

**SALT LAKE CITY  
HISTORIC LANDMARK COMMISSION  
Minutes of the Meeting  
Held at 451 South State Street, Room 126  
June 6, 2007**

A field trip preceded the meeting and was attended by Commission Members Dave Fitzsimmons, Noreen Heid, Pete Ashdown, Paula Carl, Creed Haymond, Esther Hunter, and Anne Oliver. Planning Staff present were Joel Paterson, Doug Danise, Nick Norris, Casey Stewart, and Lex Traugher. A quorum was present, therefore, minutes were taken of the field trip.

**MINUTES OF THE FIELD TRIP**

715 North West Capitol Street

Mr. Paterson gave an overview as to why the project was coming back to the Commission to be amended. Staff and the Commission discussed the changes that were proposed on the original application.

15 South Main

Mr. Dansie gave an overview of the request by describing the current makeup of the façade and the proposed relocation site. Mr. Dansie explained that the applicant considered the façade as an integral part of the proposed new development and that the work would be bonded.

220 South 700 East

Mr. Traugher explained the proposal to the Commissioners. He discussed the possibility of additional landscaping in the parking lot. He further explained details of easement that runs in front of the proposed new structure and also the proposed façade of the Big Lots/RiteAid building including the materials that would be used.

623 North Wall Street

Mr. Stewart gave the Commission an overview of the proposal including a review of the setbacks and indicated that depending upon the decision of the Historic Landmark Commission, the proposal may need to be heard before the Board of Adjustment.

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING**

The Historic Landmark Commission and Staff assembled for the meeting. Present from the Historic Landmark Commission were Chairperson Fitzsimmons, Commissioner Heid, Commissioner Ashdown, Commissioner Carl, Commissioner Haymond, Commissioner Hunter, Commissioner Lloyd, and Commissioner Oliver.

Present from the Planning Staff were George Shaw, Planning Director; Cheri Coffey, Deputy Planning Director; Joel Paterson, Planning Programs Supervisor; Doug Dansie,

Principal Planner; Janice Lew, Principal Planner; Casey Stewart, Principal Planner; and Lex Traugher, Principal Planner.

Due to equipment malfunction, the meeting did not start at the scheduled time. Chairperson Fitzsimmons called the meeting to order at 4:17 p.m.

An agenda was mailed and posted in accordance with Zoning Ordinance regulations for public hearing noticing and was posted in the appropriate locations within the building, in accordance with the open meeting law. Members of the Public were asked to sign a roll, which is being kept with the minutes of the Historic Landmark Commission meeting. The sign in sheet indicates that thirteen members of the public were present, however, twenty-six seats were filled. An electronic recording of this proceeding will be retained in the Planning Division office for a period of no less than one year.

Chairperson Fitzsimmons inquired if all Commissioners had the opportunity to visit sites that would be the subject of discussion at this meeting. The Commissioners indicated they had visited the sites.

The Chair and Commissioner Heid gave a report of the meeting on May 17, 2007 with the Redevelopment Agency (RDA). The participants were: David Fitzsimmons, Noreen Heid, George Shaw, Cheri Coffey, D.J. Baxter, Eric Jergensen, Carlton Christensen, Valda Tarbet, and others.

Ms. Tarbet agreed to meet with the Historic Landmark Commission and give an informal presentation describing how the RDA functions. During the joint meeting with the RDA, the discussion led to how the Historic Landmark Commission could be involved with the RDA decision making earlier in the process. As the RDA acquires its own properties, the consensus of meeting participants was that the Historic Landmark Commission should be involved with the property shortly after acquisition, and the RDA committed to notifying the Commission immediately after the property purchase was finalized.

The Cambridge, Regis, and Windsor properties, all located on State Street, have historic significance and the Historic Landmark Commission was invited to look at these properties and to provide feedback as to how these properties could be appropriately renovated and used. A forum for collaboration was not decided at the meeting, but Ms. Tarbet agreed to notify Ms. Coffey when property of historical nature was purchased by the RDA.

Commissioner Hunter expressed the desire to hold a monthly work session until the quarterly work sessions had been scheduled. Seeing as it was approaching 4:30 p.m., which is the traditional time to begin hearings, Chairperson Fitzsimmons requested that the Commissioners send him an email stating a preferred subject for the upcoming work session.

## COMMENTS TO THE COMMISSION

Chairperson Fitzsimmons stated comments would be taken for issues impacting the Historic Districts and Historic Preservation in Salt Lake City.

Cindy Cromer commented that having Historic Landmark Commission members present at the Economic Hardship hearing on March 13, 2007 to consider the matter of Case No. 470-06-57, regarding 265 South 700 East, 262-264 South 700 East, and 268 South 700 East was helpful. She thanked them for taking the time to attend. She asked that members of the Historic Landmark Commission consider attending the appeal of the decision of that case before the Land Use Appeals Board on June 18, 2007.

Seeing as no further members of the public expressed the desire to speak, Commissioner Fitzsimmons closed the Public Comment portion of the meeting and moved on to the approval of the minutes.

## APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Commissioner Lloyd moved to approve the minutes of the May 2, 2007, Historic Landmark Commission meeting.

Commissioner Ashdown seconded the motion. All voted "Aye"; the minutes were approved.

## UNFINISHED BUSINESS

**Case No. 470-06-34** — a petition by Wayne Harrier requesting to modify a previous approval by the Historic Landmark Commission to construct a single-family house in the Capitol Hill Historic District at approximately 715 North West Capitol Street.

*(This item was heard at 4:34 p.m.)*

Mr. Paterson introduced the case explaining that on October 4, and November 1, 2006, the Historic Landmark Commission considered a proposal by Mr. Wayne Harrier for the construction of a new single family home on a vacant lot at 715 N. West Capitol Street. After the applicant made the revisions recommended by the Historic Landmark Commission, the proposed project was approved on November 1, 2006. Subsequently, a Certificate of Appropriateness was issued, building permits were granted and construction began on the home.

During the excavation of the site, the applicant determined that the actual grade along the west edge of the home was approximately eight feet (8') below the elevation indicated on the approved building plans. After further review by the Building Services Division, it was determined that adjusting the building plans to accommodate the change in grade would result in a structure that exceeded the thirty-five foot (35')

maximum building height limit in the RMF-35 Moderate Density Multi-family Residential District.

Mr. Harrier was forced to redesign the house and submitted revised plans to the Planning Division on May 15, 2007. The Planning Staff determined that the proposed modifications of the approved plans were significant and scheduled a public hearing to allow the Historic Landmark Commission the opportunity to review the latest proposal.

The revised house plans include the following modifications to the plans approved by the Historic Landmark Commission on November 1, 2006 (see Attachment 1 – Revised Site Plan and Elevations):

- The rear section of the home has been shifted about twenty feet (20') to the north.
- The ridge of the roof over the main portion of the house is at a consistent elevation and no longer steps-down on to the west.
- The deck on the west (rear) façade has been reduced in size and the door under the deck has been replaced by a window.
- The configuration of windows on the west (rear) façade was revised.
- The width of the deck on the north (right) elevation has been narrowed to accommodate the step in the house.
- The east (front) elevations were modified by the proposed shift of the rear portion of the building to the north. This creates a new element of the house that will be visible from West Capitol Street; however it is setback approximately fifty-five feet (55') from the east (front) face of the house.

The exterior materials have not changed from those approved earlier and will be extended to the new facades of the house. The revised plans have been reviewed by the Building Services Division to ensure that the house meets all Zoning Ordinance requirements.

The Planning Staff recommends that the Historic Landmark Commission approve the revised plans for the house at 715 N. West Capitol Street subject to the following condition:

Approval of the final details of the design including the fenestration pattern of the proposed house shall be delegated to the Planning Staff based upon the direction given by the Historic Landmark Commission during the hearing.

The applicant was invited to approach the Commission to add to the presentation and to answer any questions that the Commission might have. He stated that he had the property surveyed and the grades represented in the revised application are reliable. In response a question from the Commission, the applicant confirmed that he had incorporated double hung windows into the home design as recommended by the Commission at the Historic Landmark Commission meeting on November 6, 2006.

Mr. Paterson noted that he had received written comments regarding the project which are included with the Staff Report. In response to a question from the Commission he briefly described the changes reflected in the drawings.

### **Motion**

**Commissioner Ashdown put forward a motion in regards to Case No. 470-06-34 that the Historic Landmark Commission does accept the proposed modification which was a previously approved request for construction of a single family home at 715 North West Capitol Street as designated by Staff.**

**Seconded by Commissioner Haymond.  
All voted 'Aye"; passed unanimously.**

**Case No. 470-07-21 Issues Only Public Hearing (No decision will be made by the Historic Landmark Commission)— a request by Trolley Square Associates, LLC, to build multiple new structures at Trolley Square, located at approximately 602 East 500 South. The new structures include a 10,372 square foot addition to an existing structure, a new 52,293 square foot building and a 23,500 square foot building with two levels of underground parking. Trolley Square is a Historic Landmark Site and is located within the Central City Historic District.**

*(This item was heard at 4:46 p.m.)*

Mr. Norris gave a PowerPoint presentation regarding the history of the property and an overview of changes that will be proposed in the future. He stated that on May 15, 2007 a joint subcommittee that included members of the Historic Landmark Commission and the Planning Commission convened to review the proposed development at Trolley Square. The Subcommittee members include Noreen Heid, Warren Lloyd, and Esther Hunter from the Historic Landmark Commission and Prescott Muir, Peggy McDonough, and Tim Chambless from the Planning Commission. The subcommittee reviewed the proposed changes and provided the applicants with direction on the key issues. The key issues discussed at the meeting were:

1. Relocating the sand house, water tower, entry sign, and trolley car;
2. The architecture of all new buildings and additions;
3. Pedestrian access to the site, particularly on 500 South at 600 and 700 East Streets;
4. The overall impact of the proposed development on the historical nature of Trolley Square.

The proposed relocations would be discussed under a separate agenda item.

The main issue relating to the architecture of the proposed buildings and additions is focused on the impact the architecture could have on the original structures at Trolley Square. The distinguishing features of the trolley barns are the mission style arches

that define the roof lines. The applicants are proposing modification of the arch style and changing the materials for the main entrance to proposed new Building C (Whole Foods). The main entry will be along the 700 East frontage with the existing parking between the structure and the street. On the proposed addition to Building A (existing northern building) the applicants are proposing a tilted arch roof element. Proposed Building C (Whole Foods Store) is designed in a manner that places the service area of the building along 500 South. This results in the building being inward oriented and essentially turning its back to the street. It was discussed that improving the north elevation of the building could result in an improved appearance along 500 South. In addition, a parking ramp that would go up from the established grade is located near the northeast corner of the block. The ramp becomes a prominent feature at a highly visible corner at 500 South and 700 East. It will be necessary to design the ramp so that it does not become a focal point.

The subcommittee commented that pedestrian activity was very important at the 600 East and 700 East intersections with 500 South. Addressing the pedestrian connectivity to these corners would promote a walkable center and take advantage of the TRAX stop between 600 East and 700 East on 400 South.

Upon hearing feedback from the Historic Landmark Commission during this hearing, the applicant would be able to address the issues and make any necessary changes to the drawings for the proposed development.

It is anticipated that the Planning Commission will review the site plan during a public hearing on June 27, or July 11, 2007. If the site plan is approved by the Planning Commission, the project will come back to the Historic Landmark Commission for review of the proposed new construction and additions. Staff will prepare a staff report and a recommendation based on how the proposal relates to the Historic Design Guidelines and City Ordinance.

Seeing as the Commission did not have questions for Mr. Norris at this time, Chairperson Fitzsimmons opened the public comment portion of the hearing.

#### Public Comment

Cindy Cromer, property owner, approached the Commission. She stated that construction of a new building would block the view from the street of the trolley barns. She further stated that the north east corner blocks the view as well as displaying utilitarian fixtures prominently.

Luke Garrot, a neighborhood council member, who spoke as a neighborhood resident, stated that the site plan as proposed is a development that has turned in on itself and will block the view of the significant historic buildings from 500 South and cause limited pedestrian access from that street. The two new tall buildings, the proposed Whole foods Building, and on the the new building where the crumbling parking structure now sits, significantly block the view from the public way. The feeling of openness will be

violated. The elevation in the packet does not reflect the extent of the loss of view of the historic structures.

No additional members of the public expressed the desire to speak. The Acting Chair closed the public comment part of the hearing and moved to Executive Session.

### Executive Session

The Commissioners entered a detailed discussion debating concerns they had in regards to the project. The Commission in general agreed with the findings of the Subcommittee in regards to identified problems. They stated further concerns in regards to the impact that new construction would have on the existing buildings, specifically the views of bldg B. The Commission raised the following discussion points and listed specific items that the applicant should address in the proposal:

1. Commissioner Hunter walked on the sidewalks around the site and across the street and noted how visible the existing trolley barns are. Particularly Building A and B from 600 East, Building A from the corner of 500 South and 600 East and Building B facing 700 East.
2. The rhythm and shape of the existing buildings in terms of how they relate to each other and the role the mission style arch plays in creating the rhythm between the buildings.
3. The slope of Trolley Lane and how the grade change impacts the views of the trolley barns, particularly with Building P in front of Building B. Adding the outlines of the existing buildings would help demonstrate how much of the existing buildings will be visible.
4. Shape of the roof line of the addition to Building A and the modified arch on Building C overwhelms the defining characteristics of the existing buildings, particularly the mission style arch.
5. Concerned over the street trees, particularly the Fremont Poplars on 600 East. The Fremont Poplars have been nominated to be placed on the Heritage Tree list to help protect them. Commissioner Hunter requested a tree protection plan from the developer that showed how the trees would be protected during the construction process.
6. Commissioner Hunter specifically discussed providing the developer with a list of concerns raised to avoid the problem of the developer receiving different opinions from different people.

One of the key features of the site is the view from northwest of the property which allows a view of the west end of Building A with a distinctive mission style parapet wall. The proposed plan would interfere with that view. The commission asked about the grade change in this area and how it impacted the overall height of the addition. The commission asked if the architect could add the arches of the existing buildings to the elevations of the new drawings to get a better idea of what was being covered up.

The Commission expressed particular concerns about the modified arch of Buildings A and B. The modified arch would detract from the impact of the existing historic style and disrupt the rhythm of the existing buildings. Specific concerns were expressed regarding the shape of the modified arch for the Whole Foods structure.

There is a tree protection plan prepared by the developer that incorporates protection of the trees but the Commissioners made comment that the buildings seem to jut out too close to the root system. The Commission asked if a more detailed tree protection plan was necessary. Specifically, two elms which have been nominated under the Heritage Act would be potentially jeopardized. The applicant rebutted that the trees were older and have an expected 100 to 125 year life span.

Members of the Commission stated that it would be helpful to have a model or more detailed drawings to visualize the views from the streets. The commission also stated that they need to provide the applicant with a detailed list of issues to avoid the possibility of the applicant getting a mix of opinions between the subcommittee and the full commission.

The architect provided a response to the concerns raised by the public and the Commissioners. The applicants would develop a response to the issues after all of the comments were received during the Historic Landmark Commission and Planning Commission meetings. The applicant acknowledged that the development must balance the economic needs of the property owner while protecting the public interest in the site. The development team was addressing public access issues on the northwest and northeast corners of the site.

The Commission asked several questions of the architect and raised additional concerns. The body asked about groundwater levels and the impact on underground parking vs. podium parking and the overall height of bldg C. The Commission and applicant talked about the process from this point forward.

Members of the Commission stated that it would be helpful to have a model or more detailed drawings to visualize the views from the streets.

**Case No. 470-07-19** — a request by Trolley Square Associates, LLC, to relocate multiple structures at Trolley Square located at approximately 602 East 500 South. The structures include the sand house (bank building), the water tower, the entry sign along 500 South and a trolley car that is occupied by a restaurant. The proposal would relocate the structures to new locations within Trolley Square. Trolley Square is a Historic Landmark Site and is located in the Central City Historic District.

*(This item was heard at 5:27 p.m.)*



Mr. Norris introduced the request to relocate key elements of Trolley Square: The sand house originally was used to store sand that was placed on the trolley tracks to provide additional traction in the winter months. The brick structure had very few openings. In the 1970s the structure was converted to commercial purposes. Multiple alterations were made to the structure and most of the original openings in the building were filled in. New openings were cut for doorways and service windows.

The water tower was an original feature of the site, and is 97 feet in height. The original purpose of the tower was to provide an emergency water supply to the trolley barns in case of a fire. When the site was converted into a shopping center in the 1970s, a spiral staircase, decorative lighting, and signage were added to the tower. Similar changes have occurred over the years as tenants changed.

The trolley car is representative of the types of vehicles that ran on the trolley lines in Salt Lake City. The trolley car was added to the site as a permanent feature when the barns were converted to a shopping center. The trolley car was the home to a variety of uses over the years, and is currently occupied by a restaurant.

The entry sign on 500 South was originally located in front of the Orpheum Theater, (which became the Capitol Theater in 1927) where it spanned 200 South in Salt Lake City. It was relocated to Trolley Square after the trolley barns were rehabilitated into a shopping center. The petitioner is requesting to relocate the structure to accommodate a relocated access point on 500 South.

The applicants are proposing to construct multiple new buildings on Trolley Square. The proposal includes the construction of a new retail building with a footprint of approximately 52,000 square feet. Constructing the new building would require the relocation of multiple structures, including the sand house which is currently occupied by a bank, the water tower, a trolley car used as a restaurant and an entry sign located along 500 South. The sand house and the trolley car would be relocated to the west side of the main trolley barn. The water tower would be relocated approximately 20 feet south of its current location and the entry sign would be relocated approximately 30 feet to the south of its current location.

Staff finds that the proposed development meets the standards specified in the ordinance, and recommends approval of this project, with the following conditions:

- 1) This approval is for the relocations only; all other City requirements must be met prior to obtaining a building permit.
- 2) That the applicant provides staff with information on the contractor who has been hired to do the work. The information shall include the preferred method for relocating the structures and a plan to reestablish any elements that are damaged as part of the relocation process.
- 3) That the petitioner would submit a bond, pursuant to City requirements, prior to the issuance of a permit for moving the structures.

- 4) That the proposed locations are subject to Planning Commission approval for the Planned Development.

If the Historic Landmarks Commission determines that other design features are required, staff recommends that the Commission include those features as conditions of approval.

The applicant was invited to approach the Commission to add comments and to answer questions from the Commission. The applicant estimated that the reusable brick from the sand house would amount to 30-60% of the existing brick. The remaining brick would probably be damaged because of wall thickness and as a result of the sandblasting treatment of the exterior brick which was degraded beyond salvaging. With the use of the brick in the interior of the building, he anticipated that there would be more than enough brick to complete the new north and south elevations. The other elevation which had the big arch addition into it will probably be replaced with glazing.

The bank tenant is expected to relocate within the mall and a new tenant acquired. For the most part, the windows would be restored to their original placement.

In response to a question from the Commission, the applicant responded that he had not investigated the availability of tax credits as the site is not on the National Register.

Seeing as there were no further questions from the Commission, the Chair opened the meeting for public comment.

#### Public Comment

Cindy Cromer, property owner within the Historic District, stated that the developer had been sensitive to the views of the community. She also stated that the Commission should require specific findings as to why the sand building structure should be relocated. She wondered if the relocation was motivated by the current state of the building structure as it was compromised as a result of substantial alteration or if it was because a new use for the sand house would be to serve some type of unspecified historic purpose with a display of the original development of the Trolley Barns.

She asked the Commission to make specific findings as she felt the move was not an example of good preservation.

Ms. Cromer stated that there had been a project in the past where the removal of trees from the public way around the Jubilee Center was justified by the developer because the specific trees were not illustrated on the plans submitted to the Historic Landmark Commission and therefore, the developer stated that they were not protected.

Seeing as no further members of the public expressed the desire to speak, Chairperson Fitzsimmons closed the public comment section of the hearing and moved to Executive Session.

### Executive Session

A discussion ensued wherein Staff and the Commission agreed that the removal of trees was a concern and that it was within the purview of the Historic Landmark Commission to make findings in regard to landscaping during the predevelopment process. The Commissioners desired clarification regarding whose role it would be to specifically address the removal of trees.

Commissioner Fitzsimmons recalled the Hearing for the Marmalade project and stated that the positions of the trees were discussed and there was a plan presented, which the developer followed.

Commissioner Heid clarified that if a plan was presented and the tree size was misrepresented or the tree missing altogether, the developer is assuming passive permission to remove trees that are not represented on the drawings or to replace trees which have a larger trunk diameter or spread with smaller trees as illustrated on the plan.

As the subject of the discussion was relevant to Historic properties, but not specifically to the case, Chairperson Fitzsimmons stated that the discussion should continue outside of the hearing of this case.

The Commission entered a discussion about the justification of relocating the building and concluded that the deteriorated condition of the sand building justified the move, which should ensure that the building would be reconstructed in a manner that would restore the structure's original integrity and visually significant historical features on the exterior. A Trolley Square museum is being considered, but the developer has not indicated commitment to that project.

Whereas the entry arch on 500 South has been moved within the last 50 years, Commissioner Ashdown wondered if historical protection would not apply. Mr. Paterson stated that the arch was originally located downtown and had been moved to its current site in the 1970s, but this would have no bearing upon its historical significance or value. Because the arch sign is such a major structure to the site and the perception of the public is that it is a historic structure of the site, the developer has decided to bring it to the Commission for their comments.

Commissioner Hunter stated concern regarding the care with which the project would require to be done safely and wanted to ensure that the contractor hired to make the proposed move would be qualified to move historic structures and have a good track record of successful moving and reconstruction of historic structures. Even though the work would be bonded, once the structures are damaged or destroyed, payment of the bond could not bring them back.

In a final question from the Commission, the previous owner, Wallace Wright, stated that the Trolley car was not original to the site. It was altered with the addition of a cattle guard, but it was an authentic trolley car from Ogden, Utah.

**Motion**

**Commissioner Lloyd moved that in regards to Case No. 470-07-19, that the Historic Landmark Commission accepts that Staff recommendations specifically:**

- 1) Approve the relocation only.**
- 2) The applicant is to provide Staff with sufficient information with the background of the contractor to assure that the relocation of these structures will be done in a proper fashion and any elements that might be damaged in the process will be repaired.**
- 3) The petitioner will submit a bond per City requirements prior to issuance of the permit for moving the structures.**
- 4) The proposed location is subject to Planning Commission approval.**

**It is noted by the Commission that the relocation of the sand building is being approved due to the existing deteriorated condition and that the petitioner will be putting forth effort to restore the condition of the building considerably.**

- 5) Approval contingent upon the approval of the entire site plan.**

**Commissioner Heid seconded the motion.  
All voted "Aye"; the motion passed unanimously.**

*It is noted that after a discussion with the remaining members of the Commission, Commissioner Lloyd agreed to amend the motion to include the contingency listed as condition 5.*

*(Commissioner Ashdown left the meeting at 5:52 p.m.)*

**Case No. 470-06-49 — a petition by Property Reserve, Inc., for the relocation of a landmark structure (ZCMI facade), which is located at approximately 15 South Main Street. The proposal is to move the ZCMI facade to the north to better align with the construction of a new building as part of the City Creek Center Project.**

*(This item was heard at 5:54 p.m.)*

Mr. Dansie explained the application along with the history of the property. He stated that Property Reserve Inc. is requesting the City allow the relocation of a Landmark Site, the ZCMI facade, generally located at 15 South Main Street to a new site slightly to the north of the existing location. The facade is both a remnant of the original cast iron structure and a 1970s recreation of the original facade. On September May 22, 1970, the facade was placed on the National Historical Register. The site was subsequently listed on the Salt Lake City Register of Cultural Resources.

The subject property is located on the east side of Main Street as part of the old ZCMI (Macys) Department Store that will redevelop as part of the City Creek Center project. The façade will be relocated because the Macy's Department Store is being replaced and will move closer to the Zion's Bank Building, approximately 25 feet north of its existing location (the space now occupied by the food court between Zion's Bank and Macy's will no longer exist.) The façade is a designated Landmark site and is not within a historic district.

The ZCMI facade has been moved from its original location but retains sufficient historic and architectural significance and physical integrity to merit continued listing on the Salt Lake City Register of Cultural Resources. Therefore, Planning Division Staff recommended that the Historic Landmark Commission allow the façade to be dismantled stored and reconstructed approximately 25 feet north of its present location as part of the façade of a new department store. The Staff recommends that the new department store design be reviewed by the Landmark Commission once final design for the building has been proposed.

Staff finds that the proposed development meets the standards specified in the ordinance, and recommends approval of this project, with the following conditions:

- 1) This approval is for the relocations only; all other City requirements must be met prior to obtaining a building permit.
- 2) That the applicant provides Staff with information on the contractor who has been hired to do the work. The information shall include the preferred method for relocating the structure and a plan to reestablish any elements that are damaged as part of the relocation process.
- 3) That the petitioner submits a bond, pursuant to City requirements, prior to the issuance of a permit for moving the structures.
- 4) That the proposed location of the facade is subject to Planning Commission approval of the City Creel Center Planned Development.
- 5) The final location and design of the new department store will be reviewed by the Historic Landmark Commission

If the Historic Landmarks Commission determines that other design features are required, Staff recommends that the Commission include those features as conditions of approval.

The Commission will need to decide if the façade will be hung on the front of the proposed new building, as it is currently, or will it be an active façade or will be incorporated to the new molding with floor levels to match up with the windows.

Bill Williams, Director of Architecture, Property Reserve, Inc., was invited to approach the Commission to add comments to the presentation and to answer questions from the Commission. The applicant gave a PowerPoint presentation, a copy of which is included with these minutes.

As a side note, Mr. Williams noted that Steven Baird wrote about the alteration it in 1975. He stated that there were 12 layers of paint that had to be removed to reach the connectors.

In response to a question by Chairperson Fitzsimmons, the applicant responded that it was unknown whether the restoration of the façade was cast aluminum or of cast iron. Mr. Baird was physically unable to answer the question, but his son said that he thought that the upper pieces were of cast aluminum, but that is not what is written by Steven in 1975.

As the Commission did not have further questions for the applicant, Chairperson Fitzsimmons opened the public comment portion of the hearing.

#### Public Comment

Cindy Cromer suggested that the Historic Landmark Commission schedule a meeting to discuss the way the façade would be attached to the new structure. She stated that there is ambiguity in relation to redevelopment of the downtown area and it would be important to make specific recommendations so that the façade could be used in a better manner than was done in the 1970s.

Seeing that no other members of the public expressed the desire to speak, the Chair closed the hearing and moved on to the Executive Session.

#### Executive Session

Commissioner Lloyd stated that even though there will be an opportunity to discuss the proposed façade in the future, it is in the purview of the Commission to recommend that the reintroduction of this element involve a more historical recreation of the original use, and that the façade not be a front piece, but to actually engage the architecture.

#### Motion

**In regards to 470-16-49, Commissioner Lloyd put forth a motion to accept the Staff recommendation to allow the ZCMI façade to be dismantled and stored for reconstruction with the following conditions:**

- 1) The approval is for the intermittent removal and storage of the façade.**
- 2) All City requirements must be met prior to obtaining a building permit.**
- 3) The applicant is to provide information in regards to the contractor prior to removal and restoration.**
- 4) The petitioner is to submit a bond pursuant to meet City requirements prior to obtaining a permit to remove the structures.**
- 5) In addition to being subject to approval from the Planning Commission of the City Creek Planned Development, the applicant is to bring the proposed location of the façade before the Historic Landmark Commission with a reuse plan of the façade encouraging them to enlighten all aspects of the façade, reintroducing windows and openings in the upper stories of the façade.**

**Second Commissioner Hunter**  
**All voted “Aye”; the motion passed unanimously**

*(Mr. Shaw left the meeting at 6:07 p.m.)*

**Case No. 470-07-12** — a request by The Bolo Corporation, represented by Russ Naylor, for approval of an exterior remodel to the front façade of the Big Lots/Rite Aid building, and new construction of a new building on the same parcel. This site is located at approximately 220 South 700 East in the Central City Historic District.

*(This item was heard at 6:08 p.m.)*

Mr. Traugher introduced the proposal and the history of the property, stating that the applicant requested approval to remodel the front façade of the Big Lots/Rite Aid building. The existing concrete arching features that support that portion of the roof that extends over the entrances and front walkway will be removed. The applicant proposes that the building will remain with a flat roof and five (5) parapet features rising over the building entrances and windows. The applicant proposes fabric awnings over the front entrance ways and windows. The remodel materials consist primarily of brick with stucco accents, and aluminum framed windows, as well as wall mounted light fixtures.

The applicant is also proposing a new building of 6,833 square feet to be located on the same property, fronting on 700 East and functioning as a pad site. The new construction will mirror the remodel of the Big Lots/Rite Aid building in terms of design features and building materials. The new building will have an entrance door fronting 700 East, in addition to doorways along the south side of the building. A pedestrian walkway extending from the proposed building will provide a pedestrian connection with the sidewalk on 700 East.

Based on the discussion and findings of fact as noted in this staff report, as well as the attached documentation showing the proposed remodel of the façade of the Big Lots/Rite Aid building and the proposed construction of a new building on the site, Planning Staff recommends that the Historic Landmark Commission grant approval for the proposed development as presented, with the following conditions:

1. Approval of the final details of the design of the proposed project shall be delegated to the Planning Staff based upon direction given during the hearing from the Historic Landmark Commission.
2. The project must meet all other applicable City requirements, unless otherwise modified within the authority of the Historic Landmark Commission.
3. Applications for signage will be separate from this proposal.

The applicant was invited to approach the Commission to make additional comments

and to answer questions from the Commission.

Commissioner Carl stated that the proposed pedestrian connection from the new proposed building to 700 East is not reflected in the drawing.

In response to questions from the Commission, Mr. Traugher stated that the applicant should be able to answer questions regarding landscaping, pedestrian connectivity, and signage. As stated previously, the signage will be handled under a separate application.

Ingress and egress easement to Chevron is not negotiable. The applicant can not build over the easement, but they have moved as close as possible to that easement.

Commissioner Fitzsimmons declared a short break at 6:21 p.m. before proceeding with the remainder of the hearing. The meeting resumed at 6:23 p.m.

The applicant was invited to approach the Commission to add comments to the presentation and to answer questions from the Commissioners. Mr. Naylor stated that his intent was to upgrade the entire site with the inclusion of landscaping in the parking lot. The main portion of the building is not being altered, with the renovations taking place at the storefront and sidewalk and pedestrian walkway in front of the building.

The pedestrian walkway was not part of the original plan, but it has since been incorporated. Mr. Naylor passed around a revised drawing incorporating the pedestrian sidewalk that connects to 700 East. There is not currently a pedestrian walkway across the parking lot.

The concrete motif will be incorporated into the standing frame, stainless seam canopy and will be obscured by the façade allowing for an eight foot covered walkway in front of the Big Lot building.

Seeing that there were no further questions from the Commission, Chairperson Fitzsimmons closed the presentation part of the hearing.

### Public Comment

Chairperson Fitzsimmons opened the public comment portion of the meeting.

Cindy Cromer, abutting property owner, stated that her properties abut the Big Lots loading dock. The other three facades that interface with the abutting properties will not be improved by this project. The parking lot experiences very heavy pedestrian activity and safety is a major concern. She expressed concern regarding the loading dock area and the retaining walls behind the building. The addition of a new building in 700 East seems to be an improvement.

Judy Aardema, daughter of the owner of the Chevron building which holds an easement on the subject property, went into some detail regarding an attempt made in 1987 and



1989 by her father to possibly purchase the property and construct a carwash. At the time of that attempt, her father was told that, per the zoning, no structure could be built as it would reduce the amount of parking available for the other retail stores.

Ms. Aardema asked why the project was being considered when her father had not been allowed to develop the site in the past. She stated that she had no issue with the new store front. Seeing as no further member of the public indicated the desire to speak, the Chair closed the public comment portion of the hearing.

The applicant was allowed to add additional comments. He stated that the parking requirements might have changed over the years, but the plan meets the current standards as required by the Zoning Ordinance.

Seeing that no further members of the public expressed the desire to speak, the Chair closed the public hearing portion of the meeting.

#### Executive Session

The Commission generally agreed that pedestrian safety in the parking lot needed to be addressed. It was also agreed that the use of landscaping to shield the view of the loading dock would be appropriate and that the view from 200 South and 700 East is predominately the parking lot. The project would improve the view from the street. Finally the Commission agreed the interconnectivity was important for this site. The Commission noted that the trees as drawn on the site plan are not existing and will total in 34 trees on the site, which they considered a significant improvement.

#### Motion

**470-07-12 Commissioner Carl moved that the Historic Landmark Commission accept Staff's recommendation and accept the renovation plan with the following stipulations:**

- 1. The approval of the final details of the design are delegated to Planning Staff.**
- 2. The project is to meet all of the applicable City requirements**
- 3. The applicant is to consider providing some pedestrian interconnectivity between the different commercial entities**
- 4. The application for signage is to be handled seperately at a later date**
- 5. The guidelines for the Central City Historic guidelines to be met.**

Case No. 470-07-16 — a request by Roger Jacobsen, represented by Pamela Wells, for approval of an addition to the rear of the existing single family dwelling and construction of a detached garage, located at approximately 623 North Wall Street. This project will subsequently be reviewed by Board of Adjustment for side and rear yard variance

*(This item was heard at 6:48 p.m.)*

Mr. Stewart introduced the proposal in detail which is outlined in the staff report filed with these minutes. The applicant proposes two construction projects: an addition to the rear of the dwelling and a detached garage. The proposed addition consists of a basement portion (play room, bedroom, storage closet) and a ground level portion (master bedroom, bathroom, closet). The existing dwelling has two bedrooms, laundry, and bath in basement; and living room, den, kitchen on main level. The proposed plans are for the hip roof to match the existing roof. The exterior will include three finishes: troweled plaster, painted brick, and painted concrete foundation.

The proposed detached garage will be architecturally compatible with the dwelling and will have an exterior finish of troweled plaster. The garage will be a single car garage and will be located in the rear yard.

The proposal complies with all of the standards and guidelines and fits within the context of the neighborhood. Based upon the comments, analysis and findings of fact noted above, Planning Staff recommends the Historic Landmark Commission approve the application requesting approval to construct an addition to the rear of the existing single-family residence and construct a new single-car detached garage at approximately 623 North Wall St, subject to the following conditions:

1. The exterior finish of the detached garage shall not include wood imitation material.
2. Approval of the final details of the design shall be delegated to the Planning Staff based upon direction given during the hearing from the Historic Landmark Commission.
3. The project must meet all other applicable City requirements, unless otherwise modified within the authority of the Historic Landmark Commission, Administrative Hearing Officer, or Board of Adjustment.
4. The Historic Landmark Commission forwards a positive recommendation to the Board of Adjustment to approve a variance relating to building location of the detached garage in the side yard because the proposed design of the house is compatible with the area and fits in well to the layout of the property.

The applicant was invited to approach the Commission to add comments to the presentation and to answer any questions that the Commission might have. Roger Jacobson, the property owner stated that as the property now stands there are two runners that lead to the rear of the property, but no garage exists. Currently there is a small accessory shed in the rear of the yard.

In response to a question posed by Chairperson Fitzsimmons, the applicant acknowledged that there was an abrupt drop off at the rear of the property line and denied that it would have a negative impact on the proposed garage structure.

#### Public Hearing

Seeing that no member of the public expressed the desire to speak, the Chairperson closed the public comment section of the hearing and moved onto Executive Session.

**Motion**

**In regards to Case No. 470-07-16 Commissioner Lloyd moved that the HLC accept the Staff recommendation to approve the additions as indicated on the drawings with the condition that garage materials shall not include wood imitation materials. Approval of final details of design are delegated to staff. The project is to meet all City requirements. The Historic Landmark Commission would forward a positive recommendation to the Board of Adjustment to approve a variance to build the attached garage.**

**Seconded by Commissioner Heid.**

**All voted "Aye", the motion passed unanimously.**

REPORT OF THE PLANNING DIRECTOR

Seeing as the Planning Director was not present and Mr. Paterson did not have anything to report on his behalf, the Chair closed this section of the meeting.

OTHER BUSINESS

The Commission recognized Pam Wells who was in the audience and commended her for her work to further the cause of preservation to help establish the University Historic District.

There being no further business, Commissioner Lloyd moved to adjourn the meeting at 6:59 p.m.

---

David Fitzsimmons, Chairperson

---

Kathryn Weiler, Secretary