

NOTICE OF MEETING
HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION
CITY OF ST. GEORGE
WASHINGTON COUNTY, UTAH
February 16, 2021

PRESENT: Bob Nicholson, Member
Rick Atkin, Member
Scott Messel, Member
Allan Carter, Member
Bette Arial, Chair

EXCUSED:

CITY STAFF: John Willis, Community Development Director
Carol Davidson, Planner III
Jami Bracken, Assistant City Attorney
Brenda Hatch, Development Services Office Manager

The agenda for the meeting is as follows:

Chair Bette Arial called the meeting to order at 12:02 pm.

1. LANDMARK REHABILITATION

Consider a request to modify the exterior of a significant historical building – The Pymm House
- located at 50 East Tabernacle

Carol Davidson presented the following:

Carol introduced the item, turned it over to the applicant.

Matt Glendenning – There are two sides the rounded top which has the plaque, the Pymm house the eastern part of the structure is slab on grade, we think it was built in the 80's so there is no historical value to the east side. We would like to take it back to what it looked like at the turn of the century and then juxtapose it on the eastern side with a more modern building. The current façade looks nothing like it did at the turn of the century, we would like to go back to that.

Bob Nicholson – What are the exterior materials you will use?

Matt Metcalf – Right now it's a stucco and stone, that sandstone and then there is wood that is faux painted. On the Pymm house we want to do a plaster finish, the trim would be a painted product like poly ash. We can get custom profiles to match the historic. The modern portion on the left is a thin brick veneer and there is a steel accent and then the flat portion is a shubie bond. The windows will be steel frame windows.

Scott Messel – I think it is a great mix of both preserving and taking it back to what it was. Dressing up and taking a building that wasn't architecturally significant and adding more significance to it. I love it.

Matt Metcalf – One change from last time was the eastern portion was 2-story, we decided not to do that because it wasn't cost effective. We did increase the height.

Bob Nicholson - You guys have done a good job.

Allan Carter – I like the fact that you did such a difference between the two buildings that adds to the significance of the one that is being left. That contrast is better than trying to come up with something that kind of makes it look like it might have been historic.

Rick Atkin – So will there be historical guidelines? These aren't on the historical registry, just in the district so there are guidelines.

Carol Davidson – The Pymm House is.

Rick Atkin – Ok that makes sense. Are the trusses original?

Matt Glendenning – We drilled a hole to see but it looks like there is engineered wood, it didn't look like it was wood from the 1800's.

Bob Nicholson – What registry is it on?

Carol Davidson – It is on our local registry.

Bette Arial – Does it comply with our requirements?

Carol Davidson – Yes, the way our requirements read is that they are supposed to use as many materials as they can that mimic historic value and just what they are doing with the roof, as in matching what the original façade was is definitely a swing in the right direction. This one is kind of hard because most of the original building has been replaced. The original façade has been replaced with replicas that weren't very good. They are trying to bring it back as best they can.

MOTION: Scott Messel made a motion to recommend approval of the proposal as presented.

SECOND: Rick Atkin

AYES: (5)

Bob Nicholson, Member

Rick Atkin, Member

Scott Messel, Member

Allan Carter, Member

Bette Arial, Chair

NAYS: (0)

Motion Carries

2. **LANDMARK SITE DESIGNATION**

Consider a request to designate the home at 295 South Main Street as a landmark site to be known as the Miner Heber Prsbrey Home

Carol Davidson presented the following:

Diana Powell – We have owned the home since the middle of 2015. It was a pretty derelict house. Dr. Christen had started some renovations, but he got sick and then we bought it amid construction.

Carol Davidson – Introduced the item showing the location on the map. It was built between 1913 and 1914. Showed what the house looks like now, then showed a historical photo of what the home looked like before and a picture of the home in 2010 and then 2015. The tree was removed before this photo was taken in 2015. It is important that you know this did come to the HPC December 9, 2015, to add the porch the motion was that the applicant change the submitted plan to meet the historical character of the home, some of the recommendations out of the minutes where they didn't like the white metal roof, the dormer needs to be changed back from straight to a hipped gable, The proposed style of porch, banister, and columns do not meet the character of the home. Those were the main items of that meeting. For you today we need to determine if it meets the qualifications. The requirement on item C is that there were no major alterations that could obscure or destroy significant historic features. The applicant stated that it hasn't had any major structural changes to the house but renovation to bring it up to code. The applicant did not mention the roof, dormer or porch. Because none of the commissioners are the same as the commission that was here when this came through before either you feel the same as the previous commission or you feel that wasn't right.

John Willis – I think part of the thing was that it was removed from the Landmark as a Landmark status. The applicant moved on and ended up doing the additions that they requested so at that time it was removed. Now they want to be placed back on as a Landmark site and we are reviewing this as a new application.

Rick Atkin – I live a block away, and I see you guys putting a lot of blood, sweat and tears in it. I have an old home, so it is a lot of work. I'm trying to find some guidance for us, or is it subjective, like the roof for example, the metal roof. I'm having a hard time seeing any guidance there, I mean asphalt wasn't a pioneer tile, and they move from wood shingle to asphalt. Logically I'm trying to find some guidance to help us make some of those decisions.

John Willis – Bob is more knowledgeable than I am, he's seen more of these applications than I have. I can tell you there have been occasions where they have replaced the shake with an asphalt shingle because it a closer look than what the metal roof is. I think you need to look at it and say does this still maintain that historic appeal, architecture that it once had.

Rick Atkin – But there are faux wood shingles now, that's why I'm asking for guidance is because I would say no more asphalt, use faux wood shingles. It sounds like it's a subjective guideline. They are very clear about the sides of the houses but not the rooves.

Diana Powell – I have a couple of questions for you to consider, we when we put the metal roof on the house we had no knowledge or idea or even awareness that the house was even on the registry. We were not told when we purchased the house that it was a part of the registry. There is no plat, nothing, it was not disclosed to us. We asked in the original disclosure documents, and we were not told, and granted we should've come to the City.

Lynn Potter – I did, if I may make one suggestion that you list what is on the registry by address.

Rick Atkin – Yes, they're listed by name not address, if you look at the Washington County site.

Diana Powell – For us, we were bootstrapping ourselves into the repairs of this home and found things once we got into the repairs of the house that incredibly increased our cost of renovation. Which is why we are still in the process of renovations today. For us to come to the Landmark home committee and have them tell us that the \$15,000 roof that you just painted, gave us no option at that point but to say ok, remove us from the listing.

Rick Atkin – I read in the last minutes that you made a point about the Seven Wives Inn and how that is a metal roof. It's not white, it matches, it's more dark and kind of matches the look of it.

Bob Nicholson – The problem I have is all the concrete that has been put in. It may be a wonderful home, and you have been able to do what you wanted. I am more in sync with the previous commission and their comments. I think the roof is out of place. To me it doesn't meet a landmark site, particularly that concrete yard. When I was at the City we tried to discourage people, keep it historic, it didn't have to be lawns, but you don't pave the side yard and front yard in concrete. I don't personally think that it meets the criteria for a landmark site. It could be a wonderful home, probably is a wonderful home, and people back in 2015 got some guidance from Historic Preservation and decided to do their own thing, so that's my opinion is that it doesn't quite meet the criteria.

Chair Bette Arial – It's one thing with the historic trees, but the concrete, that was just.

Allan Carter – I agree with Bob on a couple different issues. First of all, I have great respect for Brooks Pace. To me the dormer change, the roof change along with the concrete change. I want you applicants to understand that with the dialogue, all we are trying to do, we're trying to help. But, I just can't see it reaching a standard that we could give a designation.

Rick Atkin – So do landscaping and a not attached features like a covered porch, is that an important part of the consideration? There is no guidance on that. Part of what I'm thinking from a strategic point of view, I want good guidance and good models and a good vision. So for me it's kind of raising a bigger issue, like should those be included in it, should that be best practice? This is an interesting case example of I think that there may be some gaps in some of our guidance in some of our procedures to help us make a decision. Me, I'm just looking at the house, right now when I look at stuff, yard doesn't matter to me, the porch doesn't matter to me because there is literally no guidance in there because the porch is not attached.

Bette Arial – I think there is some flexibility that we don't want to take away. If you go to the State or National Historic they are very, very specific in this kind of thing. I can see what you're saying, it's kind of fun to have new things. To keep the integrity of our historic landmark homes we have to have them look like that. I don't know that it has to be iron clad rules, but I just think this to me doesn't.

Discussion continued on what should really be considered as alterations.

Jami Bracken – John and I were looking at City Code, it does adopt as guidelines the national standards, adopted by the Secretary of the Interior. To use for those guidelines which are pretty strict.

Bob Nicholson – I think Rick has a good point, we could probably add a few things to that guidance, especially landscaping.

Rick Atkin – And I think that's helpful, another thing that came up is I think about the inventory of houses currently on the registry, is there an inventory list we should do? Communication, marketing and what about the ones that are not on the registry, but we think could be? Should we be doing some more outreach and engagement to encourage people to follow so they are not in a scenario like you. You were doing your best, putting a lot of time and money into it. I don't want to create a negative experiences with people that want to preserve historic homes. Let's do what we can to support. If it doesn't meet the rules and requirements that is a much easier thing to follow and I think there has been a significant obstruction with the covered porch, the roof

color. I am not as concerned about the gable, it's not historic to that house but it's not completely out of line with other historic houses in the area. It just brings up a broader question, I think we should consider as a commission what our responsibility is for the broader community.

Glenn Potter – I was the person who stood before the committee years ago and I got into an argument with them. Everything I have done is to preserve the house and maintain the house. I read the guidelines very closely. It doesn't say anything about landscaping, so I put in the concrete. It said no changes in pitch to the main roof. The dormer was a small part that is not part of the main roof. The porch is not attached to the house, because the house is very fragile. The trees are gone because they were destroying the house and the foundation. The foundation is not reinforceable. There are many cracks in the foundation caused by the trees. The trees were rotten, the arborist signed off on all that, so they had to come out. I looked into faux wood for the roof, but the truth is without reinforcement even a faux wood roof is too heavy for that house. I went with a 2- or 300-year-old galvanized metal and I thought that was too historic. That is the way it was back then. The white metal roof is what is known as a LEED roof, it is energy significantly cooler which the house desperately needs. The changed dormer added a vent to the house, which the house desperately needs. The porch shades and protects the walls like the trees used to. The only thing I have left to do is put column surrounds on the columns with matching brick and a wainscoting on the outside of the house up to the window sills to protect the brick which is very soft, and it will also cover up the conduit for the electrical. Everything I have done is to preserve the home. It comes back to the question of is the committee rigidly trying to preserve homes, landmark standard is not the same as the Historic Registry which is a very rigid standard. We should be allowed to have that commercial status which would increase the value and increase the reason why this home should be preserved. Without that increase in value, we will probably get our money out of it in a few years and then we will probably tear it down because it needs a lot more work still.

Diana Powell – The question that we have is what is the committee's purpose, are you here to help residents preserve these homes? Or are you here to rigidly keep us from preserving?

Bob Nicholson – We hope you are able to preserve it, but to me that white metal roof, the huge slab of concrete around the home.

Glenn Potter – What roof would you put on there?

Bob Nicholson – I don't know what all your options would be. I would think there would be options far superior to a metal roof.

Glenn Potter – I would disagree with you as a contractor.

Bob Nicholson – To me it's not a landmark site.

Bette Arial – You made a decision to change the home.

Rick Atkin – I was looking at some of the other historic homes, there are a couple that have metal roofs, but they are, the color is more in line with an asphalt roof. I think the main issue is the color. I'm all for preserving the house. There are metal roofs on the historic registry, but they are dark.

Scott Messel – I think the detail that you have put on the roof of the porch is beautiful and around your door. Just with the guidelines were given I don't see how we can. I appreciate the work you've put into it.

Rick Atkin – To me the biggest hurdle is the color of the roof. Otherwise, I think you are going in the right direction. But I do think the color of the roof is not in line with being historic.

Bette Arial – I have been watching the house as it has progressed. I do appreciate that you are preserving the house, but I would drive by it and go no, not knowing why you were doing it. I do feel that after meeting with the committee you knew that there were criteria that they had.

Glenn Potter – It's vaguely written, it came down to what people wanted and necessarily what are the rules. So, I did my best and I came back hoping that you would go by your rules.

Rick Atkin – There are some guidelines, white is sort of an accent, but having it as the prominent feature on the house, that's what I have a problem with. I think if it was on the porch and the windows it would be fine.

Glenn Potter – If there were things that gave more guidance then I would have done things differently.

Rick Atkin – And I don't think they can put that in the guideline, because if there was a historic house that had a white roof you would probably want to keep the white roof. It just doesn't exist here.

Bette Arial – The members of that committee are very well respected, in reading their comments I think that they knew, they were specific in what their comments were.

MOTION: Bob Nicholson made a motion to recommend the request for landmark site be denied because it doesn't meet the criteria and intent of landmark sites, particularly the white roof, the large concrete pad in the front side yard, I think it has changed the character of the home.

SECOND: Allan Carter

AYES: (5)

Bob Nicholson, Member

Rick Atkin, Member

Scott Messel, Member

Allan Carter, Member

Bette Arial, Chair

NAYS: (0)

Motion Carries

Glenn Potter – Can we appeal it to the Town Council?

John Willis – If you chose to move forward, you would go to the Planning Commission and then if you want to go further the City Council. Work with Carol if that is what you choose to do.

Rick Atkin – And maybe if I can recommend, I don't know if it's with someone from the staff but there might be some strategies. So, if people want to get on the registry, you know, what would that road map look like. It might not be a quick fix, but maybe there are some things that could be done to create more of a positive or favorable approach to it.

John Willis - You talked about making painting the roof and making some other changes. You could make the changes and come back to the committee, but I think the porch and the landscaping would obviously be a pretty large obstacle. That would be an option for you.

Lynn Potter – We could paint the roof, but it would significantly increase the heat on the house and the environmental effects. If you keep the wood inside cooler it helps it last longer.

John Willis – Carol will be in touch with you.

Carol Davidson – Updated the committee on the CLG grant and the process that it will need to go through. We may have a special meeting to discuss that.

Discussion on the CLG grant and what is important to preserve.

3. **MINUTES**

Consider approval of the October 20, 2021, meeting minutes.

MOTION: Bob Nicholson made a motion to approve the October 20, 2021, meeting minutes.

SECOND: Scott Messel

AYES: (5)

Bob Nicholson, Member

Rick Atkin, Member

Scott Messel, Member

Allan Carter, Member

Bette Arial, Chair

NAYS: (0)

Motion Carries

ADJOURN

MOTION: Scott Messel made a motion to adjourn at 1:13 pm.

SECOND: Bob Nicholson

AYES: (5)

Bob Nicholson, Member

Rick Atkin, Member

Scott Messel, Member

Allan Carter, Member

Bette Arial, Chair

NAYS: (0)

Motion Carries