

---

---

## HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES March 7, 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 7, 2016. Chairman Lewis called the meeting to order at 12:00 p.m.

Committee Members Present: Amy Hochberg, Viola Goodwin, David Lewis, Keith Mott, Gary Olsen, Christian Wilson, Gene Needham (Municipal Council liaison)

Committee Members Excused: Tom Graham

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

Minutes as written and recorded from the February 1, 2016 meeting were reviewed. Mr. Wilson moved that the minutes be approved as submitted. Ms. Hochberg seconded the motion. The motion was unanimously approved.

### **PUBLIC HEARING**

**HPC 16-002 72 W Center** [Certificate of Appropriateness] Erika Hansen, authorized agent/owner, requests a facade improvement of both front and rear storefronts including the replacement of windows and doors, addition of brick veneer to more accurately portray the era in which it was built, the addition of decorative capstones above the windows, and the addition of an awning and lighting at 72 West Center St. in the Town Center-Historic District (TC-HD) zone; TIN 06-030-0011.

**STAFF:** Ms. Reeder reviewed the project. The proposed storefront renovation includes removing the existing storefront system and constructing a 1910's styled system. The facade is in need of repair and improved thermal performance. The relocation of the doorway to the center is to provide for a more inviting entrance. A metal storefront system is proposed which includes the centered door, large display windows, and transom window system. The system will be finished in a "champagne rose" color. This building has typically had a painted wood frame. The facade is twenty feet (20') wide so the simple storefront system with a finish may be appropriate. The HDDS indicates that if metal replacement window frames are used they should be finished and not metallic in appearance. The system will provide a similar amount of glazing area to the existing door, display, and transom window area.

The kickplate area is reclaimed marble from a historic building. A kickplate/bulk head area below windows is a desired element of the façade and is appropriate in this case. The column areas on the sides of the storefront system will be a white porcelain tile. At the February 1, 2016 Historic Preservation Committee meeting, the use of tile was discussed such as a subway tile similar to the property to the west. The glazed porcelain tile will have a similar look to that facade. A flatiron sconce will be mounted on either side.

Above the transom window a black tile band is indicated and an awning that is approximately 5' wide above the door and would extend 2' into the right-of-way. HDDS CC-8 indicates that traditional awnings and metal is acceptable. The standards prohibit plastic or vinyl materials.

Awnings encroaching into the right-of-way require permitting from Public Works. The Committee may discuss the specifics of materials with the applicant but the concept with signage is consistent with guidelines and other properties in the District.

The upper parapet wall has a number of changes from the previous proposal. The wall is proposed to be extended an additional 5' in height. The applicant would like to do some art panels of mosaic tile elements. There are two panel areas, each approximately 6' wide and 7.5' tall. The artistic concept is a night and day panel. The east panel is the "moon" panel with moon tile in the center, and a mosaic build of tile to indicate clouds and a hand-built flower mosaic on either side. The areas around the tile would be filled in with a colored stucco finish. Columns and cornices of a cement board and batten are proposed.

The use of tile is compatible with the adjacent buildings and the styling is reminiscent of Art-Nouveau, which was common from 1890-1910 and the time period that the building was first constructed. Art Nouveau is not a typical style to Logan's Historic District. The proposal is more elaborate than the existing and previous facades but the scale of the project is small. There is currently a stucco/plaster finish on the upper facade but stucco is not typically a preferred material to be used on a front facade. The Committee should consider the appropriateness of the colored stucco. The Historic District Standards prefer masonry material so additional tile application may be a better finish.

There was originally a cornice on the parapet and the HDDS encourages cornices to be reintroduced if they have been removed. The style and size appear appropriate but there is concern with the use of the "hardie" board and the other board and batten elements. The center column and side column areas are consistent with the architectural concept but the cement board is not a typical commercial material in the District. The additional material and pattern is introducing a lot of new elements that are not consistent with the 20<sup>th</sup> Century commercial classification of the property. A tile or plaster in the columns, such as the continuation of the porcelain tile, may be more appropriate as a masonry material.

The proposal includes replacing the door and some plywood panels with a delivery door and windows. The existing brick will remain and be repaired as needed. The renovation will improve this facade and its functionality.

**PROPONENT:** Erika Hansen explained that hardie board was chosen because of its low maintenance. Mr. Wilson noted that hardie board is not historic and suggested possibly using a hard-coat type of stucco. He also noted that he is concerned with the use of so many different materials.

Joe Sorenson explained that the problem with trying to replicate the horizontal and vertical striping with stucco would be the relief. The idea is for the vertical lines to create some depth. Mr. Wilson said another concern is that even with the hardie board being sealed, water may cause damage over time, whereas stucco is a more continuous system. Mr. Sorenson said that modern synthetic stucco is not historical. Mr. Wilson agreed, however said that a historical look could be achieved. Hardie board is mainly used in residential applications. Mr. Sorenson asked about using metal. Mr. Wilson said metal would be a good material to use for the top horizontal area and the area over the canopy. Metal can be more expensive but would hold up over time.

Mr. Olsen said bent metal would be less expensive because it would be shorter pieces. The vertical lines could be done in plaster, similar to what has been done on the old theatre to the east. Mr. Wilson agreed and also suggested the use of fiberglass.

Mr. Sorenson explained that the top cap will have a slight back slope for drainage; the preference is to drain the awning (east to west) away from the doorway. He considered using vinyl but agreed that metal might be the most practical. The marble that will be used was salvaged from a historically registered USU building.

**PUBLIC:** None

**COMMITTEE:** Chairman Lewis expressed concern about so many different types of materials being used. Simplifying it by not using hardie board would be much better. Although stucco is not necessary a preferred material it could be used. This project is creating a historic look that never existed on that building, the design will stand out on that street, which is good from a business perspective but not necessarily from a historic point of view. The Historic District Design Standards Indicate that something that didn't previously exist should not be created. This is a beautiful design, but he is concerned with how it will look in relation to the street and the district.

Mr. Sorenson said that Center Street is a very unique street and a Art Nouveau-styled theatrical design such as this would be appropriate. The art panels of mosaic tile depicting the moon and sun are derived from a similar Art Deco type of design found on the Rockefeller Center in New York. Downtown needs this type of exciting look.

Ms. Goodwin thinks the design is beautiful, however, questioned the Committee's charge to keep things historical. This design is not original to the building.

Ms. Reeder explained that the Historic District Design Standards (HDDS) Section III states that new development should be "*compatible with the surrounding historic structures and the character of the district as a whole. It is not necessary to excessively copy historic details to make a new building compatible with the surrounding structures...a new structure should instead share general features with surrounding structures*". The general features of the building and design are consistent with the guidelines. The tile and art element are compatible with the Art Deco style. The materials (specifically on the upper façade) are the main concern. A smooth stucco finish would be more consistent with the district. Hardie board is not a typical element.

Mr. Holley pointed out that the building has a generous "B" evaluation and suggesting considering the building, materials and maintenance that currently exist versus the proposal and how significant it would be to the overall district.

Mr. Olsen noted that there have been very few modifications to the building.

Ms. Hochberg asked if the color of the metal should be considered. Mr. DeSimone said the proposed color scheme should work fine with metal. Mr. Wilson said metal would tie in with the proposed silver light fixtures.

Ms. Goodwin expressed concern that approving this design could set the standard for future proposals. Mr. DeSimone suggested that the elements of the design (such as the cornice, kickplates, windows) found in the Historic District be considered as compatible or not. Ms. Goodwin was worried about the color. Mr. DeSimone said that the Committee cannot regulate color. In reference to Ms. Goodwin's concern about future proposals, he advised that each project will be reviewed by the Committee and will have to adhere to the standards.

Mr. Olsen said that each building on that street is quite different; this design will tie in nicely with the uniqueness of the street.

Ms. Reeder pointed out that the use of materials is included within condition of approval #2.

**MOTION:** Mr. Olsen moved that the Historic Preservation Committee **conditionally approve** HPC 16-002 with the amended 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 are approved shall be incorporated into the final action as conditions of approval and recorded on the Certificate of Appropriateness.
2. The storefront system is approved with a marble kickplate, finished metal storefront system, cornice and tile elements. Materials as approved by the Historic Preservation Committee. Hardie board is not an approved material for the façade. Acceptable materials for the façade and cornice include metal (finished or clear), tile, marble, plaster, smooth-finish/hard-coat stucco, or finished fiberglass.
3. The rear facade to be repaired with replacement of door and addition of windows. Any new brick to match existing and door and window finishes consistent with the front elevation.
4. The awning may extend over the sidewalk with the approval of an encroachment and right-of-way permit from Public Works.
5. Exterior lighting fixtures shall resemble historic period. Lighting shall comply with the Land Development Code §17.37.090 and be down-lit concealed source type lighting.
6. Any new signage requires a separate sign permit to be issued by the Community Development Department.
7. The proponent is responsible to ensure that any construction is appropriately permitted and inspected by the Building Safety Division through timely scheduled inspections.
8. 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 location for the community's historic and cultural resources.
3. The building is considered a "B" evaluation in the 2011 Reconnaissance Level Surveys, 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: Gary Olsen    Seconded: Keith Mott    **Passed: 5-0**

Yea: V. Goodwin, A. Hochberg, K. Mott, G. Olsen, C. Wilson

Nay:    Abstain:

**WORKSHOP ITEMS** for March 21, 2016:

HPC 16-003 Church St. Retail Renovation  
Historic District Design Standards Update/Discussion

Meeting adjourned at 1:05 p.m.

---

Minutes approved as written and digitally recorded at the Logan City Historic Preservation Committee meeting of March 7, 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