

SALT LAKE CITY HISTORIC LANDMARK COMMISSION
Meeting Minutes
451 South State Street, Room 326
October 1, 2015

A roll is being kept of all who attended the Historic Landmark Commission Meeting. The meeting was called to order at [5:30:19 PM](#). 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 Thomas Brennan, Vice Chairperson Charles Shepherd; Commissioners Sheleigh Harding, David Richardson, Kenton Peters and Rachel Quist. Commissioner Heather Thuet was excused.

Planning Staff members present at the meeting were: Nora Shepard, Planning Director; Michaela Oktay, Planning Manager; Katia Pace, Principal Planner; Michelle Moeller, Administrative Secretary and Paul Nielson, Senior City Attorney.

FIELD TRIP NOTES:

A field trip was held prior to the meeting. Historic Landmark Commissioners present were Rachel Quist and Kenton Peters. Staff members in attendance were Michaela Oktay and Katia Pace.

The following sites were visited:

- **461 South 600 East** – Staff gave an overview of the proposal.

APPROVAL OF THE SEPTEMBER 3, 2015, MINUTES [5:31:12 PM](#)

MOTION [5:31:14 PM](#)

Commissioner Harding moved to approve the minutes from September 3, 2015. Commissioner Richardson seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

REPORT OF THE CHAIR OR VICE CHAIR [5:31:31 PM](#)

Chairperson Brennan stated he had nothing to report.

Vice Chairperson Shepherd stated he had nothing to report.

DIRECTOR'S REPORT [5:31:46 PM](#)

Ms. Michaela Oktay, Planning Manager, reviewed the city tours the Commission will be taking. She reviewed the solar panel text amendments and the time line for the proposal. Ms. Oktay reviewed the National Trust Matching Grant Staff was applying for to bring Bob Yapp, Historic Preservation Expert, who will conduct classes for Staff and the Commission on various preservation aspects.

PUBLIC COMMENT [5:34:03 PM](#)

Chairperson Brennan opened the Public Comment Period, seeing no one in the audience wished to speak; Chairperson Brennan closed the Public Comment Period.

[5:34:34 PM](#)

PUBLIC HEARINGS

Major Alterations on a Contributing Building at 461 South 600 East; Demolition of Noncontributing Buildings and New Construction at approximately 625 East 500 South, 637 East 500 South, 459 South 600 East - Douglas Thimm, architect, is requesting to remove a door, add two windows, change the sign and restore the canopy on the former Ensign Floral building located at the above address. The request also includes demolishing seven of the buildings located at the above addresses and building a new four story apartment building in its place, the Liberty Square Apartments. The properties are located in the Central City Historic District. The buildings proposed for demolition are noncontributing to the historic district. The property is located in the TSA-UN-C (Transit Station Area-Urban Neighborhood-Core) zoning district and in City Council District 4, represented by Luke Garrott. (Staff contact: Katia Pace, (801) 535-6354 or katia.pace@slcgov.com .)

- a. **Major Alterations on a Contributing Building - Request to alter the former Ensign Floral building. Case number PLNHLC2015-00237**
- b. **Demolition of Noncontributing Buildings and New Construction - Request to demolish noncontributing buildings and build a new four stories apartment building. Case number PLNHLC2015-00238**

Ms. Katia Pace, Principal Planner, gave an overview of the proposal as outlined in the Staff Report (located in the case file). She stated Staff was recommending that the Planning Commission approve the petition as presented.

The Commission and Staff discussed the following:

- The reasoning behind the condition regarding the air conditioning units.
- If the proposed building and Ensign Floral buildings would be connected.
- The awning on the Ensign Floral building.
- If the pedestrian alley way was accessible to the public or what it would be used for.

Mr. Douglas Thimm, Architect, stated Cowboy Partners owned the properties and reviewed the past work the company had done. He stated the west pathway would be maintained for utilities and neighboring businesses. Mr. Thimm reviewed the location of the air conditioners for the building, the location and layout of the parking structure for the proposal and how the Ensign Floral building would be incorporated into the project. Mr. Thimm stated they were willing to meet the conditions as outlined in the Staff Report.

The Commission, Staff and Applicant discussed the following:

- The parking for the Ensign Floral Building.
 - The existing parking lot would be used for the Ensign building.
- The design of the proposed building and how it fit with the neighborhood.
- The setbacks for the proposal.
- The height and massing for the proposed building.

- The cornices, lentils and spandrel on the building.
- The materials for the proposal and if they were in keeping with the historic nature of the area.
- The function of the Ensign floral building.
- The fencing for the project.
- The cladding material on the parking structure.
- Landscaping the Ensign Floral parking lot to make it more inviting.
- How the TSA zoning applied to the proposal and the points for the project.
- The role of Lang Place played in the plan.
- If retail should be included in the proposal.
- The windows, doors, foundation expression and railings for the proposal.
- If the exterior of the building could be modulated and where it could be done.

PUBLIC HEARING [6:26:15 PM](#)

Chairperson Brennan opened the Public Hearing.

Ms. Cindy Cromer thanked Polly Hart recommending the Ensign Floral building be listed as contributing. She reviewed the other buildings that were lost in the area due to development. Ms. Cromer stated the development would close the only mid block access in the area because the TSA point system did not give credits for it. She stated the mid block streets are part of the development pattern and character of the area and should be recognized. She stated she was concerned with the treatment of Lang Place and that the planter boxes on Ensign Floral would be removed. Ms. Cromer stated the boxes should be retained and listed in the proposal as a requirement. She said the proposed front yard parking in front of the Ensign Floral building was consistent with the area but it seemed larger than it needed to be. Ms. Cromer stated the canopy on the west façade was a character defining feature and should be replaced to match the historic canopy as closely as possible. She stated the script on the signage should be the more distinctive one used for the name Ensign (the larger script).

Chairperson Brennan closed the Public Hearing.

Mr. Thimm stated they were in agreement with keeping the planter boxes on the west elevation and the possible additional landscaping in the front yard parking. He stated they would be willing to work with Staff on approval of those items. Mr. Thimm stated the west canopy failed and they did not want it to fail again. He stated they would do the best they could to secure the canopy and make it look as it did before.

The Commission, Staff and Applicant discussed the following:

- The parking ratio for the proposal.

The Commission discussed the following:

- If an architectural subcommittee would be appropriate for the proposal.
- The Commissions purview over the design aspects of the project.

- Other buildings that have been changed due to an architectural subcommittee.
- The pros and cons of a architectural subcommittee.

The Commission stated the following were the main items that need to be addressed:

- Maintaining and preserving the planter boxes on the Ensign Floral building.
- The massing and form of the building was a major concern.
- Leave the Ensign Floral as a separate building.
- Express the ground floor and street level to make it not seem so large.
- Applying the guidelines for multifamily and apartments to the proposal.
- Extending the balconies to be more historically accurate.

Ms. Oktay stated another option would be to have the applicant address the concerns of the Commission and present a revised proposal to the Commission instead of a subcommittee meeting.

The Commission and Staff discussed the purpose of a Subcommittee and the Commission's purview.

The Commission, Applicant and Staff discussed the following:

- The time frame for an architectural subcommittee.
- If the Applicant preferred to go to an architectural subcommittee or work with Staff on the suggested proposal changes and return to the Commission.
 - Mr. Thimm stated they would work on the proposal with Staff and return with changes that address the Commission's concerns.
- Why retail was not added to the proposal.
- When the proposal would be brought back to the Commission for review.
 - The earliest the proposal could come back to the Commission would be in December.

MOTION [7:07:55 PM](#)

Commissioner Harding stated in the case of PLNHLC2015-00237 and PLNHLC2015-00238, she moved that the Historic Landmark Commission table the petition for further Public Hearing so the Commission could consider new designs from the applicant. Commissioner Shepherd seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

The meeting adjourned at [7:08:35 PM](#) +