

**SALT LAKE CITY
HISTORIC LANDMARK COMMISSION
Minutes of the Meeting
Room 326, 451 South State Street
July 7, 2011**

This document along with the digital recording constitute the official minutes of the Historic Landmark Commission regular session meeting held on July 7, 2011.

Historic Landmark Commission Meetings are televised on SLCTV 17. Archived video of this meeting can be found at the following link under, "Historic Landmark Commission and RDA":
http://www.slctv.com/vid_demand.htm,

A regular meeting of the Historic Landmark Commission was called to order on Thursday, July 7, 2011, at [6:03:30 PM](#) in Room 326 of the City and County Building, located at 451 South State Street, Salt Lake City, Utah, 84111. Commissioners present for the meeting included Earle Bevins III, Arla Funk, Sheleigh Harding, Polly Hart, Acting Chairperson Anne Oliver and Commissioner Dave Richards. Commissioners Bill Davis, Creed Haymond, Stephen James and Chairperson Warren Lloyd were excused.

Planning staff present for the meeting included Cheri Coffey, Assistant Planning Director; Thomas Irvin, Principal Planner; Janice Lew, Senior Planner; Ray Milliner, Principal Planner; Joel Paterson, Planning Manager; Elizabeth Reining, Principal Planner and Cecily Zuck, Senior Secretary.

FIELD TRIP

The Commissioners left the City and County Building at 4:00 p.m. and visited the sites of the public hearings that evening:

PLNHLC201-00167, 336 South 1200 East; Staff described proposed modifications. The Commission asked about the proposed design of the dormer on the north side of the home and the design details of the proposed roof modification to the rear.

PLNHLC2011-00296, 632 South 700 East; Staff described the project. The Commission inquired about the condition of the windows scheduled for replacement and whether or not the windows could be repaired. The Commission questioned the proposed window design and why the Salt Lake County Community Action Program was the applicant for the window replacement project.

DINNER AND WORK SESSION

Dinner was served to the Commission and staff at 5:00 p.m. in Room 326.

Sign Guidelines [5:11:49 PM](#)

Ray Milliner noted staff was working to revise all of the design guidelines and he was charged with drafting guidelines for signs in historic districts, which were to be published separately from the other guidelines. Milliner reviewed the draft which had been distributed in a memo attached with these minutes. He noted staff had begun to incorporate informational sections in all of the guidelines which would redirect readers to the National Parks Service (NPS) Brief for a

particular standard or issue. He inquired if the Commission had any comments or questions regarding the proposed format before staff proceeded to create the entire document.

Commissioner Hart noted the document should somehow clarify what the guidelines were influenced by; whether it was City Code, National Parks Standards or another source.

Acting Chairperson Oliver inquired how many guidelines were currently included.

Mr. Milliner stated there were around forty.

Commissioner Richards noted he appreciated the links to related NPS Briefs included in the document.

Acting Chairperson Oliver inquired if the document would be available as a stand-alone document to applicants when applying for a sign permit.

Mr. Milliner noted this was the hope; an applicant would be able to reference the document at the counter and beforehand on the web.

Commissioner Bevins inquired if the policy would encourage retention of historically significant signs such as those painted on the sides of buildings.

Mr. Milliner noted it would be strongly encouraged in the guidelines.

Ms. Coffey noted staff would likely change the ordinance as well in certain instances to aid the guidelines and that might be one of the issues addressed.

Commissioner Hart noted this exact situation had occurred recently on a building in the University District.

Commissioner Richards inquired if signs were still handled under a separate building permit.

Mr. Milliner noted they were.

Ms. Coffey stated certain existing signs would not be allowed under current ordinances and there was language in the ordinance that the HLC could make a recommendation to the Board of Adjustment to consider retention of such a sign; staff might work to change that language so such items could come directly before the Commission instead.

Commissioner Richards inquired what signs would not be allowed under the current ordinance.

Ms. Coffey noted new roof signs were not allowed.

Commissioner Richards noted existing signs were grandfathered in.

Ms. Coffey concurred with Commissioner Richards. She inquired if the Commission knew of any other related issues which might be addressed in the document.

Several Commissioners noted the document should pay particular attention to the treatment of awnings, pole signs and color as these items had been misinterpreted in the past and had caused issues within local districts as a result.

Mr. Milliner noted that these issues would be addressed in greater detail as well as illumination and monument signs.

Acting Chairperson Oliver inquired if the sign guidelines would apply to existing and new construction.

Mr. Milliner noted they would apply to any new sign within a local district.

Commissioner Richards inquired if the document would address number of signs allowed and the maximum square footage.

Mr. Milliner noted the document currently did not; staff felt it better to address these issues through the City Zoning Ordinance. Mr. Milliner stated that the guidelines would include general statements such as, “the design of the sign should be compatible with the architecture of the structure and should be located within the areas of the building designed for signs”.

Tracy Aviary [5:31:08 PM](#)

Mr. Milliner noted that as part of the ongoing Tracy Aviary renovation, the Aviary was now beginning the design phase for their Tropical Bird Exhibit. He noted the applicant had brought preliminary drawings for the Commission to review.

Paul Svensen, with Friends of Tracy Aviary (FOTA), presented the concept plan. He noted that existing buildings being renovated during this phase would retain their current appearance. He reviewed the current plan, which included the following elements:

1. **Office House** (old curator house at center of the Aviary): Not originally a part of the bond scope, but funds may be available for building renovation. The structure would become an interpretive area, possibly a “migration station”.
2. **Holding Building**: A new facility for the Aviary’s show birds.
3. **Stage**: incorporated into the Holding Building with a naturalistic feel including a water feature, a front façade with rock work and landscaping, providing a natural setting for future shows.
4. **Amphitheatre**: public seating area facing the stage, also intended to be fairly naturalistic in design to blend into environs with landscaped, stepped seating.
5. **Old Lorikeet Building**: would be renovated to be a public restroom facility with a small janitorial closet. Birds from that building will move to building #7.
6. **Tropical Building**: would include a new central plaza and would be approximately 7500 square feet or slightly smaller than the existing Wilson Pavilion. The building entry would begin at two stories and would include release areas to the exterior of the structure. As the building moved to the rear it would step up to almost reach the maximum building height in that zone, 35 feet. He noted the roof might be comprised of a Teflon roof material used in the China Olympics Swimming Cube which would allow complete UV penetration into the building as well as a mechanical roof component to leave the exhibit

open in all but the most inclement of weather. He noted the building was meant to create an immersive experience with birds throughout an open landscaped space as indicated in drawings included in the memo attached to these minutes.

7. **Holding Building:** to replace capacity lost in old lorikeet holding facility as well as overflow from the new tropical birds' exhibit. Cross sections were reviewed.

Commissioner Richards inquired about exterior materials for the new holding building.

Mr. Svensen noted the material was likely to be CMU (concrete block) with a veneer that could be indicative of shiplap siding or another material if the Commission had a preference.

Commissioner Bevins inquired how large the new stage would be.

Mr. Svensen stated the new stage would be similar to the existing, but would include significantly larger viewer capacity in the amphitheatre seating area. He noted that the Aviary would like to have bird shows more frequently throughout the day, however, a typical raptor would be full through their reinforcement (food rewards) during one show, so holding capacity needed to be increased and more birds trained in order to have more shows.

Acting Chairperson Oliver noted that the plan looked lovely, however, the Commission's primary concern would be with the exterior materials, their appearance and how they worked in the context of their surroundings; the plan did not speak much to these details.

Mr. Svensen noted he could bring section drawings to the Commission as they became available. He stated the two challenges he foresaw were the height and design of the tropical building and the design of the holding building to be located on the periphery of the Aviary, which would be highly visible.

Ms. Coffey noted the applicant could come back before the Commission as the project detailing evolved.

Mr. Svensen noted FOTA envisioned some kind of solid façade at the bottom of the Tropical Building, but would likely incorporate fenestration at the top, probably a large clerestory. He stated they hoped the structure would also be LEED Silver certified.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES from June 2, 2011 [6:04:09 PM](#)

Commissioner Funk moved to approve the minutes from June 2, 2011 as written. Commissioner Harding seconded. Commissioners Bevins, Funk, Harding and Richards all voted, "Aye". Commissioner Hart abstained from the vote as she was not present on June 2nd. The minutes stand approved as written.

REPORT OF THE CHAIR AND VICE CHAIR [6:04:45 PM](#)

Acting Chairperson Oliver noted this meeting would have been Warren Lloyd's last as chairperson and honored him in absentia. She stated she had nothing further to report.

Mr. Paterson inquired if there were any dates at the end of August which might work for the Commission's 2011 Preservation Awards.

Ms. Coffey noted that both Commissioner Haymond and Chairperson Lloyd's second terms had expired and both would be presented with plaques for their service at the awards. Ms. Coffey stated that they were looking for applicants to fill these positions.

Commissioner Funk noted she did not know if she had been reappointed yet.

Ms. Coffey noted that if a member had only served one term, they could continue to serve until reappointed or until someone else was appointed to take their place.

Mr. Paterson stated that the Preservation Philosophy Statement had been refined according to the comments of the Commission and had been transmitted to City Council. He noted that staff had anticipated a briefing with the Council on July 19th, but it appeared it would instead occur at a later date.

PUBLIC COMMENTS [6:08:13 PM](#)

Cindy Cromer, 816 East 100 South, noted there was a public meeting scheduled for the West Liberty Neighborhood intended to discuss historic preservation. She asked that some Commissioners might attend and clarify the difference between the National and City Registers. Cromer hoped the Commission could also at some point identify which neighborhoods it may intend to include on the City Register as well. She noted it used to be that the City Register nomination came before the National Register nomination.

Ms. Coffey added these were issues staff wished to address in the future as well. She noted the National Register was a great tool, but it might be that there were neighborhoods which should only be National Register Districts and others which required greater protection under the City Register.

Al Heath, 644 Ely Place, noted his concern that the ice cream sign on the Jimmy Johns building at the northeast corner of 600 East and 400 South had been painted black. He noted it did not make sense to retain the sign, which didn't have a clear value in his eyes, and had become a headache for the current business owner. He inquired why it was there. Mr. Heath also indicated there was a home next door to the subject property for PLNHLC2011-00296 which was severely dilapidated and needed attention from the City.

Acting Chairperson Oliver stated Mr. Heath should file a complaint with the City as the Commission couldn't take action against a property that hadn't submitted an application.

Mr. Paterson noted Mr. Heath could file a complaint with Zoning Enforcement.

Mr. Heath asked what could be done about the sign.

Acting Chairperson Oliver noted the sign would remain.

PUBLIC HEARINGS [6:20:59 PM](#)

PLNHLC2011-00167; 336 South 1200 East, Certificate of Appropriateness for Major Alterations – a request by Creed Haymond to create a second story addition by modifying the rear roof line, adding a dormer and constructing a second story walk-out deck. The single family home is located in the University Historic District and the R-2 (Single and Two Family Residential) zoning district and within City Council District Four, represented by Council Member Luke Garrott. (Staff contact: Thomas Irvin, 801-535-7932 or thomas.irvin@slcgov.com.)

Staff Presentation [6:21:45 PM](#)

Acting Chairperson Oliver recognized Thomas Irvin as staff representative.

Mr. Irvin reviewed the proposal. He noted the home was considered a contributing structure in the University Historic District. He displayed the west elevation of the home, indicating the applicant wished to alter that roof form from a hipped to a gable end, providing additional interior space and installing an elevated deck over an existing trellis system. Mr. Irvin noted the applicant had proposed to install either a shed or a hipped dormer on the north roof. He noted the applicant also proposed to install aluminum clad sliding doors designed to look like French doors leading to the deck on the west elevation, an aluminum clad window on the new dormer and a wood railing on the elevated deck area. Mr. Irvin stated the applicant intended to match the existing asphalt shingles and stucco colored to match the existing material would also be used.

Mr. Irvin noted the reasons for bringing the project before the Commission were to; get a specific determination on which dormer style would be more appropriate for the home, and review the staff recommendation that some type of differentiation be provided between the historic gable ended roofline and the addition. He stated staff could also approve specific architectural detailing once full construction drawings had been submitted.

There were no questions from the Commission for staff.

Applicant Presentation [6:25:00 PM](#)

Creed Haymond, the property owner, reviewed the history of the home. Mr. Haymond stated that he wished to install an aluminum clad awning window on the bathroom addition, backwards and upside down so it would open like a hopper and the wood would face outward. Mr. Haymond noted his reason for requesting the shed roof as it matched another lower level addition to the home and would have less of an impact on the driveway and the home next door. Mr. Haymond noted he was willing to provide a differentiation on the addition in material as he could not alter the form of the addition without either compromising its structural integrity or sacrificing needed interior headroom.

Questions from the Commission [6:33:54 PM](#)

Commissioner Richards noted Mr. Haymond's drawings seemed to be in conflict with one another, particularly on the west elevation with the sliding doors. He noted that with the hip receding from the addition, there would be a slight differentiation.

Mr. Haymond noted he would prefer to follow that drawing but the concept would place the weight on the inside bearing wall which would not be possible.

Commissioner Richards stated it might be possible with reinforcement of the floor framing. He noted that installing a clipped hip dormer on the north would be more in keeping with the style of the home.

Public Comments [6:38:15 PM](#)

Seeing no one present to speak to the issue, Acting Chairperson Oliver moved to executive session.

Executive Session [6:38:22 PM](#)

Acting Chairperson Oliver noted there were two issues to address; firstly, the preferred form for the proposed dormer roof, and secondly, the design of the addition to the rear.

Commissioner Hart stated that whichever form of dormer was built, its success would come from the details. She noted her concern regarding the lack of differentiation.

Acting Chairperson Oliver concurred. She noted the depth of the existing eaves and that replicating this shadow line would make a difference.

Commissioner Richards stated that the detailing of the dormer addition on the opposite side of the home was fairly simple and would be easy to match. He noted that with its low visibility, he did not take issue with the preferred shed roof form for the dormer.

Acting Chairperson Oliver noted she appreciated the drawing for the rear addition submitted to the Commission, but did not understand enough about the cost or construction of such reinforcement to know if it would be possible.

Commissioner Richards stated it was likely you could sister up the framing in the rear area to bear the load, but it was difficult to know how costly it would be without looking directly at the framing in place. He noted an engineer could give Mr. Haymond a clearer picture of what was possible.

Acting Chairperson Oliver inquired what staff meant by incorporating a roof vent.

Mr. Irvin stated that current code usually required additional venting and that the applicant might consider a shingle ridge roof vent at that location to differentiate between the two.

Commissioner Funk noted she did not feel a need to differentiate between the two as the change seemed fairly minor.

Commissioner Richards concurred.

Motion [6:47:32 PM](#)

In the case of PLNHLC2011-00167; Commissioner Funk moved to approve a shed roof dormer and require no type of delineation to differentiate between the historic roofline and the new addition, leaving architectural detailing to staff to approve.

Commissioner Richards seconded the motion.

There was no discussion of the motion.

Commissioners Funk, Harding, Hart and Richards voted, “Aye”. Commissioner Bevins voted in opposition. The motion passed, 4-1.

Acting Chairperson Oliver moved to the next item on the evening’s agenda.

PLNHLC2011-00296; 632 South 700 East, Certificate of Appropriateness for Replacement Windows - a request by Thomas Camoin of Salt Lake Community Action Program, representing property owner Caroline Gutarra, to replace existing windows on the sides of the property, which is a single-family building. The property is located in the Central City Historic District and the RMF-30 (Low Density Multi-Family Residential) zoning district and within City Council District Four, represented by Council Member Luke Garrott. (Staff contact: Elizabeth Reining, 801-535-6313 or elizabeth.reining@slcgov.com.)

Staff Presentation [6:49:42 PM](#)

Acting Chairperson Oliver recognized Elizabeth Reining as staff representative.

Ms. Reining noted that the subject property was part of a cluster of single family residences on the block directly south of Trolley Square. She noted the applicant was the Salt Lake Community Action Program (CAP) on behalf of the property owner and the applicant wished to replace five windows as part of weatherization of the home. She stated the windows in question were along the south side of the building and not visible from the street. Ms. Reining noted it was staff’s opinion that the request be denied as the windows were original, of sound condition and the house, built in 1915, was considered a contributing structure in the district. Ms. Reining stated staff had discussed alternatives to replacement such as installing storm windows, weather stripping and caulking, but CAP would prefer to pursue replacement of the windows. She noted that the State Historic Preservation Office had approved the application under Section 106, which did not have the same standards the City used to issue Certificates of Appropriateness. Ms. Reining reviewed elevation photos detailing the windows to be replaced.

Ms. Reining stated the proposed replacement windows would be vinyl, double-paned, single hung units. Staff felt that the proposed replacement did not meet five of the twelve standards listed under section 21A.34.020G. Staff also felt there were viable options other than replacement of the original windows which should be pursued beforehand.

Questions from the Commission [6:54:38 PM](#)

Commissioner Harding inquired why CAP wasn't interested in weatherization alternatives such as caulking or installing storm windows.

Ms. Reining noted the CAP representative could answer those questions.

Commissioner Richards noted that current code did not generally allow openings within three feet of the property line and if replacing entire windows, they may not be allowed by code.

Commissioner Hart inquired if the Commission ever allowed vinyl window replacements.

Ms. Coffey noted that the Commission did; the profile and detailing should match existing, however, vinyl windows were usually allowed on less visible facades of a building.

Commissioner Bevins inquired after the difference between Section 106 and City standards.

Ms. Reining noted Section 106 standards pertained to inter-agency agreements on projects receiving federal funds. She noted that this particular project was receiving American Recovery and Reinvestment Act monies. She stated Section 106 standards were not as rigorous as either SHPO's other standards or the City's standards for COAs.

Applicant Presentation [6:57:37 PM](#)

Thomas Camoin, with the Salt Lake CAP, noted he was a fan of historic homes and had worked on windows all his life but would argue some of these windows were not repairable. Mr. Camoin noted that all window casings would remain intact. He stated the property had homes to the side and the rear were both abandoned and boarded. Mr. Camoin stated that CAP could not afford to purchase better replacement windows than these. He noted the windows to be replaced also had lead paint on them and friction over time had released this paint into the air.

Commissioner Richards inquired if the sills would remain.

Mr. Camoin noted one of the sills would have to be replaced, however, they would try to maintain as much as was possible.

Commissioner Harding inquired if they had considered storm windows.

Mr. Camoin noted that storms had not proven to be effective enough through the National Energy Audit Tool (NEAT) which his agency used to assess such projects.

Commissioner Bevins inquired if the glazing had been replaced.

Mr. Camoin noted that it could have been replaced in the past.

Commissioner Hart and Acting Chairperson Oliver noted there seemed to be a mix of new and old glass in the windows.

Commissioner Funk noted the Commission had seen data that gave very different results and indicated storms would pay back.

Mr. Camoin noted he could not use storms.

Seeing no further questions from the Commission and no one from the public to speak to the item, Acting Chairperson Oliver moved to executive session.

Executive Session [7:07:45 PM](#)

Commissioner Bevins noted the windows were not very visible, which could be considered a mitigating factor. He stated the replacement window in the front gable was much more troubling to him.

Commissioner Hart noted the front gable window was installed illegally as there was no Certificate of Appropriateness or permit on file.

Acting Chairperson Oliver noted the presentation on June 2, 2011 had persuaded many members of the Commission through a growing body of research that most energy loss occurred through the roof and the floor and energy loss through the windows could usually be mitigated through minor improvements such as weather stripping and installing storm windows.

Commissioner Funk concurred and noted that this research also indicated it took quite a bit of time to recoup the cost of replacing existing windows with new.

Commissioner Richards noted he felt it was difficult to obtain exact cost data in any case; that costs varied greatly as durability relied not only upon the material but also exterior weather conditions and the level of exposure to these elements.

Commissioner Harding noted they also needed to consider the architectural significance of the windows.

Acting Chairperson Oliver noted that though staff indicated this was an Arts and Crafts Vernacular Style home built in 1915, the home was, in her opinion, much older and the windows scheduled for replacement were one of the few remaining indications of this. She noted the detail on the bottom edge of the upper sash was indicative of a building from the 1880s or 1890s; the windows were therefore a key to understanding the structure and its history.

Commissioner Hart noted the drop detail on either side of the top sash was something which began to disappear by the early 1890s and reiterated it was one of the few details which revealed the true age of the home.

Acting Chairperson Oliver noted this detail was not present on the two windows at the back of the house which indicated it was either a later addition or at the least had been altered. She noted the front of the home may also have been a later addition. Acting Chairperson Oliver stated the existing home adjacent to the subject property might also be demolished in the future as it was a severely dilapidated and boarded structure; this would only serve to increase the visibility of the windows.

Commissioner Bevins referred to the preservation goals for Central City, particularly the overall goals for the district which noted the primary goal was to preserve the street character, allowing for more flexibility in other areas. He questioned how the Commission should weigh this factor.

Acting Chairperson Oliver noted this was a good point.

Motion [7:16:27 PM](#)

In the case of PLNHLC2011-00296, Commissioner Funk moved to support the staff recommendation that the project failed to substantially comply with the standards which pertained to the application and therefore is denied on the basis of the findings in the staff report.

Commissioner Hart seconded the motion.

Discussion [7:17:03 PM](#)

Commissioner Richards noted the only thing that seemed to be lost would be the scrollwork on the upper sash. He stated he felt it to be a reasonable case to approve. He noted the Commission should work to develop a clearer standard as to how they wanted to handle future window replacement cases.

Acting Chairperson Oliver noted Commissioner Bevins' point raised earlier that standards were not the same in every district and stated the Commission should consider reviewing this policy.

Seeing no further comments, Acting Chairperson Oliver called for a vote.

Commissioners Funk, Harding and Hart voted, "Aye". Commissioners Bevins and Richards voted, "Nay". The motion carried, 3-2.

Acting Chairperson Oliver noted the applicant had ten days to appeal the decision of the Commission if they wished to do so.

OTHER BUSINESS [7:18:42 PM](#)

The Commission had no further business to discuss.

Commissioner Funk moved to adjourn. There was no objection. The meeting stood adjourned at [7:18:59 PM](#).

Cecily Zuck, Historic Landmark Commission Secretary