

**SALT LAKE CITY HISTORIC LANDMARK COMMISSION
REQUEST BY CRAIG AMES, ARCHITECT, FOR APPROVAL TO
CONSTRUCT A MULTI-TENANT BUILDING AT 464 S. 600 E. IN THE
CENTRAL CITY HISTORIC DISTRICT**

470-06-42

WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 4, 2006

OVERVIEW

Architect Craig Ames is requesting approval to construct a 5,198 square foot commercial building at 464 S. 600 E., to house three retail tenants. The subject property is zoned CS, Commercial Shopping, the purpose of which is to “*Provide an environment for efficient and attractive shopping center development at a community level scale.*” (Salt Lake City Ordinance 21A.26.030(A)). The size of the property is 11,730 square feet.

The proposed pad site is in the southeast corner of the block associated with Smith’s Marketplace, formerly Fred Meyer. The property is the site of the former Bill McHenry house, the founder and owner of the former Bill and Nada’s Restaurant. It is located in the Central City Historic District.



BACKGROUND

Family Center Development and McHenry House Site

The Central City Historic District was designated in 1991. Three years later, Hermes Associates, Ltd., petitioned the city to demolish thirteen buildings on the block and to construct the existing “Family Center at East Downtown,” which includes Smith’s Marketplace, Café Rio, and Men’s Wearhouse on this block, and Ace Hardware, Old Navy, Staples, and Chili’s on the block just east. The subject property was once the site of the Bill and Ellen McHenry house, and was originally slated for demolition at the time the Family Center was proposed, but the McHenrys were reluctant to leave their home. Hermes was able to purchase a right of first refusal on the property, and constructed the new buildings around the McHenry’s house, allowing the McHenrys to reside in their home. The developers built a tall masonry wall to buffer the house from the adjacent shopping activity.

After Mr. and Mrs. McHenry died, three weeks apart, in 1999, East Downtown, L.L.C., the successor owners to Hermes, purchased the house from the McHenry estate. The McHenry house was demolished in 2000.

Planned Development Approval and Conditions of Approval

New development in a CS Zoning District requires planned development approval by the Planning Commission. The following text provides a background to the process and issues the Planning Commission reviewed, prior to its approval on June 11, 2003.

On May 2, 2002, the Planning Commission heard a request by applicants Total Property Asset Management for planned development approval to create a pad lot at 464 S. 600 E. as part of the Family Center (Fred Meyer, then Smith’s Marketplace) planned development. The planned development process allows the Planning Commission to modify the standards of the zone pertaining to site issues, such as minimum yard requirements and landscape yard requirements. In the case of the subject property, the applicants requested a reduction of the front yard landscaping and setback requirements, allowing front yard parking, and change of grade in excess of two feet at the property line. The Planning Commission tabled the conditional use planned development, and requested that the applicant review the issues related to the Planning Commission’s suggestion of relocating the pad site to the southeast corner of the Family Center development. The Planning Commission specifically asked the applicant to look at the issue of moving the building pad to the corner closer to the street intersection of 600 East and 500 South, eliminating the connecting driveway between the east and southwest parking lots and consider a direct access from 400 South to the existing Smith’s Marketplace loading dock.

After further review by the Planning Commission (June 6, 2002 and September 19, 2002), the Planning Commission approved the planned development on June 11, 2003. Ultimately, the design of the site plan had to be in accordance with the terms of a lease between the property owner (Total Asset Management) and Fred Meyer (now East Downtown Spe LLC) based on agreements between the City, Total Property Asset

Management and Fred Meyer. The agreements required that the building on the subject pad site had to be pushed toward the west, so that traffic within the overall development could circulate east of the building on the pad site, and connect the upper and lower parking lots.

The Planning Commission approved the subject pad site on June 11, 2003, subject to the following conditions:

1. That the developer provides a street tree protection plan and the building permit plans be reviewed and approved by the City's Urban Forester.
2. That the Planning Director or designee approves the final landscape plans.
3. That the Planning Director or designee approves the final site plan.
4. That the final plans meet all applicable City codes excluding the site plan modifications relating to landscape yard requirements, obstructions in required yards and front yard parking.
5. That the Planning Director is delegated the authority to approve the design of future structures and site plan approval including pedestrian circulation, to include a crosswalk from 600 East to the proposed building, subject to receiving input from the Central City Community and a positive recommendation from the Historic Landmark Commission.

PROPOSAL

The applicant, Craig Ames, is proposing to construct a one-story retail structure to house three tenants. The proposed building is 5,198 square feet. The height of the main structure, when viewed from the east, would be 20'-8" high; to the top of the parapet walls would be 31 feet high. The proposed materials are Atlas brick and Exterior Insulated Finish System (EIFS) on the walls, with EIFS in the parapet walls. The roofline of the overall building is flat. It is punctuated with three, gabled parapets on the east elevation, and one broad parapet on the south and the north elevations. Standing seam metal is proposed for the edges of the gables of the parapets. The applicant is proposing to use horizontal, metal railings for the walkways.

Access to the storefronts would be from the east. Each entrance is demarcated by wide sidelights and a transom. Vertically-oriented sets of windows are located on the south elevation. No wall openings are proposed on the west or north elevations.

Large signage panels are proposed for the east, south and north elevations. The CS Zoning District allows signage up to one square foot per linear feet of building frontage. Signage is reviewed as a separate permit, and will be submitted at a later date. Because large areas of three elevations include space for signage, it is important for the Historic Landmark Commission to be aware that the area for future signage does not meet the standards of the Zoning Ordinance, and thus the Historic Landmark Commission will have to review the wall treatment accordingly. The square footage of the proposed signage on the east, south and north elevations is 288 square feet (per elevation). The

allowed square footage of signage on the north and south elevations is 56.5 square feet. The allowed square footage of signage on the east elevation is 92 square feet.

ANALYSIS

Requirements of the Zoning Ordinance

As discussed earlier, the Planning Commission must review all new construction in a CS Commercial Shopping Zoning District as a planned development. The Planning Commission reviewed and approved the proposed development on June 11, 2003.

The Historic Landmark Commission must review the subject application according to the requirements of the Zoning Ordinance.

21A.34.020 H Historic Preservation Overlay District:

H. Standards for Certificate of Appropriateness Involving New Construction or Alteration of a Noncontributing Structure. In considering an application for a certificate of appropriateness involving new construction, or alterations of noncontributing structures, the historic landmark commission, or planning director when the application involves the alteration of a noncontributing structure, shall determine whether the project substantially complies with all of the following standards that pertain to the application, is visually compatible with surrounding structures and streetscape as illustrated in any design standards adopted by the historic landmark commission and city council and is in the best interest of the city.

1. Scale and Form.

- a. Height and Width. The proposed height and width shall be visually compatible with surrounding structures and streetscape;*
- b. Proportion of Principal Facades. The relationship of the width to the height of the principal elevations shall be in scale with surrounding structures and streetscape;*
- c. Roof Shape. The roof shape of a structure shall be visually compatible with the surrounding structures and streetscape; and*
- d. Scale of a Structure. The size and mass of the structures shall be visually compatible with the size and mass of surrounding structure and streetscape.*

DISCUSSION: Buildings in the vicinity of this property include a variety of sizes and shapes, including Trolley Square to the southeast, the Smith's Marketplace to the west, flat-roofed, small scale commercial structures directly north, and two-story commercial corners on the south side of 500 South. With the exception of Trolley Square and its scalloped parapet walls, the commercial buildings have flat or low-pitched roofs, and are one- to three- stories in height. Across the street to the east, the Historic Landmark and Planning commissions approved the construction of a retail bakery and restaurant, 4,144 square feet in

size, in 2006. The pad sites on the Smith's Marketplace block are similar in scale and size to the subject proposal. Similar to the nearby commercial structure, the orientation of the building is horizontal, as it is wider than it is tall. Therefore, the scale and form will be compatible with the surrounding structures and streetscape.

FINDING: The proposed design meets the intent of the "scale and form" standards. The scale and form of the proposed structure fall within the range of building forms found in the area.

2. Composition of Principal Facades.

- a. Proportion of Openings. The relationship of the width to the height of windows and doors of the structure shall be visually compatible with surrounding structures and streetscape;*
- b. Rhythm of Solids to Voids in Facades. The relationship of solids to voids in the facade of the structure shall be visually compatible with surrounding structures and streetscape;*
- c. Rhythm of Entrance Porch and Other Projections. The relationship of entrances and other projections to sidewalks shall be visually compatible with surrounding structures and streetscape; and*
- d. Relationship of Materials. The relationship of the color and texture of materials (other than paint color) of the facade shall be visually compatible with the predominant materials used in surrounding structures and streetscape.*

DISCUSSION: The fenestration pattern of the proposed building delineates each tenant on the east elevation, and consists of a single door surrounded by horizontally-oriented windows and a fixed transom. Four sets of full-length windows, divided into eighths, are located on the south elevation. These are flanked by a set of windows divided into sixths. No fenestration or wall openings are located on the north or west elevations.

Traditionally, fenestration patterns on commercial buildings of this scale (one-story in height, in this case about 5,000 square feet), were symmetrically organized, and with glazing taking up most of the wall on the street elevations. The proposed fenestration is inconsistent with this pattern, but on the east and the south elevations does not present an appearance discordant with the variety of commercial buildings in the surrounding area. It is also, on the east side under "Tenant B," off center. Staff does not find the lack of fenestration on the west elevation to be out of character with the block, given its proximity to the change in topography due to the loading dock. Staff is most concerned with the lack of fenestration on the north elevation, which will be visible to passers-by and users of the shopping center, as this presents a blank wall to the public.

On the east elevation, the three tenant spaces are accessed by an uncovered walkway. Because of the slope of the site, the walkway is not at grade at the south end of the east, or front, elevation. The entrances are atypical of historic commercial architecture, but are consistent with the buildings in the Family Center and in the development housing Ace Hardware to the east.

The proposed materials include brick on the lower two-thirds of the walls and EIFS above, including the parapet walls. The brick and EIFS are carried around the entire building, with the exception of the north elevation, which is entirely EIFS. Both brick and EIFS are found in abundance in the vicinity of the subject property: Trolley Square is brick, while the Smith Marketplace to the west is EIFS and brick. For the most part, standing seamed metal roofing is generally not in character with the City's historic architecture, but was approved for the Smith's Marketplace building, and thus is in keeping with the recent construction on this block. A materials board has not been submitted for the project at this time.

FINDING: In the existing proposal, the applicant does meet the standard in terms of proportion of openings and rhythm of solids to voids in facades for the south and east elevations, but not for the north elevation. The applicant should correct the placement of the openings for "Tenant B" and center the openings under the gabled parapet. The applicant should work with Staff or the Historic Landmark Commission to propose alternatives for this elevation, as the amount of signage proposed for this elevation will not be allowed. Rhythm of entrance porches is not an issue in this case.

3. Relationship to Street.

- a. Walls of Continuity. Facades and site structures, such as walls, fences and landscape masses shall, when it is characteristic of the area, form continuity along a street to ensure visual compatibility with the structures, public ways and places to which such elements are visually related;*
- b. Rhythm of Spacing and Structures on Streets. The relationship of a structure or object to the open space between it and adjoining structures or objects shall be visually compatible with the structures, objects, public ways and places to which it is visually related;*
- c. Directional Expression of Principal Elevation. A structure shall be visually compatible with the structures, public ways and places to which it is visually related in its orientation toward the street; and*
- d. Streetscape-Pedestrian Improvements. Streetscape and pedestrian improvements and any change in its appearance shall be compatible to the historic character of the landmark site or H historic preservation overlay district.*

DISCUSSION: Continuous setbacks and landscape massing are not characteristics of the neighborhood's streetscape. Many of the buildings in the

vicinity of the subject property, such as the Modern Display warehouse to the east and the west wall of the Family Center to the north, do not have deep setbacks and form a street wall on these block faces. These block faces are interrupted by parking lots and front-yard parking. The Smith's Marketplace to the west has a large expanse of parking throughout the development, with a wide, landscaped buffer along 600 East.

During its review for planned development approval, the Planning Commission debated the siting of the proposed building. The Planning Commission allowed the following modifications to the requirements of the Zoning Ordinance, due to the wide parking strip on 600 East and the topography of the lot:

- 1) Reduction of the front-yard landscaping and setback requirements. The Zoning Ordinance requires a landscaped front yard of 15 feet; this was waived through the planned development process when the Family Center was approved in 1994.
- 2) Allowance of parking in the front yard. Parking is not permitted within 15 feet of the front lot line, but the modifications requested for the subject pad site were consistent with the planned development approval for the surrounding Family Center development, and was necessary to connect the parking areas between 600 East and 500 East.
- 3) Grade changes greater than two feet are not permitted within the front yard. The Planning Commission approved the modifications of the grade changes reviewed as part of the planned development because they were consistent with the planned development approval for the surrounding Family Center development, and to ease the access transition between the upper and lower parking lots of the development.

FINDING: The continuity of block frontages near the subject property varies in terms of siting and the rhythm of spacing the structures on the street. The deviations from historic commercial architecture are typical of the newer development in the vicinity. The modifications to the Zoning Ordinance in terms of siting have already been approved by the Planning Commission. Despite these deviations, the proposed new building will contribute to create a greater presence on the street and in the neighborhood by breaking up a vacant piece of ground.

4. Subdivision of Lots. The planning director shall review subdivision plats proposed for property within an H historic preservation overlay district or of a landmark site and may require changes to ensure the proposed subdivision will be compatible with the historic character of the district and/or site(s).

DISCUSSION AND FINDING: The applicant has already received subdivision approval to record the existing lots as well as the proposed pad.

In addition, the Historic Landmark Commission must consider the application within the context of the Design Guideline standards that apply to this proposal:

13.31 Maximize the visual impacts of automobiles as seen from the sidewalk by pedestrians. *Provide landscaped buffer areas to screen and separate the sidewalk from parking and drive lanes within individual commercial sites.*

13.32 Screen service areas from the residential portions of the historic district. *Use fences, walls and planting materials to screen service areas. When feasible, locate service areas away from residential portions of the historic district.*

13.33 Minimize the visual impacts of signs. *This is particularly important as seen from within the residential portions of the historic district. Smaller signs are preferred. Monument signs and low pole-mounted signs are appropriate.*

13.34 Shield all site lighting such that it does not spill over into residential portions of the historic district.

DISCUSSION: As per the requirements of the Zoning Ordinance, the dumpster and other service equipment must be screened from view. Signage will be handled under a separate permit; however, the Historic Landmark Commission has a strong record for not allowing back-lit signage that is in one plastic panel. The signage area as presented is not allowed under the Zoning Ordinance. The Zoning Ordinance requires that lighting cannot spill onto other properties. There are not residential properties near these parcels.

FINDING: The applicant must resolve the issue of the placement of the dumpster and it must be screened. The proposed signage exceeds that allowed under the Zoning Ordinance. Staff has communicated these concerns to the applicant, and has listed their resolution as a condition of approval in the following section, under “Recommendation.” The applicant cannot install lighting that spills onto other properties; however, residential properties are not located near the subject property.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the Historic Landmark Commission approve the proposed plan, with final review to be delegated to the Planning Division Staff, based on the following conditions:

- 1) That the applicant resolve the issue of the signage space on the east, south and north elevations prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness.
- 2) That the applicant indicate the placement and screening of a dumpster prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness.
- 3) That a material board be submitted to Staff.
- 4) That the fenestration of the east elevation of each tenant be centered under the respective gabled parapet.
- 5) That the conditions the Planning Commission placed on the proposed pad site as per its planned development approval for Case No. 410-586 be delegated to the

- Planning Director for final review; specifically the requirement for a pedestrian walkway from 600 East to the building.
- 6) This approval is for design only; all other City requirements must be met prior to obtaining a building permit.

Elizabeth Giraud, AICP
Senior Planner
October 4, 2006

- Attachments: Exhibit A: Photographs of the Vicinity of the Property.
Exhibit B: Submitted Plans.
Exhibit C: Memorandum from Planning Division Senior Planner Everett Joyce to the Planning Commission and minutes from June 11, 2003 Planning Commission meeting.
Exhibit D: Correspondence from Central City Community Council Chair.

Exhibit A
Photographs of the Vicinity of the Property

Exhibit B
Submitted Plans

Exhibit C
Memorandum from Planning Division
Senior Planner Everett Joyce to the
Planning Commission and minutes
from June 11, 2003 Planning
Commission meeting

Exhibit D
Correspondence from Central City Community
Council Chair

