

Minutes of the Design Review Committee meeting held on February 23, 2012, at 5:30 p.m. in the Murray Public Services Building Conference Room, 4646 South 500 West, Murray, Utah.

Present: Design Review Committee:  
Jim Allred, Chair (by Phone)  
Jay Bollwinkel  
Ned Hacker  
Chad Wilkinson, Community Development Manager  
Ray Christensen, Senior Planner  
Citizens

Excused: Darrell Jones

Jim Allred opened the meeting.

### I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A motion was made by Mr. Hacker to approve minutes from November 29, 2011.

Seconded by Mr. Bollwinkel.

A voice vote was made. Motion passed, 3-0.

### II. BOARD REPORTS

No report was given

### III. BUSINESS

#### A. MICHAEL PAUL PHOTOGRAPHY– 4973 South State Street – Project # 12-20

The applicant, Michael Olsen of Michael Paul Photography is requesting Certificate of Appropriateness approval for exterior façade changes to the existing significant historic building which was constructed in 1915. Ray Christensen reviewed the location and request for Certificate of Appropriateness for the property addressed 4973 South State Street. The building is identified as the “First Iris Theater” and is designated as a significant historic structure in the Murray City Center District (MCCD) standards and guidelines. The applicant has made changes to the façade of the existing building without first obtaining Murray City approval for a Certificate of Appropriateness and without a building permit. The applicant stated they were making changes due to repair of drywall compound that had been cracking and falling off. Section 17.170.050 2. b. requires the Design Review Committee to review major modifications to buildings including changes to the building façade.

The proposed modification includes repair of the existing stucco elements on the front of the building and a change in color to a light tan for the exterior wall with a darker brown color for the columns. The building has been modified to add a cornice feature across the front of the building. Before the changes were made, the front of the building had columns which extended above the parapet wall. The center portion of the front of the

building extended higher than the sides consistent with the historic appearance of the building, thereby changing the architectural features of the building. While the color of the building has been modified over the years, it appears that the architectural design has remained fairly consistent. Awnings appear to have been added in the past, but do not appear to have always been a feature on the building. The proposed change in color is consistent with the design guidelines, which encourage the use of muted colors and earth tones for primary building materials. However, the proposed cornice feature does not appear to be consistent with the historic design of the building. The MCCD design guidelines for significant historic buildings recommend that generally, deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture, and other visual qualities and, where practical, in materials.

Mr. Bollwinkel asked if Mr. Allred had a copy of the photos that had been provided to the Design Review Committee. Mr. Allred stated that he had viewed them in an email that Mr. Wilkinson had sent. Mr. Bollwinkel wanted to make sure that everyone was aware that the biggest concern was the area between the two middle columns where there was a part that stuck up a bit more and was flanked by two lower areas. The colors don't seem to be of any concern.

Mr. Wilkinson stated that based on analysis of the architectural changes to the existing building façade and review of the design guidelines staff recommends approval of the change in color proposed and recommends that the upper portion of the façade of the building be modified in order to return the building to a design that is more consistent with the historic architectural style of the building. However as a part of the Design Review Committee they are authorized to make whatever recommendation they wish to make and that recommendation will be passed onto the Planning Commission.

Mr. Allred asked if the removal of the cornice would be more compatible with the historic appearance of the building. Mr. Bollwinkel feels that the cornice substantially changes the look and feel by squaring the building up. He would like to see the columns put back on and have the middle section raised. Mr. Olsen stated that when the work was being done he was told that by doing this, it would be the safest way to keep them intact. Mr. Bollwinkel suggested that by putting something up in stucco to match the tops might be a safer solution. Mr. Olsen thinks it would be extremely difficult and expensive to go backwards. Mr. Allred stated that he wasn't too disturbed by the elevations and is worried that if Mr. Olsen now tried to go back and mimic what was previously there, it might look worse as oppose to better. Mr. Bollwinkel stated that the work that Mr. Olsen has done is definitely an improvement. Mr. Hacker asked if they were able to do something with the new design aesthetically using other materials to accent something that would make it look similar to the way it used to look. Mr. Allred stated that there are a lot of new products that would allow them to accomplish that, with slight variations. Mr. Bollwinkel suggested rather than take the cornice off, extend the pillars up through so that there would be a cap on it like it is historically. Mr. Wilkinson made note that Mr. Bollwinkel was drawing up elements that would stick up above the cornice. Mr. Hacker was thinking if instead of building it all the way to the same level as the top, the sides could just be brought down to where they are more in line with side pillars.

Mr. Olsen reminded the Design Review Board member's that he is a small business and has already gone over budget. To do what they are suggesting would be extremely expensive and he doesn't think it would be safe to start ripping parts off.

Mr. Hacker made note that the topic of the guidelines in preserving historic property has come up with the City Council before. What happens to the small business man that has expensive historical properties that need renovation? Mr. Hacker wanted to know if there were other options as to what the historic district has in terms of assistance in funding such projects. Mr. Wilkinson stated that there is currently no kind of grant funding for that type of project. Mr. Bollwinkel made note that if the business does get itself on the historic register the History Advisory Board of Murray could possibly help with funding. It is a process and does take some time. Mr. Olsen asked if they could finish the work they are doing and then apply for getting on the historic register for funding to get it back to what the guidelines require. Mr. Hacker wanted to know if the façade renovation is just an interim fix for safety issues. Mr. Olsen said prior to the renovation, the pillars had chunks out of them. The stucco expert that he had look at them told him what he thought he should do to make them safe and structurally sound. Mr. Bollwinkel suggested letting Mr. Olsen finish what he started then giving him a year to apply for historic status and get some grants and then come back with a proposal to try and match some of the historical elements.

Mr. Wilkinson reiterated that what the Design Review Committee does is simply give a recommendation, not the final decision as to what happens. At that point it would go onto the Planning Commission for their decision. At this meeting there needs to be a determination if this renovation is in compliance with the Design Guidelines. There can be some conditions recommended for future renovations, but it cannot be ruled or determined at this meeting that what has already been done is not in compliance, but could be in the future.

Mr. Christensen stated that to his knowledge, the building department for Murray City hasn't even looked at it, so that would be another department that would need to look at it and determine whether it passes the building code. Mr. Wilkinson made note that what had already been renovated and without a permit. Mr. Hacker stated that it was obvious that the renovation that has taken place is not in compliance with the guidelines as the features were replaced as opposed to repaired. In doing so this changed the original look of the building. He would recommend to the Planning Commission that there be some time given to the applicant to figure out what is wrong structurally.

Mr. Allred wanted to make sure that he understands correctly. Elements have been removed from the building, but it appears that the Design Review Committee would like to see those elements back on the building. Mr. Bollwinkel confirmed that. Mr. Allred then stated that the committee could make a recommendation to the Planning Commission that the Design Review Committee would like to see the building look as it previously did and more in character with its historical features. Mr. Bullwinkel agrees that he likes what has been done, but he thinks that if the column tops could be put above the new parapet that has been established rather than moving the two end walls, this might be a good compromise. Mr. Wilkinson said that those suggestions could be taken to the Planning Commission. Mr. Allred added that at the Planning Commission

meeting, the applicant could then make a plea to finish the project in the direction that he has already gone.

Mr. Bollwinkel made a motion that the applicant be allowed to finish the existing renovation in the direction that he is going, but add pillars that would be similar to the pillar tops that extend above the building in the historic photographs.

Mr. Hacker seconded the motion.

A voice vote was made. Motion passed 3-0.

Mr. Hacker asked how much of the renovation is styrofoam. Mr. Olsen isn't sure what the actual materials are or what was used. Mr. Olsen is appreciative that the committee is giving the recommendation that they have, but the de-construction would not be financially feasible for him.

#### IV. ITEMS FROM STAFF

Meeting adjourned.

---

Chad Wilkinson, Manager  
Community & Economic Development