

**SALT LAKE CITY HISTORIC LANDMARK COMMISSION
MINUTES OF THE MEETING
Room 126, 451 South State Street
October 7, 2009 at 5:45 p.m.**

Commissioners present for the meeting included: Warren Lloyd (Chairperson), Anne Oliver (Vice Chairperson), David Fitzsimmons, Arla Funk, Polly Hart, Bill Davis, Sheleigh Harding, and Earle Bevins, III. Planning staff present for the meeting were: Wilf Sommerkorn, Planning Director; Joel Paterson, Planning Manager; Janice Lew, Principal Planner; Nick Norris, Senior Planner; and Angela Brusatto, Historic Landmark Commission Secretary.

A field trip was held prior to the meeting at 4:30 p.m. The field trip was attended by Warren Lloyd (Chairperson), Anne Oliver (Vice Chairperson), David Fitzsimmons, Polly Hart, Arla Funk, Creed Haymond, and Earle Bevins, III. Joel Paterson and Janice Lew attended for the Planning Division.

Field Trip 4:30 p.m.

Commissioners visited the Altadena and Sampson Apartments. The Commission focused their review of the property on whether a case was made for the significance of the buildings in the National Register of Historic Places nominations forms.

Meeting Dinner 5:00 p.m.

Mr. Nick Norris addressed the Commission in regards to signage and asked for some direction on a new type of sign that was being considered in a couple of petitions he was working on. He stated these signs were a cabinet type of sign, meaning they were an aluminum steel box, usually painted one solid color, and then the face of it were letters cut from stainless steel or another material, and raised. He stated LED lighting was used internally to light these letters. He stated internally illuminated signs were currently not covered by the city sign policy.

Mr. Norris stated typically cabinet signs were only about three (3) inches thick. In the past halo illumination was allowed and staff wanted some direction from the Commission on whether or not they would like to see these types of petitions for approval, or if the Commission wanted staff to approve these types of petitions administratively.

The Commission stated they trusted staff to make the decision regarding these types of petitions.

Chair Lloyd stated the term halo had recently come about and he inquired if that language and a definition should be included in the Commercial Design Guidelines.

Lieutenant Lee Debrowolski of the Salt Lake City Police Department discussed Proposition #1, and the \$125 million general obligation bond for the new Public Safety Building, underground parking structure, and dedicated Emergency Operations Center. He stated this petition would be included on the November ballot. There was the possibility of partnering with Salt Lake County, as well as the State on this project because though the City could move forward without partnerships there would be additional efficiencies if those partnerships were formed. He stated the State would know if they could be part of this after the legislation session in January.

Lt. Debrowolski stated Salt Lake City was in dire need of a facility of this caliber. The Department of Homeland Security nominated Salt Lake City as an Urban Area Security Initiative (UASI) city, which meant Salt Lake City was prime for a natural or manmade disaster at any moment. He stated UASI dealt with federal funding and the federal guidelines were also looked at in regards to Salt Lake City. He stated the

building was built in 1957 and was currently a very costly building to maintain due to sewer and elevator malfunctions, as well as not enough space for the over 600 employees that it housed.

Chief Chris Burbank stated the police department had outgrown this space and if services were going to be expanded to accommodate the growth of the City, a new building was a necessity.

Chair Lloyd inquired if the east side of 300 East was the best site location for this facility.

Chief Burbank stated that was not the only site the city had looked at, due to the possible partnership. He stated extensive evaluations were done on the different possible sites and as far as the criteria set forth, the 300 East location was really the best location as far as different departments that would be housed in the buildings to create a campus for these two buildings to interact. This location was also centrally located, which would be a benefit to officers accessing the courthouse as well as the City and County building on business.

Mr. Sommerkorn stated an amendment to the city master plan would need to be made and approved in regards to the new public safety facility location. He stated staff would begin the amendment process after the November vote, but in the meantime the City Council had expressed interest in giving staff some policy direction, and language was being prepared for them to consider.

Commissioner Fitzsimmons stated that during the design of this building attention was paid to the quality of life around the building, since it would be an armored building, but also part of the public interaction. He stated public buildings should make the public proud and serve the public interest.

Chief Burbank agreed and stated the city wanted a vital and inviting facility, which would also include the emergency operations center. He stated safety could be created by setbacks as much as building solid concrete walls. He stated the public safety complex would need to be a base operated facility, which needed to be designed to a higher standard and not necessarily to hide away.

Ms. Janice Lew informed the Commission that a supplemental grant was received through the Certified Local Government (CLG), in the amount of \$4, 800 and would be used to hire a consultant regarding the National Register nomination of the Public Service Building, also known as the Northwest Pipeline Building, as well doing some additional history on Liberty Park and some other properties.

5:47 p.m. Historic Landmark Commission Meeting

Approval of the Minutes from September 2, 2009 and July 1, 2009

Commissioner Fitzsimmons made the motion to approve the July 1, 2009 minutes. Commissioner Haymond seconded. All voted, "Aye" and the motion carried. The July 1, 2009 minutes were ratified.

The Commissioners directed staff to review the audio recording of the September 2, 2009 and to make corrections before they were ratified.

Report of the Chair and Vice Chair

Commissioner Lloyd reported on the outcome of the meeting with the City Council on September 29, 2009.

Commissioner Oliver appreciated the support the City Council showed the Commission regarding historic preservation. The Commission reviewed the Preservation Plan with the City Council and they suggested a Conservation District might be a great answer to some of the issues, which they perceived might be done by changing or reworking the preservation plan. She noted that would need to be a further avenue of discussion in the future, including what a conservation district was capable of doing.

Commissioner Fitzsimmons stated a conservation district was mentioned in the plan, but not really defined.

Commissioner Oliver stated a conservation district was not meant to be defined within a general preservation plan; it would be defined on a neighborhood-by-neighborhood basis. She stated hopefully great communication could be kept open with the City Council.

Commissioner Lloyd stated there was a frustration that the Commission felt they were on the verge of accomplishing something and then the presentation time was up, so he would like more time with the City Council to discuss the Preservation Plan, and the Commission was interested in having the conservation about local historic districts.

Commissioner Fitzsimmons stated he felt the City Council was in a way chiding the Commission for not doing a lot of education, and the Commission's response was what do we tell people? It is political in the end, so what plan was the City Council willing to back up.

Chair Lloyd stated the Preservation Plan was continuing to hold up under discussion and although some of the Council members would like more specifics in the plan, they realized it was a general plan and should be broad and flexible, he stated he was encouraged by that part of the discussion.

Commissioner Oliver inquired if there was anything the Commission could do to speed up the adoption of the Preservation Plan, maybe a letter to the City Council.

Mr. Paterson stated the HLC, as well as the Planning Commission, had forwarded recommendations on to the City Council, and it was a high priority for them. He stated staff would inform the Commission of the date the City Council would be discussing this, but he did not feel a letter would make the process move any faster.

Commissioner Funk suggested the Commission write a letter to the City Council reemphasizing the points the Council gave back to the Commission, such as creating more historic districts and writing definitions for the conservation and economic hardship. She stated demolition cannot be discussed without discussing economic hardship.

Chair Lloyd agreed with Commissioner Funk, the Commission should respond to the timeframe the City Council gave, and thank them for their willingness to work through the challenges of the budget, and to reiterate the items of prime concern.

Commissioner Funk volunteered to compose a draft letter for the Commission to review.

Commissioner Lloyd discussed a letter he had forwarded to the Commission via email from the U.S. Department of Transportation; relative to an invitation for the Historic Landmark Commission to become a consulting party in the Section 106 process for the proposed Sugar House Street Car Project. He wondered if there was any interest by the Commission to be involved with that.

The Commission agreed it was a remarkable offer and they should be part of the consulting party. Commissioner Lloyd stated he would respond and accept the invitation.

Ms. Lew noted staff was also doing some consulting on the Sugar House Street Car Project.

Comments to the Commission

Chair Lloyd opened the discussion to take comments; he noted there was no one present to speak.

Commissioner Oliver addressed the Planning Commission's decision to preserve the mansion in Sugar House as part of the Circuit City transformation into the new Deseret Industries. She stated it seemed preservation was really on everyone's mind right now, which was great. She stated she would like to thank the Planning Commission on their efforts.

Chair Lloyd inquired of staff if there was an appropriate way to offer advice relative to the preservation of that building, though it was not in a district.

Mr. Paterson stated the Planning Commission approved the Deseret Industries proposal subject to various conditions, one being an alternate location for the drop-off location, to be able to preserve the building. He stated the applicant would need to come back and to show how they had accomplished those conditions to the Planning Director.

Commissioner Oliver stated she had read in the newspaper an option was to move the building altogether and she inquired if that option was exercised if it would need to come back before the Planning Commission.

Mr. Paterson stated that option was discussed, an outside source offered to do that, but a final decision was not made.

Chair Lloyd stated the Commission would want to comment on moving the building rather than preserving it on site.

Mr. Paterson suggested the Commission send a letter to the Planning Commission stating they appreciated the consideration of preservation issues and would like to work with them in the future through joint work sessions.

Commissioner Oliver stated she would write a letter thanking the Planning Commission and encouraging further communication with them.

Public Hearings

PLNHLC2009-01089; Altadena Apartments National Register Nomination—a request by the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) soliciting comments from the Historic Landmark Commission to list the apartments located at 310 South 300 East on the National Register of Historic Places. The property is zoned R-MU (Residential/Mixed-use District), and is located in City Council District 4 represented by Council Member Luke Garrott. **PLNHLC2009-01090 ; Sampson Apartments National Register Nomination** –a request by the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) soliciting comments from the Historic Landmark Commission to list the apartments located at 276 East 300 South on the National Register of Historic Places. The property is zoned R-MU (Residential/Mixed-use District), and is located in City Council District 4 represented by Council Member Luke Garrott.

Chair Lloyd recognized Janice Lew as staff representative.

Korral Broschinsky shared a Powerpoint presentation regarding the Altadena and Sampson apartments.

Ms. Broschinsky stated she was the preservation consultation that prepared the National Registration nominations for these apartments and they were a matched set with a similar history and architecture. She stated the apartments were built in 1906 on the corner of 300 East and 300 South, and were typical of the period because they were both three story brick masonry buildings with sandstone foundations. Beginning around 1902 exterior porches were very popular for urban apartments.

She stated both buildings were eligible for the National Register of Historic Places under the multiple property submission called urban expansion into the early twentieth century from the 1890s to the 1930s, also called the Salt Lake City urban apartments. She stated this was an umbrella document, which provided context for the range of urban apartments built within the city during that time period.

Ms. Broschinsky stated the Altadena and Sampson apartments were quite upscale for that time period, there was a lot of architectural design that went into these buildings, and they were well preserved. She stated the buildings had several amenities, one of them being an open elevator to access the enclosed porches, which operated until the 1960s, and were removed in the 1970s. This was the only major change to the exterior of those buildings.

She stated each individual unit of both buildings had a large kitchen and bathroom, which for the time period were fairly large, as well as two rooms and closets, which was rare at that time. She stated the living room areas had access to the exterior porches.

Ms. Broschinsky stated another area of significance regarding the national register was community planning and development. She stated the Sampson apartments were owned by O.T. and Eunice Sampson, the early residences were lower to upper middle class, and social engagements were held there.

Chair Lloyd inquired if Ms. Broschinsky's research included the number of these types of walk up apartments in the City.

Ms. Broschinsky stated the multiple property came up with 180 properties when it was originally done, and probably one third of those were walk up apartments, which lasted until the mid 1920s.

Chair Lloyd inquired how large the units were.

Ms. Broschinsky stated the Sampson apartments were a little larger at 1,085 square foot units, and the Altadena apartments were around 975 square feet.

Commissioner Hart thanked Ms. Broschinsky for her presentation and noted it was really well written.

Public Hearing

Chairperson Lloyd opened the public hearing and noted there was no one present to comment. He then closed the public hearing.

Motion

Commissioner Fitzsimmons made a motion regarding petition PLNHLC2009-01089, that the Commission forward a recommendation to approve the Altadena Apartments nomination to SHPO.

Commissioner Hart seconded the motion.

All in favor voted, “Aye”. The motion carried unanimously.

Commissioner Fitzsimmons made a motion regarding petition PLNHLC2009-01090, that the Commission forward a recommendation to approve the Sampson Apartment’s nomination to SHPO.

Commissioner Hart seconded the motion.

All in favor voted, “Aye”. The motion carried unanimously.

PLNHLCHLC2009-00983; McDonald’s Restaurant Minor Alterations – a request by Jane McKenzie, representing McDonald’s Restaurant, for a minor alteration located at approximately 242 South 700 East in the Central City Historic District. The request is to legalize a vinyl fence that was installed without the appropriate permits. The request could not be approved administratively since the action does not meet the standards of the Zoning Ordinance or Design Guidelines. Therefore, Planning Staff refers the request to the Historic Landmark Commission for consideration. The property is zoned CB (Community Business District), and is located in City Council District 4 represented by Council Member Luke Garrott.

This item was postponed.

Other Business

PLNPCM2009-00628 Commercial Design Guidelines – The Historic Landmark Commission will discuss the proposed Commercial Design Guidelines for historic designated properties. This discussion will be held in Room 126 following the regularly scheduled meeting and is open to the public for observation.

Chair Lloyd recognized Janice Lew as staff representative.

Ms. Lew presented the second part of a three part series regarding the Commercial Design Guidelines, with the purpose to receive instruction and guidance from the Commission to give to the consultants working on the project. She stated the topic of discussion would be the design of additions, new construction, and some elements of the general design standards including: accessibility, seismic, and mechanical service type properties.

She stated dealing with the additions there were several different types that would be considered including the ground level, roof additions, and additions that were house form buildings. She stated when looking at ground level additions those involved expanding the footprint of a structure either to the rear or side of a building and tend to have the least amount of impact on the character of a building. She inquired of the Commission if they felt the ground level additions should maintain the original alignment of moldings, cornices, and upper story windows, that exist on the main part of the building.

Ms. Lew noted buildings that were built for a residential purpose and were now being used for commercial purposes were typically attached to the rear and secondary side elevations and warranted careful consideration by trying to make sure additions were sensitive to the historic building, as well as to neighboring buildings and spaces.

Ms. Lew stated she wanted to cover new construction and a section that would cover new design considerations was added to the document. She stated this was a similar format to the residential structures which basically outlined the typical approach and design features, and included discussions about site sign, building scale, building form, and building details. She inquired of the Commission what might help them when dealing with these types of buildings. She stated when looking at the house-type additions the Commission should really consider accessibility as well.

Commissioner Lloyd stated new construction in the city was outdated and he wondered how much design input a historic district had, and was that a positive element in the design of some of those existing buildings in the city. He stated the Commission liked to see building additions that were a product of their time period, but the buildings along 400 South looked like the product of the historic district, meaning a semi-modern building covered with some traditional details.

Commissioner Fitzsimmons stated the Commission should be careful not to destroy creativity by being prescriptive.

Commissioner Oliver stated one way to put it would be historic buildings would continue to evolve and as long as the size and scale were respected and not overwhelming to buildings adjacent to them.

Ms. Lew inquired if the language in the Design Guidelines was helping to allow that type of development.

Commissioner Oliver stated she felt it was, and it did allow very different interpretations. She stated size, scale, and defining lines, and cornices on the building were all important to keep in mind. She stated noise from commercial systems, noise from HVAC, as well as design issues should be taken into consideration.

Ms. Lew inquired where Commissioner Oliver thought those suggestions would fit into the guidelines.

Commissioner Oliver stated through some minor language changes that suggestion could be worked in throughout the entire document.

Ms. Lew inquired if the Commission felt there was sufficient language in the document to address buildings being from their own time period.

Commissioner Funk stated on Page 45, under *Lateral Additions*, it stated, *lateral additions are less preferable than rear additions*. She noted she would prefer *less desirable* instead of *less preferable*. She stated the illustrations included in the document were too dark and it was difficult to see what was trying to be depicted, but the drawings were adequate.

Ms. Lew stated because this was such a large document she scanned the sections for this meeting, but each Commissioner should have received a color copy of the full document a few months ago to use as a reference.

Commissioner Oliver noted the building reference on 68 K Street was a commercial building that was converted to a residence, so it was not a commercial building at all, but was used frequently in the document. She referred the Commission to Page 50.

Ms. Lew stated on Page 46 it discussed the conversion of residential properties to commercial uses and then the photograph portrayed the opposite.

Chair Lloyd stated that was a more common pattern, industrial lofts were converted to residential uses, it might be easier to make the argument that it was still a commercial structure, even though it was being used as multifamily residences.

Commissioner Oliver inquired if a specific directive needed to be made regarding that, because the Commission had decided residences converted to commercial uses would abide by the residential design guidelines. She inquired if the guidelines needed to say commercial properties converted to residential uses should abide by commercial design guidelines.

Ms. Lew stated if that was the direction the Commission would like to take that was fine, or different types of guidelines for each of those buildings would also work.

Chair Lloyd stated it seemed more consistent that if a commercial storefront was converted to residential use, then the structure really did need to be consistent with the commercial design guidelines.

Ms. Lew stated the language the Commission discussed at the last meeting was the guidelines stated, *the applicant follows the residential guidelines for the residential building and references the commercial guidelines for site features, parking, access, mechanical, etc.* She inquired if the Commissioners still agreed with that.

Commissioner Hart inquired if the Commission wanted to consider when the conversion took place, because if it was converted more than fifty (50) years ago then would the Commission need to respect that change being historic in its own right, and residential may apply in some cases more than commercial.

Commissioner Lloyd inquired if there were any examples Commissioner Hart could think of where that was the case.

Commissioner Hart stated no, but at some point that might become an important factor, once a change was fifty (50) years old the Commission might want to acknowledge it, and not simply say commercial buildings converted to residential uses needed to be looked at as commercial, because if it was residential for one hundred years the commercial aspect of it may have taken a backseat.

Chair Lloyd stated something that was built fifty (50) years ago could be recognized as a historic use, which might determine the standards that apply.

Commissioner Hart stated every building had to be looked at individually to figure out the dominating features, while still respecting what came before.

Ms. Lew stated she would pass on to the consultant that the Commission did recognize additions that had acquired significance in their own right, and there should be some language included that addressed commercial properties being converted to residential as well.

Commissioner Oliver stated the Commission should not be trapped by the fifty (50) year rule either. She stated there were a lot of properties converted in the city to commercial uses and if they were built shoddily and someone wanted to restore the house, that was older than the addition, the Commission did not want to be powerless when it came down to it.

Commissioner Hart stated if it was an A or a B building it was considered to be kept.

Commissioner Oliver stated frankly a building which had that done to it was noncontributing, and these things were going to start to come up more and more frequently.

Commissioner Hart stated if that storefront was an old contributing store front, for instance a 100 year old house in back and a 50 year old store front in front, if the store front was still contributing it was old enough and had enough integrity to keep both pieces.

Chair Lloyd stated the question was would there be an instance where that scenario would occur.

Commissioner Hart stated maybe the general language that should be included would be in regards to recognizing and respecting contributing aspects of whatever exists, if a storefront still had historic integrity it was still considered a contributing part of that property whether the full Commission agreed on it or not, it reflected the history of what was happening. She stated to clarify she meant the windows were still original and had not been enlarged or enclosed, doors changed out, etc.

Commissioner Fitzsimmons stated the fifty year characteristic was kind of an arbitrary measure, but it gave some notion it had become part of the fabric of a historic neighborhood. It was not just the architecture, but the history that went along with it that was fascinating, which was what the Commission was after.

Commissioner Oliver stated the fifty year timeframe used to bridge a significant changing point in history, which was World War II, prior to that there was a certain type of construction, so in the 1960s when the preservation movement started fifty (50) years extended past that war.

Commissioner Fitzsimmons stated it was trying to save all of the Victorian houses.

Commissioner Oliver stated that was exactly what it was designed for, and she was saying that timeframe needed to be rethought a little bit, now that there was not that giant cutoff point in history.

Chair Lloyd stated one of the most exciting things that was happening in preservation currently was around mid-century/modern preservation. He stated the architectural gems built in the 1950s were something that people now connected to, which was not to say they did not appreciate Victorian houses, but there was something about the preservation of early modern/post war housing. He stated there was so much bad building that came with that, so it might be hard to distinguish.

Commissioner Oliver stated there were wonderful things that happened in that time period, but now there was a lot of it.

Commissioner Fitzsimmons stated part of the history was that explosive growth and the need for stuff that was on hold for twenty years because of the depression and the war, it was part of the character.

Chair Lloyd stated the types of multifamily housing built in the avenues in the late 1950s early 1960s, was the predominate construction that went on there, which was the multi-family units that destroyed single-family housing.

Commissioner Oliver agreed, the building of those box square apartments was what drove the whole creation of the avenues historic district, and were now fifty years old and the city was now trying to save what actually forced the creation of that historic district. She stated it was wonderful history, but a complicated issue she felt had not been addressed.

Chair Lloyd inquired what the city ordinance said about the standards. Was fifty years used as criteria to save a structure.

Ms. Lew noted that did exist.

Commissioner Hart stated the goal of the historic districts was to preserve history, not just to preserve the point in time the Commission felt was the prettiest.

Commissioner Oliver stated she knew the goals of preservation, but it was just ironic and something the city really has not grappled with.

Chair Lloyd stated this would be a good time to bring up Trolley Square. Were there guidelines that were looked at while reviewing that case?

Ms. Lew stated there really was not much, as far as guidelines, to support anything. There were a few sections in the central city area, but otherwise there was not much guidance when looking at the criteria for new construction for example. She stated in the case of Trolley Square, the current guidelines were used, the question was did this document now add to that project review, and was there more direction when looking at the standards found in the zoning ordinance.

Chair Lloyd stated Trolley Square was a unique project, because it involved an entire block of the city, so all of the additions were front additions. He stated he would like to think the Commission basically got it right when Trolley Square was reviewed and what was approved was a better designed project than what was originally presented.

Ms. Lew stated the Commission did have to work really hard on the review of that project, and the Commission should keep in mind the Commercial Design Guidelines were also for architects and designers to review to be able get the same design by using these guidelines for direction.

Commissioner Fitzsimmons stated they probably would have come with the same project they presented to the Commission at first; they took a great deal of care regarding the larger components of that project.

Chair Lloyd stated there were a few design elements that were totally modern, but the majority was good.

Commissioner Oliver stated the most troublesome element was the giant Wholefoods store, so maybe additional guidelines in the section on storefronts would be helpful in the future.

Commissioner Fitzsimmons stated regarding the Trolley Square project, sometimes the Commission forced the buildings to look pretty average in the interest of making them look sort of like what the predecessor was. He stated the Commission kept beating at the design plans for the Wholefoods store to make it a less contemporary structure, which actually would have been perfectly appropriate there for it's own time. He stated that was the problem with really restrictive language, it really was hammered down to something that was indistinguishable from everything else on the block, which was not particularly good; however, he stated the preservation pieces of the guidelines were really good.

Chair Lloyd suggested adding to the guidelines that if someone could explain to the Commission why an alternative material would be better than the preferred material the Commission would be open to that discussion.

Ms. Lew inquired if the Commission wanted that suggestion to apply to additions as well as new construction.

The Commission stated yes.

Chair Lloyd stated the Commission saw new materials all the time, that might not need to be excluded, but a discussion would need to take place regarding how it would related.

Commissioner Oliver stated that mass and scale was really the element that could destroy the feel of a project. She stated it was the most popular public comment when the neighborhood viewed something negatively.

Commissioner Funk stated the same information regarding materials needed to be written throughout the document, as well as the mass and scale whether it was in regards to additions, rooftops, accessibility, ground additions, etc. She stated on Page 53 it read, *access ramps should be simple in design. Simple designs will be more compatible with historic buildings.* She inquired if the Commission agreed with that.

Ms. Lew stated when dealing with accessibility for a commercial structure, there was a possibility that a structure would be put in on the front of the building.

Commissioner Funk stated there seemed to be a conflict between that sentence and the policy statement on Page 51, so that needed to be corrected as far as materials were concerned.

Commissioner Fitzsimons stated the popular assumption was t accessibility was a stick-on solution to the building and there may be circumstances when the redesign of the façade to give grade level access was more appropriate, so should the Commission prohibit this by saying accessibility access could only be by ramping, or should other approaches be considered and allowed. He stated it might be appropriate for that sentence to state, *design and materials should be appropriate to the historic structure.*

Commissioner Hart recused herself from the meeting at 7:42 p.m.

Chair Lloyd stated accessibility was a building code requirement, which the Commission recognized, there were certainly conditions where ramps needed to be provided that might have a temporary looking appearance, so while it was nicer to have concrete integrated ramp structures that look like they belonged, there probably did need to be a place in the guidelines for wood construction as well, with some regulations.

Ms. Lew inquired if the Commission would also like to allow for substitute materials for ramps and accessibility.

Commissioner Fitzsimmons stated these types of things were in response to an immediate need and sometimes were not a permanent fixture, which was a key element for a historic house.

Mr. Paterson stated he did not remember seeing certificates of appropriateness being issued regarding this, it had probably happened. It was part of the law to provide accessibility and in certain instances it was a matter of finding a cost effective way to do that without destroying the character of the building. He stated there were a lot of requests by people building porches, stairways, or decks and wanting to use alternative materials like Trek and sometimes there was not a lot of guidance in the guidelines. He stated there were a lot of alternate materials coming out and maybe the Commission needed to do a better job at having these types of discussions to help formulate those guidelines.

Chair Lloyd stated Trek was a brand name for a plastic/wood composite material, which had recyclable and durable materials. He stated Trex was not a structural material, it was usually used for decks and so far seemed like it was a good solution.

Commissioner Fitzsimmons inquired if the Commission approved a substitute material, would it forever be an acceptable material.

Mr. Paterson stated the Commission's policy document was revised over time to deal with new types of materials, or the use of materials in a different way that was seen in the past. He stated to adopt a new policy it did not require a whole ordinance text amendment type of process.

Chair Lloyd inquired if the Commission allowed a synthetic material like Trex to be used, would that be closer to having to legitimizing vinyl fencing.

Commissioner Fitzsimmons stated the word compatible was pretty open; it would seem that would have to be well defined.

Ms. Lew stated substitute materials were allowed for porches in most cases because you could not really see it, but she was not really aware of how that allowance had evolved.

Commissioner Oliver inquired if Ms. Lew felt it would be better to remove some materials from the list to give the guidelines and the Commissioners more flexibility in the future. She stated the Commission was always going to struggle with material issues, which was part of the job, but if some of the materials were removed the Commission could review each petition and decide what was specifically appropriate.

Commissioner Fitzsimmons agreed.

Commissioner Funk stated Ms. Lew could use the language appropriate and sustainable materials.

Commissioner Fitzsimmons stated that would open another realm of discussion, which would probably be beneficial as well.

Commissioner Oliver suggested the word *compatible* because it gave the Commission a lot of leeway.

Ms. Lew inquired how the Commission felt about seismic design. She stated staff asked for more specifics especially when dealing with commercial type buildings and what it would take to seismically upgrade those.

Commissioner Fitzsimmons inquired why the Commission would want to make seismic design reversible; he stated he could not imagine circumstances when the building code would allow those changes to be reversed.

Commissioner Oliver inquired if the word *reversible* could be deleted or replaced with, *to allow repair of the historic materials*.

The Commission agreed with that.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:33 p.m.

This document along with the digital recording constitute the official minutes of the Historic Landmark Commission regular session meeting held on October 7, 2009.

Tami Hansen