

**SALT LAKE CITY
HISTORIC LANDMARK COMMISSION
Minutes of the Meeting
Room 326, 451 South State Street
June 2, 2011**

This document along with the digital recording constitute the official minutes of the Historic Landmark Commission regular session meeting held on June 2, 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, June 2, 2011, at [5:45:17 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, Bill Davis, Arla Funk, Sheleigh Harding, Creed Haymond, Stephen James, Chairperson Warren Lloyd, Vice Chairperson Anne Oliver and Commissioner Dave Richards. Commissioner Polly Hart was excused from the meeting.

Planning staff present for the meeting included Janice Lew, Senior Planner; Carl Leith, Senior Planner; Ray Milliner, Principal Planner; Joel Paterson, Planning Manager and Cecily Zuck, Senior Secretary.

There was no field trip prior to the meeting.

Dinner was served to the Commission at 5:00 p.m. in Room 326; the Commission had no business to discuss.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES from May 5, 2011 [5:45:44 PM](#)

Vice Chairperson Oliver moved to approve the minutes from May 5, 2011 as written. Commissioner James seconded. Commissioners Bevins, Davis, Funk, Harding, Haymond, James, Richards and Vice Chairperson Oliver all voted, "Aye". The minutes stand approved unanimously.

REPORT OF THE CHAIR AND VICE CHAIR [5:46:26 PM](#)

Chairperson Lloyd noted he had nothing to report. Vice Chairperson Oliver concurred.

PUBLIC COMMENTS [5:46:40 PM](#)

Katherine Gardener, Chairperson of the Capitol Hill Community Council, noted her concern over the former Hansen Station and its future use. Ms. Gardner noted the station had closed. She stated her frustration that there seemed to be no action on the part of the City to provide a change in zoning for this property when others in the area had received them so easily. Ms. Gardner stated the Capitol Hill Community Council was thankfully now working with staff member Nole Walkingshaw to create a small business amendment for the troubled property.

Mr. Paterson noted that staff had met with Ms. Gardner and representatives of the property owner to discuss options, but no one had come forward with a petition. He noted that the Mayor's Office and the City Council had been approached about initiating a rezoning petition; however, the property owner was told he would need to initiate one. He stated the request had instead been rolled into the Small Neighborhood Business Amendment (SNBA) and staff was glad to continue working with Ms. Gardner to find a solution.

Commissioner Lloyd inquired how the proposed amendment would aid this request.

Mr. Paterson noted Mr. Walkingshaw hoped to use the property as a possible case study for what could be accomplished with the SNBA.

As there were no public hearing items to be considered at this meeting of the Commission, Chairperson Lloyd moved to the workshop.

HISTORIC WINDOWS WORKSHOP [5:52:18 PM](#)

Chairperson Lloyd recognized staff member Carl Leith.

Mr. Leith stated windows encapsulated a number of the key issues facing historic preservation today; the stewardship of resources with cultural and historical significance, and the sensitive management of change. He noted that windows had a direct and major impact not only on the character of a structure itself, but also upon the street frontage, therefore becoming one of the most important character defining features.

Mr. Leith noted a window's characteristics helped to define the scale, dimensions and proportions of a building; creating a profile and modeling of the building's façades, varying with the fenestration, composition, materials, treatment of the glass and projection or recess. Mr. Leith stated that a window's characteristics also helped to express the age and maturity of a building, as well as its integrity.

Mr. Leith stated that one might argue that preservation of historic windows aided in preserving the craftsmanship and intent of the original architecture of the building. Mr. Leith noted that a historic window, when properly maintained, could last almost indefinitely. He stated that most wood windows were repairable and inherently sustainable. Concluding the introduction, Mr. Leith quoted an article from the 2005 Journal of the APTI (Association for Preservation Technology International);

Retaining and celebrating authenticity is one key element of an exemplary preservation program. No one should take lightly the option of discarding authentic historic materials without fully evaluating the consequences. Once an authentic material is lost, it is lost forever. It does not matter how accurate a replacement window, it never reflects the nuances of the original.

Outfitting historic buildings with modern replacement windows can and does result in a mechanical, contrived or uniform and sterile appearance. Worse, when historic windows are replaced, the authenticity is lost forever.

Mr. Leith introduced Susie Petheram with CRSA to the Commission.

Ms. Petheram gave a presentation to the Commission She reviewed common myths about replacing old windows:

- **Common Myth #1: Replacement windows will save money.** Ms. Petheram noted that David Richardson with Capitol Hill Construction would elaborate upon this point later; but cost savings are minimal, amounting to a couple of hundred dollars a year at best and it could take 30-50 years to recoup the original cost.
- **Common Myth #2: Replacement windows are a no maintenance option.** Ms. Petheram noted windows were like any aspect of a home, they must be maintained regularly over time in order to last.
- **Common Myth #3: New windows are “green”.** Ms. Petheram noted that while the new windows might be somewhat more energy efficient, the embodied energy which went into the creation of materials and their distribution must also be considered.
- **Common Myth #4: Replacements are guaranteed.** Ms. Petheram stated that often, once these windows failed, either the owner who originally installed the windows was not present to reveal the manufacturer, or the business had ceased to exist. She also noted vinyl could not be repaired; therefore, it would be replaced and the failed product would be placed in a landfill, creating more waste.
- **Common Myth #5: New windows will look “okay”.** Ms. Petheram noted that this was of course, subject to opinion, but losing the original windows meant losing a crafted product meant to be a part of the original design of the home, and in general, replacement windows were usually not suitable when compared to the original.
- **Common Myth #6: New windows are energy efficient.** Often, savings are not as substantial as reported and the embodied energy of the original window is not considered.

David Richardson, AIA, with Capitol Hill Construction, noted that the presentation he would give to the Commission was one designed for the Utah Heritage Foundation several years ago. Mr. Richardson commended staff member Carl Leith for the documents he presented to the Commission. Following are highlights of Mr. Richardson’s presentation:

- Two bricks = one gallon of gas in terms of embodied energy. Imagine the energy lost in the demolition of one building.

- Heating and cooling accounts for approximately one-third of all household energy consumption.

Mr. Richardson reviewed a case study where the owners of a Greek Revival home in the Avenues had requested an energy efficiency upgrade. The following list denotes the order of largest heat loss;

1. **The attic.** The largest heat loss in the home; one-third of the home's energy was being lost through the roof.
2. **The floor.** Approximately 15% of the home's energy was being lost through the floor.
3. **Air infiltration.** Small leaks around doors, windows, vents and other cracks that could be easily fixed.
4. **The walls.** In this home, some heat was being lost through the cinderblock walls, but not as much as might be expected.
5. **Windows.** The windows represented the smallest amount of heat loss.

Considering these findings, what can a person do to best improve the energy efficiency of their home?

1. **Install a programmable thermostat.** Setting the temperature back at night on a programmable thermostat can simulate living in a warmer climate, using less overall energy. A programmable thermostat alone would pay for itself in two and a half weeks.
2. **Replace the furnace.** Newer furnace models can be up to 95% efficient, compared to "Old Model Ts" which are often around 65% efficient. A more efficient furnace can cut the cost of your gas in half and pay for itself within four years.
3. **Insulate the attic.** Insulating the attic is nearly free. It may cost a dollar a square foot to install, but will pay for itself very quickly.
4. **Insulate floors.** Insulating floors also creates a very quick return.
5. **Seal air leaks.** Remember that heat rises. Sealing leaky areas in floors and ceilings is often a very small and worthwhile investment. It only costs about twenty dollars to seal a leaky window.
6. **Insulate walls.** Wrapping the home in foam or insulating the interior of walls will also save energy, but is more costly.

These improvements would require a 25 year payback period overall.

What about replacement windows?

1. **Consider mathematics: 2x0 is still 0.** The R value (Capacity of an insulating material to resist heat flow. The higher the R value, the greater the insulating power). The R value of a wood window is about 1. The R value of the glass itself is approximately .74. The R value of a storm sash on a wood window is about 1.8. The R value of a new, double pane

window is between 2 and 2.5. The IBC code requires a minimum R value of 19 for wall insulation and a minimum R value of 38 or 40 for attic insulation.

2. **They never pay you back.** It takes longer to make up the energy savings than the average 20 year guaranteed life expectancy of a new double paned glass unit. The payback for installing a storm window is about 4.5 years; 40 years for a vinyl replacement unit; 34 years for a double pane low-E window.

At the conclusion of his presentation, Mr. Richardson commended staff for the documents they had provided for the Commission to review. He noted the document from Denver required an applicant to survey their windows before requesting replacements; a protocol the Commission might consider adopting in the near future.

Mr. Leith noted there was a link to Albany, Oregon in the list of resources provided for the Commission; window repair was a requirement of Albany's code.

Questions from the Commission [6:40:53 PM](#)

Commissioner James posed the dilemma the Commission had seen in the recent past where it was difficult to ascertain the value of a more vernacular, plain window. He inquired how the Commission might address the request of an applicant for a more ornate window they felt was more appropriate, or address the issue of several styles of windows from different periods on a home.

Mr. Richardson noted it was the job of HLC to continually educate home owners in local districts. He stated new homeowners needed to be reminded they chose to live in their neighborhood due to the aesthetic values which could be lost over time without preservation.

Vice Chairperson Oliver noted that the primary argument lately had not been about energy efficiency, but about ease of use and the cost of repair.

Commissioner James inquired if there were enough craftsmen in the area to meet demand.

Mr. Richardson noted he believed there were.

Ms. Petheram concurred. She noted that any worthwhile general contractor could make necessary repairs to restore functionality to the majority of old windows. She noted it did not seem people weighed the long term costs of replacing windows over and over again, rather than repairing a product which would last indefinitely if maintained.

Mr. Richardson noted current advertising did not aid the cause either; most replacement window advertising was aimed towards homes that had failing vinyl or aluminum windows already, but those in historic homes were affected by the breadth of these campaigns.

Commissioner Funk noted the Commission should take a greater role in educating the applicant before they made an application.

Ms. Petheram concurred. She noted policy may need to shift; the standard should be that a window should be repaired rather than replaced unless you prove that it cannot.

Commissioner Funk noted information new to her was the durability of the product in old wood windows versus new wood.

Mr. Leith noted there was a recent body of research comparing the composition of old growth and new wood, confirming that old growth wood was much stronger and more durable. He stated this research also confirmed new wood; grown rapidly, harvested earlier and seasoned faster than old growth was therefore lighter, more porous and a less durable material.

Chairperson Lloyd inquired if craftsmen often reused wood from other sources to repair old wood windows.

Michael Mahaffey, local craftsman, noted he often went to George's Demolition Salvage (Architectural Salvage, 470 E 900 South) to buy old wood to use in repairing and rebuilding wood windows, as he knew from experience it had a tighter grain, was a superior product to new wood.

Commissioner Richards stated he didn't think many people cared about the windows in their old homes.

Ms. Petheram concurred and noted this was a return to thinking of the window as a piece of trim to be replaced.

Commissioner Richards noted that if it became onerous to people in the long run to repair their windows, it might become an issue for the neighborhood's continued livability.

Commissioner James noted that change also needed to be part of the discussion; as time moved on so did the needs of homeowners. For instance, no one was parking their Model T in the garage anymore. The Commission didn't need convincing windows needed to be repaired whenever possible, but it seemed that the Commission often had to pick and choose their battles in regards to the issue. He noted that on a recent trip to Montreal he had observed that several old stone homes had metal replacement windows installed. He also questioned the HLC policy that secondary façades be allowed a different treatment than the primary façade.

Vice Chairperson Oliver noted the Commission should consider this discussion ground zero; perhaps it could inform the future development of their windows policy. She noted she would like to see the Commission agree that every window was innocent until proven guilty; that it should not be replaced until proven it could not be repaired. Vice Chairperson Oliver stated she believed the Commission could incorporate language into their standards or request that a window replacement specific permit be created, placing the burden of proof upon the applicant.

Commissioner Davis stated he found it interesting there had been a lot of talk with the Yalecrest issue in the recent past that the Commission could not be advocates for preservation, instead they had to remain neutral.

Vice Chairperson Oliver noted that they couldn't go out and begin proselytizing on windows, but could incorporate language in the guidelines, code and policies of the Commission which matched current practice in other parts of the country.

Commissioner Bevins stated that currently, the burden of proof had been given to staff to prove that windows could be repaired, whereas in other communities the burden laid with the applicant, forcing them to at least explore other options.

Vice Chairperson Oliver noted that first the Commission should work to educate the public that other options existed outside of replacement.

Chairperson Lloyd noted he had invited Terry Lukken from Kolbe Windows to sit and observe the meeting. He invited Mr. Lukken forward to comment.

Mr. Lukken noted Kolbe Windows had restored a number of historic windows on high profile restoration projects in Salt Lake City including the Frank Moss Courthouse. He stated there were alternatives to restoration, respectfully disagreeing with some of the earlier comments regarding craftsmanship. He stated that many replacement windows did not shed a positive light on the craft, but this was a question of the quality of the manufacturer rather than the craft. He noted that Kolbe could replicate an original window with great precision. Mr. Lukken did note comments about the payback period for replacement windows were accurate.

Chairperson Lloyd inquired how many projects which included replacement windows received tax credits for rehabilitation.

Mr. Lukken noted that the majority of projects completed within the last year had received tax credits.

Mr. Richardson noted that Kolbe was a premium brand which the vast majority of home owners would not be able to afford or did not see in advertising.

Vice Chairperson Oliver noted that the fundamental tenants of preservation stated a product should be preserved and if not possible, replaced in kind, which was the kind of product Mr. Lukken could offer. She stated this was usually not the option the Commission saw before them.

Commissioner Harding returned to the issue of secondary façades. She noted her concern that the Commission retains a certain amount of flexibility on less visible elevations to accommodate the needs of a particular homeowner.

Ms. Petheram noted it wasn't just a question of the perceived aesthetic value or the fashion of the time, but one of preserving the original character of a home, embodied in the windows if still present.

Chairperson Lloyd noted the issue became unclear often because an older home might have no original windows; they could be from the 1930s, 1940s, 1950s, et cetera. He noted it often, therefore, became an issue of determining what was significant and what was not.

Mr. Leith noted the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation as well as the Residential Design Guidelines began with retain and repair above all else. He stated the initial charge should be to identify and preserve those elements warranting care.

Commissioner Funk noted the Commission should establish a clearer, standard policy so the Commission didn't debate these issues overlong. She recused herself at this time, [7:20:04 PM](#), for another meeting.

Chairperson Lloyd inquired if the Commission should consider the State Historic Preservation Office's stance on such projects.

Mr. Richardson noted staff could contact Barbara Murphy with the Division of State History and ask for more information.

Ms. Petheram noted the State was starting to pay more attention to windows and their preservation, particularly on civil and commercial projects. She stated the federal tax credit program seemed less lenient now than five to ten years ago.

Commissioner Davis stated he had heard that spending money on windows to improve energy efficiency did not make much sense but had never seen it quantified; he was therefore grateful for Mr. Richardson's presentation. He noted the information presented made him more likely to question a request for window replacement and agreed with Vice Chairperson Oliver that it might require a separate application process.

Vice Chairperson Oliver inquired if staff had discussed Denver's policy with their preservation staff.

Mr. Leith noted he intended to contact officials in Boulder and Denver, Colorado and do just that; both communities took a focused approach towards window replacement with the onus on the applicant to make their case.

Commissioner Davis noted the end result of adopting such a policy would likely be the applicant was educated as to alternate options and their costs.

Commissioner Davis inquired about the science behind floor insulation being more effective than upgrading windows.

Mr. Richardson and Ms. Petheram both noted it was a matter of interior and exterior temperature differences; it took less energy to evenly heat a well insulated area than one where it might be 0 degrees outside; the ceiling might be 90 degrees and the floor 50. They also noted the surface area of floor space in a space was often much greater than the area of the windows and also a factor.

Commissioner James wished to discuss the following quoted excerpt from the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation:

“...A highly decorative window with an unusual shape, or glazing pattern, or color most likely identified immediately as a character defining feature of a building. It is far more difficult, however, to assess the importance of repeated windows on a façade, particularly if they are individually simple in design and material, such as a large, multi-pane sash of many industrial buildings. Because rehabilitation projects frequently include proposals to replace window sash or entire windows to improve thermal efficiency or to create a new appearance, it is essential that contribution to the overall historic character of the building be assessed separate from or together with their physical condition before specific repair/replacement work is undertaken.”

He noted it seemed from the statement there was room for aesthetic assessment even within the standard.

Mr. Leith stated the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards on Sustainability, which were only recently published, contained an increased emphasis on a hierarchy of repairing over replacing.

Ms. Petheram noted these standards had been created primarily for commercial construction and that should be taken into consideration as well.

Chairperson Lloyd inquired if the statement was less valid when dealing with residential properties.

Ms. Petheram noted she would not say so, but it should be considered.

Vice Chairperson Oliver stated that the emphasis did change when considering a home with a dozen windows that were potentially all different in comparison to a commercial structure with several dozen identical windows.

Commissioner Haymond stated the primary objective of a historic district should be to improve and preserve the neighborhood for its residents, but often, residents might not be ready to make the commitment necessary.

Commissioner Davis noted there seemed to be a bias in general towards upscale renovations.

Commissioner James stated there seemed to be reluctance in the planning profession to take a point of view about aesthetics. He noted there were clear characteristics of historic neighborhoods that could be identified visually and were worthy of preservation, but these elements were often not clearly identified for residents. Commissioner James noted he was all for the preservation of windows, but the mixing and matching of styles and patterns which occurred over time muddied the issue; would not disappear.

Chairperson Lloyd stated the conversation was clearly far from over, to that end; staff was working on work sessions which would outline the mechanics of window repair and other options.

Mr. Leith concurred that further work sessions would be organized and noted staff was willing to discuss the topic in as much detail as the Commission felt they required.

Chairperson Lloyd thanked the presenters for their time and expertise. He stated he hoped the Commission could create a more informed policy and approach on the issue in the future.

Commissioner Richards stated any policy needed to be coupled with more public outreach; while there were residents of districts that wouldn't care about the issue, there were those that could be reached.

Mr. Leith noted that in terms of the current process, staff attempted to educate the public to what alternative options were available and why they should save the resource. He noted that often, the information hit home, proposals were amended and therefore did not reach the Commission. He stated it tended to be the more unusual cases which reached the Commission.

OTHER BUSINESS [7:54:42 PM](#)

Mr. Leith noted staff hoped to revise all the design guidelines and wished to establish a working group with members of the Commission to examine the residential design guidelines in particular.

Commissioners James and Richards volunteered.

Mr. Paterson reviewed the revised Preservation Program Philosophy document for the Commission and inquired if they had any comments.

Vice Chairperson Oliver noted Commissioner Funk had left comments, including; the audience is still unclear, as well as where it will appear. Commissioner Funk noted that if the document was intended for the public it was too lengthy, formal, and included too many phases, too much legal jargon.

Ms. Lew inquired if the Commission would be willing to hold an extra meeting in July to review awards nominations for the 2011 Preservation Awards in August.

There was no objection to this request.

The Commission had no further business to discuss. Seeing no objection, Chairperson Lloyd called for an adjournment. The meeting adjourned at [8:01:38 PM](#)

Cecily Zuck, Historic Landmark Commission Secretary