

HISTORIC LANDMARK COMMISSION

**Graylynn Apartments Window Replacement
PLNHLC2010-00311
205 2nd Avenue
August 4, 2010**



Planning and Zoning Division
Department of Community and
Economic Development

Applicant:

Bridger Development, Craig
Robinson

Staff

Ray Milliner
ray.milliner@slcgov.com
(801)535-7645

Tax ID:

09-31-381-003

Current Zone:

RMF-35 (Multi Family
Residential District)

Master Plan Designation:

Avenues, Medium Density
Residential

Council District:

District 3 – Stan Penfold

Lot Size:

Approximately .19 Acres

Current Use:

Multi Family Apartment

**Applicable Land Use
Regulations:**

- 21A.34.020 G

Notification:

- Notice mailed on 7/22/10
- Agenda posted on the
Planning Division and Utah
Public Meeting Notice
websites 7/22/10
- Property posted on 7/23/10

Attachments:

- A. Letter from Applicant
- B. Photos
- C. Historic Information

Request

The applicants propose to retroactively request approval for replacement windows, and request approval for the installation of additional replacement windows at the subject property.

Recommendation

Staff recommends that the Historic Landmark Commission review the proposed window replacements, and approve the application pursuant to the findings and conditions of approval in this staff report.

Conditions of Approval

1. The new windows (including those installed without a building permit) shall have significant exterior muntins installed with the same design as the muntins on the original windows.
2. Prior to the issue of a building permit, the applicant shall bring examples of the muntins to staff for review and approval.
3. To the greatest extent possible, the casing of each window shall be preserved.

Options

- Approval:** If the Commission finds that the proposed project meets the standards of the ordinance, the application should be approved provided the replacement windows conform to the requirements of the Uniform Building Code and all other applicable City ordinances.
- Denial:** If the Commission finds that the proposed project does not meet the standards of the ordinance the application should be denied.
- Continuation:** If the Commission finds that additional information is needed to make a decision, then a final decision may be postponed with specific direction to the applicant or Planning Staff regarding the additional information required for the Commission to take future action.

VICINITY MAP



Background

The Graylynn Apartments, built circa 1929, is a contributory three story brick building with a truncated hip roof and a steep center gable in the Gothic and Jacobethan Revival Styles. The structure is contributory due to the fact that it reflects the shift in the Avenues from single family dwellings to multi-family structures during the depression era. The property was originally the site of a single family home that was built around 1898 the house was torn down to make way for the apartment building. The apartments have remained relatively unchanged since their construction.

Prior to submitting an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness, the applicant replaced several windows in the building with vinyl windows. It was noticed by a citizen, who filed a complaint with the City enforcement division, who in turn, placed a stop work order on the project. The applicant then filed an application with the Planning Division for approval of the replaced windows, as well as to replace those windows that have not yet been replaced.

Project Description

On May 20, 2010, the applicant submitted a Certificate of Appropriateness application for the replacement of the remaining apartment windows in the building (note: none of the ornamental windows on the front façade facing 2nd Avenue will be replaced). Prior to submitting the certificate application, the applicant had replaced 31 of the approximately 126 windows in the building. He is now requesting the HLC grant approval for the replacement of the remaining windows.

A majority of the existing windows are original from the 1929 construction. They are wood casement style windows with a large frame, and small panes with divider muntins in the top ¼ section.

The replacement window proposed is a vinyl slider style window that would be painted to match the trim color of the original windows. The windows are double paned with false muntins between the panes to match the original style (see photos exhibit B). The Historic District Design Guidelines state that the installation of vinyl windows should be reviewed on a case by case basis, requiring approval by the HLC. Normally, window replacements are reviewed administratively and only rise to the level of the Commission in the case of an appeal of an administrative action.

Comments

Public Comments

No public comment regarding this application was received as of the date of the preparation and distribution of this staff report.

Analysis and Findings

ZONING ORDINANCE AND DESIGN GUIDELINES

21A.34.020 H Historic Preservation Overlay District

G. Standards For Certificate Of Appropriateness For Alteration Of A Landmark Site Or Contributing

Structure: In considering an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness for alteration of a landmark site or contributing structure, the Historic Landmark Commission, or the Planning Director, for administrative decisions, shall find that the project substantially complies with all of the following general standards that pertain to the application and that the decision is in the best interest of the City:

Standard 1: A property shall be used for its historic purpose or be used for a purpose that requires minimal change to the defining characteristics of the building and its site and environment;

Analysis: The use of the property will not change.

Finding: The proposal meets this standard.

Standard 2: The historic character of a property shall be retained and preserved. The removal of historic materials or alteration of features and spaces that characterize a property shall be avoided;

Analysis: A majority of the remaining windows are original. They are however, in poor repair. The applicant states that the majority do not properly operate, are broken, or have been modified

significantly and as such, many have been nailed shut so that they do not fall out of place (see photos exhibit B).

Planning Staff asserts that the primary issue with the proposed slider windows is that they do not appropriately replicate the muntins of the originals. Typically, a more substantial muntin would separate side-by-side windows of this nature. This window grid pattern is an important feature in the architecture of the building. An internal grid (sandwiched between the double panes of glass) has been installed on the existing vinyl windows. Planning Staff finds that this internal system is not consistent with the historic characteristics of the windows that are proposed to be replaced. Therefore, the grids should be removed from the newly replaced windows, and substantial exterior muntins should be installed on the replacement windows. Internal grid patterns are never appropriate for windows on the primary façade (and perhaps secondary or rear facades) for structures in the City's historic districts, nor have they ever been approved.

Finding: In general, the side-by-side double-hung windows installed, and those proposed, on the front façade retain and preserve the historic character of the subject home. The absence of a substantial muntin feature on these windows is inconsistent with the historic configuration of windows of this nature, and therefore detracts from retaining and preserving the historic character of this property. To be more historically accurate, a substantial muntin feature is needed. Because of the lack of this feature in the windows installed and those proposed Planning Staff finds that the application can only be approved if a substantial exterior muntin is installed in all replacement windows.

Standard 3: All sites, structures, and objects shall be recognized as products of their own time. Alterations that have no historical basis and which seek to create a false sense of history or architecture are not allowed;

Analysis: The finished and proposed windows on the building do not create a false sense of history. In general, the newly replaced and further proposed windows accurately reflect the original historic character of the building in their style and dimensions. As noted previously there are outstanding issues related to the muntins in the windows.

Finding: The windows replaced, and those that are proposed to be replaced, do not create a false sense of history, and in general reflect the original historic character of the home in their style and dimensions.

Standard 4: Alterations or additions that have acquired historic significance in their own right shall be retained and preserved;

Analysis: No alterations or additions to the building are proposed to be modified.

Finding: This standard is not applicable.

Standard 5: Distinctive features, finishes and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a historic property shall be preserved;

Standard 6: Deteriorated architectural features shall be repaired rather than replaced wherever feasible. In the event replacement is necessary, the new material should match the material being replaced in composition, design, texture and other visual qualities. Repair or replacement of missing architectural features should be based on accurate duplications of features, substantiated by historic, physical or pictorial evidence rather than on conjectural designs or the availability of different architectural elements from other structures or objects.

Applicable Design Criteria for Standards 5 and 6:

3.5 Match a replacement window to the original in its design: If the original is double-hung, then the replacement window should also be double-hung, or at a minimum appear to be so. Match the replacement also in the number and position of glass panes. Matching the original design is particularly important on key character-defining facades.

3.6 Match the profile of the sash and its components, as closely as possible to that of the original window: A historic wood window has a complex profile—within its casing, the sash steps back to the plane of the glazing (glass) in several increments. These increments, which individually only measure in eighths or quarters of inches, are important details. They distinguish the actual window from the surrounding plane of the wall. The profiles of wood windows allow a double-hung window, for example, to bring a rich texture to the simplest structure. In general, it is best to replace wood windows with wood on contributing structures, especially on the primary façade. Non-wood materials, such as vinyl or aluminum, will be reviewed on a case-by-case basis, and the following will be considered: will the original casing be preserved? Will the glazing be substantially diminished? What finish is proposed? More importantly, what is the profile of the proposed replacement window?

3.7 In a replacement window, use materials that appear similar to the original: Using the same material as the original is preferred, especially on key character defining facades. However, a substitute material may be considered in secondary locations if the appearance of the window components will match those of the original in dimension, profile and finish.

Analysis: The vinyl windows chosen to replace the existing wood windows generally meet the design criteria for replacement windows (with the exception of the muntins discussed above). The style is similar to the originals, and the profile of the windows generally meets the criteria as well. The applicant is proposing to retain the original casing of the window and to retain the original glazing pattern of the windows.

The crux of the discussion is whether or not all of the windows have degenerated to the point that they need to be replaced. Many of the windows are in need of replacement. They have been broken, abused, and generally poorly maintained over the years. On the other hand, there are other windows that are in a state where they could be repaired. Nonetheless, staff finds that as a whole, the state of the windows in the building is poor, and they are in need of replacement.

Finding: In general, the windows installed, and those chosen for installation, meet Standard 6 based on duplications of features.

Standard 7: Chemical or physical treatments, such as sandblasting, that cause damage to historic materials shall not be used. The surface cleaning of structures, if appropriate, shall be undertaken using the gentlest means possible.

Analysis: This proposal does not involve chemical or physical treatments.

Finding: This criteria is not applicable.

Standard 8: Contemporary design for alterations and additions to existing properties shall not be discouraged when such alterations and additions do not destroy significant cultural, historical, architectural, or archaeological material, and such design is compatible with the size, scale, color, material, and character of the property, neighborhood, or environment;

Applicable Design Guidelines for Standard 8:

3.0 Background: Windows are some of the most important character-defining features of most historic structures. They give scale to buildings and provide visual interest to the composition of individual facades. Distinct window designs in fact help define many historic building types.

3.0 Window Features: The size, shape, and proportions of a historic window are among its essential features. Many early residential windows in Salt Lake City were vertically-proportioned, for example. Another important feature is the number of “lights,” or panes, into which a window is divided.

Analysis: In general, the window replacements on the front and rear facades meet this standard, as they are compatible with the size, scale, design and character of the older windows, with the exception of the muntins discussed above.

Finding: The proposed windows will not destroy significant cultural, historical, architectural or archaeological material.

Standard 9: Additions or alterations to structures and objects shall be done in such a manner that if such additions or alterations were to be removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the structure would be unimpaired. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible in massing, size, scale and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment;

Analysis: No addition is proposed.

Finding: This standard is not applicable.

Standard 10: Certain building materials are prohibited including the following:

- a. Vinyl or aluminum cladding when applied directly to an original or historic material, and
- b. Any other imitation siding material designed to look like wood siding but fabricated from an imitation material or materials;

Analysis: This project does not include altering the siding of the dwelling.

Finding: This standard is not applicable.

Standard 11: Any new sign and any change in the appearance of any existing sign located on a landmark site or within the H historic preservation overlay district, which is visible from any public way or open space shall be consistent with the historic character of the landmark site or H historic preservation overlay district and shall comply with the standards outlined in part IV, [chapter 21A.46](#) of this title;

Analysis: The project does not include signs.

Finding: This standard is not applicable.

Standard 12: Additional design standards adopted by the Historic Landmark Commission and City Council.

Analysis: No other design standards apply.

Finding: No other design standards apply.

Attachment A
Letter from Applicant

Bridger Development

141 First Avenue, #101, Salt Lake City Ut, 84103
(801) 595-8068 Fax (801)596-3215

Dear Salt Lake City Planning,

My name is Lance Anderson I am the property manager for Bridger Development who is based in Seattle and owns approximately 100 apartment units thru-out the avenues of Salt Lake City. The owner of Bridger Development is Craig Robinson. His office # is 206-622-7454.

We own an apartment building at 205 2nd avenue called The Graylynn. This 28 unit apartment building has the worst windows in the city. We have windows that are just flat out dangerous and need to be replaced. Many times our residents have attempted to open a window only to have it stick. This forces our residents to use a little more force to open the window. When this happens our wood window frame will snap and a broken piece of glass will fall to the ground. This building has 4 stories. Many of these windows have been nailed shut because it is safer to make them a fixed window. They simply can't be repaired. Also when we purchased this building about 16 years ago there were a few windows that were replaced that didn't have the original look to the building. Unknowingly we have replaced approximately 19 windows without a permit. There are approximately 230 windows that should be replaced. We are applying for that permit.

I have been told that the 19 vinyl windows which we have replaced may not comply with the historical integrity which the avenues require. The windows which we have chosen to use have many more advantages than disadvantages. Please listen to our reasons for the vinyl windows.

Currently our windows have an egress of approximately 15 inches. These windows are on a hinge which swings outward to open. In order to keep the integrity of our building as close to its original look we chose a similar looking window that slides to open. This sliding has increased our egress to 20 inches. (Certainly a safer window for escape which our insurance company likes) Also this window when closed looks just like the original window, keeping its original integrity.

Our apartment units do not have air conditioning. Our residents must leave their windows open to help cool their apartments during the summer. Because these windows swing out ward to open a gust of wind can blow the window completely open and break the window frame and cause glass to tumble down. (this happens often) The new windows because they slide side to side to open will never snap because of a gust of wind.

Another advantage of the new windows is that we will be able to keep our residents warmer and more comfortable during the winter months. Costs to heat the units should go down drastically and help our building to be more environmentally friendly.

Replacing these windows will also clean the building up. The vinyl will have minimal maintenance. (Wood windows need to be repainted every 5 to 7 years) Also the cost of vinyl windows are much more affordable than wood windows. The cost to replace all of these wood windows with the same wood window is astronomical. Not to mention we would have to paint a new wood window after they were installed. Approximately 10 years ago we received bids to replace these windows with the same wood window and the cost was over \$250,000 that was 10 years ago. That didn't include paint. What would the cost be in today's market?



I have seen numerous buildings within a ½ mile radius of our building that have vinyl windows. They look great. Because there are so many building with vinyl and aluminum windows around us we assumed it was fine to use this kind of window. These are old buildings whose original windows were once wood. The buildings that have the original wood windows look terrible and are bringing down the neighborhood. Just take a drive for your self to see which looks better. I have also seen buildings with historical plaques which do not have wood windows. Old wood windows require a lot of maintenance and owners can't keep up with the maintenance that is required. The windows that I have seen look great and it is very hard to tell if they are wood or vinyl.

It just isn't logical to replace our windows with the same window. Just the increased egress alone make sense. I have included pictures of our current windows and pictures of a few windows that have been replaced. We believe the windows that we have installed and want to install will maintain the historical character of the building and the area. I have many compliments on the new windows which we have replaced. My residents are anxious for us to continue replacing these windows. I have also included the specifications of our new windows. I hope you will give us a permit so we can continue the project. My phone # is 801-595-8068.

Thank you,



Lance Anderson
Bridger Development

 <p>National Fenestration Rating Council®</p> <p>CERTIFIED</p>	 <p>3052 SOUTH 460 WEST SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH 84115 OFFICE (801) 886-8000 FAX (801) 908-0376</p> <p>Sunview Series Vinyl Frame Window</p> <p>Double Glazing • Argon Fill • Low E Product Type: Horizontal Slider w/ Grids Emissivity 0.22 CPD# ADV-A-2</p>
<p>ENERGY PERFORMANCE RATINGS</p>	
<p>U-Factor (U.S./I-P)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">0.30</p>	<p>Solar Heat Gain Coefficient</p> <p style="text-align: center;">0.20</p>
<p>ADDITIONAL PERFORMANCE RATINGS</p>	
<p>Visible Transmittance</p> <p style="text-align: center;">0.47</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">_____</p>
<p>Manufacturer stipulates that these ratings conform to applicable NFRC procedures for determining whole product performance. NFRC ratings are determined for a fixed set of environmental conditions and a specific product size. NFRC does not recommend any product and does not warrant the suitability of any product for any specific use. Consult manufacturer's literature for other product performance information.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">www.nfrc.com</p>	

Attachment B
Photos

Beyond Repair







East side

wind has done its damage



East side

Existing windows



Attachment C
Historic Information

Researcher: Kathryn McKay
Date:

Site No. _____

Utah State Historical Society
Historic Preservation Research Office
Structure/Site Information Form

1 IDENTIFICATION

Street Address: 205 2nd Avenue Plat D Bl. 41 Lot 2
Name of Structure: The Graylyn T. R. S.
Present Owner: Preckleton, Wayne B. & Aileen UTM:
Owner Address: Tax #:

2 AGE/CONDITION/USE

Original Owner: Paul E. Keyser Construction Date: 1929 ca. Demolition Date:
Original Use: multi-family
Present Use: Occupants:
 Single-Family Park Vacant
 Multi-Family Industrial Religious
 Public Agricultural Other
 Commercial
Building Condition: Integrity:
 Excellent Site Unaltered
 Good Ruins Minor Alterations
 Deteriorated Major Alterations

3 STATUS

Preliminary Evaluation: Final Register Status:
 Significant National Landmark District
 Contributory National Register Multi-Resource
 Not Contributory State Register Thematic
 Intrusion

4 DOCUMENTATION

Photography: 5/77
Date of Slides: Views: Front Side Rear Other
Date of Photographs: Views: Front Side Rear Other

Research Sources:

<input type="checkbox"/> Abstract of Title	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> City Directories	<input type="checkbox"/> LDS Church Archives
<input type="checkbox"/> Plat Records	<input type="checkbox"/> Biographical Encyclopedias	<input type="checkbox"/> LDS Genealogical Society
<input type="checkbox"/> Plat Map	<input type="checkbox"/> Obituary Index	<input type="checkbox"/> U of U Library
<input type="checkbox"/> Tax Cards & Photo	<input type="checkbox"/> County & City Histories	<input type="checkbox"/> BYU Library
<input type="checkbox"/> Building Permit	<input type="checkbox"/> Personal Interviews	<input type="checkbox"/> USU Library
<input type="checkbox"/> Sewer Permit	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Newspapers	<input type="checkbox"/> SLC Library
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sanborn Maps	<input type="checkbox"/> Utah State Historical Society Library	<input type="checkbox"/> Other

Bibliographical References (books, articles, records, interviews, old photographs and maps, etc.):

Salt Lake Tribune, November 21, 1945.
Polk, Salt Lake City Directory, 1925.
Sanborn Maps, 1898-

5
ARCHITECTURE

Architect/Builder:

Building Materials: brick

Building Type/Style:

Description of physical appearance & significant architectural features:

(Exclude additions, alterations, ancillary structures, and landscaping if applicable)

The decoration of this three-story apartment block, with basement below, shows the influence of the Gothic and Jacobethan Revival Styles popular in the period. The truncated hip roof has a steep center gable with half-timber decoration. The facade, of brick, has small paned casement windows arranged in horizontal bands. Between the windows are vertical brick panels and two pillasters above the entry corbelled out at the top to carry the gable. The entry is framed in carved stone with a flamboyant Gothic arch and the door and side window have small, diamond shaped panes.

-----Thomas W. Hanchett



6
HISTORY

Statement of Historical Significance:

- | | | | |
|---|---|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Aboriginal Americans | <input type="checkbox"/> Communication | <input type="checkbox"/> Military | <input type="checkbox"/> Religion |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Agriculture | <input type="checkbox"/> Conservation | <input type="checkbox"/> Mining | <input type="checkbox"/> Science |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Architecture | <input type="checkbox"/> Education | <input type="checkbox"/> Minority Groups | <input type="checkbox"/> Socio-Humanitarian |
| <input type="checkbox"/> The Arts | <input type="checkbox"/> Exploration/Settlement | <input type="checkbox"/> Political | <input type="checkbox"/> Transportation |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Commerce | <input type="checkbox"/> Industry | <input type="checkbox"/> Recreation | |

These apartments reflect the shift in the Avenues in the 1920-30 era from single to multi-family dwellings.

The apartments, called the Graylyn, replaced a pre-1898 two-story brick house. They were built about 1929 by Paul E. Keysor (1889-1945), a prominent Salt Lake City businessman, and club and civic leader. He and his brothers George D. and Malcolm A. had many property holdings in the Avenues.