

SALT LAKE CITY HISTORIC LANDMARK COMMISSION
Meeting Minutes
451 South State Street, Room 326
February 5, 2015

A roll is being kept of all who attended the Historic Landmark Commission Meeting. The meeting was called to order at [5:34:49 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 Sheleigh Harding; Commissioners Kenton Peters, Rachel Quist and David Richardson. Commissioner Heather Thuet and Charles Shepherd were excused.

Planning Staff members present at the meeting were: Nora Shepard, Planning Director; Cheri Coffey, Assistant Planning Director; Michaela Oktay, Planning Manager; Lex Traugher, Senior Planner; Katia Pace, Principal Planner; Amy Thompson, Associate Planner; Michelle Moeller, Administrative Secretary and Paul Neilson, Senior City Attorney.

FIELD TRIP NOTES:

A field trip was held prior to the work session. Historic Landmark Commissioners present were Rachel Quist and Kenton Peters. Staff members in attendance were Nora Shepard, Michaela Oktay, Lex Traugher and Amy Thompson.

The following sites were visited:

- **1160 East 200 South** - Staff gave an overview of the proposal.
- **Trolley Square**- Staff gave an overview of the proposal.

APPROVAL OF THE JANUARY 15, 2015, MINUTES [5:35:06 PM](#)
MOTION [5:35:26 PM](#)

Commissioner Richardson moved to approve the minutes from January 15, 2015. Commissioner Harding seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

REPORT OF THE CHAIR OR VICE CHAIR [5:35:46 PM](#)

Chairperson Brennan stated he had nothing to report.

Vice Chairperson Harding stated she had nothing to report.

DIRECTOR'S REPORT [5:35:57 PM](#)

Ms. Nora Shepard, Planning Director, stated the City Council approved the local historic districts for Yalecrest Normandie Circle, Yalecrest Princeton Park, Yalecrest Upper Harvard and Yale Park Plat A and City Creek Canyon. She stated the application for Upper Yale Second Addition and Yalecrest Upper Yale Local Historic Districts were withdrawn by the petitions.

The Commission and Staff discussed why the petitions were withdrawn.

Ms. Michaela Oktay, Planning Manager, reviewed the new Local Historic Districts for Uintah Heights and Yale Park that will be coming to the Commission for review in the spring. She stated there are vacancies on both the Planning Commission and the Historic Landmark Commission therefore; if anyone wished to apply or knew of anyone please forward them to Staff.

The Commission and Staff discussed the fact that there are four vacancies on the Historic Landmark Commission.

PUBLIC COMMENT [5:39:30 PM](#)

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

PUBLIC HEARINGS [5:39:59 PM](#)

[Terrace Falls Sun Deck at approximately 171 East Third Ave.](#) – Fernando Silva, a Terrace Falls condominium unit owner, is requesting approval from the City to construct a sun deck on unit 601 on the west end of the building. The Terrace Falls Condominiums is located at the above listed address and is a noncontributing structure in the Avenues Historic District. The subject property is located in the RMF-35 (Moderate Density Multi-family Residential) zoning district in City Council District 3, represented by Stan Penfold. (Staff contact: Katia Pace, (801) 535-6354 or katia.pace@slcgov.com.) Case number PLNHLC2014-00576

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 Historic Landmark Commission approve the petition as presented.

The Commission and Staff discussed the following:

- The proposed height of the windows.
- If the building was contributing structure.
 - It was built in 1980, and was not a contributing structure.
- Changes that had been made to the original structure over the years.

Mr. Tim Boss, Architect, reviewed the proposal and that the reasoning for the height of the windows was to make the units symmetrical across the building. He stated they would no longer be adding height to the actual structure.

The Commission and Applicant discussed the following:

- The proposed changes to the roof structure and slope.

PUBLIC HEARING [5:52:42 PM](#)

Chairperson Brennan opened the Public Hearing.

The following individuals spoke in favor of the petition: Ms. Cindy Cromer and Ms. Gladis Lemmon.

The following comments were made:

- This was a great building that allowed many people to live in this wonderful area of the city.
- Neighboring properties would see the addition but it would not impose anymore than what currently existed.
- Roof membrane needed to be earth tone to match the existing.
- Windows needed to match the existing window color.
- Opposed to the mirror image on the south side in the original proposal.
- If there were any legal matters that would be brought about by the additional height.
- Addition would not be unattractive or take away from the neighborhood.

Chairperson Brennan closed the Public Hearing.

Mr. Boss stated they were not adding height to the building, symmetry was not an issue in the December meeting, there had been numerous changes to the building over the years and the proposal would be a improvement to the existing structure.

The Commissioners, Applicant and Staff discussed the following:

- The roof membrane and window color for the proposal.
 - Staff stated there was an enforcement case on the east side of the building to address the white roofing membrane.

The Commissioners made the following observations:

- Agreed with the Staff Report.
- The height of the window was not an issue because it was a noncontributing building and the changes did not affect the character of the building or neighborhood.
- If there would be an issue with solid to void ratios.
- Would make the building look better as a whole and the corner read as one mass.

MOTION [6:03:12 PM](#)

Commissioner Peters stated regarding PLNHLC2014-00576, based on the analysis and findings of fact in the Staff Report, testimony and plans presented, he moved that the Commission approve the request for a sun deck addition for unit 601 located on the top floor at the west end of the condominium complex located at 171 East Third Avenue as with no restrictions.

The Commission clarified that it was without condition number one.

Commissioner Peters amended the motion to state the petition would be approved as submitted.

Commissioner Quist stated the reasoning would be that the petition met standard two relating to the composition of principle facades.

Commissioner Peters amended the motion to include the reasoning that the proposal was not located on a principle façade and it would continue the fenestration line that currently existed and make the corner of the building look more complete and in proportion. Commissioner Richardson seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

6:05:18 PM

New Single Family Home at approximately 1160 East 200 South - Jeff Taylor is requesting approval from the City to construct a new single family home at the above address in the University Historic District. The subject property is currently vacant, zoned R-2 (Single- and Two-Family Residential) and is located in City Council District 4, represented by Luke Garrott. This application must be reviewed by the Historic Landmark Commission because it is considered new construction in a local historic district and requires special exception approvals. (Staff contact: Carl Leith, (801) 535-7758 or carl.leith@slcgov.com.)

- a. New Construction - In order to build the proposed single-family residence a New Construction application must be approved by the Historic Landmark Commission. Case number PLNHLC2014-00861.**
- b. Special Exceptions - In order to build the project mentioned above, special exception approval is required to increase the maximum building coverage from 40% to approximately 49%; reduce the side yard setbacks on the east side from 4' to 2.5' and on the west side from 10' to 7.5' and 5'; and increase the maximum height of a flat roof building along the west side of the house from 20' to 23' at the southwest corner and decreasing in height to 22' at the northwest corner. Case Number PLNHLC2014-00909**

Mr. Lex Traugher, Senior Planner, gave an overview of the proposal as outlined in the Staff Report (located in the case file). He stated Staff was recommending that the Historic Landmark Commission approve the petition as presented.

Mr. Jeff Taylor, Property Owner, reviewed the history of the lot and the proposed design. He reviewed the concerns regarding the back slope of the property that would be addressed by installing a retaining wall. Mr. Taylor reviewed the height of the structure and stated the structure fit with the neighborhood as there was a mix of styles in the area. He reviewed the materials for the proposal.

PUBLIC HEARING

Chairperson Brennan opened the Public Hearing.

Ms. Cindy Cromer stated she previously lived in the area and did not realize the lot was actually a buildable lot. She stated the neighborhood was very diverse in architecture and the proposal would fit in extremely well.

Mr. Tony Godfey stated the neighbor, Ms. Workman, had hired him to do some research on the geotechnical side of the proposal. He stated Ms. Workman's home was historic and a contributing structure to the rear of the subject property. Mr. Godfey stated Ms. Workman was initially concerned over the view shed but after reviewing the plan they were satisfied that Ms. Workman's view would not be impacted. He stated they were concerned over the slope of the back yard and what would happen if it was disturbed. Mr. Godfey asked for evidence supporting the Applicant's claim that geotechnical research had been done for the area, as the property was on a fault line. He stated the slope needed to be stabilized to ensure Ms. Workman's property would not be affected.

Mr. John Wood stated the property was unique and Mr. Taylor was the right developer for the project. He commended Mr. Taylor for the quality of work done on other projects in the neighborhood and that this project would be a great addition to the neighborhood. Mr. Wood stated the scale, setback and materials were appropriate with the neighborhood and the proposal would address the concerns over the slope of the property.

Chairperson Brennan closed the Public Hearing.

Mr. Taylor stated in regards to the comments about the slope, the home to the rear was about one hundred feet away from the slope. He discussed the retaining wall that would secure the slope and all of the research had been done to ensure the slope would be stable.

The Commissioners and Staff discussed and made the following observations:

- If the Commission needed to address the fact that the front door did not address 200 South.
 - Staff stated the Commission could approve the design and waive the requirement for the front door to address the street.

MOTION [6:25:14 PM](#)

Commissioner Peters stated regarding PLNHLC2014-00861 and PLNHLC2014-00909, based on the analysis and findings listed in the Staff Report, testimony and the proposal presented, he moved that the Historic Landmark Commission approve the request for new construction located at 1160 East 200 South, to include exceeding the maximum lot coverage, setbacks, and height limitations of the zoning district, subject to the following conditions:

- 1. Approval of design details, consistent with the proposed development as approved by the Historic Landmark Commission, be delegated to Planning Staff.**

Chairperson Brennan asked if the Commission wanted to add language regarding the location of the main entry door not being on the main façade.

Commissioner Peters amended the motion to include that the location of the entrance door, as described in the plans, not being on the front façade also be approved as part of the motion. Commissioner Quist seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

[6:26:51 PM](#)

Trolley Square-New Exterior Signs and Master Sign Plan - A request by Robert Pinion, architect representing Trolley Square Ventures LLC., for new exterior signs at Trolley Square and a Master Sign Plan for the site. The proposal includes a new pole shopping center identification sign with an internally illuminated electronic changeable copy panel, a monument sign, and two flat signs. Construction of new wall is proposed on the south west corner above the loading docks to accommodate one of the proposed flat signs. A Master Sign Plan for the Trolley Square site will also be reviewed and considered for adoption. Trolley Square is an individually listed landmark site on the City Register, and located in the Central City Historic District. The subject property is in the CS (Community Shopping) zoning district and is located in City Council District 4, represented by Luke Garrott. (Staff contact: Amy Thompson, (801) 535-7281, or amy.thompson@slcgov.com) Case number PLNHLC2014-00845, PLNHLC2014-00843

Ms. Amy Thompson, Associate Planner, gave an overview of the Master Sign Plan proposal as outlined in the Staff Report (located in the case file). She stated Staff was recommending that the Historic Landmark Commission approve the petition as presented.

The Commission and Staff discussed the following:

- The definition of animation in relation to signs.
- How the signs would be regulated after installation.
- The Commission could not change the time limit for static images on the signs
- If there was a precedent for these types of signs in Historic areas in Salt Lake or other cities
 - The site was unique therefore, different signs may be approved that would not be approved in other areas of the city.
- The reasoning for selecting the six foot identification sign versus a taller sign.

Mr. Robert Pinion, applicant, reviewed the history of the site, the updates to the site and the reason for the proposal. He reviewed the items they agreed with and those they have issues with, mainly items one and three as listed in the conditions for approval. Mr. Pinion reviewed the possibilities for LED signs on the property and how they could be incorporated in the plan and on the site. He asked the Commission to review the conditions on LED signs and allow for more LED signs on the site. Mr. Pinion stated they did not want to limit the future use of signs on the property with the proposed Master Plan.

The Commission and Applicant discussed the following:

- LED language in the plan and where in the ordinance.
 - The language was not listed on the correct slide in the presentation.
- Having a Master Sign Plan would help the Commission to assist the site in the future.
- The items addressed in conditions one and three were the most visually prominent in the proposal and how the Applicant could address the concerns of Staff and the Commission regarding these signs.
 - The Applicant stated they did not want to restrict what the possibilities would be in the future for these signs. He discussed options for the sign such as placement along the interior street and on the west plaza.
- If the Master Sign Plan could be amended in the future.
 - Staff stated the Master Plan could change or be amended.
 - May want to review the plan at five year intervals.
 -

PUBLIC HEARING [6:59:10 PM](#)

Chairperson Brennan opened the Public Hearing.

The following individuals spoke in favor of the petition: Ms. Mandy McKenna, Mr. Nick Clayton, Mr. Sean Bradley and Mr. Steve Farr.

The following comments were made:

- Trolley Square was suffering because of the lack of knowledge of what was inside the square.
- Need to bring the site back to its grandeur and the plan would be a step in that direction.
- It was imperative to have signage on the front of the buildings and in prominent locations.
- Small businesses need to have signage to bring people in off of the street.

Mr. Khosrow Semnani gave the history of the site and reiterated how important the signs were for the site to make it viable. He stated he wanted to support the historic value of the site but have signage to promote the businesses inside.

Chairperson Brennan closed the Public Hearing. [7:13:52 PM](#)

****** Minutes were transcribed verbatim from 7:13:58 pm to 8:03:50 pm to clearly reflect the Commission's decision. ******

[7:13:58 PM](#)

Brennan: Commissioners, I know that for the most part the Applicant has accepted most of the recommendation from Staff. There were two items that specifically...items one and....three...

Richardson: Three.

Brennan: Thank you. That they were asking for more flexibility on...thoughts? Well then I am going to open this up a little bit. I think in the past when this...we have had the Applicant come in front of us, we've struggled and I know Kenton as a newer member, you raised questions with regard to the LED sign...both and I believe at this point, as I am understanding it, we have had some changes over the period of application for the pole sign, but the key to their request for LED signs....and as I understand, the one at the northeast corner at the pole sign and then the monument sign to the southeast.

Richardson: You know Tom, what we are looking at here is a document that is a Master Sign Plan.

Brennan: Yes.

Richardson: And I think we should be very careful not to discuss specific signs while we are discussing a Master Plan. And I actually think we should even decouple the concept of LED signs from the Master Plan. I really think it is not relevant. If we...either we want internally illuminated signs or we don't and we can cross that bridge and we don't specify how they are internally illuminated.

Brennan: I think that is a great comment, what do others think?

Quist: What are the different types of internally illuminated signs?

Richardson: There is one right there.

Coffey: I think some other examples are things like the kind of the big plastic backlit types of signage that you see at McDonalds. Those types of things are internally illuminated.

Quist: So you are saying the specific light type of a LED is irrelevant? Is that what, am I understanding?

Richardson: Correct, my personal opinion is that internally illuminated signs are not appropriate on a historic structure and that if an owner wants to come to us with a specific proposal for a specific sign I think that is one thing but to create a map to allow something like that in an overarching Master Plan, that could be enforced for the next thirty years is inappropriate.

Harding: And I guess the one thing that I would add is that I think 700 East is different from the other block faces and I think we all know that. And I'm really not as troubled by certain internally lit signs on 700 East and what I am trying

to imagine more is just how big these pole signs might end up being and would that be appropriate with all of the buildings there or are they going to dwarf buildings, are they going to be garish and huge. That is what I am struggling with a little bit.

Quist: Alright, and there's already two internally lit signs on the tower from the theater days is that correct?

Brennan: Yes.

Oktaay: That's right.

Brennan: Also, I think it is...we have struggled with the LED sign concept, but I do think that Sheleigh's comment which is simply the scale of the sign regardless of whether it is an externally or internally illuminated and the locations is a significant issue that merits discussion again perhaps separately from the illuminations. I tend to agree that 700 East is a...has a different feel, it is a collector road. Quite honestly you could say the same about 500 South which is, in my opinion, even more so of a collector or collector road.

Harding: Well except, I live right there. There are a lot of residences.

Brennan: I'm sorry 500 South...600 South.

Harding: And that was what I was thinking then. I think 500 and...well 500 is busier yeah, you are right but neither of those in my mind compares to 700 East.

Richardson: Well sure, 700...the setback of the buildings is deeper and there are a lot of things going on there and I think...item number four here, if we are itemizing the proposals, where it says dimension of monument signs will be determined based on the location and compatibility of the mass/scale of adjacent buildings. I think that is completely appropriate and, you know, it may be appropriate to have a monumental sign on one of those corners or both of those corners. But this language as part of the Master Plan sets that up for review in that way. We are not approving a monumental sign we are approving language that says the dimensions of this monumental sign will be determined based on its location, mass and what have you, what is going around on it. And perhaps that language should apply to pole signs as well.

Harding: That is a good point, yeah.

Peters: David as you...talk about perhaps pulling illuminated signs out of this, if I understood you right. I think I'd more tend to what Sheleigh is saying about let's look at the location and the type of illuminated sign...makes a big

difference because where its illustrated and described here, what we are calling an LED sign, proposed on 700 East might in my eyes be...have some merits if its...if its grouped in a category that also includes the cheap internally illuminated plastic signs then I don't believe we are being fair to the approach the Applicant is trying to take.

Richardson: Well and I just sincerely believe that illuminated signs should not be part of the Master Plan, those should be reviewed as exceptions to it.

Peters: So we would be calling...it is a pole sign and then the manner of expression of the pole sign itself...if it is proposed as illuminated then we have to address that separately?

Richardson: Yes.

Brennan: So if we were to use language that said that illuminated pole signs or internally illuminated monument signs would be approved...on a case by case basis. Is that what you are suggesting?

Richardson: I think we leave the word...we say illuminated signs are not permitted and then if you want to do that you come back...you come to the Commission for that. There is language here that allows someone to do that.

Quist: So would you support an illuminated sign on...at 700 East and 500 South.

Richardson: Perhaps, but I don't think it should be part of a Master Plan.

Quist: I think that that particular corner...the northeast corner, because the surrounding buildings are not necessarily historic. You've got State Trust Lands, for example right across the street, and because the...it's in front of the Whole Foods which is a newer construction that adding an illuminating sign is not going to detract from any sort of historic aspect of Trolley Square. So I think that saying, with that northeast corner...and you can define that specifically or not so specifically, illuminated signs are appropriate because that corner has say the least amount of historic integrity. And that would support the Applicant and the members of the Public who spoke but I think still preserve the historic Trolley.

Richardson: The Applicant and the Applicant's tenants.

Quist: Yeah.

Richardson: Yeah.

Brennan: I...agree with that and I have struggled with the LED sign for quite a while and I...I'm concerned that if we...I'm concerned that if we basically say we

are going to...then on a case by case basis review applications for amendments to the Master Plan at each step of the way, which is I'm afraid that's what we are setting up...

Richardson: No, no I am not suggesting amending the Master Plan. I am suggesting that...

Brennan: Or exceptions to.

Richardson: Exactly.

Peters: Or in what you are suggesting David, does that give the Applicant a mechanism for submitting subsequent proposals for illuminated signs if they see it necessary. Would this be streamlining or simplifying that approach.

Richardson: That might be a question for Paul but it...I think this is a Master Plan that governs their signage that goes on their building, tenant signage inside and outside of the building, wayfaring signage, all sorts of signage and I think that they should be given...we should not be dictating in this Master Plan document exactly how the monument and pole signs look. I think that those should be reviewed on a case by case basis but darn it every time that the Rodizio Grill wants to change their sign we don't want to review that.

Shepard: It seems that, you know, you could put actual language in the sign plan or recommend that language be added to the sign plan that says...that says really what you just said that monument...that you find that a pole sign and or a monument sign along 700 Avenue...700 East may be appropriate but it would be...the individual sign would be subject to review by the Historic Landmark Commission and you could even, you could address illumination or not.

Richardson: Right.

Shepard: You could say generally illumination in historic structures or adjacent in historic districts are not appropriate but the Landmarks Commission will consider illumination under certain conditions or.... I definitely think there is some wording there if you wish.

Richardson: And I think we need to be careful here, you see, we could turn around and Smith's Food King could decide they need a big monumental changing sign on 600 Avenue and E Street and think of...is that more appropriate down at Trolley Square to have a sign like that, well of course. And that is a case, in my opinion, of looking at it on a case by case basis.

Coffey: I think....the purpose of the Master Sign Plan is to kind of give the Commission, the Property Owners, future tenants an understanding of what

types and how many and what types and where are appropriate for signage. That is the whole purpose of the Master Sign Plan so the Commission is looking at this now saying, you know, trying to determine what types of signs are appropriate at this location if some, like the pole sign which is not usually something that is allowed in historic districts is appropriate then this is the opportunity for the Commission to kind of give the guidance for the Owners and for Staff and for future tenants of what kind of signage is appropriate there, So it is kind of not always piece milled. The Applicants can always come in and request signage approval. The Master Sign Plan will help Staff know it is in line or it isn't, if it isn't then we would bring it to the Commission but a lot of signage that we review, we review administratively and approve it administratively. It's because Trolley Square is one big site, how much signage is appropriate there, that's kind of the idea of the Master Sign Plan. You are giving everybody a guide.

Harding: So maybe then instead of having limits, like you can only have X number of pole signs or X number of internally illuminated electronic changeable copy signs, what if we just say these can be considered and might be more appropriate on the east side. So do we have to limit it to a certain number of signs when we anticipate they will come back with specific requests anyway?

Coffey: You don't have to. There are certain...in the underlying zoning...sorry Amy.

Thompson: Oh you are fine.

Coffey: In the underlying zoning it does have limits on signs and so...but there is also something in the Zoning Ordinance that allows the Landmarks Commission through Special Exception process to allow for more. But, for example pole signs on this site would be limited to...

Thompson: So pole signs, as is the proposal could have up to eight pole signs and that would include existing signs and that's because they get four, one per pad site and there are four pad sites on Trolley Square and that would also be if they have all of their pole signs as shopping center identification signs and they are allowed one per street frontage.

Harding: But in terms of the maximum of one sign for the internally illuminated one, we don't need to specify that in a document like this.

Coffey: You don't have to that was Staff's recommendation.

Thompson: You don't have to.

Peters: Now given the illustrations and the locations of the signs as shown within this document it would seem to me that they are asking for specific signs in

specific places, so rather than being a Master Plan we've got a case by case issue here.

Quist: Well I think that is the second proposal. I think there are two separate proposals.

Richardson: There are two separate proposals. This is for specific signs and this is a Master Plan but you are right Kenton, I think that it gets a little blurry which is why I think that we should be careful as we're addressing the Master Sign Plan that we address it as a Master Sign Plan not specific signs. I am going to take a stab at a motion. It is a long one.

Brennan: Please David. Lets...I am curious to see how you are going to state this.

Richardson: And...it actually just eliminates a little bit of language from the proposed motion here approving and modifies a tiny bit. Now I'll paraphrase before I say this, under pole signs I am going to suggest that there are the two existing pole signs and one other location be allowed and then I am going to not mention anything about internally illuminated electronic changeable copy, I am not going to talk about that paragraph at all.

Brennan: So you are suggesting eliminating it?

Richardson: I am not even going to mention it. Then on number two, I am not going to mention, number three I'm going to say internally illumination of signs is not permitted so I'm going to remove the word monument. It is mostly removing things. Number six; no change its just some punctuation changes. Number seven, on information signs I think the height is fine maybe I am going to suggest seven or eight feet but I am also going to suggest that those signs be smaller at twenty square feet instead of thirty. The reason is the square root of thirty is five and a half feet, that's a big sign. I would like some discussion on that and then similarly on the signs, the projecting signs, I think the vertical height of nine may be more appropriate but a smaller sign is more appropriate to an eight square foot sign, is quite big and those are the changes.

Brennan: You know I am going to suggest that we have some discussion before we put a second to this because I think this is maybe a draft motion for consideration and discussion.

Richardson: Yes.

Brennan: And I think that illumination of signs, I personally think I would recommend that perhaps illumination of signs should be considered on a case by case basis and I would say of pole signs and monument signs and all other signs we would not have to, you know...

Richardson: So perhaps eliminate...internal illumination of signs is not permitted however, monument and pole signs maybe considered on a case by case basis.

Nielson: If you are going to do something on a case by case basis we are going to need some sort of standard by which to judge that. Otherwise it is going to be a completely arbitrary thing.

Richardson: See that's why it is easier to just to say...from a Master Plan standpoint I think it's easier just to say no.

Peters: But then how do they get permitted in the future.

Richardson: It comes back on a case by case basis.

Peters: If we say not permitted in the Master Plan then they come back and submit for this particular sign? Does that...this is their Master Plan not a City...

Richardson: It is their plan not ours.

Nielson: It is the plan for that property.

Richardson: The plan for that property.

Harding: So what if we...are you totally opposed to internal illumination of signs is not permitted except on 700 East. Are you open to that at all, how does everyone else feel about that.

Quist: I support that.

Peters: I would support that too.

Brennan: Does...I mean we have an existing...we have an existing pole sign, the Trolley arch on 500 North is that not an internally illuminated sign...is that how the Staff is interpreting that currently?

Thompson: I think right now we have determined that it is a pole sign and it is a shopping center identification sign. I don't know that we have ever, it is internally illuminated but I don't know if that determination has ever been made.

Peters: Is a halo sign considered internally illuminated.

Thompson: It's back lit.

- Richardson: It is back lit so technically isn't internally illuminated.
- Oktaay: But a neon sign would be internally illuminated.
- Thompson: Correct.
- Brennan: Let's not get hung up on those details...on those just yet. I mean actually would illuminated signs on 500 South be a concern if they are not a concern on...or treated differently on 700 East.
- Quist: You know I think we are more comfortable with doing 700 East now, and then I would be more comfortable looking at the other blocks after one of these signs has actually been built and I can kind of actually see what it looks like and visualize it. So for at least...for this first part of the plan my recommendation would be to limit internally illuminated to just 700 East. That doesn't mean that the Applicant cannot come back and ask for things in the future but for now that would be what I am most comfortable with.
- Nielson: If you are going to do something that relates to a street...my recommendation would be something...language that indicates facing 700 East but also, you know, within a certain distance from the street so that we don't have something on the back of 600 East that's for something that is on 500 South or 600 South.
- Quist: Right and I would personally confine it to in front of or adjacent to the non-contributing structures meaning the Whole Foods building.
- Peters: That would make sense, I wonder about the facing 700 East. If the sign is proposed to be on a diagonal that's....
- Nielson: That is the kind of thing that....
- Peters: It's just some wording but let's be careful not to state.
- Nielson: That's the kind of thing, for me it is just about clarity.
- Brennan: Well and it's the same, although other members are going in the other direction, the monument sign to the southeast corner which is perpendicular, I believe, to the flow of traffic on 700 East is that facing 600 East or 700 East.
- Oktaay: I would like to ask a clarifying question of Rachel. Was it to limit internally illuminated signs on 700 East or specifically internally illuminated electronic copy panel type signs.
- Quist: It is the internally illuminated/LED type sign that we have been talking

about.

Oktaay: Okay the electronic copy. Thank you.

Thompson: I just want to add one other clarifying point about the nine feet reducing it to nine as they suggested. It is a ten foot clearance requirement in the zoning ordinance to have ten feet similar to the pole sign is required for the projecting sign and that's why Staff was recommending that it be increased to ten feet instead of the nine.

Richardson: Okay so inside Trolley Square could a projecting sign be lower?

Thompson: I don't know because we don't review those.

Richardson: Could it be at pedestrian height rather than ten feet.

Coffey: When you say inside Trolley Square, so you mean inside a building?

Richardson: Inside a building yeah.

Coffey: We don't regulate that at Landmarks Commission.

Thompson: We don't do that.

Brennan: Well what about internal alleyways. Is this suggesting that the potential street that is going from 500 South to 600 East there could be signs along that.

Thompson: Under the Zoning Ordinance any projecting sign, which is again not permitted in CS but could be done through a Special Exception has a ten foot clearance requirement.

Coffey: I am not sure what that is for. If it's a safety issue or why there is that requirement but...

Richardson: Yeah, it seems to me that if it gets higher then it ought to get bigger but, as it gets lower is could be smaller.

Brennan: well I personally don't have a problem with the proposed I think it was eight square feet on the sign as a maximum.

Richardson: Okay.

Brennan: I do wish the ten foot could be dropped to nine feet but...I think that unfortunately ten feet is a little bit high. Especially for those people that would be interested in something smaller than eight square feet.

- Coffey: And maybe if the Commission wants to make a recommendation when you talk about the projecting store front signs we can double check and if there is a way that that can be modified then we will do that.
- Brennan: What's the minimal height for an awning projecting out over a public sidewalk? Because it seems I have seen a lot that are new that are less than ten feet.
- Richardson: That is a good point because, you know, doorways are typically eight feet or less.
- Brennan: I am thinking specifically of Sam Wellers when they were on Main Street, that awning was built within the last ten years and I do not believe that it is ten feet.
- Shepard: It's probably really a building code issue. I suspect; it's probably a public safety...
- Brennan: It is a public works issues not a code issue.
- Shepard: Yes it is definitely Public Works but there may also be a minimal clearance that's required from a building code stand point for safety.
- Brennan: I think that's ADA and its six foot eight.
- Richardson: I doubt it; it has to be a zoning thing. Building code lets you go through a seven foot doorway, or a six eight doorway, or even six.
- Brennan: Maybe that is something we could consider. I wanted to jump to seven on the information sign height and area I do tend to agree thirty square feet is awfully large, I do agree that six feet is a little low, nine feet may be a little to high, maybe a seven and a half feet.
- Richardson: I was thinking doorway height seven or eight feet.
- Brennan: Seven feet, eight feet, it is a large block and I think that one of the challenges is that to create graphics that are large enough that they are legible for an entire ten acre block does...is a challenge.
- Richardson: But these are directional, informational signs.
- Brennan: did you say twenty square feet previously.
- Richardson: Yes, well I was thinking four by four is sixteen, that is too small but we are getting arbitrary here.

Brennan: Yeah, but so is ten feet, we have established there is arbitrary. I would suggest maybe twenty five square feet and seven and eight feet tall.

Richardson: Five by five is twenty five.

Brennan: A five by five or a four by six...that you have Trolley Square over the top and then a four by four graphic something of that nature.

Richardson: Yeah, or maybe the thirty feet stands and we just scratch that whole line and let it stand as proposed by the applicant.

Peters: I would be fine with that. I don't, I think we've got bigger issues here.

Brennan: Well we are chipping off the easy ones here.

Richardson: Yes we are.

Brennan: So with regards to seven, eight...well six, seven and eight any other further discussion on those. So we are back to really one, two and three I believe.

Richardson: Yeah we could probably just scratch eight and let it stand and see what happens with the nine feet.

Brennan: I agree. Or that maybe we take a more proactive and that we are recommending the nine feet even though city sign regulation for safety indicate and ten foot minimum. See if we can get them to reconsider that.

Richardson: So you are right the elephant in the room is one, two and three.

Brennan: Yeah. I personally would like to try and give a little bit more guidance in the number and the locations of both the pole signs and monument signs in terms where they might be acceptable and not acceptable rather than just saying...rather than on a case by case basis, I think partly because initially when they came to us the request was for a pole sign on the water tower and the request was come back to us with a...don't piece mill this come back to us with a Master Plan and so to a certain degree, I think we have gotten what we've asked for and I don't really want to then turn around, personally, and kind of say ok we have this Master Plan we are not going to let anything but we will look at pole signs, internally illuminated, illuminated monument signs etc. on a case by case basis.

Richardson: The challenge I had with the wording here is that, you know, when you say pole signs there are two existing pole signs and then it says if approved other pole signs. These two...other specific and I just get back to I just think we should be generic and not specific about....as generic as we can be in the

Master Sign Plan and not....trying to avoid specifics.

Peters: If we do that, do we then step to their other proposal and consider that as the specific request?

Richardson: Yeah.

Peters: Then we could do that.

Brennan: So remind me David, item one you kind of...

Richardson: Item one....

Brennan: Under pole signs.

Richardson: Under pole sign, the pole sign should be limited to the water tower pole sign. I am going to say the two existing pole...the existing water tower pole sign, the existing arch pole sign, the 400 South vehicular entrance and one other location.

Quist: As approved by?

Richardson: Just one other...well do you want to approve?

Quist: I think for pole signs...

Brennan: That the signs themselves be specifically approved.

Richardson: As approved by the Commission.

Brennan: Shopping center identification sign.

Richardson: That remains unchanged, seven total.

Brennan: You are suggesting straight to number two...

Richardson: From that point yes, we skip that entire paragraph about internally illuminated electronic...

Brennan: And we address that on a case by case basis.

Richardson: Yes, and two could stand and three I think internally illumination of signs is not permitted but that is the hard one.

Peters: I thought we wanted to consider that in the next step with their proposal.

Richardson: Illumination, okay so how about internal illumination of monument and pole signs maybe permitted on a case by case basis.

Coffey: And that's all ready.

Nielson: That case being?

Brennan: How about shall be considered? Can we come up with any language that gives us the flexibility to...

Coffey: I think everything that the Landmarks Commission does is on a case by case basis. Your design guidelines that you've adopted help you get there. This Master Sign Plan is to try and help even further.

Brennan: How about illumination of monument and pole signs...

Richardson: May be permitted on...

Brennan: Are generally not encouraged but...are generally not encouraged but maybe...

Quist: Or maybe....

Richardson: Why don't we just say are generally not encouraged and leave it there?

Quist: But if you are going to allow for it to be approved you need to say where it can be and what circumstances. So by saying adjacent to or nearby contributing structures would be an appropriate location.

Richardson: Okay, yeah.

Nielson: Sorry, I had a moment there because generally not encouraged is not a standard it's a desire.

Coffey: And that's already in your adopted guidelines.

Richardson: Yeah, unfortunately.

Brennan: Generally not encouraged? Well what about, I mean, what if illumination of signs along 500 South, excuse me, 600 South and 600 East are not permitted.

Richardson: Is 700 East a State Highway?

Coffey: Yes.

Richardson: Is 600 South a State Highway.

Quist: No.

Coffey: 600 and 500 are to a point. I think it is closer to where they get by the interstate.

Richardson: Where they drop down the first couple blocks, okay. Well could we do something like, internal illumination of signs is not permitted except within thirty feet of a State Highway.

Brenan: How about within thirty feet of 500 South, 600 South and 700 East.

Quist: How about just the northeast corner.

Peters: Again what are we trying to do here?

Richardson: We are trying to...we are trying to move this Master Sign Plan along and...

Peters: Okay and in doing this....

Richardson: In my opinion I don't think there should be illuminated signs at all, internally illuminated signs, I really feel that way. I like neon but hey, I personally agree with the Secretary of the Interior and interior illuminated signs should not be permitted. I am trying to find some words here that maybe...

Harding: It is just that 700 East, 700 East is so different. It really is and there is a real history of using that water tower with bright lighting and so I think this might be a continuation of that just in that limited area.

Richardson: You know that Central Artery in Boston went through Faneuil Hall and they never had illuminated signs there.

Harding: But we have so many others on 700 East. There are so many on 700 East though that is the problem. So if we cut out this area and say this little portion of 700 East cannot have any internally illuminated signs, I am not sure there is a real benefit to that.

Peters: So I think we...as, I think Tom suggested there has been a lot of work done over many months that I wasn't involved in but...to get to this point and I think it would be reasonable to give the Applicant a yeah or nay on what we have got before us rather than just filter down. If it is a nay then so be it but I think we ought to work toward a...

Richardson: I think for the most part we are yeah here.

- Nielson: The difficulty with the nay is that they have to start over.
- Brennan: Yeah. I mean, I agree Rachel...with Rachel's thought, the northeast corner is really no longer really part of the significant elements that are historic, the water tower which is the original request that came to us, I struggle with and I still struggle with. I frankly, I am tempted to allow it or consider it because it does....there is a sign there now, there has been a sign, it is as Sheleigh said part of the historic...it gives some presence both north and south along 700 East. It will be challenging, I know it's pulled back off the road at least thirty feet, probably fifty, sixty feet. It's somewhat concealed by some fairly mature sycamore trees, it think I would be open to allowing an illuminated sign at the existing locations, I should say the electronically illuminated changeable copy, the internally illuminated electronic changeable copy signs at the existing locations and at the northeast corner of the site.
- Quist: I don't think the water tower is part of our proposal is it?
- Brennan: I thought it was....
- Richardson: It's a ninety seven foot sign that just is there and we are just accepting it.
- Coffey: The water tower, there is a petition for the water tower but the specific proposal for that is not before you tonight. However, as part of the Master Sign Plan it is part of Trolley Square so you should talk about that.
- Brennan: And so I was just looking at., the pole signs should be limited to the water tower pole sign, the arch pole sign at 500 South and one additional and I thought that I saw...and maybe I was just confusing past memory with this that potentially those three locations be considered for or be allowed for internally illuminated electronic, LED signs and then everything else be non internally illuminated signs.
- Harding: I would agree with that.
- Quist: Yeah, and I think...did the Staff Report state that regarding the water tower if there was an LED sign on the water tower it should only be illuminated on the north end or am I....
- Richardson: No I didn't read that.
- Thompson: The water tower regardless of whether there is...the existing nonconforming signs or not will always be considered a pole sign because of the Trolley Square potion on the water tower. So in referencing the existing sign that is what we are referencing. The nonconforming portions of the signs like Cheri

said there is a petition for those, but that's not before you this evening.

Brennan: Okay.

Coffey: Yeah the water tower sign is a pole sign and a shopping center identification sign because the tank says Trolley Square.

Brennan: And it's internally illuminated because it is neon.

Coffey: Its neon, right.

Richardson: It is a dandy of a sign it really is the sign for Trolley Square.

Brennan: Well I would still maybe suggest that those three be it and should the Applicant come in the future to discuss a panel, internally illuminated panel sign down lower it's...we consider it at that point.

Richardson: So we accept the three existing signs...the three existing pole signs.

Brennan: Two plus one.

Richardson: Oh, right...

Brennan: Okay do we have more discussion? Is somebody going to put forth a motion?

Richardson: I don't have a good one for line three except to leave it as is.

Harding: Well maybe that's covered by what we talked about in one. That the internal illumination could be limited to the pole signs. In which case we would leave the monument signs alone and leave that how it is.

Quist: I like that.

Peters: Yeah, I think that makes sense too.

Brennan: Okay, then....is somebody going to make a motion?

Harding: Okay I will try but it's going to be a little difficult.

Brennan: It is going to be a long one. Take a deep breath.

Nielson: Try to go slow so Staff can follow along.

[7:57:52 PM](#)

Harding: Regarding the Trolley Square Master Sign Plan Petition, based on the

analysis and findings of fact in the Staff Report, testimony and plans presented, I move that the Historic Landmark Commission approve the request to adopt the Trolley Square Master Sign Plan subject to the following conditions of approval. The Applicant submit a revised Master Sign Plan with the following changes. We would adopt number one. Under pole sign we would add that internally illuminated signs could be considered or...can we say might be appropriate Paul? No we just have to say....

Nielson: You can say it but I don't want to hear it.

Harding: Oh okay. Maybe appropriate?

Nielson: Based on? Give me some criteria.

Harding: Based upon the discussion that we have had that we think they would be on high traffic areas, very close to non historic areas of the whole property.

Brennan: Well we have limited...under one, we have limited the pole signs to the 500 South vehicular entrance, the corner...the northeast corner of 500 South and 700 East.

Harding: Right but Paul is asking for the reasoning.

Brennan: Well I guess...

Nielson: I am looking for predictability. I think that the property owner is entitled to predictability.

Richardson: Yeah and I think Rachel had a good one there.

Brennan: I guess what I am saying is the illumination of the pole signs identified in number one can be eliminated.

Harding: Okay that is fine I would accept that. Was there something better that Rachel said?

Quist: I think that it was just...that it was adjacent to the non-contributing structure, meaning the Whole Foods at the northeast block. Is that what you are referring to and then the two other pole signs are historic in and of themselves so it's really just the...a new...this third pole sign would be confined to the northeast corner because it's a non-contributing and high traffic area.

Harding: Does that cover it for you Paul.

Nielson: That's much more specific yes.

Harding: Okay, I think we left the shopping center identification sign language, we are okay with that and I would strike the language regarding the maximum of one sign. I would strike that whole thing. Number two we are accepting. Number three we are accepting, illumination of pole sign supports.

Brennan: Supports yes.

Harding: Okay, and number three we are accepting. Number four we are accepting and we are adding that it is not just monument signs it is pole signs. So we want to look...you should look at location and compatibility. Five we are accepting, six and I believe we are accepting seven and eight with direction to consider whether it could be nine feet. Is that correct everyone?

Brennan: I would suggest that six we leave and seven we strike and allow it as submitted which is the nine feet and thirty feet.

Harding: Oh okay that's what we said, you are right, so strike seven. We wanted to strike eight in my notes is that correct.

Richardson: With recommending nine.

Harding: With recommending nine feet. And then we would keep nine, ten and eleven.

Nielson: So on eight you are not striking it? You are modifying it to nine feet.

Harding: Right, if possible.

Nielson: Okay.

Brennan: Yeah, we are recommending acceptance of the...as submitted be accepted by the city sign regulations being amended.

Richardson: Do we want to make it smaller?

Harding: So that would be it.

Coffey: And then....

Brennan: Okay, do we have a second?

Peters: I second the motion.

Brennan: Do we have any further discussion.

Coffey: Can I ask a question?

Brennan: Yes.

Coffey: There was a lot of discussion about the information signs and how big they are. Did you modify that at all or did you keep it as proposed?

Brennan: We have eliminated...so we have allowed...we have kept six, that we changed direction sign to be an information sign and then we have eliminated seven that what they have requested at nine feet high, thirty square foot is acceptable.

Coffey: Okay.

Brennan: So if we have no further discussion or questions I would like to put this to a vote. Those in favor?

Harding, Quist and Peters: Aye

Brennan: None opposed?

Richardson: One opposed.

Brennan: Oh sorry, I apologize I thought I heard all of you...and one opposed. The measure passes. For those that are aggrieved you may appeal the decision by the Salt Lake City Appeals Hearing Officer within ten days. I believe we are going to move to the second part of this applicant and review and approval of...or consideration of specific signs.

[8:03:48 PM](#)

Ms. Amy Thompson, Associate Planner, gave an overview of the Trolley Square New Exterior Signs proposal as outlined in the Staff Report (located in the case file). She stated Staff was recommending that the Historic Landmark Commission approve the petition as presented.

The Commission and Staff discussed the following:

- If by approving the sign in the southwest corner, they were also approving the new loading dock doors and the brick lintel.
 - Staff stated yes because of the nature of the construction.
- If Staff recommended a smaller sign size for the northeast corner.

- Staff was recommending something that was more compatible with the scale of the adjacent structures.

Mr. Pinion, applicant, reviewed the signs they were requesting and that they were willing to work with Staff and the Commission on making the signs work with the site. He discussed the intensity of the light that would be used for LED lighting, how they would design the lighting and use it on the site. Mr. Pinion presented a slide show that depicted how the proposed signs would look and the lighting that would be used on the signs.

The Commission, Staff and Applicant discussed the following:

- The height and size of the proposed signs.
- If the sign on Broadway had been viewed at night and the current enforcement issue on that sign.
 - The Applicant stated they would monitor their sign to make sure it did not become an issue.

PUBLIC HEARING [8:27:36 PM](#)

Chairperson Brennan opened the Public Hearing.

Mr. Siminoni, Property Owner, stated he was pleased with the discussion over the Master Sign Plan and he was trying to come up with ideas on how to advertise for the tenants in the site. He asked the Commission for any ideas on how to address the signs and not just eliminate them.

Chairperson Brennan closed the Public Hearing

The Commission discussed the following:

- The northwest flat sign on 500 South and 600 East.
 - If Staff was wanted to increase or decrease the size.
 - Request was to make the sign fit from left to right within the boarder of the two windows seen on page 34, in the picture.
 - Commissioners supported the proposal as submitted and encouraged Staff to work with the Applicant to tie the sign to the architectural features.
- Southwest corner flat panel sign.
 - The sign could be larger as it was along a major busy road.
 - Proposed sign was subtle.
 - The placement of the service entrance on that side of the site.
 - If the building was being extended to the south.
 - No they were just adding a brick lintel.
 - If the neon trolley was still on the bridge.
 - Identified under existing signage in the Master Plan.
- The font for both signs.
 - Staff could address that with the Applicant.

- Southwest corner monument sign.
 - Staff's recommendation to reduce the size.
 - Sign could be larger helping to be seen.
 - Who would actually see the sign.
 - Commission agreed with the proposed size.
- Northeast sign.
 - The video was helpful in understanding the scale and the sign echoed the water tower.
 - After seeing the night video a subtle illumination of the poles may be helpful to anchor the sign.
 - Asked the Applicant if the sign supports were not lit, how the posts would be finished.
 - There would be acrylic inside the iron work to give it some substance.
 - The colors of the posts if they were not lit.
 - If it would be better to allow the illuminated columns to the signs.
 - Changing backlit signs are not appropriate on historic sites.
 - Allowing the illuminated column as a Special Exception.

MOTION [8:45:01 PM](#)

Commissioner Peters stated regarding Trolley Square New Exterior Signs PLNHLC2014-00846 and PLNHLC2014-00845, based on the analysis and findings of fact in the Staff Report, testimony and plans presented, he moved that the Historic Landmark Commission approve the following elements of the proposal and subject to the conditions noted below:

- 1. Monument sign - including the proposed reconstruction of the existing retaining wall to accommodate the sign as submitted by the Applicant.**
- 2. Flat/building sign on the northwest corner of the subject parcel with the following condition:**
 - **The position of the sign is modified so that the natural frame created by the architectural details of the storefront window frames the sign.**
- 3. Flat/building sign on the southwest corner of the subject parcel.**
- 4. Construction of a new wall on the southwest corner to accommodate the southwest flat sign.**
- 5. Final sign drawings are submitted and final design is subject to review and approval by the Planning Director or her designee.**
- 6. That the pole sign on the northeast corner of the subject parcel is allowed as submitted by the Applicant including the illuminated poles themselves.**

Commissioner Quist asked to amend the motion to add that it could be done by guideline 35, which was on the bottom of page 9 stating because it was in a commercial area with larger developments along arterial streets and with many non-contributing structures. So because it was in front of the Whole Foods non-

contributing structure it would be appropriate for the illuminated poles.

Commissioner Peters accepted the amendment.

Commissioner Harding seconded the motion. Commissioners Quist, Harding and Peters voted “aye”. Commissioner Richardson voted “nay”. The motion passed 3-1.

The meeting adjourned at [8:48:10 PM](#)