, number, color, and design to be delegated to Planning Staff based upon direction given during the hearing from the Historic Landmark Commission.
2. This approval is for design only. The project must meet all other applicable City requirements.
3. Any changes to approved plans must be reviewed and approved by the Historic Landmark Commission or Planning Staff.

A copy of the Staff Report is filed with these minutes.

Mr. Ashdown asked about the subcommittee that is to be established to help Staff develop City policy and guidelines.

Ms. Lew indicated a subcommittee has not yet been designated. Staff is to do further research and then the committee would be established.

Ms. Coffey indicated that they have members for the subcommittee but were waiting until the Staff research was completed to meet. She also concluded that Staff was not opposed to solar panels it is just the placement of these particular panels because they are very visible from the street.

Ms. Carl asked where they could be placed so they aren't visible.

Ms. Lew felt it best to discuss these things with the applicant.

Mr. Ashdown asked Ms. Lew that in comparison to skylights, if a glass greenhouse were put on the back of the house with more surface glass visible, would it fall within the current guidelines.

Ms. Lew said it would depend on the design. There are a number of characteristics regarding this particular installation (the expanse of the roof that is covered, the closeness to the ridge, the visibility from the street, and the reflectivity) that are concerns.

Mr. Ashdown asked if there were other questions for Ms. Lew. Seeing none, he opened the meeting for public comment and asked the applicant to come forward.

Mr. Alex Steckel, property owner, of 175 "O" Street came forward. He indicated that his reason for doing this is the current energy situation. He is concerned about greenhouse gases. The slope of his roof is protected from the south and the street would be the only visible site of the panels. The panels are only four inches tall, they are non intrusive, and do not have iridescent coding, preventing an intense glare. He also indicated that in the *Secretary of the Interior Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties*, it recommends installing mechanical and service equipment on the roof such as air conditioning, transformers, or solar collectors when required for the new use so as to be inconspicuous from the public right-of-way. There are many evaporated coolers in the Avenues and they are much more obstructive than solar panels. He also was concerned about the guidelines of the Secretary of the Interior. He wondered if the information was still relevant and pertinent in regards to addressing energy independence and air quality in 2006.

Mr. Warren was concerned about the size and number of panels. He was concerned about the panels lapping over onto the existing roof structure and asked if they were required to be so large.

Mr. Steckel replied that the edge of the roof of the new addition to the wall line is approximately twenty-seven and a half to twenty-eight feet. He is proposing to install the panels over thirty-two feet with eight panels including some protruding onto the existing roof. The eight panels would provide all the radiant floor heat as well as the hot water culinary needs.

Mr. Fitzsimmons asked if he was planning to provide supplementary heating.

Mr. Steckel said there will be a conventional boiler to supplement any weather inversions or problems.

Mr. Ashdown asked what was the number of panels needed to be cost effective.

Mr. Rod Height, contractor, of 2639 North 3750 East, Eden, Utah, stated that seven panels would be acceptable, but stated that eight panels would be the most cost effective.

Mr. Fitzsimmons asked if the panels would work as efficiently if they were placed back further to be less-visible from the street.

Mr. Height indicated that would require going to the westernmost side of the roof to be least intrusive and to get the best effect. The panels can only be seen from the street. The color of the roof has not been decided yet but they would make the transition as discrete as possible.

Mr. Lloyd said asked what method was used to determine how much surface area was needed for the panels.

Mr. Height said that they target 70-80% of the need between October and late spring and they don't target December and January. The eight panels are targeted around sixty percent of the year-round heating and will do one hundred percent of the heating of water. The slant of the roof is a little flatter than they like. It will help the needs and respect of the community to make them look like a sky-light or tinted windows and will look very discrete. He also mentioned that what was decided at the meeting would set precedence in the future as they are becoming more popular.

Sarah Wright, Utah Clean Energy Executive Director, a non-profit organization to promote energy efficiency located at 917 2nd Avenue, came forward. She talked about British Petroleum (BP) predicting that our natural gas will be imported at 30 percent in the future. She also talked about the Ritz Apartments on South Temple. When driving down "E" Street you can see they have a thirty-one Kilowatt solar tag system on the roof.

Mr. Lloyd asked Ms. Wright if the PV system or solar collective would be used more often in the future.

Ms. Wright said the hot water systems have a much better return of savings and it is easier on a retrofit if you already have hot water heat, and then go to a hot water system; unless you want to put up a couple panels for culinary water. Any natural gas saved is a positive thing.

Mr. Ashdown asked about the portable tanks and if Utahans were able to receive tax credits if running the meters backwards.

Ms. Wright indicated that anyone served by Utah Power is able to but Utah state has very inexpensive electricity compared to other states so it is more advantageous to take advantage of the program in other states. Because other parts of the country have a large demand for this system, the supply is not keeping up with the demand.

Lisa Romney, the Mayor's Environmental Adviser, came forward to speak about Salt Lake City's environmental initiatives and the overall administrative support for environmental improvements. Recently, Salt Lake City received a world leadership award for environmental actions. She felt that the Utah Historical Preservation Group

Historic Landmark Commission
January 4, 2006

(HPG) strongly promotes LEED guidelines because they maintain so much of a historical structure. She would like to see more people incorporating renewable energy in their homes for all sorts of environmental reasons.

Mr. Ashdown asked if there were any further comments from the audience. Seeing none, he closed the Public Hearing and opened the Executive Session.

Mr. Christensen indicated that moving the system back from the front of the house seven or eight feet would remove it off the historic portion of the house and make it somewhat less visible from the street.

Mr. Ikefuna indicated that this is a very delicate issue and not a new practice. As this is a recommendation, it can be approved with additional recommendations by having Staff work with the applicant for design only while working to develop some type of framework to formulate the appropriate policy to address these issues. The policy can be approved with modifications like color, number of panels or design.

Mr. Christensen asked if six panels instead of the eight would be acceptable to the applicant and also asked if the panels could be horizontal.

Mr. Steckel indicated he did not have the roof space to place them horizontally. The roof is fairly shallow and the panels are eight feet long. The rack is ten feet with a ten foot rafter span.

Mr. Lloyd asked what the ideal angle of the panels relative to the roof angle would be, as it looks like about an 8:12 pitch.

Mr. Wright indicated that due to the latitude we are at and the flat installation of the panels on the roof, a few more panels are needed to collect the needed solar energy.

Ms. Giraud asked if the panels should have been tilted.

Mr. Wright indicated that if the roof were more shallow they would put on more panels.

Mr. Ashdown again asked for further questions from the audience.

Ms. Coffey clarified that it is important that the Commission be very specific with their motion relating to this case because it is not necessarily setting precedence. When the subcommittee is formed the subcommittee can develop more general policy.

Ms. Giraud indicated that the design guideline relating to standards for roofs is very specific.

Standards for Roofs:

7.4 Minimize the visual impact of skylights and other rooftop devices.

The addition of features such as skylights or solar panels should not be installed in a manner such that they will interrupt the plane of the historic roof.

Mr. Ashdown called for a motion.

Mr. Fitzsimmons moved that in Case No. 033-05 at 269 North “N” Street that it be approved subject to the following conditions:

- 1. Approval of final details of the design including the location, size, number, color and design of the panels shall be delegated to Planning Staff based upon the direction given during the hearing from the Historic Landmark six if that is feasible while still maintaining a functioning system. The Planning Staff has the latitude to approve between six and eight panels, based on the discussions with the applicant as to what will be the most appropriate number for the system to function property.**
- 2. The roof color be compatible with the color of the panels to decrease the visibility of the panels from the street.**
- 3. This approval is for design only. The project must meet all other applicable City requirements.**
- 4. Any changes to approved plans must be reviewed and approved by the Historic Landmark Commission or Planning Staff.**
- 5. This is not a precedence setting decision. The approval is specific for this case because the Commission finds that the project is sensitively designed due to the fact that the panels are flush to the roof, the location of the panels are shielded from view in most directions, the panels are set well away from the street and will have minimal impact on the historical characteristics of the building.**

Noreen Heid seconded. Mr. Christensen, Mr. Fitzsimmons, Ms. Heid, Mr. Lloyd and Ms. Carl voted “Aye” No one opposed. The motion passed.

Unfinished Business

Case No. 020-04 at 748-750 North 300 West by the Salt Lake City Redevelopment Agency requesting a review of the findings of the Economic Review Panel related to the request for demolition of a duplex, which is a contributing structure located in the Capitol Hill Historic District.

Ms. Giraud gave a report of the findings of this case from the meeting of December 6, 2005. The panel members that were selected were Mr. Nathan Anderson, Ms. Valda Tarbet and Mr. Rob Fetzer. Two of the three were present at today’s meeting. Ms. Giraud noted the findings of the three scenarios that the panel presented as possible economic hardships:

1. If an investment company, i.e. real estate investors, bought the property as part of their portfolio.

Historic Landmark Commission
January 4, 2006

2. If an individual or couple bought the property, lived in one side and used their sweat equity to remodel the other unit and then rent it out,
3. If an individual bought the property as a quick investment (known as a “Flipper”) made the repairs themselves then sold the property.

The discussion focused on item #2. Mr. Anderson felt that this scenario would be where a young couple, that perhaps couldn't afford to get into a home, would buy the structure rent out one unit to help pay the mortgage. They probably could not qualify for tax credits, and rent in that area would not support rental income for the mortgage.

Mr. Lloyd asked Ms. Giraud why the couple wouldn't qualify for tax credit.

Ms. Giraud replied that the couple may not have income that would make the tax credit profitable.

The panel members were invited to come forward. Ms. Tarbet, of the Salt Lake City Redevelopment Agency (RDA) and Mr. Anderson, 4915 South Waimea Way, Holladay, came forward.

Ms. Tarbet explained the item that was previously discussed in reference to a young couple buying the property. Although they may buy the property for \$110,000 dollars, the additional cost of the renovation would be incurred before it could be lived in. By adding all costs together a \$500 to \$550 rent comes in.

Mr. Christensen asked about the minimum of \$50,000 of renovation that would need to be done before it could be livable. He asked if an architect had looked at the duplex and how did they decide on those figures.

Ms. Tarbet indicated that the RDA did have JC Architects look at the property and provide an estimation of the renovation. They gave an estimate of \$75,000. Mr. Fetzer did not like that amount. It was agreed by the panel a range of \$50,000 to \$75,000 would be appropriate.

Mr. Christensen asked if that included the mechanical and electrical repairs.

Ms. Tarbet indicated that it included those and some structural repairs on one side of the building. She said the duplex needs almost everything in terms of renovation.

Mr. Ashdown asked about the consideration of any “Flipper” deals.

Ms. Tarbet said the RDA had attempted to rent the property but have not had anyone that was interested and they did not compare with any other properties in the area that might have been bought or sold.

Ms. Tarbet felt that 200 West had less traffic, a landscaped median and other real amenities. 300 West does not have these amenities and that environment is what you discuss when comparing property value. Square footage also makes a difference as

Historic Landmark Commission
January 4, 2006

this is a relative small duplex. These are the comparisons that they made. RDA has not tried to sell the duplex or lease it as a commercial space. The property is zoned Mixed-Use and could be converted to a small office space but that is very unlikely. The panel did discuss that possibility.

Mr. Fitzsimmons asked why the RDA purchased the property.

Ms. Tarbet indicated that this was one piece of three properties that were acquired to protect the residential area further to the east and to build a Mixed-Use development that faces 300 West. The property to the north has problems and was closed by the police as a drug house. The property to the east was a commercial property, "Morrison Meat Pies". This property creates problems for the other two because of easements. Parking for the duplex cannot be reached without going behind or between the Morrison Meat Pie property. The RDA wanted to clean up some of the easement issues as well as to bring in a residential mixed-use development.

Mr. Fitzsimmons asked that once the demolition is accomplished if the Mixed-Use development can be enforced.

Ms. Tarbet replied yes, that it would. The property will not be marketed until there is a resolution on this issue.

Mr. Ashdown asked if there were any further questions for the applicant. Hearing none, he closed the Public Hearing. He asked for clarification before a motion was made as to whether marketing had been done before demolition, and whether a buyer needs to be found before finding an Economic Hardship.

Ms. Giraud replied that the panel can ask the Commission to look at Economic Hardship at any point in the process. In August of 2004, the Commission denied demolition of the property and a bona fide effort on the marketing process was completed. The RDA will have to come back to the Commission with a plan for landscaping or an actual building to be built there but some sort of reuse plan will have to be presented before a demolition permit can be issued.

Ms. Coffey read the Ordinance 21A.34.020K.c.iii relating to the duties of the Commission that after reviewing all the evidence the *"Historic Landmark Commission finds that the application results in an Economic Hardship the Historic Landmark Commission's decision shall be consistent with the conclusions reached by the Economic Review Panel unless, based on all the evidence and documentation presented to the Landmark Commission, the Commission finds by a vote of ¾ majority of a quorum present that at the Economic Review Panel acted in an arbitrary manner or that its report was based on erroneous findings of materials fact"*.

Mr. Fitzsimmons moved that in Case 020-04 that the Commission accepts the recommendation of the Economic Review Panel. Seconded by Mr. Christensen. Mr. Lloyd, Ms. Heid, Mr. Fitzsimmons, Mr. Christensen all voted "Aye". Ms. Carl abstained. The motion passed.

OTHER BUSINESS:

Mr. Ashdown asked Mr. Ikefuna, Planning Director, if he would like to make any remarks. Mr. Ikefuna said that he did not have any report but that he is receiving many negative calls from the community, City Council and news media on the solar panel resolution. He wants the subcommittee formulated and to act on the policy as soon as possible.

Ms. Giraud talked about the Certified Local Government Grant funding (CLG) cycle occurring soon. The State Preservation Office will be sending out the applications next week and they will be due in early February. She stated in the past she has submitted requests for funding survey needs that have been expressed to her by the community. Staff is also trying to receive funding for a preservation plan through Community Development Block Grant, (CDBG). In the process, she wants to be able to prioritize funding surveys. However, she indicated that she is very interested in having the CLG money used to hire a consultant to complete a nomination for the Yalecrest neighborhood for National Register Status. This has been in the process for a few years since the past CLG money was used for the survey. The Yalecrest neighborhood is a good candidate for tax credits. It would balance issues with infill and large additions and would help the neighborhood with putting some funding into renovation work. She indicated that by next meeting the application will have been in the mail and she would like input from the Commission now. The grant would be a small amount of money. In the past, some of the money has been used for conferences or signage for historic districts. If the Commission is agreeable to this suggestion, Staff would apply for money to complete the National Register nomination.

Ms. Coffey indicated that part of Staffs response to the City Council's legislative intent was to focus on existing districts, by upgrading surveys and to complete a preservation plan that would identify where else in the city they can focus preservation issues and identify preservation priorities.

Mr. Lloyd asked about funding on updating existing neighborhoods.

Ms. Coffey said that each year they have been applying for CDBG money and asking for General Fund money. This year they received money to survey the Capitol Hill and South Temple neighborhoods. They are in the process of obtaining consultants now. This year the application is for a preservation plan. An application for the Preserve America Grant has also been submitted but no grants have been offered.

Ms. Giraud said that Staff prioritized the districts when they presented the response to the City Council's legislative intent. South Temple, the oldest district in terms of designation and Capitol Hill would be resurveyed first. The Avenues the largest district, would be resurveyed after South Temple and Capitol Hill. A lot of buildings that were built between 1930 and 1960 were never surveyed at the intensive level but are now becoming contributing.

Ms. Heid moved to accept staff recommendation to use the CLG funds to continue preservation efforts with the Yalecrest neighborhood including preparing a National Register Nomination. Mr. Fitzsimmons seconded. Ms. Carl, Mr. Fitzsimmons, Mr. Lloyd, Mr. Christensen, and Ms. Heid all voted “Aye”. None were opposed. The motion passed.

Ms. Giraud then talked about the Awards Ceremony to be held in May in conjunction with Preservation Month. She thought that a subcommittee should be formed to review potential projects, make standards, and make those decisions.

The Commission thought that was already done. She will check the minutes to verify.

Seeing nothing further to bring before the Commission, Mr. Ashdown called for a motion to adjourn. Mr. Lloyd moved to adjourn. Meeting adjourned at 5:40 P.M.

Mr. Pete Ashdown, Vice Chair

Louise Harris, Secretary