

---

---

## HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES March 21, 2016

---

---

City Hall Council Chambers \* 290 North 100 West Logan, UT 84321 \* [www.loganutah.org](http://www.loganutah.org)

The meeting of the Logan City Historic Preservation Committee convened in regular session on Monday, March 21, 2016. Chairman Lewis called the meeting to order at 12:00 p.m.

Committee Members Present: Viola Goodwin, Amy Hochberg, David Lewis, Keith Mott, Christian Wilson

Committee Members Excused: Tom Graham, Gary Olsen

Staff Members Present: Mike DeSimone, Russ Holley, Amber Reeder, Debbie Zilles

Minutes as written and recorded from the March 7, 2016 meeting were reviewed. Mr. Mott moved that the minutes be approved as submitted. Mr. Wilson seconded the motion. The motion was unanimously approved.

### **PUBLIC HEARING**

**HPC 16-003 Church St. Retail Renovation** Joshua Choate/Church Street LLC, authorized agent/owner, request an update of the lower half of the south exterior face with new glass and aluminum and the door relocated from the west to the east side and recessed. The project is located at 155 Church Street in the Town Center-Historic District (TC-HD) zone; TIN 06-018-0020.

**STAFF:** Mr. Holley reviewed the project. The property is approximately 0.13 acres with an 8,800 SF 2-story building. The proposal includes a complete front (south) facade remodel to include a new glass storefront, entryway and fabric awning. The streetscape and narrow existing park strip are to remain as currently existing.

This proposal will create a new storefront on a non-storefront corner side facade that currently has upper windows, a brick wall and a solid service door. The existing front door faces east toward Federal Avenue. The proposed new storefront will allow the building to have multiple ground floor tenants with separate entrances.

Staff finds that the proposed modifications maintain historic elements of the building and allow for better pedestrian utilization of the area. The proposed storefront modifications have elements deemed important by the HDDS, including storefront windows, kick plates, transom windows, recessed entries and fabric awnings. The additional storefront access, improvements and utilization of the public right-of-way will also contribute to the adjacent area.

**PROPONENT:** Joshua Choate explained that the placement of recessed door was out of necessity due to the interior layout (structural pillar) of the building and it seems to be a good arrangement for traffic flow in and around the building. There is an existing sign post on the corner of the building which might be used in the future.

Mr. Wilson asked about the change from the original proposal. Mr. Choate explained that initially they wanted two entrances; however, due to issues with the interior design it became unfeasible and cost prohibitive. The design/plan for the original proposal was what was desired, however, the facade grant money received was only a portion of the requested amount. The hope is to continue to improve the building to its full potential over time. Mr. Wilson agreed that this is an improvement, however, the Historic Preservation Committee is charged with upholding the standards of the district and is responsible to the community and what is presented and approved should be completed.

**PUBLIC:** An email from Peggy Chanson (Managing Partner of the Italian Place) in support of the project was received and distributed prior to the meeting.

**COMMITTEE:** Mr. Mott noted that this design is much different regarding the extent of flat glass, both horizontally and vertically, and he would like to see it broken up more. Mr. Choate said that could be a possibility and he will talk to the contractor about removing some sections of aluminum and bringing some of the original brick back to do some columns. Mr. Mott said that would be an improvement.

Mr. Wilson asked about planters on the sidewalk, and noted that it would help to have some exterior interest. Mr. Holley said that the 5' sidewalk setback would need to be retained. Mr. Choate noted that planters could also help provide a buffer to parking.

Mr. Wilson said benches along the south facade might improve the look and use of the space. Mr. Choate explained that a small market had been operating in that space, however, it did not succeed. If another business comes in that would benefit from benches, that option could certainly be a possibility. They are looking at subtle ways to discourage loitering and littering around the outside of the building.

Ms. Goodwin pointed out that one of the main concerns of the Committee was the fact that the original plan was approved and it was changed with receiving any additional review and approval.

**MOTION:** Mr. Wilson moved that the Historic Preservation Committee **conditionally approve** HPC 16-003 with the conditions of approval as listed below. Mr. Mott seconded the motion.

#### CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

1. Any representations by the proponent at the Historic Preservation Committee hearing that is approved shall be incorporated into the final action as conditions of approval and recorded on the Certificate of Appropriateness.
2. The Committee approves the proposed building materials and designs as submitted.
3. Exterior lighting shall comply with Land Development Code §17.36.210 and be down-lit concealed source type lighting.
4. Any new signage requires a separate sign permit to be issued by the Community Development Department.
5. The proponent is responsible to ensure that any construction is appropriately permitted and inspected by the Building Safety Division through timely scheduled inspections.
6. Failure to comply with any conditions of approval shall void the permit and require a new Historic Preservation Committee hearing.

#### FINDINGS FOR APPROVAL

1. The project complies with all requirements imposed by Title 17 of the Logan Municipal Code.
2. The project is consistent with the objectives and purpose of the General Plan and Title 17 of the Logan Municipal Code by helping to maintain the Town Center (TC) zone as the central hub for Logan City and Cache Valley.

3. The building is considered a “B” evaluation in the 2011 Reconnaissance Level Survey, and considered eligible and contributory to the historic district.
4. As conditioned, the new construction and materials share the same general features as the majority of the surrounding contributing structures and will therefore be compatible to the entire district.
5. The project substantially complies with standards outlined in the *Historic District Design Standards* and the *Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation and Reconstruction*.

Moved: Christian Wilson    Seconded: Keith Mott    **Passed: 4-0**  
Yea: V. Goodwin, A. Hochberg, K. Mott, C. Wilson    Nay:    Abstain:

## **OTHER BUSINESS**

### **Historic District Design Standards (HDDS)**

A draft of the updated Design Standards was distributed to the Committee prior to the meeting for review. Ms. Reeder provided a summary of the Steering Committee meetings where issues including misconceptions and/or frustrations with the approval process, public input related to color and the tax process were discussed.

The document has two sections; the first is an overview and background relating to the theory and process, the second section is specifically related to design standards (with residential and commercial categories separated out). Many of the regulations come from national standards.

Ms. Goodwin asked about color. Ms. Reeder explained that the current guidelines contain a general statement that color be of an “historic palate”. The new draft has a section on color; however, it is quite general. Chairman Lewis said “simple” and “muted” are good words but the pushback (from members of the Steering Committee) of any color regulation seemed disproportionate to concerns the Committee has addressed. Mr. Wilson pointed out that everyone has a different taste in color. Mr. Holley said brighter colors are more appropriate for trim/accent areas. Color can help contribute to the overall style so it is important how it is used. Ms. Reeder said page 31 of the draft discusses color (2.10.4.1). Color is not a regulated item in the design review process for historic properties; however, it can dramatically affect the perceived character of a historic building. Property owners are encouraged to use colors that are historically and traditionally common and that will help establish visual continuity for the block. The proposed guidelines include:

- ✓ General historic practice to use one cohesive base color (preferably muted) and one or two accent colors.
- ✓ Variety and visual interest added by using varying tints and shades from one color family.
- ✓ Use contrasting color to make an architectural element stand out from the body of the structure.
- ✓ Using a brighter color on doors and windows, combined with a more muted color on the body of the house, is a good way to add color and personality without overwhelming the character of the historic structure.
- ✓ Consider the impact of proposed color on the adjacent properties of the historic building.

Ms. Hochberg suggested incorporating clarifying language regarding guidelines based upon the evaluation or grade of the structure (specifically allowing enhancements) in the approval process. Mr. DeSimone said there should be some allowance for flexibility. Chairman Lewis agreed and said that the character of what is around the structure should be included in consideration. Mr. DeSimone said there should be a recognition regarding the continuity of change and make sure the standards allow for that to happen.

Chairman Lewis noted that there have been quite a few buildings that have been updated and there should be some flexibility allowing for restoration to a certain historic point in time (even if modified from the original format). Ms. Reeder pointed out that on page 10 restoration is defined

*as the act or process of accurately depicting the form, features and character of a property as it appeared at a particular period of time by means of the removal of features from other periods in its history and reconstruction of missing features from the restoration period.* This treatment focuses on the retention of materials from the most significant time in a property's history, while permitting the removal of materials from other periods – which does allow for some flexibility.

Ms. Goodwin pointed out that when Knit Unique was approved with paned windows, which although not original, was appropriate because it was indicative of a period and other structures in the area had a similar type of look. Mr. DeSimone said that it is important to look at the compatibility of other buildings.

Mr. Holley noted that an example would be the Edwards Furniture store, which was built in 1903, however, the applicant could restore the façade to the current 1950 motif rather than tearing it off and returning to 1903 elements. Projects can be reviewed and considered on a case-by-case basis.

Mr. Wilson said it is most important that quality is maintained, not necessarily picking a certain time period.

Ms. Reeder advised that commercial structures were built (average time) in 1930 and residential structures in 1924.

Mr. Mott suggested that the architectural importance and significance of the building be considered. Mr. DeSimone stated that the grade or evaluation of building can be used in the decision-making process (which should be included in the guidelines). The Committee agreed.

Mr. Holley said there is a similar criterion that is used to consider/approve demolition.

Ms. Hochberg asked about the 50-year significance. Ms. Reeder said that is a national standard. Chairman Lewis said the target area in the district seems to be from 1880-1930. Ms. Reeder advised that the guidelines indicate that contributory structures are those built more than 50 years ago that maintain their original historic fabric and significance. Non-contributory structures are those built either less than 50 years ago or build within the historic period, but their historic make-up no longer maintains its integrity. Two surveys (1999 and 2011) redefine the contributory and non-contributory structures within the district. The majority of the structures were constructed in the early 1900's and have significance Cache Valley. A variety of structures make up the district, including commercial, residential and institutional buildings. There are approximately 535 buildings within the boundary of the district, 399 (75%) of which are considered contributory structures.

Meeting adjourned at 1:05 p.m.

---

Minutes approved as written and digitally recorded at the Logan City Historic Preservation Committee meeting of March 21, 2016.

---

Michael A. DeSimone  
Community Development Director

---

David Lewis  
Historic Preservation Committee Chairman

---

Russ Holley  
Senior Planner

---

Amber Reeder  
Planner II

---

Debbie Zilles  
Administrative Assistant