MEMORANDUM

PLANNING DIVISION COMMUNITY & ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

To:	Historic Landmark Commission
From:	Maryann Pickering – Principal Planner Phone: 801-535-7660 Email: <u>maryann.pickering@slcgov.com</u>
Date:	April 11, 2014
Re:	Trolley Square Site Improvements PLNHLC2013-01006

The Historic Landmark Commission voted unanimously at the meeting on February 6, 2014 to continue the public hearing for the above referenced item. The reason for the continuation was so that details of the proposed canopy features and the lighting columns could be provided by the applicant. Besides the canopy and lighting columns, the Historic Landmark Commission approved the remainder of the requested site improvements. Staff has received the details of the canopy and lighting columns. Below is an analysis of those two items.

Recommended Motion

Consistent with Staff Recommendation: Based on the findings made at the February 6, 2014 Historic Landmark Commission meeting, testimony and plans presented, I move to grant the request for a Certificate of Appropriateness for the remaining portion of the project s requested, for the following and subject to conditions:

- a. All lighting associated shall be downlit and comply with other applicable City Ordinances.
- b. All final design is subject to review and approval by Planning Division staff.

Project Description

The applicant has provided details of the two features noted above for your approval. The plans submitted to the Planning Division staff only show the details of these two features. Each item will be discussed separately.

Canopy

The entire overview or expanse of the canopy structure can be seen on Sheet AS-101. As a reminder, the canopy will extend from the proposed traffic circle/drop off area along 700 East and will be built parallel to the historic trolley barn building (Building D). The canopy terminates near the front of Pottery Barn. In addition to being parallel to the buildings, the canopy extends to the north at one section to provide shelter from patrons existing from the parking garage that is part of the Whole

Foods Building. The canopy also extends slightly to the south to provide shelter into the north entry of Building D (the historic trolley barn building).

Sheets AS-102.1-3 is enlarged site plans that show the location of the canopy on the ground. These sheets show the locations of the canopy supports and various dimensions.

Sheets AS102.4-6 is the same site plans showing the location as described above. In addition, these sheets show how the supports members for the actual canopy will be designed.

Sheets AS-102.7-9 again shows the canopy and its location, but these sheets are the ones to focus on for the design of the canopy. Sheet AS102.7 has the most detail with the proposed canopy design and an enlarged detail. These sheets and that design will be analyzed in more detail below.

Each panel will be 4 feet by 6 feet in size. The ivy leaf design shown will be laser cut into the metal panels. The panels will be a gray color that matches the concrete trim and concrete arches that are located on Building D (shopping mall building). The panel itself will then be sandwiched between two custom made crystal clear polycarbonate panels designed to protect the metal from the elements.

The applicant has proposed to light the panels with a programmable and changeable color LED lighting strip that will be located above or on top of the individual panels. A detail of the proposed lighting and its attachment to the panels can be found on Sheet AS-104.

Staff would also like to direct your attention to Sheet AS-104 for an exterior elevation of how the canopy will look from the 700 East side of the property. The panel is shown in the dashed area and the height has been adjusted so that it matches or flows with other horizontal features on the two buildings will be located between.

Lighting Columns

As with the canopy, the entire stretch of the proposed lighting can be seen on Sheet AS-101. The lighting columns are proposed to form a meandering line from the driveway along 500 South and extend south towards Building D (shopping mall). The light line will then continue east under and around the canopy and terminate at the water tower.

The details of the proposed lights can be found on Sheet AS-103. There will be four different heights for the columns, but they will all have the same pattern and same lighting components. The pattern on the columns will be laser cut metal panels with the same ivy leaf pattern as the canopy panels. Each column with have resin exterior that will protect the metal panel and lighting within the column. As with the canopy, these columns with have a changeable color LED light source incorporated into them.

On the far left side of Sheet AS-103, the applicant has provided a detail that shows how the heights of the light will be in a random pattern and create the appearance of a wave.

Analysis

Overall, Planning Staff is supportive of the revisions as described above. The details of the canopy and columns with their design is subtle in nature and will blend in with the historic nature of the site. The design of the panels on the canopy will be visible when patrons are around or under the canopy. From the exterior of the site, it will appear as a simple canopy with the metal support posts and arched roof. The lighting columns are designed to match the canopy, but they are also acceptable by themselves as a standalone design feature on the site. The design of the panels with a smaller ivy leaf pattern makes the columns a more solid feature than as shown previously.

The concern that Planning Staff has with both of the features is the lighting element of each feature. The level of illumination should be subtle in nature to fit with the historic character of the property. Bright LED lights will not be in keeping with the character of the site. Staff feels that a bright glow from the canopy or the lighting columns is not appropriate. Staff is also concerned with the fact that the applicant has chosen changeable color LED lighting for both of the features. Most historic lighting was white in nature and certainly not a lighting element that changed color when turned on. Staff acknowledges that lighting should be incorporated into each of the features, but it needs to be subtle.

A conditions of approval has been included that require all lighting to be white LED lighting. Staff would also recommend a condition to limits the amount of light for the features so that the glow is compatible with the character of the site.

Findings

The Historic Landmark Commission approved the concept of the canopies and lighting columns along with the rest of the site improvements at the February 6, 2014 Historic Landmark Commission meeting. The concern with the canopies and lighting columns was their design and proposed lighting. Those two items (design and lighting) have been discussed in this follow up memo. A link to the original report from February 6, 2014 can be accessed by the following link: http://www.slcdocs.com/Planning/HLC/2014/1006.pdf

Staff Recommendation

Based on the decision by the Historic Landmark Commission on February 6, 2014 to approve the site improvements for the subject site subject to further design review of the proposed canopy and lighting columns, it is the Planning Staff's opinion that overall the design of the canopy and lighting columns generally meets the standards and findings made by the Historic Landmark Commission on at their February 6, 2014 regular meeting.

Alternative Motion

Not Consistent with Staff Recommendation: Based on the findings made at the February 6, 2014 Historic Landmark Commission meeting testimony and plans presented, I move to deny the request for a Certificate of Appropriateness for the remaining portion of the project as requested. The Commission denies the proposal based on the following findings: (Commissioner then states findings to support the motion based on the following standards):

- 1. A property shall be used for its historic purpose or be used for a purpose that requires minimal change to the defining characteristics of the building and its site and environment;
- 2. The historic character of a property shall be retained and preserved. The removal of historic materials or alteration of features and spaces that characterize a property shall be avoided;
- 3. All sites, structures and objects shall be recognized as products of their own time. Alterations that have no historical basis and which seek to create a false sense of history or architecture are not allowed;
- 4. Alterations or additions that have acquired historic significance in their own right shall be retained and preserved;

- 5. Distinctive features, finishes and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a historic property shall be preserved;
- 6. Deteriorated architectural features shall be repaired rather than replaced wherever feasible. In the event replacement is necessary, the new material should match the material being replaced in composition, design, texture and other visual qualities. Repair or replacement of missing architectural features should be based on accurate duplications of features, substantiated by historic, physical or pictorial evidence rather than on conjectural designs or the availability of different architectural elements from other structures or objects;
- 7. Chemical or physical treatments, such as sandblasting, that cause damage to historic materials shall not be used. The surface cleaning of structures, if appropriate, shall be undertaken using the gentlest means possible;
- 8. Contemporary design for alterations and additions to existing properties shall not be discouraged when such alterations and additions do not destroy significant cultural, historical, architectural or archaeological material, and such design is compatible with the size, scale, color, material and character of the property, neighborhood or environment;
- 9. Additions or alterations to structures and objects shall be done in such a manner that if such additions or alterations were to be removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the structure would be unimpaired. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible in massing, size, scale and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment;
- 10. Certain building materials are prohibited including the following:
- a. Aluminum, asbestos, or vinyl cladding when applied directly to an original or historic material.
- 11. Any new sign and any change in the appearance of any existing sign located on a landmark site or within the H historic preservation overlay district, which is visible from any public way or open space shall be consistent with the historic character of the landmark site or H historic preservation overlay district and shall comply with the standards outlined in chapter 21A.46 of this title.

Attachments:

- 1. Revised Plans for Canopies and Lighting Columns
- 2. Excerpt of minutes from February 6, 2014 Historic Landmark Commission meeting





PLNHLC2013-01006 - Trolley Square



SYMBOLS LEGEND











PROJECT TEAM

PROJECT ARCHITECT

FFKR ARCHITECTS 730 W. Pacific Ave. S.L.C., Utah 84104 (801) 521-6186 office (801) 539-1916 fax

STRUCTURAL ENGINEER

PALMER ENGINEERING, LLC 1408 N. 1050 W. Pleasant Grove, Utah 84062 (801) 796-0590 office (801) 796-3616 fax

Page 4 of 21



TROLLEY SQUARE

SITE IMPROVEMENTS - PHASE II **REVIEW DOCUMENTS** (NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION) 4 APRIL 2014

DRAWING INDEX

COVER SHEET

AS-101	SITE KEY PLAN
AS-102.1	CANOPY PLAN
AS-102.2	CANOPY PLAN
AS-102.3	CANOPY PLAN
AS-102.4	CANOPY STRUCTURE PLAN
AS-102.5	CANOPY STRUCTURE PLAN
AS-102.6	CANOPY STRUCTURE PLAN
AS-102.7	CANOPY REFLECTED CEILING PLAN
AS-102.8	CANOPY REFLECTED CEILING PLAN
AS-102.9	CANOPY REFLECTED CEILING PLAN
AS-103	COLUMN LIGHTS PLAN
AS-104	ELEVATIONS



S Ш PHA S Ζ SQUARE ME \mathbb{H} 0 HA L L M CITY, Ξ ш D SALT SALT PROJECT NUMBER: 14057 Published Date: April 24, 2014











Page 7 of 21



Palmer Engineering Project # 14012 Project Name Trolley Square Canopy 2408 N. 1050 W. Pleasant Grove, Utah 84062 Office 801-796-0590 Fax 801-796-3616 Date April 2014 Rev Page of gep (HSSIZ×8?) (main frame (HSS 8×2 ?) 12' 3) NTS Tour bolts Keep plan apther typ. 1 linds - embed P (2) C1 AS-104 ____ _____ _____ - CANOPY FRAME HSS 12X8 (TYP) ē Ç 4'-0'' TYP. 3'-0" TYP. Ĺ____j _____ PLNHLC2013-01006 - Trolley Square







PLNHLC2013-01006 - Trolley Square

Page 10 of 21















EXCERPT of SALT LAKE CITY HISTORIC LANDMARK COMMISSION Minutes of the Meeting Room 326, 451 South State Street February 6, 2014

A roll is being kept of all who attended the Historic Landmark Commission Meeting. The meeting was called to order at <u>5:36:59 PM</u>. Audio recordings of the Historic Landmark Commission meetings are retained in the Planning Office for an indefinite period of time.

Present for the Historic Landmark Commission meeting were: Chairperson Sheleigh Harding, Vice Chairperson Polly Hart; Commissioners Earle Bevins III, Thomas Brennan, Arla Funk, Robert McClintic, David Richardson, Charles Shepherd and Heather Thuet.

Planning Staff members present at the meeting were: Cheri Coffey, Assistant Planning Director; Michaela Oktay, Planning Manager; Maryann Pickering, Principal Planner; Molly Robinson, Urban Designer; Michelle Moeller, Senior Secretary and Paul Neilson, City Attorney.

FIELD TRIP NOTES:

No field trip was held prior to this meeting.

DINNER

Dinner was served to the Commission and Staff at 5:00 p.m. in room 126 of the Salt Lake City and County Building.

<u>6:42:11 PM</u>

<u>Trolley Square Site Improvements at approximately 602 East 500 South</u> - SK Hart Management, represented by Lynn Attwood, AIA, is requesting approval from the City to improve various public spaces within the Trolley Square property. Possible improvements include, but are not limited to: new trellis features, new awnings, new lawn, new lighting fixtures, enhancements to existing entrances, portable shade structures and other minor site features. There are no changes proposed to any of the buildings as part of this petition. Currently the land is used as a shopping center and is zoned CS (Community Shopping). This type of project is a minor alteration but cannot be approved administratively by staff. Therefore, review by the Historic Landmark Commission is required. The subject property is located in Council

District 4, represented by Luke Garrott. (Staff contact: Maryann Pickering at (801) 535-7660 or <u>maryann.pickering@slcgov.com</u> Case number PLNHLC2013-01006).

Ms. Maryann Pickering, Principal Planner, reviewed the petition as presented in the Staff Report (located in the Case File). She stated Staff was recommending the Historic Landmark Commission approve the following items A through E

- a. Addition of the drop-off/pick up area in the 700 East parking area between Buildings C and D with artwork or a sculpture in the middle.
- b. Repair and modification of the existing water feature on the east entrance of Building D.
- c. Replacement of the entry vestibules on the north, south, east and west sides of Building
- d. Upgrades to the West Plaza area including covered canopies, water feature, planter support frames, performance platform or stage, lighting and landscaping.
- e. Freestanding planters located in the alleyway between Buildings B and D.

And deny the following items F and G

- f. The addition of covered canopies connecting the drop off/pick up area at the 700 East parking area with the north entrance of Building D and connecting to Building C.
- g. Lighting fixtures in the plaza area leading from 500 South to and around the covered canopy proposed in a above

Mr. Semnani discussed the proposed sign improvements and encouraged the Commission to approve the improvements. He discussed the canopy by Whole Foods and the desire to get people to move through the mall. Mr. Semnani stated the center needed to be kept viable as well as maintain the historic nature of the structure.

Mr. Lewis explained the placement of the new proposed lights and the existing historical lights. He explained the flow of traffic on and around the property and stated the lighting would help to enhance that flow. Mr. Lewis thanked the City for helping them through the process and working with them on the project.

The Commissioners and the Applicant discussed the design and lighting of the canopy proposed for the front of Whole Foods and the light fixtures on the interior of the block.

The Commission asked if there were plans to connect with 500 South.

Mr. Lewis reviewed the developments on 500 South that would help improve the connection and feel of 500 South.

The Commission and Applicant discussed other alternatives for illumination of the canopy. It was stated that the canopy design was conceptual and not a final design.

PUBLIC HEARING 7:14:26 PM

Chairperson Harding opened the Public Hearing.

The following people spoke in favor of the petition: Mr. Scott Beck, Mr. Shawn Bradley, Mr. Tom Love and Mr. Brian Fetzer.

The following comments were made:

- Trolley Square was a corner stone of the City
- The proposal insures the evolution and vitality of the Center
- Was a historical site not a historical area
- The canopy would enhance the lighting and provide weather protection
- Enhancements would help to draw the people into Trolley Square and make it viable again
- Safety is a must and way finding is important
- History is important but the future is important as well
- Lighting is extremely good for Trolley Square

Chairperson Harding read the following comments:

• Ms. DeEita Barta– I believe the blue lighting is not congruent with the look and it is too modern looking.

Chairperson Harding closed the Public Hearing.

Mr. Lewis stated the color of the lights were optional and could be white if so desired. He stated the covering in the alley would encourage pedestrian flow through the mall. Mr. Lewis stated the site had history but the history of the structure had changed over the years.

Mr. Semnani stated a museum of Trolley Square would be added to the building in the future.

DISCUSSION 7:25:31 PM

The Commission stated and discussed the following:

- Lighting of the canopy
- Use of traditional stand alone lights rather than what was presented
- Modifications to the canopy design

- Project elements were insightfully done and the project was close to being complete
- The possibility of tabling the questionable issues for further review
- The use of the iconic lighting would work with the structure for connection and walkability, as the light posts would link the new with the old on the site
- Whether approval should be delegated to Staff to approve the final plans or if the Commission wanted to review the final proposal

MOTION <u>7:38:58 PM</u>

Commissioner Shepherd stated regarding Trolley Square Site Improvements, PLNHLC2013-01006, based on some of the findings listed in the Staff Report, testimony and plans presented, he moved that the Historic Landmark Commission grant the request for a Certificate of Appropriateness for items A through E as listed in the Staff Report and approve conceptually the design element of the covered canopy and the light fixtures in the plaza leading from 500 South to be presented as further developed at a future meeting. Commissioner Shepherd stated the fact that the canopy and light fixture elements clearly differentiated from the historical features, were not attached or impacting the historic building or structures, and were a design clearly of their own time and not historically replicated should be allowed and for those items (the canopies and stand alone lighting) to be brought back to the Commission for final consideration and acceptance depending on the final resolution and design development.

Commissioner Hart clarified the motion was to approve everything but items F(canopies) and G (light fixtures), as listed in the Staff report, and recommending that items F and G are brought back to the Commission for further review.

Commissioner Shepherd stated the request was to bring back the canopies and the light fixtures after the architect had fully designed them for the Commission's final review and decision.

Commissioner Funk seconded the motion.

Staff stated lighting in the other corridors was recommended for approval. Ms. Pickering stated if the Commission wanted the canopy lighting and canopy design to match throughout the property, the Commission should require all the canopies and their lighting and all freestanding light fixtures to come back for further review.

Commissioner Shepherd amended the motion to include all the canopies and their lighting as well as the free standing light fixtures throughout the project be brought back to the Commission for further review and decision.

Commissioner Funk seconded the amendment.

The motion passed unanimously.