

**SALT LAKE CITY HISTORIC LANDMARK COMMISSION
MINUTES OF THE MEETING
451 South State Street, Room 126
September 2, 2009**

Present for the Historic Landmark Commission meeting were Chair Warren Lloyd and Vice Chair Anne Oliver. Commissioners David Fitzsimmons, Arla Funk, Polly Hart, Bill Davis, Sheleigh Harding, and Earle Bevins, III.

A field trip was held prior to the meeting. Historic Landmark Commissioners present were: Warren Lloyd, Anne Oliver, David Fitzsimmons, Polly Hart, Arla Funk, Sheleigh Harding, and Earle Bevins, III. Staff members present were: Janice Lew and Ray Milliner.

A roll is being kept of all who attended the Historic Landmark Commission Meeting. The meeting was called to order at 5:50 p.m. Audio recordings of the Historic Landmark Commission meetings are retained in the Planning Office for an indefinite period of time. Planning staff present for the meeting were: Wilf Sommerkorn, Planning Director; Pat Comarell, Assistant Planning Director; Robin Zeigler, Senior Preservation Planner; Janice Lew, Principal Planner; and Angela Brusatto, Historic Landmark Commission Secretary.

FIELD TRIP: 4:00 p.m.

224 North 'B' Street—Commissioner Hart recommended the full Commission visit this site to see the existing aluminum siding was being removed to expose the original wood siding.

PLNHLC2009-00866; 168 North 'E' Street—Staff provided an overview of the project which included a request for replacement windows. The Commissioners inspected the condition of the historic wood windows that would be replaced, as well as the new windows that were purchased for the project following discussions with the Buzz Center. The Commissioners asked questions about the treatment of the leaded glass windows and the amount of window material that would be retained.

DINNER: 4:30 p.m.

Ms. Comarell conducted a work session in regards to Preservation Priorities. Ms. Comarell reminded the Commission of the briefing to be held on September 8, 2009 along with the City Council regarding Historic Preservation. She reminded the Commission there would also be a meeting with the City Council on September 29, 2009, when the Council would be interviewing the Commission about how they were generally doing.

The Historic Landmark Commission and staff discussed the ideas and concerns raised in individual interviews with Commissioners. A summary of the discussion is below.

Historic Landmarks Commission Work Session: September 2, 2009

- **In performing Commission duties, members need to:**
 - Responsibly make educated judgments based on the ordinance and design guidelines, so each petition is handled fairly and the process is predictable. The guidelines should be followed, as they illustrate the standards for historic preservation.
 - Express views openly so the issues are discussed effectively and others know what the Commission is thinking.
 - Wisdom often comes out of discussion had among well-informed people.
 - One Commissioner might say, “This is what I’m thinking of including in a motion; what do you think?”
 - Define the motion in the meeting, rather than postpone it to the next meeting. Respect the applicants need for a decision.
 - The substance of any ex parte communications (i.e., communication with applicant outside of the HLC meeting) should be brought up at the HLC meeting and made part of the public record, so the public does not think the Commission is hiding anything.
 - The City needs better guidelines regarding parks and larger commercial projects.
- **Balancing tests** – Even with the standards and guidelines, the Commission will often be asked to make value judgments, i.e., faced with conflicting values or guidelines. The Commission needed to decide where the balance lies.
- **The following suggestions would help the Commission in performing these responsibilities:**
 - Interdepartmental support of historic preservation, e.g., RDA staff
 - Consistent enforcement of the Commission’s decisions
 - Continual training by planning staff at the Buzz Center
 - Maintaining a comfortable number of Commissioners
 - Better communication between the Commission and the City Council
- The Commission members prefer to meet once a month and have longer meetings, than to have two meetings which are shorter.

5:51:31 PM Approval of the Minutes from August 5, 2009

Commissioner Fitzsimmons made a motion to approve the minutes with noted corrections. Commissioner Hart seconded the motion. All in favor voted, “Aye”. Commissioners Funk and Bevins abstained. The motion carried unanimously.

[5:53:03 PM](#) **Report of the Chair and Vice Chair**

Commissioner Oliver stated she and Commissioner Lloyd met with Wilford Sommerkorn, Planning Director and Pat Comarell, Assistant Planning Director, to discuss the September 8, 2009 meeting with the City Council regarding priorities of the Historic Landmark Commission. She and Chair Lloyd asked the Commission for their ideas regarding priorities.

[5:53:39 PM](#) **Comments to the Commission**

Esther Hunter, representative of University Community Council and the East Central Community Council, commended Robin Zeigler for her contributions to historic preservation in Salt Lake City, and her ability to build bridges of trust with great skill, peace, and goodwill toward a project or a problem with many stakeholders. She stated Ms. Zeigler had done monumental things in the City which would live on for a long time.

Kirk Huffaker also thanked Ms. Zeigler for her contributions to the City. He presented a position statement created by the Utah Heritage Foundation regarding the rehabilitation of the Public Safety Building. He stated there was historic and architectural value in this building, and encouraged the Commission to support the position of the rehabilitation of the Public Safety building.

Mr. Huffaker noted the Yalecrest Neighborhood planed to include issues and prospects of preservation more at their community council meetings, by engaging the community in education and discussion. He stated the Yalecrest neighborhood wanted to be a local historic district and wanted to have better protection options for their neighborhood. He stated the boundaries for the national Yalecrest District ran from 900 South to 1300 East to 1800 East.

Commissioner Lloyd stated the district included approximately 1100 homes.

[6:01:29 PM](#) **Motion**

Commissioner Hart made a motion that the Historic Landmark Commission would write a letter to the City Council and Mayor Becker in support of the preservation and restoration of the current Public Safety building, formally identified as the Pacific Northwest Pipeline building.

Commissioner Funk seconded the motion.

[6:02:11 PM](#) **Discussion of the Motion**

Commissioner Lloyd inquired of Mr. Huffaker if the status for listing the building as a landmark site.

Mr. Huffaker stated the State Preservation Office stated it was eligible for the National Register.

Commissioner Oliver wanted to know the consensus of the Yalecrest neighborhood to support a historic district.

Mr. Huffaker stated the support of the neighborhood tended to come in waves as these issues came up. It seemed there were more demolition issues on the horizon, and when the community heard about demolition the neighborhood tended to show more support. He stated at times there was a pocket of people that understood the issue and supported it, but the challenge, for a relatively new community council, was bringing everyone together to support one movement.

Commissioner Funk inquired how large the district should be, suggesting Foothill Boulevard or 2000 East to be the boundary of that district.

Mr. Huffaker stated the Community Council boundary went up to Foothill Boulevard, but typically local districts followed the national registry boundary districts; however, there were well defined historic subdivisions, that were platted within the Yalecrest national register district, which may create some small historic districts within that national boundary.

Commissioner Funk inquired what needed to occur to place the Public Safety Building on the National Register.

Mr. Huffaker stated the City would need to initiate that process as the owner of the building at this point.

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

6:08:27 PM Motion

Commissioner Funk made a motion that a the letter should be written to the City concerning the preservation of the Public Safety building, and should include a recommendation that the application be initiated for the building to go on the National Register.

Commissioner Hart seconded the motion.

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

Ms. Zeigler inquired who would be responsible for writing the letter.

Chair Lloyd inquired if Ms. Zeigler would write a draft of the letter to give to the Commission for comments before it was sent.

6:10:07 PM Public Hearing

PLNHLC2009-00866; Provost Residence Minor Alterations—a request by Larry Rowe, representing the property owner Scott Provost, for a minor alteration located at approximately 168 North ‘E’ Street. The request is to replace existing windows. The request could not be approved administratively since the action does not meet the ordinance or design guidelines. Therefore, Planning Staff refers the request to the Historic Landmark Commission for consideration.

Chair Lloyd recognized Janice Lew as staff representative.

Ms. Lew presented a PowerPoint presentation showing the residence under consideration of approval for replacing existing, historic windows on the main level of the home. She stated staff did not approve this petition administratively because the existing windows did not meet the existing criteria for replacement, as they were original and appeared to be repairable.

Ms. Lew noted this property was a one and a half story, Victorian eclectic home. She stated the Provost Residence was built in 1903 and has a hipped roof gablet, a hipped roof dormer on the front, and gabled bays on the west side and the south side elevations. The character defining features of the bays include an oversized fixed window, with a transom above, and were flanked by two double-hung windows. The window openings had stone sills and lentils as well. There are also several leaded glass windows on the house.

Ms. Lew stated a certificate of appropriateness had not been issued before the property owner purchased the windows, based on discussions he had with the Buzz Center.

She stated the applicant proposed he would replace the sash of the original window, as well as storm windows to be placed over the leaded glass windows. She stated four double-hung windows would be replaced on the north side of the house.

Ms. Lew noted there were two windows on the south side in the rear that were previously replaced prior to the purchase of the property by the current owner with vinyl windows; however, she was unable to find documentation of the appropriate permits issued.

Staff recommended the Commission deny this request because the project failed to substantially meet the standards of the ordinance and the design guidelines. The project did not meet standards 2, 5, 6, 8, 9 and 12. Standards 4, 7, 10, and 11 are not applicable to the application.

Mr. Larry Rowe, the general contractor of the project, and Mr. Scott Provost, property owner, were invited to address the Commission.

Mr. Rowe stated that on July 14, 2009 he went to the Buzz Center and met with Tom Barlow to discuss this project with him. He stated he was told by Mr. Barlow the permits should be issued administratively based on City criteria. He stated they discussed the types of windows that would be used, and what would be replaced versus what would not be replaced. Mr. Rowe stated Mr. Barlow asked him to fill out an additional application and bring pictures of the subject areas back in before the permit would be issued.

Mr. Rowe stated he went ahead and ordered the windows because Mr. Barlow was confident he would not need to have the Commission review this application. He stated he was concerned he would lose the money he invested in the cost of the windows if the Commission decided to reject this application.

Mr. Provost stated he wanted functional windows, which was the purpose of the application. He stated his primary concern was to retain the original look of the house.

Commissioner Fitzsimmons stated economic hardship was not an option to be used in approving an application. He stated the guideline in replacing components was does more than fifty percent of the component need to be replaced.

Mr. Rowe stated about fifty percent of the window did need to be replaced, but the original casings on the inside and out would be kept.

Commissioner Fitzsimmons inquired if the replaceable percentage of the windows on the front of the house were different than the windows on the sides.

Mr. Rowe stated yes, due to the different sizes.

Mr. Provost stated the windows on the north side were more beat up than the other windows on the house.

Commissioner Fitzsimmons stated the windows on the house did not seem terribly rotted, probably some of them were painted closed, and he inquired if the operating hardware was still functional on the windows.

Mr. Rowe stated none of the windows opened at this point. The interior of the home was remodeled and at one point some of this stuff was torn apart, so he was not sure if the weights and pulleys were really still functioning at all because he had not torn anything apart yet and inspected it.

6:29:09 PM **Public Hearing**

Chair Lloyd opened the public hearing portion of the petition.

Cindy Cromer addressed the Commission regarding historic glass and how on a building of this age the glass was a significant portion of the exterior building materials. She stated there was original 1903 glass on this structure and there was definitely a striking difference between original and new glass. She stated if the applicant wanted to take the original glass and place it in a wood composite window that would be fine, but it was about the glass and the reflective properties.

Mr. Provost stated his intent was to preserve the character and appearance of the home. He stated storm windows seemed to be an onerous proposition, as far as being able to open the windows and enjoy the outdoor air.

Commissioner Harding asked if Mr. Provost felt it was a possibility to salvage the historic glass and place it in a new wood frame.

Mr. Provost stated he did not know if that was a possibility.

Chair Lloyd closed the public hearing.

6:35:25 PM **Executive Session**

Commissioner Harding stated she was concerned the windows did not currently work. She inquired if the owner started to fix the windows and they broke, was he then in a situation where he could replace them the way he wanted to, or could he not replace windows that did not function in a historic district.

Commissioner Funk stated her experience has been that the reason historic windows did not work was because they have been painted shut. She stated the applicant had noted he had not done anything to determine whether

they actually would work or not, which would be an indicator that was the problem and could be corrected. She stated storm windows would replicate the features of the house and be functional.

Commissioner Hart noted in viewing the windows they appeared to be painted shut. She stated the windows could be unsealed without breaking the windows.

Commissioner Oliver agreed this process was burdensome, but it was also possible.

Commissioner Hart stated she had issues with this case because a month or so ago an applicant wanted to replace their windows with acceptable replacement windows and they were denied based on the guidelines which stated one could only replace windows if the current windows were too degraded. She stated the Provost home windows were not degraded enough to be considered for replacement.

Commissioner Fitzsimmons stated that regarding that past case the owner admitted the windows were in good condition and the issue was changing them out for comfort. He stated the Provost windows were not in good condition.

Commissioner Hart stated the staff report mentioned the windows were in acceptable condition, and she assumed staff was given more than the cursory look the Commission was given.

Ms. Lew stated she had not been inside the residence and when reviewing the Design Guidelines the exterior was looked at as well.

Commissioner Hart stated it was clear from the outside the windows were painted shut and as Commissioner Oliver said there may have been issues beyond, but it was obvious that one of the problems was that paint was sealing the openings.

Commissioner Fitzsimmons stated the Commission had certainly seen windows that were much worse.

Commissioner Hart stated the windows looked in fairly good condition to her.

Commissioner Fitzsimmons stated it was unfortunate the applicant received inaccurate information at the Buzz Center, and he would support the staff's recommendation in this case.

Commissioner Oliver stated there seemed to be three small issues here: first, the issue of the information received at the Buzz Center. She stated this Commission was not the appropriate body to say anything regarding this issue, it was regrettable whatever happened there and it should not happen again, but the Commission was here to look at the issue of the existing historic windows, and if they were in reasonable condition. She stated based on the staff recommendation in the staff report it was clear the windows did not need to be replaced, as defined in the ordinance and they did not meet any of the guidelines for replacements, so the Commission could not support this application regarding that issue. Third, it was discussed that what the Commission might recommend is storm windows. She agreed storm windows would create a really flat light, but the purpose of preservation was to preserve what existed, not to fool onlookers as to what was there, but actually to preserve the historic materials still intact.

Commissioner Fitzsimmons stated he did not think the issue was to recommend storm windows or not, that was up to the owner. He stated the Commission's issue was whether or not replacement of the existing windows would be allowed.

Commissioner Harding stated the Commission's decision came down to the applicable design standards. She quoted the design standard 3, *whenever possible repair historic windows rather than replace them*. She noted that a repair process needed to be attempted first. She stated she was disturbed with what information was given out at the Buzz Center, but again the Commission could not really do anything about that.

Ms. Comarell stated Ms. Zeigler had been doing training with the Buzz Center staff in terms of what was appropriate and what was not. She had also put together some procedures for them for straightforward issues like re-roofing etc. She stated she was unaware that the Buzz Center planner came back to the applicant to say he had just received training and what he had said was not appropriate. She assured the Commission; management would speak to the planner and also require more training regarding historic applications. She apologized to the applicant and the Commission regarding this situation.

Commissioner Lloyd stated if there were situations when the applications could be approved administratively, was there any situation when a Buzz Center planner would sign a Certificate of Appropriateness.

Ms. Comarell stated on simple issues those certificates were signed and issued over the counter. The Buzz Center planners were directed that if there was any question, they should send the applicant up to the preservation team in the Planning Department.

Ms. Zeigler stated the Buzz Center did have the capability of issuing certificates over the counter and sometimes it may be for windows if the application met certain criteria. She stated the bottom line was still an applicant was not supposed to do any work until they had a permit in hand, because final approval had not been given until that permit had been issued.

6:51:25 PM **Motion**

Commissioner Funk made a motion regarding petition PLNHLC2009-00866; Provost Residence Minor Alterations, that the Historic Landmark Commission support the staff recommendation that the project fails to substantially meet the standards that pertain to the application and the Commission denies the request to replace the windows because it does not meet standards 2, 5, 6, 8, 9, and 12 of Section 21.A.34-02G of the Zoning Ordinance and standards 4, 7, and 10 are not applicable to this application.

Commissioner Fitzsimmons seconded the motion.

All in favor voted, "Aye". Commissioner Davis voted, "No". The motion carried.

6:54:06 PM **Other Business**

Ms. Comarell discussed the re-appointment of Anne Oliver to the Historic Landmark Commission for her second term. The City Council placed her re-appointment on the agenda of the September 8, 2009 meeting. The Mayor signed the recommendation from the City Council appointing Dave Richards to the Commission.

Ms. Comarell stated David Richardson would also be contacted to see if he would be interested in serving on the Commission and noted that staff was willing to accept other suggestions as well.

Chair Lloyd stated in terms of appointments of Commissioners, there were some guidelines created which included criteria such as representation from each district, a representative that was AIA certified, etc. He inquired how closely these current guidelines were being followed.

Ms. Comarell stated these guidelines were in the ordinance and staff was following these criteria. She stated the district staff has had a hard time finding a representative for was Exchange Place.

Commissioner Fitzsimmons suggested contacting the AIA office to see if they had a list of people they could suggest serving on the Commission.

Ms. Comarell stated she would follow up on that.

PLNPCM2009-00628; Commercial Design Guidelines—This Commission will discuss the proposed commercial design guidelines for historic designated properties.

Chair Lloyd recognized Janice Lew as staff representative.

Ms. Lew stated the Commission would be specifically discussing the rehabilitation standards of the Design Guidelines. These guidelines were written perspectives that provide clarity and the application of the standard of the zoning ordinance. She stated standards were based upon the Secretary of Interior Standards for rehabilitation and provided criteria against which work may be measured, and the guidelines are guides for the applicants work, providing instructions on how to meet the standards.

Ms. Lew stated ultimately the goal is to encourage the preservation and careful treatment of historic resources, while recognizing the need for continuing adaptation and improvements to those resources. She stated the guidelines are divided into several sections with respect to rehabilitation: site features, store fronts, primary materials, windows, architectural details, roofs, foundations, and additions.

She stated these design guidelines talk about maintaining and preserving character defining features, then if something is so deteriorated an owner would start looking at the replacement of materials. She stated staff was looking for the Commissions input on how well this rehabilitation section reflects the Commission's philosophy and if it sufficiently defines the character features of a commercial building, provides information about the basic principles of historic preservation and urban design, whether or not in provides clarity in the application of the zoning ordinance standards, and whether or not these guidelines provide a comprehensible information and guidance on the appropriate treatment and resources. She stated these guidelines should also provide a good framework for staff and the Commission to make their decisions.

Chair Lloyd stated there were several sections to go through and inquired if staff should proceed sequentially.

7:06:25 PM Public Hearing

Chair Lloyd opened the public hearing portion of this petition.

Mike Stransky stated he did not have a great understanding of these guidelines at this point and he was largely present at this meeting to understand what the City was trying to accomplish here. He was in support of these guidelines because they were necessary, but he had a few comments for the Commission to consider. First, regarding economic hardship, it seemed there were resources for residential owners to turn to, but when dealing with a commercial piece of property he was not sure the same criteria applied. He stated sometimes an owner was in a better monetary position shutting their operation down rather than abiding by the rules of historic preservation. He stated standards and guidelines should not back someone into a corner so strictly that there was not a way to help retirees in a historic neighborhood to the other side of the spectrum of someone trying to save commercial enterprises. He stated economic hardship had to be part of the discussion whether or not the Commission could make a ruling on it or not, it was an important piece, and he would also like more clarity on the procedures of the process.

Chair Lloyd stated even the City codes allowed for some interpretation from a code official, in terms of the feasibility of preservation issues, which would allow for some of the flexibility Mr. Stransky was looking for.

Commissioner Lloyd closed the public hearing.

7:15:48 PM **Comments by the Commission**

Commissioner Oliver suggested that sustainability and historic preservation be stated in the opening material of the commercial design guidelines, just a small section on sustainability and historic preservation and what that meant, because the entire document was essentially about sustainability and that should be stated upfront. She also suggested a list of other resources to help guide people through this process, such as the Utah State Preservation Office and the list of contractors, architects, preservation specialists, etc. with different backgrounds in historic materials for the public to have a resource of some technical assistance.

Commissioner Lloyd stated residential structures converted into commercial uses were still evaluated by the residential design guidelines. He inquired if there was a point when a property was well established as a commercial use, if that evaluation would fall under the commercial design guidelines because there may be site features relative to commercial use.

Ms. Lew stated that was a point raised previously. She inquired if there needed to be a distinction made to address those residential buildings that were being converted to commercial uses.

Commissioner Lloyd stated if a building's zoning allows for commercial uses, then those guidelines should be evaluated.

Commissioner Oliver inquired if a commercial enterprise was located in a residential structure; than should those residential guidelines need to be followed.

Ms. Zeigler suggested it may be as simply as referencing the residential for the building itself, which still read like a residential building no matter what the use was, then the commercial guidelines were reference regarding site features like parking, access, mechanicals, etc.

Commissioner Oliver stated that was a great start, if staff could think that through to make sure that would work explicitly for the person trying to use the guidelines.

Commissioner Lloyd inquired if an owner wanted to re-lamp with LED lights or compact florescent lights would these guidelines on Page 11 address that, and do these guidelines address lighting efficiency.

Ms. Zeigler stated the intent was the fixture itself, not the bulbs or how it worked.

Commissioner Oliver stated on Page 15, there was detail regarding original framing and she inquired if this was helpful and was as detailed in the residential portion of the document.

Ms. Lew stated some of that detail was included in the residential portion of the document. She stated ultimately these two documents would be blended.

Chair Lloyd inquired of staff what the next step would be.

Ms. Lew stated the Commissioner's comments would be sent to the consultant and then the Commission would be looking at the next small portion of the document at the following meeting.

Commissioner Oliver noted on Page 23 it stated, the use of hard based mortars was entirely appropriate with some hard bricks, beginning around the 1930s. She stated that to tell everyone they needed to use a lime-based mortar seemed inappropriate.

Ms. Lew stated windows were the next section to discuss. There was already lengthy discussion regarding preserving original windows that made economic and environmental sense. She inquired if the language staff included was something the Commission could support.

Commissioner Oliver stated some great standards had been included regarding when someone could replace a window, but there were not clear guidelines on when historic doors could be replaced.

Commissioner Harding stated she felt doors were sturdy enough that they were always repairable, but windows were pretty fragile and constantly exposed to the weather.

Commissioner Bevins stated he agreed there were usually fewer salvaged doors in historic houses versus windows.

Ms. Zeigler stated safety issues were the topic of discussion regarding residential structures, which was why there was not much mentioned about doors, and usually the original door was not part of the structure in the first place.

Commissioner Oliver stated she would like to see some consistency regarding doors and windows.

Commissioner Oliver stated the one thing missing from the windows section was discussion on muntins, true divided light versus snap-in or sandwiched-in muntins. She suggested adding language to Page 33. She stated if replacement was necessary, it needed to replicate what was originally there.

Ms. Zeigler inquired about simulated divided lights that were mounted on the inside and outside.

Commissioner Harding stated that would be okay, they looked very similar.

Commissioner Harding stated the Commission kept approving metal clad wood windows. She noted they looked nice, but she was unsure as to why approval was given because it would not weather like a wood window.

Ms. Zeigler stated the new growth wood did not last as long as the old growth wood, so it was a type of concession to people who did have to replace windows.

Commissioner Harding inquired why then just a metal window was not allowed.

Ms. Zeigler stated because it was wood on the inside, she stated it would be helpful to add additional language regarding residential structures.

Ms. Lew brought the Commissions attention to the issue of vinyl on page 30.

Commissioner Bevins stated the first sentence stating, *most windows do not look like historic wood windows*, began by dismissing this idea because there had been changes and the Commission was presented with some pretty nice vinyl windows in the past, and he was not sure this was a balanced statement anymore.

Ms. Lew stated there needed to be a balancing of the sustainability issues as well.

Ms. Zeigler stated vinyl was an extremely toxic material; it created toxic fumes within a home and if it burned those fumes were extremely toxic. She stated when looking at materials it was also important to look at how long it would last.

Commissioner Bevins inquired if the final draft of this document would include a detailed index to the guidelines along with a table of contents.

Ms. Lew confirmed there would be.

Commissioner Fitzsimmons stated by looking at these guidelines rather globally the idea was to preserve buildings, but to be alive and thriving as well, otherwise owners might abandon them and request demolition. He stated the Commission needed to focus on these tools, and how these guidelines would be a benefit in the future. He stated that was his concern regarding the commercial guidelines, what could be done other than demolition.

Ms. Lew inquired if Commissioner Bevins felt there was not a lot of flexibility within the guidelines.

Commissioner Fitzsimmons stated he did not see mechanisms in place for flexibility.

Chair Lloyd stated if a smaller historic structure in a local district fell under these guidelines, the fact that these guidelines were residential meant inherently there was a little bit of flexibility. He stated it might be helpful to give the standards to an applicant to review at the beginning of the application process.

Commissioner Oliver stated the federal tax credit had provided an increase of projects in historic districts and could help applicants manage the costs of preservation.

Commissioner Fitzsimmons stated that helped when dealing with the cost of preservation, but if the issue was larger design issues it still may not be the answer. He noted the ZCMI façade was a great example of this issue.

Commissioner Oliver stated maybe the answer was the Commissioner's approach. She stated when they dealt with the ZCMI façade she felt much more willing to compromise, which was the Commission's role it seemed, and this might be different when dealing with residential structures.

Ms. Zeigler stated maybe that was not the best example because it was just a façade and not a building. She stated she wanted to discuss the ordinance and the Secretary of Interior Guidelines. She stated the entire purpose for this process was to help guide change, not to prevent change, because buildings have to change. She stated the ordinance, for the most part, follows the national Secretary of Interior Standards and the design guidelines were ways to implement that ordinance. She stated there was flexibility to look at each project individually, which had been done in the past and which was the whole point of the guidelines being so broad and would aid in fair decisions.

Chair Lloyd inquired if the Public Safety Building came before the Commission in the future would the guidelines be helpful in reviewing that project.

Commissioner Fitzsimmons noted if someone wanted to preserve ninety percent of that building, but wanted to make sweeping changes for a retail enterprise on the ground floor, the Commission would get into the discussion of existing doors and windows, but could the Commission accommodate themselves to that kind of a change to make the building salvageable, which the Commission made a motion on tonight stating that was what they wanted to happen.

Commissioner Funk suggested maybe a statement could be created to include in the guidelines federal tax credit requirements. She also stated that it might be possible to list the economic incentives that were available at the beginning of the process and let the applicant know the resources available.

Ms. Comarell stated staff shared the concern with the Commission that preservation not only be seen as a regulatory body, but a service. She stated the City was trying to get information out to the public and these guidelines would be a marvelous tool in the future.

Chair Lloyd inquired of the Commission what they felt they would like presented to the City Council.

Commissioner Oliver stated as far as more surveys to be done, certainly the need for them needed to be reevaluated and prioritized, she agreed with staff's recommendation to the Council, but would add to resource protection, meetings with neighborhoods as potential districts along with protecting the City's own resources and analysis of the City's own properties to ensure they were properly designated and maintained, so the City becomes an example to everyone else.

She stated generally the recommendations of the preservation plan should be evaluated and implemented and the surveys of neighborhoods that have been done in the past should be reviewed before new surveys were done. She stated existing policies on materials and sustainability issues, such as solar panels and windows should be reevaluated to insure agreement with nationally accepted standards.

Commissioner Oliver also suggested that communication be increased and executed on a regular basis with the LDS church in some way regarding their properties, as well as the University of Utah, RDA, the Mayor's Office, and the City Council, as far as what they would like to move forward with.

Ms. Zeigler stated the Planning staff used those surveys every day; there was a summary of all of the recommendations from the surveys from the past ten years. She inquired of the Commission what would be their number one priority from those recommendations: designation of new properties, education, national register districts for those that are not already recognized recommendation of new surveys, or extension of boundaries, etc.

Commissioner Oliver suggested staff should move forward with what would make the biggest impact. She stated the Commission would like to see more districts protected, but that requires more planners.

Ms. Zeigler stated the City Council allowed for another planner, so how did the Commission want the new planner's time to be spent; writing nominations, working with neighborhoods to designate properties, etc.

Commissioner Oliver stated that was where staff should develop a prioritized list, and then whatever could be done given the amount of time and money allotted is where they should start.

Commissioner Lloyd suggested that priority be given to re-link the development of demolition standards.

Ms. Zeigler suggested that the Central City neighborhood needed to have the boundaries reevaluated.

Ms. Comarell stated once the Council acts, and the new staff positions are filled, it would be beneficial to review the surveys to see exactly what needs to be done next and to take the list of City properties and develop a priority list.

The Commission agreed to reschedule a discussion of the Secretary of Interior Standards, and stressed the importance of going over those items.

8:58:29 PM MOTION

Commission Hart made a motion to adjourn.

The meeting Adjourned at 8:59 p.m.

This document along with the digital recording constitute the official minutes of the Historic Landmark Commission regular session meeting held on September 2, 2009. **If you are viewing a hard copy of the minutes and would like to view the attached materials and listen to audio excerpts of the record, please go to: www.slcgov.com/boards/HLC/hlc-agen.htm.**

Tami Hansen, Senior Secretary Historic Landmark Commission