



Staff Report

PLANNING DIVISION
COMMUNITY & ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

To: Salt Lake City Historic Landmark Commission
From: Carl Leith, Senior Planner
801 535 7758 or carl.leith@slcgov.com
Date: February 4, 2016
Re: PLNHLC2016-00029 New Construction
PLNHLC2016-00027 Special Exception

NEW CONSTRUCTION – APARTMENT BUILDING

PROPERTY ADDRESS: 454-466 SOUTH TEMPLE
PARCEL ID: 1606202008, 1606202009
HISTORIC DISTRICT: South Temple Local Historic District
ZONING DISTRICT: H Historic Preservation Overlay District. R-MU (Residential/Mixed Use District)
MASTER PLAN: Central Community Master Plan
DESIGN GUIDELINES: Multi-Family

REQUEST: New Apartment Building at approximately 454-466 E. South Temple. Chris Huntsman, CRSA, on behalf of Garbett Homes, is requesting approval from the City to construct a new apartment building on a corner site in the South Temple Historic District. The proposed development would include 5515 SF of commercial space, 166 apartment units and provision for parking 208 vehicles. The site is zoned R-MU (Residential / Mixed Use).

- A. **New Construction** – In order to build the proposed apartment building a New Construction application must be approved by the Historic Landmark Commission. Case Number PLNHLC2016-00029.
- B. **Special Exception Approval** – In order to construct the proposed development as proposed, special exception approval is sought for an encroachment of 20 feet into the required rear yard setback on the west side of the development to accommodate part of the building, two stair ways and an ADA ramp that are greater than 4 feet in height. In conjunction with the encroachment, the applicant is seeking a special exception for approximately 7 feet in additional building height for a portion of the west elevation and a portion of the south elevation at the southwest corner of the site. A grade change greater than four feet is also requested in order to accommodate the parking access ramp. Case Number PLNHLC2016-00027

RECOMMENDATION: Based on the analysis and findings listed in this staff report, testimony and the proposal presented, I recommend that the Commission approve this application for a Certificate of Appropriateness for New Construction, and the application for associated special exception approvals, subject to the following conditions:

1. That the design for the façade to 500 East be revised to address concerns as identified in this report and/or defined by the commission.
2. That the design of the façade walls facing the Piccadilly Apartments be revised and refined to address concerns as identified in this report and/or defined by the commission.
3. That the materials and their detailed design are defined and/or revised as identified in this report and/or defined by the commission.
4. That no mechanical systems/air conditioning units be located on the balconies.
5. That the approval of all design details in accordance with commission findings and conclusions are delegated to staff for approval.

MOTION: Based on the analysis and findings listed in the staff report, testimony and the proposal presented, I move that the Commission approve this application for a Certificate of Appropriateness for New Construction, and the application for associated special exception approvals, subject to the following conditions:

1. That the design for the façade to 500 East be revised to address concerns as identified in this report and/or defined by the commission.
2. That the design of the façade walls facing the Piccadilly Apartments be revised and refined to address concerns as identified in this report and/or defined by the commission.
3. That the materials and their detailed design are defined and/or revised as identified in this report and/or defined by the commission.
4. That no mechanical systems/air conditioning units be located on the balconies.
5. That the approval of all design details in accordance with commission findings and conclusions are delegated to staff for approval.

These are new applications for this development following denial of the previous applications, PLNHLC2015-00930 & 931, at the Historic Landmark Commission meeting on 1/7/16. The proposals are essentially for the same development, with a series of revisions to the previous proposals.

BACKGROUND - HISTORIC LANDMARK COMMISSION REVIEW 1/7/16

The application, revised in response to commission concerns on 12/3/15, was reviewed by the Historic Landmark Commission on January 7, 2016. The staff report had identified remaining issues and concerns relating to the façade and use facing 500 East, the setting of the adjacent Piccadilly Apartments, the palette of materials and specifically the proposal to use vinyl window framing on the two street facades in the South Temple Historic District. The staff recommendation accompanying this report was to approve the revised proposals, subject to further revisions as identified by staff and/or the commission to address these areas, with these further revisions delegated for staff review and approval.

During the public hearing the commission was addressed by four public speakers. Cindy Cromer acknowledged improvements in massing and retained concerns on the 500 East design, the south-west corner and avoiding mechanical systems on balconies. Kirk Huffaker acknowledged progress in the design but proposals for South Temple should reflect the greatness of the street and this should not be a missed opportunity; proposals should address the terminal vista from E Street to the north; insufficient communication with the street; and the adverse effect of too uniformity on the viability of the commercial spaces. Scott Anderson agreed with Kirk Huffaker, questioned why there should be such a fear of Classical architecture, and whether there was sufficient commercial space to be viable. Bradford Houston thought the proposals should reflect the area 'at a higher level' and that the reason for the loss of local businesses was a lack of design and detailing at ground level.

The commission acknowledged a number of positive revisions to the proposals and also expressed several points of concern, itemized below under the six principal issues previously identified.

1. HEIGHT, SCALE & MASSING

The reconfiguration of the building to create a more traditional 'H' plan form was a notable improvement which would reduce the massing and perceived scale on South Temple. The proposed building was still high, with concern focused primarily on the south west corner wing, where the expectation of the Multifamily Design Guidelines would be a reduced height and scale towards the center of the block. The height of the south-west wing was thought to detract from the symmetry of the principal façade to South Temple.

2. GROUND LEVEL PARKING & 500 EAST ACCESS & CHARACTER

The design of the main floor of the proposed building, particularly the fenestration and setbacks, on 500 East would warrant additional attention and refinement. The increase in commercial frontage on this façade relative to the previous proposals was an enhancement, as was stepping back the apartment floors above.

3. SETTING OF PICCADILLY APARTMENTS

Additional design attention and refinement to relieve the otherwise blank stretches of façade wall facing the Piccadilly Apartments, as identified in the staff report

4. MIXED USE CHARACTER

The increase in commercial space and frontage was welcomed as a positive revision. Concerns were expressed

on the lack of stature, modeling and variation in the commercial frontage with particular reference to how this might be used to reduce the scale and increase the interest of the ground level to South Temple.

5. **PALETTE OF MATERIALS**

The increase in the proportion of brickwork, and the use of two colors, was identified as a positive revision in the integration of a new building on South Temple. Concern was identified regarding the proposal to use Corten steel for the cladding of the central apartment entrance, and the use of vinyl windows being uncharacteristic of the city's nationally important boulevard.

6. **MASSING & CONFIGURATION OF OPEN SPACE**

The revised massing of the proposal was regarded as a notable improvement on the configuration of the building, subdividing second level courtyard space between the north and the south sides of the building. Points of concern were raised in relation to the setbacks which characterize many of the larger buildings on South Temple as a way of reducing scale in this setting which were not apparent on this proposal.

Additional issues discussed included the importance of South Temple and ensuring its protection and enhancement, and that the opportunity of this development should not be missed, adequate balcony depth and ensuring that balcony space was not used for mechanical equipment.

The commission, after detailed discussion, proposed a motion to approve the applications in line with staff recommendations. This motion did not attract majority support and failed. A second motion to approve the applications in line with staff recommendations, but excluding approval of special exception approval for height at the south-west corner and materials aligned to the Multifamily New Construction Design Guidelines, did not attract majority support and also failed. In further discussion, the commission considered tabling the applications to a future meeting, but acknowledged the applicant's request for either approval or denial of the Certificate of Appropriateness, in preference to tabling the petition. A third motion was therefore made to deny the applications, as defined in draft below.

Commissioner Harding stated in the case of PLNHLC2015-00930 and PLNHLC2015-00931, New Apartment Building at approximately 454-466 E. South Temple, she moved that the Historic Landmark Commission deny the petition based on the following:

1. *Standard 1 –The proposed height and width should be visually compatible with surrounding structures and streetscape.*
 - *The proposal did not meet this standard due to the fact that it would be built to the sidewalk, the massing of the structure was not compatible with the area and the building did not decrease in size as it went further into the interior of the block.*
2. *Standard 1D- The size and mass of the structure shall be visually compatible with the size and mass of surrounding structures and streetscape.*
 - *The proposal loomed far above the smaller buildings on either side, although there are larger buildings further out on the block, the proposal was on a corner and therefore the massing was more problematic.*

Commissioner Richardson seconded the motion. Commissioners Harding, Richardson and Brennan voted "aye". Commissioners Shepherd and Peters voted "nay". The motion passed 3-2.

The extract of the draft minutes of the Historic Landmark Commission meeting on January 7, 2016 forms part of Attachment I to this report.

CURRENT REVISIONS TO THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT

A range of revisions are identified with the new applications and are summarized below.

Apartment Unit Mix: the application is currently for 166 units, comprising 30 studio, 101 1-bedroom and 35 2-bedroom units.

Lower Levels 1 & 2: the parking structure wall has been moved 18 ins north of the south property line, and consequently that much further away from the Piccadilly Apartment building.

Main Level Floor Plan:

- North façade at Main Level only is moved south by 3 ft off of the South Temple property line, and
- Entrances are recessed by 5 ft from the South Temple property line, both helping to break up the linear façade along South Temple.
- Current commercial space figure of 5515 SF.

- At the south-west corner the unit mix is revised to adjust for reduction in height.
- 500 East – revised design between the vehicle entrance ramps to echo the fenestration pattern of the commercial frontage with aluminum window frames, planting boxes and a green wall.

Level 2 Courtyard Plan, Levels 3 & 4:

- South-west corner – adjustment to unit mix.
- Along the south property line the residential units at all levels have been moved 6 ft 11 ins north of this line and away from the Piccadilly Apartments, changing the unit distribution internally.
- Interior courtyard – this now has three access entrances, rather than the previous one.

Level 5 roof top deck: rendering of the proposals for the deck provided.

Level 6: The height of the building has been reduced by a floor at the south-west corner.

South Temple Façade:

- The street level has been redesigned for both the commercial space and the apartment entrance.
- The recessed central range of the facade has been redesigned and simplified with a central full height window bay.

Materials:

- Design revisions from the previous proposals have reduced the variety of brickwork, with dark brick cladding predominating, and contrasting red brick now proposed only for the South Temple façade.
- Revisions have reduced the proportion of brickwork relative to the stucco cladding.
- Vinyl window framing for the apartments has been retained, after initial considerations of revising this to aluminum-clad wood frames.

HISTORIC LANDMARK COMMISSION REVIEW 12/3/15

The initial application was reviewed by the Historic Landmark Commission on December 3, 2015. The commission concurred with the recommendation of the Staff Report that the petition be tabled for further consideration and revision based upon the findings of the staff report, with the commission, focusing primarily on the six key issues distilled from the design evaluation of the proposals. The commission’s conclusions are summarized and addressed below under the same six issues.

Relative to the six key issues identified in the previous Staff Report and discussed by the commission and the applicant, the following provides a synopsis of previous concerns and points of discussion. Revisions to the development proposals following that review and discussion are defined under Project Description Revisions below.

1. HEIGHT, SCALE & MASSING

HLC comments: Issues remain, concern expressed regarding total height with a primary focus on the overall massing, with the combination creating the largest building on the street. Setbacks from the street were likely to be less effective in reducing bulk and scale of the proposal. An ‘H’ plan may be much more effective than ‘U’ plan proposed, creating a courtyard facing South Temple as well – one to the south and one to the north.

2. GROUND LEVEL PARKING & 500 EAST ACCESS & CHARACTER

HLC comments: Concern was expressed on the viability of shallow commercial space on South Temple. There was acknowledgement of the current character of the 500 East in relation to the use and design proposed, although concern was expressed regarding openings to parking deck in terms of character and design, visual vitality and the ordinance design standard for minimum glazing, with reflection being seen as better than void in an unglazed opening.

3. SETTING OF PICCADILLY APARTMENTS

HLC comments: The step down in height adjacent to the Piccadilly Apartments helps in this setting. The case for special exception for height along the south side of the proposal was not convincing, and consideration should be given to stepping down at SW corner as well.

4. MIXED USE CHARACTER

HLC comments: The variety of uses and their contribution to existing character were acknowledged, now and in the past. Concerns were expressed regarding the viability of the area and depth of proposed commercial space.

5. PALETTE OF MATERIALS

HLC comments: Materials were considered of importance in establishing and maintaining this as city’s premier street, while contemporary design also considered of importance. More brick than stucco would be appropriate in this context. Materials used in the past for more contemporary designs have helped establish

many buildings of durable quality, upon which the description of the district as designated relies and will rely. Materials and detailing are significant issues which deserve detailed consideration at the second round of review.

6. MASSING & CONFIGURATION OF OPEN SPACE

HLC comments: There was general agreement on importance of revising the massing to create a volume and form more effectively the South Temple setting and character. H plan rather than internal U plan generally regarded as the better formula. The question was raised as to whether private open space in the form of rooftop garden area really could be defined as effective open space.

An extract from the draft minutes of the meeting on December 3 forms part of Attachment I to this report.

DEVELOPMENT DESCRIPTION – AS CURRENTLY REVISED

The following describes the proposed apartment building as currently revised with the new applications; where previous proposals differ in quantitative terms they are identified in parentheses.

The proposal as revised is for a 166 unit (12/3/15 - 176 units) and 165,715 SF apartment building, with apartments on five floors, above three floors of parking deck providing space for 208 vehicles (12/3/15 – 226, 1/7/16 - 212). The apartment mix comprises 30 studio units (12/3/15 – 39, 1/7/16 - 32), 99 101 1-bedroom (12/3/15 – 113, 1/7/16 - 99) and 35 2-bedroom units (12/3/15 - 24). This apartment mix has been slightly revised to accommodate a reduction in height of one floor at the south-west corner of the development. The South Temple frontage as currently proposed would provide 5515 SF of commercial space and leasing office (12/3/15 - 4155, 1/7/16 - 5211), either side of the apartment entrance. Commercial space is defined on plan as three units, with 933 SF of leasing office. Part of the SW corner of the site is defined as tenant clubroom, fitness and outdoor pool/hot tub area. The first floor of the building, beyond the proposed commercial frontage to South Temple, is designed as parking deck, above two lower parking levels.

The common centrally placed, south facing, private open court/patio is retained as a residential amenity at second floor level to the rear of the proposed building combined with the previously proposed tenant courtyard facing South Temple setting back c.23 ft from the frontage. The north facing court is echoed at street level on South Temple by setting back the apartment entrance section of the façade. Additional roof terrace space is retained at fifth level immediately adjacent to the Piccadilly Apartments on 500 East, while with the recent height revision an additional amenity terrace is created at the south-west corner. Above the first level of the proposed building the apartment floors step back to create open patio space for the second level units. With the initial proposal, reviewed in December, there was no setback along the South Temple frontage.

The proposed building would be six stories and approximately 72 ft in height (12/3/15 - 74' 11") above grade at South Temple. The proposal maintains this height across the majority of the plan of the building. With the reduction in grade across the site to the south the proposal would be seven plus stories and 82 ft in height. At the south-east corner adjacent to the neighboring Piccadilly Apartments there is a two story reduction in height. At the south-west corner, and following concerns expressed by the commission, the height has been reduced by one floor to 72 ft. Next to the Piccadilly Apartments the parking structure wall at Lower Levels 1 & 2 has been moved north, and as currently proposed would be 18 ins further away from the adjacent building. At Levels 02, 03 and 04 the residential units have been moved 6 ft 11 ins away from the south property line and the Piccadilly Apartments.

The proposed development retains the symmetrically placed and partly recessed apartment entrance facing South Temple. Entrances to commercial space off South Temple are also symmetrically placed, with secondary entrances to the sides of the building. Street level frontage to South Temple would be either apartment entrance or commercial use. This Main Level building line has been moved 3 ft to the south, with entrances to the commercial spaces recessed 5 ft, resulting in stronger modeling and variation in the design of this commercial street frontage. This frontage has also been redesigned to enhance the stature of the fenestration, and as revised is now framed by more brickwork against a concrete background. The fenestration rhythm is now articulated and varied by alternating the design of the windows and doorways. The stature of the apartment entrance has also been increased and as revised is now expressed in brickwork.

The façade facing 500 East retains the two parking access ramps serving three levels and a revised fenestration, adjacent to the extended commercial frontage from the South Temple corner. The fenestration to the parking deck has been redesigned to reflect the pattern of 'storefront' windows set into a brick façade and associated 'green

wall'. Additional planting boxes are also proposed in this iteration. The design of proposed garage doors also appears to have been reconsidered.

Above ground level on 500 East the street facades to the apartment floors step back between 5 ft and 14 ft, with more pronounced modulation and articulation. The South Temple façade is composed of two flanking wings framing the central recessed entrance range of the frontage.


The design of the facades has been revised and is now primarily expressed in a dark brick against a white stucco background. The design of the central section of the South Temple façade above the apartment entrance has been revised and is now expressed as a central full height bay of windows within a brickwork façade. The contrasting façade sections in red brick are now confined to two areas on the South Temple façade. The proportion of brickwork relative to stucco on the 500 East façade appears to have been reduced.

The fenestration pattern retains a similar hierarchy and variation, and the range of balcony widths has been retained, with the three different types of residential balcony ranging from the continuous balcony feature used at the corners to two other balcony widths defining window widths. Little to no information is currently available on proposed window reveal depth. Some definition of detailed design of the brickwork at street level is identified in the corner section detail but at this stage is less considered and resolved above. The suggested revision of window framing to aluminum clad wood for the apartments had been re-revised to the initial proposal of vinyl framing.

CONTEXT – SOUTH TEMPLE HISTORIC DISTRICT

The site is the south-west corner of the intersection of South Temple and 500 East, currently contains no extant buildings, and has several mature or semi-mature trees. Previous buildings appear to have been an apartment building and a small strip mall on the corner. It appears that the site includes two distinct lots, thus requiring their consolidation as part of these proposals. This is a corner site with two primary street facades, facing both South Temple and 500 East. It is consequently of considerable importance in the context of the character and special interest of the South Temple Historic District, while affecting the setting of the Central City Historic District on the opposite side of 500 East.

LOCATION PLAN



Facing the site to the east, across 500 East, is a three story office building with café (508 S Temple) and immediately adjacent to the south is a historic four story apartment building (the Piccadilly Apartments, 24 South 500 East). To the west, on the south side of South Temple, the site is adjacent to parking space, and single and two story buildings primarily in retail uses (434 & 430 South Temple), and then a five story office building on the corner of 400 East (466 S Temple). On the north side of South Temple the site faces three single story buildings in

office, restaurant and retail use (505, 481 & 445 South Temple), a three story office/bank building (455 South Temple) and a three and a half story historic apartment building (Rita Apartments, 435 South Temple).

The zoning district for this site is Residential /Mixed Use (RMU). The height maximum of 75 feet does not relate to the scale of the historic context for this site. The zoning does acknowledge the character of the setting in terms of its range of mixed use. Adjacent, the facing and nearby buildings provide a range of commercial uses which establish and maintain the vitality of this part of South Temple and the historic district. These include a café immediately adjacent to the east, Mrs. Backer's Pastry Shop and other small scale retail adjacent to the west, and two restaurant/cafe uses and a bank building facing the site on the north side of South Temple. The range of uses is an established characteristic of this historic context and its street vitality.

All the above buildings in this context, with the exception of 508 S Temple immediately east on the south side of South Temple, occupy notably smaller sites, which combine to establish a setting within this section of the South Temple Historic District of relatively small scale buildings. The sequence of buildings, their height and scale, individual and comparative massing, design, materials and uses, create the immediate setting for any development proposals on this site within the South Temple Historic District. This section of South Temple itself provides the setting for several landmark and contributing buildings to the east, to the west and to the south.

ORDINANCE DESIGN STANDARDS & DESIGN GUIDELINES FOR NEW CONSTRUCTION

New Construction Design Standards are defined by chapter 21A.34.020.H of the Ordinance, addressing three key aspects of contextual design – Scale & Form, Composition of Principal Facades & Relationship to the Street, and the Subdivision of Lots. The Design Guidelines for Historic Apartment and Multifamily Buildings, Chapter 12 New Construction, provides more detailed advice and guidance on design considerations to accord with the design standards. The proposed development is reviewed in detail in the context of the design guidelines and then guidelines and standards in Attachments G & H of this report, respectively.

SPECIAL EXCEPTION APPROVALS

To construct the proposed building the applicant is seeking Special Exception approval for encroachment of approximately 20ft into required rear setbacks towards the SW corner of the site. Two stairways and an ADA ramp are in excess of 4 ft in height within the rear setback. With the reduction in established grade proceeding south across the site, the proposed building would be in excess of the 75 ft R-MU base zone height ceiling, with height extending to 82 ft along the south facades, thus approximately 7 ft in excess of the R-MU maximum height. Vehicle access ramps will occasion a grade change in excess of 4 ft. The applicant seeks approval in these respects.

KEY ISSUES:

From an analysis of the proposed development in this report, public comments and department review comments, the following key issues are identified. See in particular Attachments G & H of this report.

Issue 1: PROPOSED HEIGHT, SCALE & MASSING OF THE DEVELOPMENT IN THIS HISTORIC CONTEXT

Evaluation – 12/3/15: This is a sloping site at a key intersection of South Temple and 500 East within the South Temple Historic District. The existing building scale of this context on South Temple and 500 East ranges from one to five stories in height, and in most cases on smaller lots with narrower facades than this proposal. The base zoning of R-MU recognizes the mixed use character of this setting, but it identifies a height maximum of 75 ft which does not equate with a compatible development scale for the historic character and scale of this context. The proposed development adopts this height ceiling and continues this across the site, creating a proposed height above grade along the south facades which is identified as approximately 82 ft. Allowing for incremental future development in this setting, a compatible building scale and a sensitivity to the reduction in established grade across the site would prompt a lower building with incremental height reduction and more varied massing to reduce the scale and respond to the topography and setting.

Evaluation – 1/7/16: In previous review, concerns focused upon height, volume expressed on South Temple and the configuration of the building around the south facing private second level court to the rear. Massing, more

than sheer height, was identified as the primary concern. The plan of the building has been revised to create a second upper level court above a slightly recessed central entrance range on South Temple, achieving more of an 'H' plan for the building. This redesigned plan and orientation effectively begins to address previously identified concerns with the massing of the proposal, helping to create a more characteristic building module and scale on South Temple. Proposed building heights have been marginally adjusted although overall heights remain largely as they were previously proposed.

Current Evaluation: As revised, and in acknowledgement of the commission concerns, the proposed apartment building has been reduced by a floor at the south-west corner. The previously proposed 'H' plan form has been retained. The step back and variation in plane of the apartment floors, in particular along 500 East, has also been retained. Current revisions increase the stature of the main street level façade to South Temple across the commercial frontage and the central apartment entrance, while the design of commercial frontage has a greater degree of modeling, articulation, rhythm and variety. All these revisions help to reduce either the actual height and/or the perceived scale of the proposed building.

Issue 2: USE OF GROUND LEVEL AS PARKING SPACE WITH PARKING ACCESS POINTS OFF 500 EAST

Evaluation – 12/3/15: The ground level of the proposed development, with the exception of the South Temple frontage, is designed for parking and parking access. This is a corner site in the historic district, with frontages to both South Temple and 500 East. The primary contribution of the 500 East frontage to the street scene would be parking deck and two vehicular access ramps. The proposed residential building has no entrance off 500 East. This cannot readily be identified as compatible with existing and future street vitality and character, despite the design consideration given to minimizing window openings to the ground level parking. The mixed use character of this setting, and the existence of potential alternative parking access off South Temple, suggest further and alternative consideration of the use of this floor, its vehicle access points and building entrances.

Evaluation – 1/7/16: The revised design for the building would extend the commercial space and frontage further south on the 500 East façade. The façade is also completely redesigned, while retaining the two vehicular access ramps and openings flanking a brick clad wall framing a sequence of five horizontally proportioned window openings to the parking deck. The background material proposed for this one and then two story section of the façade is identified as 'architectural concrete' using a panel system. Deeper commercial space and extended frontage on this street façade acknowledges previously expressed concerns with viability and street character. Parking ramp access shutters/doors are now defined on the elevations. The window openings to the main level parking deck appear to be open. While the design of the façade to the main level and lower level is consistent with the revised design for the building overall it tends to pay less attention to the slope of the street in defining the different levels within the building, thus losing something in terms of human scale definition in the composition, when compared with the previous design approach. An aspect of the character of 500 East and its role in providing a series of vehicular access points was argued and acknowledged in previous commission review. It remains in Staff evaluation an important street, on the west side within the South Temple Historic District, and on the east within the Central City Historic District as well as South Temple. Current and future proposals for this street should focus on the potential to not only retain but where appropriate enhance its character and street vitality. It does not seem appropriate in the stewardship of the city's historic resources to focus upon negatives in designing future character, particularly where these negatives are not readily defined as part of that historic character. In that context it remains the Staff evaluation that more can be achieved with the design of this building to contribute to the street character, vitality and public realm. Additional glazing, both to vehicle openings and to parking deck openings might be one such positive.

Current Evaluation: The design of the façade at street levels to 500 East has been revised. The fenestration to the parking deck between the two vehicular access ramps now reflects the design of the commercial frontage at street level at the north-east corner and across the South Temple frontage. A similar window framing has also been introduced. A more considered garage access door design approach is also included. The redesign of the commercial frontage to 500 East helps to emphasize its presence and importance. This combination of revisions tends to create a more coherent design approach to the street frontage at this level. Other revisions include attention to landscaping expressed in a defined planting box strip and a 'green wall'.

Issue 3: SETTING OF THE PICCADILLY APARTMENTS ON 500 EAST

Evaluation – 12/3/15: The adjacent Piccadilly Apartments on 500 East are four stories in height. This height and scale are echoed by the other historic apartment building, the Rita Apartments, facing the site on the north side of South Temple. The proposed building would be situated at the property line immediately adjacent to the narrow side access drive for the historic apartment building. As currently proposed, the new development would place a parking access ramp adjacent to the site boundary. The height of the proposed development would be two floors lower in the proximity of the Piccadilly Apartments, although the proposal would be five stories above established grade at this point and markedly higher than the adjacent building. The lower roof deck adjacent to the Piccadilly is also proposed as an outdoor residential terrace amenity, although with its proximity, relative height and use, it may be less of an amenity for the residents of the existing adjacent building. This combination would adversely affect the setting of the Piccadilly Apartments, and prompt consideration of height reduction, frontage setbacks, greater modulation and more varied massing of the proposal.

Evaluation – 1/7/16: The outline of the Piccadilly Apartment building is now shown on the East Elevation in the revised proposals. The step down in the building height of the proposal immediately adjacent to this building is retained, was acknowledged as a positive in previous review, and is perhaps further defined in the revised design. The south facing court for the apartments is also retained to reduce the impact of the proposals on this building. The juxtaposition between the Piccadilly and vehicle access opening remains, while the five story height of the proposal immediately facing the north façade of the Piccadilly also remains. Both would have a less than positive impact on the amenities enjoyed by the Piccadilly residents. More design consideration might usefully be given to how this initially five story and then two story flank wall along the south façade might be defined, detailed and embellished to relieve what might otherwise be a stark setting and enclosure for the adjacent building and site.

Current Evaluation: The revised proposals move the parking structure wall 18 ins to the north, away from the south property line and the Piccadilly Apartments. Revisions also move the adjacent residential units approximately 7 ft further away from the south property line and the Piccadilly Apartments. Of the five story wing of the building facing the Piccadilly, the upper three floors are defined in brickwork with a central bay of windows and patio doors. Below this level the proposal retains an unrelieved and undefined two story stucco façade. This remains an area where further attention to the design and materials could markedly enhance the setting.

Issue 4: THE MIXED USE CHARACTER OF THIS HISTORIC SETTING

Evaluation – 12/3/15: This corner site is located within a context retaining a variety of uses, from residential to office, banking, café/restaurant and retail. The site in fact previously had a variety of uses. The ‘status quo’ is recognized in the base zoning classification of R-MU (Residential/Mixed Use). The historic character of this part of the South Temple Historic District relies in part upon this vitality and this variety of uses. In this proposal, an area of 5,000 SF (supporting statement) or 4133 SF (plans) either side of the apartment entrance facing South Temple is identified as retail commercial, commercial and leasing office space. Subject to how this is defined, it could contribute to this vitality. The use of the ground level of the building as parking space, and the devotion of most of the ground level 500 East frontage to this use and to vehicular ramp access points, would however detract from the potential of this frontage to contribute to the vitality and character of the historic district.

Evaluation – 1/7/16: The commercial space proposed for this building was acknowledged as a positive in previous review and discussion, although there were questions on viability relative to depth of space. The revised design for the building increases the area of proposed commercial space and extends this further along both sides of the building from the South Temple corners. The revision is positive in both respects, and in particular helps to create more public use frontage on the 500 East façade.

Current Evaluation: Commercial area is increased slightly with the latest revisions, while the visual importance, variety and interest of the commercial frontage at street level is enhanced by the recent revisions to the design which include an increase in window height, greater modeling and articulation and consideration of design detail. All revisions in this iteration could be considered positive in terms of commercial presence and character.

Issue 5: THE PALETTE OF MATERIALS PROPOSED FOR STREET FACADES

Evaluation – 12/3/15: The proposal is designed with two primary materials, red brick and a hard-coat stucco system. This would be varied on the 500 East façade with sections of (currently undefined) masonry in the vicinity of the parking access ramps. Secondary materials include full height glass framed in aluminum to South Temple ground level, metalwork to canopies and balconies, and vinyl window framing used universally for the fenestration of the apartment levels. Of the two street facades, the ratio would be approximately 30% brick to 70% stucco, with brickwork used more extensively on the South Temple façade. The South Temple historic district is characterized by a range of materials, and this setting echoes this characterization. Brickwork is the predominant facing material and is employed in six of the nearby buildings, including the three closest to this site. Concrete and stucco are also found, although they articulate buildings which tend to be smaller in scale. Vinyl window framing is not a current feature of the context and would introduce limitations in detailing window frame profiles and in terms of durability. South Temple is Salt Lake City’s grandest boulevard and first historic district. The choice of materials and their detailing should recognize this importance, and accompanying sense of permanence, to the character of the historic district and of South Temple in particular. Brickwork also has the potential of more varied and creative detailing, and an inherent sense of human scale. The setting would suggest a greater use of brickwork and a higher quality of window framing.

Evaluation – 1/7/16: The building has been completely redesigned in terms of its configuration, volumes, massing and materials. The revised palette of materials now includes architectural concrete, hard coat stucco, two colors of brickwork, an unspecified cladding material to frame the apartment entrance from South Temple, and aluminum and vinyl window framing. The materials, and their detailing, were considered important in previous review discussions, and thought to be worthy of separate and detailed discussion in their own right. The proportion of brickwork has been increased responding to observations on the materials characteristic of the South Temple Historic District. The range and variety of materials, colors and textures has also been enhanced with the revised design. Staff concerns remain, however, on the use of vinyl window framing for this proposal, given the impact on the otherwise more durable palette of materials proposed for the building and the materials that are characteristic of this historic district and the nationally recognized importance of South Temple to Salt Lake City.

Current Evaluation: The recent revisions to the proposed development include a different approach to the materials. Additional consideration has been given to the street level facades in terms of materials and their detailing, to the general benefit of the proposals. Elsewhere, this iteration of the building design retains the palette of stucco, brickwork and concrete with a revised concentration on one brick color against the stucco background, with variation in brick color now limited to two panels of red brick on the South Temple frontage, with the same brick proposed for the slightly recessed central apartment entrance. The 500 East facade as revised, now expressed in one color of brick, appears to lose a proportion of the brickwork relative to stucco which tends to alter the potential character of this façade both in terms of its balance and its variety. Brickwork has been a focus of previous discussion of these proposals with an assessment of the sense of durability, permanence, design detail and character associated with South Temple as a historic district and South Temple as important historic boulevard. Window framing has also been a focus of discussion previously, with concern expressed about the use of vinyl windows in this context. Although some consideration appears to have been given to revising window framing to a higher quality alternative, the current proposals maintain the proposal to use vinyl window framing for the apartment floors. In staff evaluation, concerns remain regarding the materials and their potential or otherwise to introduce some design detailing and refinement to the two important street facades in this context.

Issue 6: BUILDING MASSING & CONFIGURATION OF OPEN SPACE

Evaluation – 12/3/15: The development proposals include ‘open space’ amenities for residents including pool, second level and fifth level courtyard or terrace open space. There is scope, and the associated potential to reduce the scale of the proposal, in configuration of some of this open space component in the form of front setbacks, thus introducing more varied massing on one or both street facades. Traditionally, larger scale apartment buildings were configured with greater modulation in their plan form, providing one or more landscaped street-facing courts and more varied access to the building and to natural light. Greater modulation of the proposals would effectively reduce the scale of the building.

Evaluation – 1/7/16: The plan form and the design of the building have been revised. The proposal as revised adopts more of an ‘H’ plan form, creating second level external court space facing South Temple as well as the south. The central section of the proposed building would also be set back slightly at ground level, effectively supporting the recessed central range of the building. Concerns were previously expressed regarding the definition of ‘open space’ relative to ordinance design requirements for the base zoning district (a minimum of 20% is required). The majority of this open space would remain at upper level and private, although the reconfiguration of the central upper court to face both north and south, and recessing the central section of the building facing South Temple, creates a plan and building massing that more characteristically responds to this site and context in the historic district.

Current Evaluation: The primary massing of the building is retained from the previous proposals, while the story height reduction of the south-west corner wing helps to address concerns expressed by the commission. This would consequently compete and detract less from the symmetry of the proposed building frontage to South Temple. The configuration and variety of open space remains largely as it was previously proposed, with the applicants confirming a total of 29% defined as open space.


ATTACHMENTS:

- A.** Vicinity Map
- B.** Historic District Map
- C.** Photographs
- D.** Application Statements
- E.** Application Photographs & Plans
 - 1 Revised Application Plans
 - 2 Previous Application Plans 1/7/16
 - 3 Previous Application Plans 12/3/15
- F.** R-MU Zoning Ordinance Standards
- G.** Design Guidelines for New Construction
- H.** Standards for New Construction in a Historic District
- I.** Public Process and Comments
 - 1 Draft Minutes HLC 1/7/16 Extract
 - 2 Minutes HLC 12/3/15
 - 3 Public inquiries & comments
- J.** Motions

ATTACHMENT A: VICINITY MAP



ATTACHMENT B: HISTORIC DISTRICT MAP



★ *Approximate project location*

ATTACHMENT C: PHOTOGRAPHS OF THE CONTEXT



76 SOUTH 500 EAST



42 SOUTH 500 EAST



34 SOUTH 500 EAST



PICCADILLY APARTMENTS, 24 SOUTH 500 EAST



508 SOUTH TEMPLE





505 SOUTH TEMPLE



481 & 455 SOUTH TEMPLE



435 (RITA APARTMENTS) & 445 SOUTH TEMPLE



420, 430 & 434 SOUTH TEMPLE



APPLICATION SITE, 466 SOUTH TEMPLE



APPLICATION SITE, 466 SOUTH TEMPLE



APPLICATION SITE, 454 SOUTH TEMPLE



APPLICATION SITE, 454 SOUTH TEMPLE

ATTACHMENT D: APPLICATION STATEMENTS

Issue #1 – Context Height and Scale

The height of the surrounding buildings vary greatly. The intersection of 4th East and South Temple is anchored with tall buildings. Each corner has a 7 story building. One, the IBM abuts this development at the SW corner of our property. On the other side of the project at the NE corner of 5th East and 1st South is a 14-story building. The Governors Square apartment complex directly to the east is twelve stories in height. Another apartment building on SW corner 1st Avenue and F Street is 7 stories. There are also multiple buildings in the 4-5 story range along the south side of South Temple and a few buildings that are one to two stories in height.

The widths of buildings in the general area of the project vary as much as the heights.

The four-story Piccadilly apartments to the south and the IBM Building are the only buildings immediately adjacent to the site. The other two buildings to the west are separated by two parking lots.

The proposed building acknowledges the 4 story Piccadilly to the south by stepping down the SE corner of the new building.

At the SW corner of the property the proposed building drops one story due to sloping topography. The new building measures 72' from grade and is shorter than the existing 7½ story IBM Building at its SE corner.

Issue #2 – Ground Level Parking

5th East vs. South Temple façade:

The South Temple experience will be a walking/shopping/lounging experience that will be similar to that experienced on the opposite side of the street where Einstein Bagels exists and the former Wild Grape restaurant existed. The façade at street level will be open to the view of drivers and pedestrians alike in an effort to enliven the street through a visual connection with activity both inside and outside the building. The main level façade has been pulled off of South Temple 3' and 5' at the entrances.

The Fifth East experience will be different as the grade drops from South Temple rather quickly. Fifth East provides the entrance to the parking garage below the building. The 5th East façade will be less transparent but will still contain windows along the street level allowing light into the garage. There will be two means of access to the parking garage. The access will be similar to that experienced by other buildings in the surrounding area with similar needs for parking access. Two examples are the buildings and parking structures directly across the street and also the two buildings on the corner of South Temple and 4th East. There are numerous other examples within the district.

Both facades are varied in height and width along the primary facades. The building is designed with setbacks and balconies along both facades. The step back on 5th east ranges from 5'-0" to 14'-0". The step back will continue though the upper five floors. The upper floors also step back again for balconies for additional visual interest.

The South Temple façade is broken into three components above the commercial level to reduce the feeling of bulk and height and more closely match other apartment buildings within the district and the City. This was done by adopting the more traditional "H" footprint for the building instead of the originally proposed "U" footprint.

Issue #3 – Piccadilly Apartments

The proposed development drops two floors as it approaches the Piccadilly apartments on the south property line softening the overall height of the project in context with the Piccadilly Apartments.

Issue #4 – Mixed-Use Character

The amount of available commercial space has been increased to encourage mixed-use development on South Temple. The total square footage for commercial/retail space is now 5,515 SF. The development has no commercial / retail space along 5th East due to parking access.

Issue #5 – Palette of Materials

Materiality: The materials of the buildings on South Temple vary widely. Brick may be the predominant material but there is also a significant amount of exposed architectural concrete, and stucco. In the area surrounding this project all of those materials are represented. We have chosen a pallet of brick, stucco, and architectural concrete. The primary material on South Temple and 5th East will be two colors of brick. Pre-finished aluminum window systems will be used on the main level facing South Temple and 5th East. The apartments will have aluminum clad wood window systems.

Issue #6 – Building Massing and Configuration of Open Space

As noted the H-shape of the proposed development softens the building façade on South Temple. This massing and building configuration can be seen along South Temple in other developments. This configuration creates a north facing front courtyard and a south facing interior courtyard.

With 29% of the proposed development designed as open space, a mix of diverse spaces such as public seating and dining areas, tenant hot tub and lounging decks, open courtyards, semi-enclosed interior courtyards and an intimate roof top terrace have been incorporated into the project.

Area between the proposed building and western boundary of the site

The area between the building and the west property line is dedicated to tenant and public use. The southern part of this outdoor seating area is an informal plaza where tenants and patrons can congregate. Benches will line the pedestrian paths to the clubroom located in the southwest area.

Design Statement and Rationale

The building is contemporary in design. Its clean lines help this building fit within the context of South Temple. It represents our time on South Temple. We feel that this building will become part of the fabric of South Temple as other contemporary buildings have done. Our time is concerned with the environment, global awareness, economy, durability, technology, and simplicity. The building addresses these concerns with durable materials, such as brick, concrete, and hard coat stucco systems. In addition, with 185 photovoltaic panels located on the roof, this project will generate electricity for years to come and move us toward a more sustainable as a society.

Project summary: 166 total units; (30) studios, (101) 1-bedrooms, and (35) 2-bedrooms

Current revisions:

Lower Level 2 Floor Plan & Lower Level 1 Floor Plan (Sheet AE097 and Sheet AE098)

Along the south property line we have moved the parking structure wall 18" to the north. This provides needed space for constructability and also slightly pulls the overall building away from Piccadilly.

Main Level Floor Plan (Sheet AE099)

Revised the Commercial space along South Temple. We have pulled the north façade (Façade at main level only) south 3'-0" off of the South Temple property line. The entrances to the commercial spaces have been recessed 5'-0" from the property line, this helps break up the linear façade along South Temple. The changes to the commercial space will be evident in our renderings and elevations that are forthcoming. Adding up the commercial space along South Temple, we have 5,515 SF of Commercial Space.

The unit mix within the Southwest corner property has been slightly revised to help accommodate the overall reduction in building height in this area. We have reduced the total building height in this area to approx. 72'-0". This is a reduction from the previous design of 82'-0".

Along 5th East, we have revised the wall between the two vehicular entrances to incorporate more planter boxes and a 'green wall'. This will be evident in our forthcoming renderings and elevations.

There were some concerns from the commission regarding the openings along 5th east, we have revised the façade design there and now show aluminum storefront windows between the two parking entrances instead of the previous openings.

Level 02 Courtyard Floor Plan, Level 03, and Level 04 (Sheets AE101, AE102, and AE103)

We have the same revisions to the Southwest corner as described above.

Along the south property line between the Hardison Apartments and the Piccadilly we have moved the residential units 6'-11" away from the south property line. This provides more space between the two building than our previous design. This change occurs on all the levels above.

The interior courtyard now has three access entrances; one to the north (which was in the previous design), one to the southeast, and one to the southwest.

Unit distribution has changed slightly, mainly around the interior courtyard to accommodate moving the apartment buildings 6'-11" to the north of the south property line.

Level 05 (Sheet AE104)

We see the roof top deck along the south property line near the Piccadilly apartments. We will provide a rendering that shows how this roof top deck will look in context with the Piccadilly apartment.

Level 06 (Sheet AE105)

The major change here is the reduction of building height in the Southwest corner of the property. We have eliminated a floor of units in the SW and added an outdoor roof deck area. This is in response to several concerns from our HLC meeting.

ATTACHMENT E: APPLICATION PHOTOGRAPHS & PLANS




HARDISON APARTMENTS



HISTORIC MAP






- RMF-35
- RO
- R-MU
- RMF-45
- I
- PL
- SR-3
- CN
- SR-1A
- D-1
- RMF-75

ZONING MAP



ISSUE 4: The Mixed-Use Character

5,515 SF COMMERCIAL SPACE




MAIN LEVEL FACING SOUTH TEMPLE:

3,235 SF, 41% GLAZING,
59% DURABLE MATERIAL, BRICK, CONCRETE, AND METAL


MAIN LEVEL FACING 5TH EAST:

3,000 SF, 40% GLAZING & OPENING






SITE SECTION



HARDISON APARTMENTS



SITE SECTION




HARDISON APARTMENTS

1. OUTDOOR SEATING
2. OUTDOOR PLAZA
3. POOL DECK AND POOL AREA
4. COURTYARD
5. PARKING GARAGE ENTRANCE
6. ROOF TOP AREA
7. SOLAR PANELS

TOTAL SITE AREA: 49,687.5 SF
 TOTAL OPEN AREA: 14,688 SF
 PERCENT OPEN: 29.5%

SPECIAL EXCEPTION

A SPECIAL EXCEPTION IS BEING REQUESTED TO ALLOW THE DEVELOPMENT ON THE SOUTHWEST CORNER OF THE PROPERTY. THIS PORTION OF THE PROPERTY IS UNDEVELOPABLE WITHOUT ALLOWING CONSTRUCTION TO OCCUR WITHIN THE REAR SETBACK OF THE 30' SETBACK ALONG THE WEST PROPERTY LINE. THERE IS A VERY NARROW OPENING BETWEEN THE TWO PROPERTIES AND WITHOUT ENCROACHING ON THE BACK OF 30' SETBACK THAT INTERIOR PIECE OF PROPERTY CANNOT BE DEVELOPED. THE ENCROACHMENT IS 20'-0" WIDE BY 42'-2" DEEP



SITE PLAN



ELEVATION
0'-0"

NORTH ELEVATION



HARDISON APARTMENTS



WEST ELEVATION



HARDISON APARTMENTS



SOUTH ELEVATION



HARDISON APARTMENTS



EAST ELEVATION




HARDISON APARTMENTS



LOWER LEVEL 2





SPACE LEGEND

 LOBBY	 STORAGE
 PARKING	 UTILITY
 STAIRS	 CLUBHOUSE
 EL.	

LOWER LEVEL 1





MAIN LEVEL





SPACE LEGEND

 STUDIO	 HALLWAY
 1-BEDROOM	 EL.
 2-BEDROOM	 STORAGE
 STAIRS	

LEVEL 2 COURTYARD





LEVEL 3





LEVEL 4






LEVEL 5





LEVEL 6






ROOF PLAN





HARDISON APARTMENTS




HARDISON APARTMENTS




HARDISON APARTMENTS




HARDISON APARTMENTS




NORTH ELEVATION - WALL SECTION FINISH MATERIALS




1 ELEVATION
Scale 1/8" = 1'-0"



1 SECTION
Scale 1/16" = 1'-0"



D1 WINDOW AND DOOR DETAIL AT APARTMENTS
Scale 1/4" = 1'-0"



D2 WINDOW AND DOOR DETAIL AT COMMERCIAL SPACE
Scale 1/4" = 1'-0"

Issue #1 – Context Height and Scale

The height of the surrounding buildings vary greatly. The intersection of 4th East and South Temple is anchored with tall buildings. Each corner has a 7 story building. One, the IBM abuts this development at the SW corner of our property. On the other side of the project at the NE corner of 5th East and 1st South is a 14-story building. The Governors Square apartment complex directly to the east is twelve stories in height. Another apartment building on SW corner 1st Avenue and F Street is 7 stories. There are also multiple buildings in the 4-5 story range along the south side of South Temple and a few buildings that are one to two stories in height.

The widths of buildings in the general area of the project vary as much as the heights.

The four-story Piccadilly apartments to the south and the IBM Building are the only buildings immediately adjacent to the site. The other two buildings to the west are separated by two parking lots.

The proposed building acknowledges the 4 story Piccadilly to the south by stepping down the SE corner of the new building.

At the SW corner of the property one additional story is exposed due to sloping topography. The new building measures 82' from grade and is shorter than the existing 7½ story IBM Building at its SE corner.

Issue #2 – Ground Level Parking

5th East vs. South Temple façade:

The South Temple experience will be a walking/shopping/lounging experience that will be similar to that experienced on the opposite side of the street where Einstein Bagels exists and the former Wild Grape restaurant existed. The façade at street level will be open to the view of drivers and pedestrians alike in an effort to enliven the street through a visual connection with activity both inside and outside the building.

The Fifth East experience will be different as the grade drops from South Temple rather quickly. Fifth East provides the entrance to the parking garage below the building. The 5th East façade will be less transparent but will still contain openings along the street level allowing light and air for ventilation into the garage. There will be two means of access to the parking garage. The access will be similar to that experienced by other buildings in the surrounding area with similar needs for parking access. Two examples are the buildings and parking structures directly across the street and also the two buildings on the corner of South Temple and 4th East. There are numerous other examples within the district.

Both facades are varied in height and width along the primary facades. The building is designed with setbacks and balconies along both facades. The step back on 5th east ranges from 5'-0" to 14'-0. The step back will continue though the upper five floors. The upper floors also step back again for balconies for additional visual interest.

The South Temple façade is broken into three components above the commercial level to reduce the feeling of bulk and height and more closely match other apartment buildings within the district and the City. This was done by adopting the more traditional "H" footprint for the building instead of the originally proposed "U" footprint.

Issue #3 – Piccadilly Apartments

The proposed development drops two floors as it approaches the Piccadilly apartments on the south property line softening the overall height of the project in context with the Piccadilly Apartments.

Issue #4 – Mixed-Use Character

The amount of available commercial space has been increased to encourage mixed-use development on South Temple. The total square footage for commercial/retail space is now 5,211 SF. The development has no commercial / retail space along 5th East due to parking access.

Issue #5 – Palette of Materials

Materiality: The materials of the buildings on South Temple vary widely. Brick may be the predominant material but there is also a significant amount of exposed concrete, concrete block, stucco and steel cladding. In the area surrounding this project all of those materials are represented. We have chosen a pallet of brick, stucco, and architectural concrete. The primary material on South Temple and 5th East will be two colors of brick.

Issue #6 – Building Massing and Configuration of Open Space

As noted the H-shape of the proposed development softens the building façade on South Temple. This massing and building configuration can be seen along South Temple in other developments. This configuration creates a north facing front courtyard and a south facing interior courtyard.

With 29% of the proposed development designed as open space, a mix of diverse spaces such as public seating and dining areas, tenant hot tub and lounging decks, open courtyards, semi-enclosed interior courtyards and an intimate roof top terrace have been incorporated into the project.

Area between the proposed building and western boundary of the site

The area between the building and the west property line is dedicated to tenant and public use. The southern part of this outdoor seating area is an informal plaza where tenants and patrons can congregate. Benches will line the pedestrian paths to the clubroom located in the southwest area.

Design Statement and Rationale

The building is contemporary in design. Its clean lines help this building fit within the context of South Temple. It represents our time on South Temple. We feel that this building will become part of the fabric of South Temple as other contemporary buildings have done. Our time is concerned with the environment, global awareness, economy, durability, technology, and simplicity. The building addresses these concerns with durable materials, such as brick, concrete, and hard coat stucco systems. In addition, with 185 photovoltaic panels located on the roof, this project will generate electricity for years to come and move us toward a more sustainable as a society.



HARDISON APARTMENTS




SITE LOCATION





HISTORIC MAP






- RMF-35
- RO
- R-MU
- RMF-45
- I
- PL
- SR-3
- CN
- SR-1A
- D-1
- RMF-75

ZONING MAP



ISSUE 1: Context Height & Scale





CONTEXT





8 STORIES



8 STORIES




8 STORIES



3 1/2 STORIES



5 STORIES



160'-0" - 13 STORIES




160'-0"



77'-0"



180'-0" - 14 STORIES




21 STORIES

HEIGHT MAP



83'-0" - 6 STORIES



60'-0" - 5 STORIES



80'-0" - 5 STORIES



140'-0" - 13 STORIES



80'-0" - 5 STORIES



ISSUE 2: Ground Level Parking




ISSUE 3: Piccadilly Apartments



ISSUE 4: The Mixed-Use Character

5,211 SF COMMERCIAL SPACE



MAIN LEVEL FACING SOUTH TEMPLE:

3,235 SF, 41% GLAZING,
59% DURABLE MATERIAL, BRICK, CONCRETE, AND METAL

MAIN LEVEL FACING 5TH EAST:

3,000 SF, 40% GLAZING & OPENING



ISSUE 5: Palette of Materials - BRICK, CONCRETE, AND STUCCO




ISSUE 6: Building Massing and Configuration of Open Space




ISSUE 6: Building Massing and Configuration of Open Space







SITE SECTION



HARDISON APARTMENTS



SITE SECTION




HARDISON APARTMENTS

1. OUTDOOR SEATING
2. OUTDOOR PLAZA
3. POOL DECK AND POOL AREA
4. COURTYARD
5. PARKING GARAGE ENTRANCE
6. ROOF TOP AREA
7. SOLAR PANELS

TOTAL SITE AREA: 49,687.5 SF
 TOTAL OPEN AREA: 14,688 SF
 PERCENT OPEN: 29.5%

SPECIAL EXCEPTION

A SPECIAL EXCEPTION IS BEING REQUESTED TO ALLOW THE DEVELOPMENT ON THE SOUTHWEST CORNER OF THE PROPERTY. THIS PORTION OF THE PROPERTY IS UNDEVELOPABLE WITHOUT ALLOWING CONSTRUCTION TO OCCUR WITHIN THE REAR SETBACK OF THE 30' SETBACK ALONG THE WEST PROPERTY LINE. THERE IS A VERY NARROW OPENING BETWEEN THE TWO PROPERTIES AND WITHOUT ENCROACHING ON THE BACK OF 30' SETBACK THAT INTERIOR PIECE OF PROPERTY CANNOT BE DEVELOPED. THE ENCROACHMENT IS 20'-0" WIDE BY 42'-2" DEEP





ELEVATION
0'-0"


NORTH ELEVATION



HARDISON APARTMENTS



WEST ELEVATION



HARDISON APARTMENTS




SOUTH ELEVATION





HARDISON APARTMENTS




EAST ELEVATION




HARDISON APARTMENTS






LOWER LEVEL 2






LOWER LEVEL 1






MAIN LEVEL






LEVEL 2 COURTYARD






LEVEL 3






LEVEL 4






LEVEL 5





LEVEL 6





ROOF PLAN






HARDISON APARTMENTS



HARDISON APARTMENTS



HARDISON APARTMENTS




NORTH ELEVATION - WALL SECTION FINISH MATERIALS




BRICK VENEER 1



BRICK VENEER 2 ACCENT




HARD COAT STUCCO SYSTEM FIELD COLOR




ARCHITECTURAL CONCRETE



* COR-TEN STEEL



NORTH ELEVATION



PRE-FINISHED ALUMINUM



The Hardison














SPECIAL EXCEPTION

A SPECIAL EXCEPTION IS BEING REQUESTED TO ALLOW THE DEVELOPMENT ON THE SOUTHWEST CORNER OF THE PROPERTY. THIS PORTION OF THE PROPERTY IS UNDEVELOPABLE WITHOUT ALLOWING CONSTRUCTION TO OCCUR WITHIN THE REAR SETBACK OF THE 30' SETBACK ALONG THE WEST PROPERTY LINE. THERE IS A VERY NARROW OPENING BETWEEN THE TWO PROPERTIES AND WITHOUT ENCROACHING ON THE BACK OF 30' SETBACK THAT INTERIOR PIECE OF PROPERTY CANNOT BE DEVELOPED. THE ENCROACHMENT IS 20'-0" WIDE BY 42'-2" DEEP



SITE PLAN



ARCHITECTURE • PLANNING • INTERIORS
649 E SOUTH TEMPLE • SLC, UT 84102
801.355.5915 • www.crsa-us.com



NORTH ELEVATION
SCALE 3/32" = 1'-0"



EAST ELEVATION
SCALE 3/32" = 1'-0"

Issue Date
Project Status
NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION
ARCHITECT-ENGINEER STAMP

THE HARDISON

5TH EAST SOUTH TEMPLE
SALT LAKE CITY, UT

GARBETT HOMES

CLIENT ADDRESS

1		Issue Date - Project Status
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
CD		
DD		
PROJECT NUMBER: 15-027	FILE NAME: filename.rvt	
DRAWN BY: Author	CHECKED BY: Checker	

CONCEPT ELEVATIONS

AE203

P:\B\15-027 5th Temple 5th E.dwg 11/17/2015 8:34:59 AM



ARCHITECTURE • PLANNING • INTERIORS
649 E SOUTH TEMPLE • SLC, UT 84102
801.355.5915 • www.crsa-us.com

ELEVATION
0'-0"

ELEVATION
-11'-0"

Issue Date
Project Status
NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION

ARCHITECT-ENGINEER STAMP

THE HARDISON

5TH EAST SOUTH TEMPLE
SALT LAKE CITY, UT


GARBETT HOMES

CLIENT ADDRESS

1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
DD	
CD	
DD	
PROJECT NUMBER: 15-027	FILE NAME: filename.rvt
DRAWN BY: Author	CHECKED BY: Checker

CONCEPT ELEVATIONS

AE204



SOUTH ELEVATION

SCALE 3/32" = 1'-0"

TOP OF CAP
74'-10"




WEST ELEVATION

SCALE 3/32" = 1'-0"

P:\B\15-027 5th Temple 5th E App\07 DRAWINGS\02 Revit\Local Revit Files\Chris Hurlburt\15-027 5th E & South Temple_Chris.rvt
11/17/2015 8:35:01 AM



ARCHITECTURE • PLANNING • INTERIORS
649 E SOUTH TEMPLE • SLC, UT 84102
801.355.5915 • www.crsa-us.com



Issue Date
Project Status
NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION

ARCHITECT-ENGINEER STAMP

THE HARDISON

5TH EAST SOUTH TEMPLE
SALT LAKE CITY, UT


GARBETT HOMES

CLIENT ADDRESS

1	Issue Date	Project Status
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
CD		
DD		
PROJECT NUMBER: 15-027	FILE NAME: filename.rvt	
DRAWN BY: Author	CHECKED BY: Checker	

LOWER LEVEL 2 FLOOR PLAN

AE097




1 LOWER LEVEL 2 FLOOR PLAN
AE097 1/16" = 1'-0"

P:\B\15-027 50 Temple 5th E\Apt07 - Drawings\2D - Revit\Local Revit Files\Chris Hartsman\15-027 5th E & South Temple_Chris.rvt
11/17/2015 8:38:17 AM



ARCHITECTURE • PLANNING • INTERIORS
649 E SOUTH TEMPLE • SLC, UT 84102
801.355.5915 • www.crsa-us.com



Issue Date
Project Status
NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION
ARCHITECT-ENGINEER STAMP

THE HARDISON

5TH EAST SOUTH TEMPLE
SALT LAKE CITY, UT


GARBETT HOMES

CLIENT ADDRESS

1	Issue Date	Project Status
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
CD		
DD		
PROJECT NUMBER: 15-027		FILE NAME: filename.rvt
DRAWN BY: Author		CHECKED BY: Checker

LOWER LEVEL 1 FLOOR PLAN

AE098



1 LOWER LEVEL 1 FLOOR PLAN
AE098 1/16" = 1'-0"

P:\B\15-027 50 Temple 5th E\Apt07 DRAWINGS\02- Revit\Local Revit Files\Chris Hartsman\15-027 5th E & South Temple_Chris.rvt
11/17/2015 8:34:17 AM



ARCHITECTURE • PLANNING • INTERIORS
 649 E SOUTH TEMPLE • SLC, UT 84102
 801.355.5915 • www.crsa-us.com



Issue Date
 Project Status
NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION

ARCHITECT-ENGINEER STAMP

THE HARDISON

5TH EAST SOUTH TEMPLE
 SALT LAKE CITY, UT

GARBETT HOMES

CLIENT ADDRESS

1	Issue Date	Project Status
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		
29		
30		
31		
32		
33		
34		
35		
36		
37		
38		
39		
40		
41		
42		
43		
44		
45		
46		
47		
48		
49		
50		
51		
52		
53		
54		
55		
56		
57		
58		
59		
60		
61		
62		
63		
64		
65		
66		
67		
68		
69		
70		
71		
72		
73		
74		
75		
76		
77		
78		
79		
80		
81		
82		
83		
84		
85		
86		
87		
88		
89		
90		
91		
92		
93		
94		
95		
96		
97		
98		
99		
100		

**LEVEL 02 COURTYARD
 FLOOR PLAN**

AE101



1
 AE101 1/16" = 1'-0"

P:\B\15-027 50 Temple 5th E Apr07 DRAWINGS\02 Revit\Local Revit Files\Chris Hartsman\15-027 5th E & South Temple_Chris.rvt
 11/17/2015 8:38:28 AM



ARCHITECTURE • PLANNING • INTERIORS
 649 E SOUTH TEMPLE • SLC, UT 84102
 801.355.5915 • www.crsa-us.com



Issue Date
 Project Status
NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION

ARCHITECT-ENGINEER STAMP

THE HARDISON

5TH EAST SOUTH TEMPLE
 SALT LAKE CITY, UT

GARBETT HOMES

CLIENT ADDRESS

1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
CD	
DD	
PROJECT NUMBER: 15-027	FILE NAME: filename.rvt
DRAWN BY: Author	CHECKED BY: Checker

LEVEL 03 FLOOR PLAN

AE102



1 LEVEL 03
 AE102 1/16" = 1'-0"

P:\B\15-027 50 Temple 5th E App\07 DRAWINGS\02 Revit\Local Revit Files\Chris Hartsman\15-027 5th E & South Temple_Chris.rvt
 11/17/2015 8:36:36 AM



ARCHITECTURE • PLANNING • INTERIORS
649 E SOUTH TEMPLE • SLC, UT 84102
801.355.5915 • www.crsa-us.com



Issue Date
Project Status
NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION

ARCHITECT-ENGINEER STAMP

THE HARDISON

5TH EAST SOUTH TEMPLE
SALT LAKE CITY, UT

GARBETT HOMES

CLIENT ADDRESS

1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
CD	
DD	
PROJECT NUMBER: 15-027	FILE NAME: filename.rvt
DRAWN BY: Author	CHECKED BY: Checker

LEVEL 06 FLOOR PLAN


AE105

1
AE105
1/16" = 1'-0"

P:\B\15-027 50 Temple 5th E App\07 DRAWINGS\06 Revit\Local Revit Files\Chris Hartsman\15-027 5th E & South Temple_Chris.rvt
11/17/2015 8:34:57 AM



ARCHITECTURE • PLANNING • INTERIORS
649 E SOUTH TEMPLE • SLC, UT 84102
801.355.5915 • www.crsa-us.com



STREETSCAPE EAST -WEST



STREETSCAPE NORTH-SOUTH

1 STREETSCAPE
AE205 1" = 60'-0"

Issue Date
Project Status
NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION
ARCHITECT-ENGINEER STAMP

THE HARDISON

5TH EAST SOUTH TEMPLE
SALT LAKE CITY, UT

GARBETT HOMES

CLIENT ADDRESS

1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
CD	
DD	
PROJECT NUMBER: 15-027	FILE NAME: filename.rvt
DRAWN BY: Author	CHECKED BY: Checker







STREETSCAPES

AE205

P:\B\15-027 50 Temple 5th E App\07 DRAWINGS\02 Revit\Local Revit Files\Chris Hartsman\15-027 5th E & South Temple_Chris.rvt
11/17/2015 8:35:04 AM



ARCHITECTURE • PLANNING • INTERIORS
649 E SOUTH TEMPLE • SLC, UT 84102
801.355.5915 • www.crsa-us.com



STUCCO FIELD COLOR #1



STUCCO ACCENT COLOR #1



BRICK VENEER

Issue Date
Project Status
NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION
ARCHITECT-ENGINEER STAMP

THE HARDISON

5TH EAST SOUTH TEMPLE
SALT LAKE CITY, UT

GARBETT HOMES

CLIENT ADDRESS

1/A	
2/A	
3/A	
4/A	
5/A	
6/A	
CD	
DD	
PROJECT NUMBER: 15-027	FILE NAME: filename.rvt
DRAWN BY: Author	CHECKED BY: Checker

SECTION, DETAIL, AND MATERIALS



AE206

1 SECTION, DETAIL, AND MATERIALS
AE206 3/16" = 1'-0"

P:\B\15-027 50 Temple 5th E App\07 DRAWINGS\02 Revit\Local Revit Files\Chris Hartsman\15-027 5th E & South Temple_Chris.rvt
11/17/2015 8:35:05 AM



ARCHITECTURE • PLANNING • INTERIORS
 649 E SOUTH TEMPLE • SLC, UT 84102
 801.355.5915 • www.crsa-us.com




STUCCO FIELD COLOR #1



STUCCO ACCENT COLOR #1



STUCCO FIELD COLOR #2



STUCCO ACCENT COLOR #2



BRICK VENEER

NORTH ELEVATION - WALL SECTION FINISHES AND WINDOW DETAILS

Issue Date
 Project Status
NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION
 ARCHITECT-ENGINEER STAMP

THE HARDISON

5TH EAST SOUTH TEMPLE
 SALT LAKE CITY, UT

GARBETT HOMES

CLIENT ADDRESS

1	Issue Date	Project Status
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		
29		
30		
31		
32		
33		
34		
35		
36		
37		
38		
39		
40		
41		
42		
43		
44		
45		
46		
47		
48		
49		
50		
51		
52		
53		
54		
55		
56		
57		
58		
59		
60		
61		
62		
63		
64		
65		
66		
67		
68		
69		
70		
71		
72		
73		
74		
75		
76		
77		
78		
79		
80		
81		
82		
83		
84		
85		
86		
87		
88		
89		
90		
91		
92		
93		
94		
95		
96		
97		
98		
99		
100		

SECTION, DETAIL, AND MATERIALS

AE207

1 SECTION, DETAIL, AND MATERIALS 2
 AE207 3/16" = 1'-0"

P:\B\15-027 50 Temple 5th E App\07 DRAWINGS\02 Revit\Local Revit Files\Chris Hurdman\15-027 5th E & South Temple_Chris.rvt
 11/17/2015 8:35:06 AM



ARCHITECTURE • PLANNING • INTERIORS
 649 E SOUTH TEMPLE • SLC, UT 84102
 801.355.5915 • www.crsa-us.com

Issue Date
Project Status
NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION
 ARCHITECT-ENGINEER STAMP

THE HARDISON

5TH EAST SOUTH TEMPLE
 SALT LAKE CITY, UT

GARBETT HOMES

CLIENT ADDRESS

△	
△	
△	
△	
△	
△	
CD	
DD	
PROJECT NUMBER: 15-027	FILE NAME: filename.rvt
DRAWN BY: Author	CHECKED BY: Checker

SITE IMAGES

AE208

P:\015-027 50 Temple, 5th E, Apr07, DRAWINGS\02 - Revit\Local Revit Files\Chris Hartsman\15-027 5th E & South Temple_Chris.rvt
 11/17/2015 8:35:09 AM



NORTH WALL SECTION ELEVATION



NORTH WALL SECTION ELEVATION

MATERIAL LEGEND

- 1- HARD COAT STUCCO COLOR #1
- 2- HARD COAT STUCCO COLOR #2
- 3- HARD COAT STUCCO COLOR #3
- 4- WINDOW AND DOOR TRIM COLOR
- 5- CLEAR ANODIZED STOREFRONT
- 6- VINYL-FRAMED WINDOW SYSTEM
- 7- BRICK VENEER



1



2




3



4



5



6



7



THE HARDISON

ATTACHMENT F: R-MU ZONING ORDINANCE STANDARDS

Existing Condition

The site is currently vacant and consists of two parcels.

Zoning Ordinance Standards for R-MU (Residential-Mixed Use) (21A.24.170)

Purpose Statement: The purpose of the R-MU residential/mixed use district is to reinforce the mixed use character of the area and encourage the development of areas as high density residential urban neighborhoods containing retail, service commercial, and small scale office uses. This district is appropriate in areas of the city where the applicable master plans support high density, mixed use development. The standards for the district are intended to facilitate the creation of a walkable urban neighborhood with an emphasis on pedestrian scale activity while acknowledging the need for transit and automobile access.

Standard	Finding	Rationale
Minimum Lot Area: None required		No minimum required
Minimum Lot Width: 50 ft	Complies	
Setbacks: Front Yard - No setback required Corner & Interior Side Yards - None required	Complies Complies	
Rear Yard - 25% of lot depth (need not exceed 30 ft)	Special Exception Required	HLC Approval
Maximum Building Height: 75 ft	Special Exception Required	HLC Approval
Minimum Open Space: 20% of lot area	To be confirmed	
Entrance & Visual Access: Minimum First Floor Glass – 40%	To be confirmed	
Facades: Provide at least one operable entrance per elevation facing a public street	Complies	
Maximum Façade Length: 15 ft without interruptions	Complies	Design articulation

Discussion: In order to construct the proposed development as proposed, special exception approval is sought for an encroachment of 20 feet into the required rear yard setback on the west side of the development to accommodate part of the building, two stair ways and an ADA ramp that are greater than 4 feet in height. In conjunction with the encroachment, the applicant is seeking a special exception for approximately 7 feet 4 inches in additional building height for a portion of the west elevation and a portion of the south elevation at the southwest corner of the site. A grade change greater than four feet is also requested in order to accommodate the parking access ramp.

- A. **Compliance With Zoning Ordinance And District Purposes:** The proposed use and development will be in harmony with the general and specific purposes for which this title was enacted and for which the regulations of the district were established.
- B. **No Substantial Impairment Of Property Value:** The proposed use and development will not substantially diminish or impair the value of the property within the neighborhood in which it is located.
- C. **No Undue Adverse Impact:** The proposed use and development will not have a material adverse effect upon the character of the area or the public health, safety and general welfare.
- D. **Compatible With Surrounding Development:** The proposed special exception will be constructed, arranged and operated so as to be compatible with the use and development of neighboring property in accordance with the applicable district regulations.
- E. **No Destruction Of Significant Features:** The proposed use and development will not result in the destruction, loss or damage of natural, scenic or historic features of significant importance.

- F. No Material Pollution Of Environment: The proposed use and development will not cause material air, water, soil or noise pollution or other types of pollution.
- G. Compliance With Standards: The proposed use and development complies with all additional standards imposed on it pursuant to this chapter.

Finding: The Historic Landmark Commission has the authority to grant special exception requests. Staff would conclude that the proposals do not conflict with the standards of the H Historic Preservation overlay, subject to the conditions attached to this report, and that the standards for the Special Exception approvals have been met.

ATTACHMENT G: DESIGN GUIDELINES FOR NEW CONSTRUCTION

Design Guidelines for Historic Apartment & Multifamily Buildings in Salt Lake City, Chapter 12 New Construction, are the relevant historic design guidelines for this design review, and are identified here as they relate to the corresponding Historic Design Standards for New Construction (21A.34.020.H).

[Historic Apartment & Multifamily Buildings in Salt Lake City](#)

[Historic Apartment & Multifamily Buildings in Salt Lake City, Chapter 12 New Construction](#)

Design Standards for New Construction	Design Guidelines for New Construction
<p>1. SCALE & FORM 1.a Height & Width: The proposed height and width shall be visually compatible with surrounding structures and streetscape;</p>	<p>Building Façade Composition, Proportion & Scale</p> <p>Height - Design Objective The maximum height of a new multifamily building should not exceed the general height and scale of its historic context, or be designed to reduce the perceived height where a taller building might be appropriate to the context.</p> <p>12.48 The building height should be compatible with the historic setting and context.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The immediate and wider historic contexts are both of importance. • The impact upon adjacent historic buildings will be paramount in terms of scale and form. <p>12.50 Where there is a significant difference in scale with the immediate context, the building height should vary across the primary façade, and/or the maximum height should be limited to part of the plan footprint of the building.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Step back the upper floor/s of a taller building to achieve a height similar to that historically characteristic of the district. • Restrict maximum building height to particular sections of the depth and length of the building. <p>12.51 The upper floor/s should step back where a taller building will approach established neighborhoods, streets or adjacent buildings of typically lower height.</p> <p>12.52 The primary and secondary facades should be articulated and modulated to reduce an impression of greater height and scale, and to enhance a sense of human scale.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Design a distinctive and a taller first floor for the primary and secondary facades. • Design a distinct top floor to help terminate the façade, and to complement the architectural hierarchy and visual interest. • Design a hierarchy of window height and/or width, when defining the fenestration pattern. • Consider designing for a distinctive projecting balcony arrangement and hierarchy. • Use materials and color creatively to reduce apparent height and scale, and maximize visual interest. <p>Width - Design Objective The design of a new multifamily building should articulate the patterns established by the buildings in the historic context to reduce the perceived width of a wider building and maintain a sense of human scale.</p> <p>12.53 A new multifamily building should appear similar to the width established by the combination of single and multifamily historic buildings in the context.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reflect the modulation width of larger historic apartment buildings. • If a building would be wider overall than structures seen historically, the facade should be subdivided into significantly subordinate planes which are similar in width to the building facades of the context. • Step back sections of the wall plane to create the impression of similar façade widths to those of the historic setting.

<p>1.b Proportion of Principal Facades: The relationship of the width to the height of the principal elevations shall be in scale with surrounding structures and streetscape;</p>	<p>Building Form & Scale The Character of the Street Block – Design Objective The form, scale and design of a new multifamily building in a historic district should equate with and complement the established patterns of human scale characteristics of the immediate setting and/or broader context. 12.42 A new multifamily building should appear similar in scale to the scale established by the buildings comprising the current street block facade.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Subdivide a larger mass into smaller “modules” which are similar in size to buildings seen traditionally. • The scale of principal elements, such as entrances, porches, balconies and window bays, are critical to creating and maintaining a compatible building scale. <p>12.43 A new multifamily building should be designed to create and reinforce a sense of human scale. In doing so consider the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Design building massing and modulation to reflect traditional forms, e.g. projecting wings and balcony bays. • Design a solid-to-void (wall to window/door) ratio that is similar to that seen traditionally. • Design window openings that are similar in scale to those seen traditionally. • Articulate and design balconies that reflect traditional form and scale. • Design an entrance, porch or stoop that reflects the scale characteristic of similar traditional building types. • Use building materials of traditional dimensions, e.g. brick, stone, terracotta. • Choose materials that express a variation in color and/or texture, either individually or communally. <p>Building Façade Composition Proportion & Scale 12.45 The principal elements of the front facade should reflect the scale of the buildings comprising the block face and historic context.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The primary plane/s of the front facade should not appear to be more than a story higher than those of typical historic structures in the block and context. • Where the proposed building would be taller than those in the historic context, the upper floor/s should step back from the plane of the façade below. • A single wall plane or bay of the primary or secondary facades should reflect the typical maximum facade width in the district.
<p>1.c Roof Shape: The roof shape of a structure shall be visually compatible with the surrounding structures and streetscape;</p>	<p>Building Form & Scale Massing 12.54 The overall massing of a new multi-family building should respect and reflect the established scale, form and footprint of buildings comprising the street block and historic context.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Modulate the building where height and scale are greater than the context. • Arrange the massing to step down adjacent to a smaller scale building. • Respect, and/or equate with the more modest scale of center block buildings and residences where they provide the immediate context. <p>12.55 The proportions and roof forms of a new multifamily building should be designed to respect and reflect the range of building forms and massing which characterize the district.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focus on maintaining a sense of human scale. • The variety often inherent in the context can provide a range of design options for compatible new roof forms. • Vary the massing across the street façade/s and along the length of the building on the side facades. • Respect adjacent lower buildings by stepping down additional height in the design of a new building.

<p>1.d Scale of a Structure: The size and mass of the structures shall be visually compatible with the size and mass of surrounding structures and streetscape.</p>	<p>Building Façade Composition Proportion & Scale</p> <p>Height - Design Objective</p> <p>The maximum height of a new multifamily building should not exceed the general height and scale of its historic context, or be designed to reduce the perceived height where a taller building might be appropriate to the context.</p> <p>12.48 The building height should be compatible with the historic setting and context.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The immediate and wider historic contexts are both of importance. • The impact upon adjacent historic buildings will be paramount in terms of scale and form. <p>12.50 Where there is a significant difference in scale with the immediate context, the building height should vary across the primary façade, and/or the maximum height should be limited to part of the plan footprint of the building.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Step back the upper floor/s of a taller building to achieve a height similar to that historically characteristic of the district. • Restrict maximum building height to particular sections of the depth and length of the building. <p>12.51 The upper floor/s should step back where a taller building will approach established neighborhoods, streets or adjacent buildings of typically lower height.</p> <p>12.52 The primary and secondary facades should be articulated and modulated to reduce an impression of greater height and scale, and to enhance a sense of human scale.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Design a distinctive and a taller first floor for the primary and secondary facades. • Design a distinct top floor to help terminate the façade, and to complement the architectural hierarchy and visual interest. • Design a hierarchy of window height and/or width, when defining the fenestration pattern. • Consider designing for a distinctive projecting balcony arrangement and hierarchy. • Use materials and color creatively to reduce apparent height and scale, and maximize visual interest. <p>Width - Design Objective</p> <p>The design of a new multifamily building should articulate the patterns established by the buildings in the historic context to reduce the perceived width of a wider building and maintain a sense of human scale.</p> <p>12.53 A new multifamily building should appear similar to the width established by the combination of single and multifamily historic buildings in the context.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reflect the modulation width of larger historic apartment buildings. • If a building would be wider overall than structures seen historically, the facade should be subdivided into significantly subordinate planes which are similar in width to the building facades of the context. • Step back sections of the wall plane to create the impression of similar façade widths to those of the historic setting. <p>Massing</p> <p>12.54 The overall massing of a new multi-family building should respect and reflect the established scale, form and footprint of buildings comprising the street block and historic context.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Modulate the building where height and scale are greater than the context. • Arrange the massing to step down adjacent to a smaller scale building. • Respect, and/or equate with the more modest scale of center block buildings and residences where they provide the immediate context. <p>12.55 The proportions and roof forms of a new multifamily building should be designed to respect and reflect the range of building forms and massing which characterize the district.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focus on maintaining a sense of human scale. • The variety often inherent in the context can provide a range of design options for compatible new roof forms. • Vary the massing across the street façade/s and along the length of the building on the side facades. • Respect adjacent lower buildings by stepping down additional height in the design of a new building.
--	--

<p>2. COMPOSITION OF PRINCIPAL FACADES</p> <p>2.a Proportion of Openings: The relationship of the width to the height of windows and doors of the structure shall be visually compatible with surrounding structures and streetscape;</p>	<p>Building Character & Scale</p> <p>Solid to Void Ratio, Window Scale & Proportion – Design Objective The design of a new multifamily building in a historic context should reflect the scale established by the solid to void ratio traditionally associated with the setting and with a sense of human scale.</p> <p>12.61 Window scale and proportion should be designed to reflect those characteristic of this traditional building type and setting.</p> <p>Rhythm & Spacing of Windows & Doors - Fenestration – Design Objective The window pattern, the window proportion and the proportion of the wall spaces between, should be a central consideration in the architectural composition of the facades, to achieve a coherence and an affinity with the established historic context.</p> <p>12.62 Public and more important interior spaces should be planned and designed to face the street.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Their fenestration pattern consequently becomes a significant design element of the primary facade/s. • Avoid the need to fenestrate small private functional spaces on primary facades, e.g. bathrooms, kitchens, bedrooms. <p>12.63 The fenestration pattern, including the proportions of window and door openings, should reflect the range associated with the buildings creating the established character of the historic context and area.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Design for a similar scale of window and window spacing. • Reflect characteristic window proportions, spacing and patterns. • Design for a hierarchy within the fenestration pattern to relieve the apparent scale of a larger facade, and especially if this is a characteristic of the context. • Arrange and/or group windows to complement the symmetry or proportions of the architectural composition. • Emphasize the fenestration pattern by distinct windows reveals. • Consider providing emphasis through the detailing of window casing, trim, materials, and subdivision, using mullions and transoms, as well as the profiles provided by operable/ opening windows. See also guideline 12.71-74 on window detailing.
---	---

<p>2.b Rhythm of Solids to Voids in Facades: The relationship of solids to voids in the facade of the structure shall be visually compatible with surrounding structures and streetscape;</p>	<p>Building Character & Scale Solid to Void Ratio, Window Scale & Proportion – Design Objective The design of a new multifamily building in a historic context should reflect the scale established by the solid to void ratio traditionally associated with the setting and with a sense of human scale. 12.60 The ratio of solid to void (wall to window) should reflect that found across the established character created by the historic structures in the district. Consider the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Achieve a balance, avoiding areas of too much wall or too much window. • Large surfaces of glass can be inappropriate in a context of smaller residential buildings. • Design a larger window area with framing profiles and subdivision which reflect the scale of the windows in the established context. • Window mullions can reduce the apparent scale of a larger window. • Window frame and mullion scale and profiles should be designed to equate with the composition. <p>12.61 Window scale and proportion should be designed to reflect those characteristic of this traditional building type and setting. Rhythm & Spacing of Windows & Doors - Fenestration – Design Objective The window pattern, the window proportion and the proportion of the wall spaces between, should be a central consideration in the architectural composition of the facades, to achieve a coherence and an affinity with the established historic context. 12.63 The fenestration pattern, including the proportions of window and door openings, should reflect the range associated with the buildings creating the established character of the historic context and area.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Design for a similar scale of window and window spacing. • Reflect characteristic window proportions, spacing and patterns. • Design for a hierarchy within the fenestration pattern to relieve the apparent scale of a larger facade, and especially if this is a characteristic of the context. • Arrange and/or group windows to complement the symmetry or proportions of the architectural composition. • Emphasize the fenestration pattern by distinct windows reveals. <p>Consider providing emphasis through the detailing of window casing, trim, materials, and subdivision, using mullions and transoms, as well as the profiles provided by operable/ opening windows. See also guideline 12.71-74 on window detailing.</p>
<p>2.c Rhythm of Entrance Porch and Other Projections: The relationship of entrances and other projections to sidewalks shall be visually compatible with surrounding structures and streetscape;</p>	<p>Building Character & Scale Façade Articulation, Proportion & Visual Emphasis Visual Emphasis – Design Objective The design of a new multifamily building should relate sensitively to the established historic context through a thorough evaluation of the scale, modulation and emphasis, and attention to these characteristics in the composition of the facades. 12.57 Overall facade proportions should be designed to reflect those of historic buildings in the context and neighborhood.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The “overall proportion” is the ratio of the width to the height of the building, especially the front facade. • The modulation and articulation of principal elements of a facade, e.g. projecting wings, balcony sequence and porches, can provide an alternative and a balancing visual emphasis. • With townhouse development, the individual houses should be articulated to identify the individual unit sequence and rhythm. • See the discussion of individual historic districts (PART III) and the review of typical historic building styles (PART I) for more information on district character and facade proportions. <p>12.58 To reduce the perceived width and scale of a larger primary or secondary façade, a vertical proportion and emphasis should be employed. Consider the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vary the planes of the façade for all or part of the height of the building. • Subdivide the primary façade into projecting wings with recessed central entrance section in character with the architectural composition of many early apartment buildings. • Modulate the height down toward the street, and/or the interior of the block, if this is the pattern established by the immediate context and the neighborhood.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Modulate the façade through the articulation of balcony form, pattern and design, either as recessed and/or projecting elements. • Vary the planes of the primary and secondary facades to articulate further modeling of the composition. • Design for a distinctive form and stature of primary entrance. • Compose the fenestration in the form of vertically proportioned windows. • Subdivide horizontally proportioned windows using strong mullion elements to enhance a sense of vertical proportion and emphasis. <p>12.59 A horizontal proportion and emphasis should be designed to reduce the perceived height and scale of a larger primary or secondary façade. Consider the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The interplay of horizontal and vertical emphasis can create an effective visual balance, helping to reduce the sense of building scale. • Step back the top or upper floors where a building might be higher than the context along primary and/or secondary facades as appropriate. • Design for a distinctive stature and expression of the first floor of the primary, and if important in public views, the secondary facades. • Design a distinct foundation course. • Employ architectural detailing and/or a change in materials and plane to emphasize individual levels in the composition of the facade. • Design the fenestration to create and/or reflect the hierarchy of the façade composition. • Change the materials and/or color to distinguish the design of specific levels. <p>Balconies, Porches & External Escape Stairs – Design Objective The design of a new multifamily building in a historic context should recognize the importance of balcony and primary entrance features in achieving a compatible scale and character.</p> <p>12.64 Balconies, encouraged as individual semi-public outdoor spaces, should be designed as an integral part of the architectural composition and language of the building.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use projecting and/or recessed balcony forms to complement and embellish the design composition of the facades, and to establish visual emphasis and architectural accent. • Use a balcony or a balcony arrangement to echo and accentuate the fenestration pattern of the building. • Design balcony forms to be transparent or semi-transparent, using railings and/or glass to avoid solid balcony enclosures. • Select and design balcony materials and details as a distinct enrichment of the building facade/s. <p>12.65 An entrance porch, stoop or portico should be designed as a principal design focus of the composition of the facade.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Design for greater stature to enhance visual focus, presence and emphasis. • Design for a distinct identity, using different wall planes, materials, details, texture and color. • Consider designing the name of the apartment building into the facade or the porch/stoop.
--	---

<p>2.d Relationship of Materials: The relationship of the color and texture of materials (other than paint color) of the facade shall be visually compatible with the predominant materials used in surrounding structures and streetscape.</p>	<p>Building Materials, Windows, Elements & Detailing</p> <p>Materials – Design Objective The design of a new multifamily building should recognize and reflect the palette of building materials which characterize the historic district, and should help to enrich the visual character of the setting, in creating a sense of human scale and historical sequence.</p> <p>12.67 Building materials that contribute to the traditional sense of human scale and the visual interest of the historic setting and neighborhood should be used.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This helps to complement and reinforce the palette of materials of the neighborhood and the sense of visual continuity in the district. • The choice of materials, their texture and color, their pattern or bond, joint profile and color, will be important characteristics of the design. • Creative design, based on analysis of the context, will be invaluable in these respects. <p>12.68 Building materials that will help to reinforce the sense of visual affinity and continuity between old and new in the historic setting should be used.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use external materials of the quality, durability and character found within the historic district. <p>12.69 Design with materials which provide a solid masonry character for lower floors and for the most public facades of the building. Consider the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use brick and/or natural stone, in preference to less proven alternatives for these areas. • Limit panel materials to upper levels and less public facades. • Where panel materials are considered, use high quality architectural paneling with a proven record of durability in the regional climate. • Synthetic materials, including synthetic stucco, should be avoided on grounds of limited durability and longevity, and weathering characteristics. <p>12.70 Materials should have a proven durability for the regional climate, as well as the situation and aspect of the building.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Avoid materials which merely create the superficial appearance of authentic, durable materials. • The weathering characteristics of materials become important as the building ages, in that they should compliment rather than detract from the building and historic setting as they weather and mature. • New materials, which have a proven track record of durability in the regional climatic conditions, may be considered. <p>Windows – Design Objective The design of a new multifamily building should include window design subdivision, profiles, materials, finishes and details which ensure that the windows play their characteristic positive role in defining the proportion and character of the building and its contribution to the historic context.</p> <p>12.71 Windows should be designed to be in scale with those characteristic of the building and the historic setting.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Excessive window scale in a new building, whether vertical or horizontal, will adversely affect the sense of human scale and affinity with buildings in the district. • Subdivide a larger window area to form a group or pattern of windows creating more appropriate proportions, dimensions and scale. <p>12.72 Windows with vertical proportion and emphasis are encouraged.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A vertical proportion is likely to have greater design affinity with the historic context. • It helps to create a stronger vertical emphasis which can be valuable integrating the design of a larger scale building within its context. • See also the discussion of the character of the relevant historic district and architectural styles (PART I).
--	---

12.73 Window reveals should be a characteristic of masonry and most public facades.

- These help to express the character of the facade modeling and materials.
- Window reveals will enhance the degree to which the building integrates with its historic setting.
- A reveal should be recessed into the primary plane of the wall, and not achieved by applying window trim to the façade.
- This helps to avoid the impression of superficiality which can be inherent in some more recent construction, e.g. with applied details like window trim and surrounds.
- A hierarchy of window reveals can effectively complement the composition of the fenestration and facades.

12.74 Windows and doors should be framed in materials that appear similar in scale, proportion and character to those used traditionally in the neighborhood.

- Frame profiles should project from the plane of the glass creating a distinct hierarchy of secondary modeling and detail for the window opening and the composition of the facade.
- Durable frame construction and materials should be used.
- Frame finish should be of durable architectural quality, chosen to compliment the building design.
- Vinyl should be avoided as a non-durable material in the regional climate.
- Dark or reflective glass should be avoided.
- See also the rehabilitation section on windows (PART II, Ch.3) as well as the discussions of specific historic districts (PART III) and relevant architectural styles (PART I).

Architectural Elements & Details – Design Objective

The design of a new multifamily building should reflect the rich architectural character and visual qualities of buildings of this type within the district.

12.75 Building elements and details should reflect the scale, size, depth and profiles of those found historically within the district.

- These include windows, doors, porches, balconies, eaves, and their associated decorative composition, supports and/or details.

12.76 Where used, ornamental elements, ranging from brackets to porches, should be in scale with similar historic features.

- The scale, proportion and profiles of elements, such as brackets or window trim, should be functional as well as decorative.

12.77 Creative interpretations of traditional details are encouraged.

- New designs for window moldings and door surrounds, for example, can create visual interest and affinity with the context, while conveying the relative age of the building.
- The traditional and characteristic use of awnings and canopies should be considered as an opportunity for creative design which can reinforce the fenestration pattern and architectural detail, while being a sustainable shading asset in reducing energy consumption. See also PART IV on Sustainable Design.

<p>3. RELATIONSHIP TO THE STREET</p> <p>3.a Walls of Continuity: Facades and site structures, such as walls, fences and landscape masses, shall, when it is characteristic of the area, form continuity along a street to ensure visual compatibility with the structures, public ways and places to which such elements are visually related;</p>	<p>Settlement Patterns & Neighborhood Character</p> <p>The Public Realm - Design Objective A new multifamily building should respect the characteristic placement, setbacks, massing and landscape character of the public realm in the immediate context and the surrounding district.</p> <p>12.6 A new building should contribute in a creative and compatible way to the public and the civic realm.</p> <p>12.7 A building should engage with the street through a sequence of public to semi-private spaces.</p> <p>12.8 A new multifamily building should be situated and designed to define and frame adjacent streets, and public and common spaces, in ways that are characteristic of the setting.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reflect and/or strengthen adjacent building quality, setbacks, heights and massing. • Reinforce the historic streetscape patterns of the facing primary and secondary streets and/ or alleys. <p>12.9 A building on a corner lot should be designed to define, frame and contribute to the historic character of the public realm of both adjacent streets.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The street character will also depend on the adjacent street blocks and frontage. • Building setbacks may be different. • The building scale may also vary between the streets. <p>Building Placement, Orientation & Use - Design Objective A new multifamily building should reflect the established development patterns, directly address and engage with the street, and include well planned common and private spaces, and access arrangements.</p> <p>12.10 The established historic patterns of setbacks and building depth should be respected in the siting of a new multifamily building.</p> <p>12.11 The front and the entrance of the building should orient to and engage with the street.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A new building should be oriented parallel to lot lines, maintaining the traditional, established development pattern of the block. • An exception might be where early settlement has introduced irregular street patterns and building configurations, e.g. parts of Capitol Hill. <p>12.12 Access arrangements to the site and the building should be an integral part of the planning and design process at the earliest stage.</p> <p>12.13 The situation, orientation, configuration and design of a new multifamily building should include provision for common exterior open spaces at ground level. Site and design such space/s to address the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reducing the bulk and the scale of the building. • Configuration for residential amenity and casual social interaction. • Shelter from traffic and traffic noise. • Plan for solar access and seasonal shade. • Landscape and light to enhance residential relaxation, enjoyment and neighboring environmental quality.
---	---

	<p>12.14 Consider additional common open space on higher terrace or roof levels to enhance residential amenity and city views.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Locate and design to preserve neighboring privacy. • Plan and design for landscape amenity and best practices in sustainable design. (PART IV) <p>12.15 Private open space for each unit, whether ground level, terrace or balcony space, should be designed to create attractive outdoor space, and to help articulate the design of the building to reduce its bulk and scale.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Private space should be contiguous with the unit. • Private space should be clearly distinguished from common open space. <p>Site Access, Parking & Services - Design Objective The site planning and situation of a new multi-family building should prioritize access to the site and building for pedestrians and cyclists, motorized vehicular access and parking should be discreetly situated and designed, and building services and utilities should not detract from the character and appearance of the building, the site and the context.</p> <p>12.17 The primary public entrance to the building should be afforded priority and prominence in access from the street, and appropriately scaled in the design of the street façade/s.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Avoid combining with any vehicular access or drive. • Provide direct access to the sidewalk and street. • Landscape design should reinforce the importance of the public entrance. <p>12.24 Driveways serving groups of similar uses should be consolidated to minimize visual intrusion, and to provide less interruption to the sidewalk, pedestrian character and flow.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Curb cuts should be shared between groups of buildings and uses where possible. • Joint driveway access is encouraged. <p>12.25 Wherever possible, vehicular parking should be situated below the building, or alternatively behind the building in a manner that does not conflict with pedestrian access from the street.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Surface parking areas should be screened from views from the street and adjacent residential properties.
<p>3.b Rhythm of Spacing and Structures on Streets: The relationship of a structure or object to the open space between it and adjoining structures or objects shall be visually compatible with the structures, objects, public ways and places to which it is visually related;</p>	<p>Building Placement, Orientation & Use - Design Objective A new multifamily building should reflect the established development patterns, directly address and engage with the street, and include well planned common and private spaces, and access arrangements.</p> <p>12.10 The established historic patterns of setbacks and building depth should be respected in the siting of a new multifamily building.</p> <p>12.11 The front and the entrance of the building should orient to and engage with the street.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A new building should be oriented parallel to lot lines, maintaining the traditional, established development pattern of the block. • An exception might be where early settlement has introduced irregular street patterns and building configurations, e.g. parts of Capitol Hill. <p>12.12 Access arrangements to the site and the building should be an integral part of the planning and design process at the earliest stage.</p> <p>12.13 The situation, orientation, configuration and design of a new multifamily building should include provision for common exterior open spaces at ground level. Site and design such space/s to address the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reducing the bulk and the scale of the building. • Configuration for residential amenity and casual social interaction. • Shelter from traffic and traffic noise. • Plan for solar access and seasonal shade. • Landscape and light to enhance residential relaxation, enjoyment and neighboring environmental quality.

<p>3.c Directional Expression of Principal Elevation: A structure shall be visually compatible with the structures, public ways and places to which it is visually related in its orientation toward the street;</p>	<p>Building Placement, Orientation & Use - Design Objective A new multifamily building should reflect the established development patterns, directly address and engage with the street, and include well planned common and private spaces, and access arrangements.</p> <p>12.10 The established historic patterns of setbacks and building depth should be respected in the siting of a new multifamily building.</p> <p>12.11 The front and the entrance of the building should orient to and engage with the street.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A new building should be oriented parallel to lot lines, maintaining the traditional, established development pattern of the block. • An exception might be where early settlement has introduced irregular street patterns and building configurations, e.g. parts of Capitol Hill. <p>12.12 Access arrangements to the site and the building should be an integral part of the planning and design process at the earliest stage.</p> <p>Vehicular – Cars & Motorcycles</p> <p>12.22 A vehicular access and driveway should be discreetly placed to the side or to the rear of the building.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A vehicular entrance which incorporates a ramp should be screened from street views. • Landscape should be designed to minimize visual impact of the access and driveway. <p>12.23 A single curb cut or driveway should not exceed the minimum width required.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Avoid curb cuts and driveways close to street corners. <p>12.24 Driveways serving groups of similar uses should be consolidated to minimize visual intrusion, and to provide less interruption to the sidewalk, pedestrian character and flow.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Curb cuts should be shared between groups of buildings and uses where possible. • Joint driveway access is encouraged. <p>12.25 Wherever possible, vehicular parking should be situated below the building, or alternatively behind the building in a manner that does not conflict with pedestrian access from the street.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Surface parking areas should be screened from views from the street and adjacent residential properties. <p>12.43 A new multifamily building should be designed to create and reinforce a sense of human scale. In doing so consider the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Design building massing and modulation to reflect traditional forms, e.g. projecting wings and balcony bays. • Design a solid-to-void (wall to window/door) ratio that is similar to that seen traditionally. • Design window openings that are similar in scale to those seen traditionally. • Articulate and design balconies that reflect traditional form and scale. • Design an entrance, porch or stoop that reflects the scale characteristic of similar traditional building types. • Use building materials of traditional dimensions, e.g. brick, stone, terracotta. • Choose materials that express a variation in color and/or texture, either individually or communally. <p>12.44 A new multifamily building should be designed to respect the access to light and the privacy of adjacent buildings.</p>
---	---

<p>3.d Streetscape; Pedestrian Improvements: Streetscape and pedestrian improvements and any change in its appearance shall be compatible to the historic character of the landmark site or H historic preservation overlay district.</p>	<p>Settlement Patterns & Neighborhood Character</p> <p>Block & Street Patterns - Design Objective The urban residential patterns created by the street and alley network, lot and building scale and orientation, are a unique characteristic of every historic setting in the city, and should provide the primary design framework for planning any new multifamily building.</p> <p>12.5 A new apartment or multifamily building should be situated and designed to reinforce and enhance the established character, or master plan vision, of the context, recognizing its situation and role in the street block and building patterns.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Respect and reflect the scale of lots and buildings associated with both primary and secondary street frontages. • Site a taller building away from nearby small scale buildings. • A corner site traditionally might support a larger site and building. • A mid-block location may require careful design consideration to integrate a larger building with an established lower building scale. • Respect and reflect a lower scale where this is characteristic of the inner block. <p>The Public Realm - Design Objective A new multifamily building should respect the characteristic placement, setbacks, massing and landscape character of the public realm in the immediate context and the surrounding district.</p> <p>12.6 A new building should contribute in a creative and compatible way to the public and the civic realm.</p> <p>12.7 A building should engage with the street through a sequence of public to semi-private spaces.</p> <p>12.8 A new multifamily building should be situated and designed to define and frame adjacent streets, and public and common spaces, in ways that are characteristic of the setting.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reflect and/or strengthen adjacent building quality, setbacks, heights and massing. • Reinforce the historic streetscape patterns of the facing primary and secondary streets and/ or alleys. <p>12.9 A building on a corner lot should be designed to define, frame and contribute to the historic character of the public realm of both adjacent streets.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The street character will also depend on the adjacent street blocks and frontage. • Building setbacks may be different. • The building scale may also vary between the streets. <p>Building Placement, Orientation & Use - Design Objective A new multifamily building should reflect the established development patterns, directly address and engage with the street, and include well planned common and private spaces, and access arrangements.</p> <p>12.11 The front and the entrance of the building should orient to and engage with the street.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A new building should be oriented parallel to lot lines, maintaining the traditional, established development pattern of the block. • An exception might be where early settlement has introduced irregular street patterns and building configurations, e.g. parts of Capitol Hill. <p>12.12 Access arrangements to the site and the building should be an integral part of the planning and design process at the earliest stage.</p>
--	---

	<p>Vehicular – Cars & Motorcycles</p> <p>12.22 A vehicular access and driveway should be discreetly placed to the side or to the rear of the building.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A vehicular entrance which incorporates a ramp should be screened from street views. • Landscape should be designed to minimize visual impact of the access and driveway. <p>12.23 A single curb cut or driveway should not exceed the minimum width required.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Avoid curb cuts and driveways close to street corners. <p>12.24 Driveways serving groups of similar uses should be consolidated to minimize visual intrusion, and to provide less interruption to the sidewalk, pedestrian character and flow.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Curb cuts should be shared between groups of buildings and uses where possible. • Joint driveway access is encouraged. <p>12.25 Wherever possible, vehicular parking should be situated below the building, or alternatively behind the building in a manner that does not conflict with pedestrian access from the street.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Surface parking areas should be screened from views from the street and adjacent residential properties.
<p>4. Subdivision Of Lots: The planning director shall review subdivision plats proposed for property within an H historic preservation overlay district or of a landmark site and may require changes to ensure the proposed subdivision will be compatible with the historic character of the district and/or site(s).</p>	<p>Settlement Patterns & Neighborhood Character</p> <p>Block & Street Patterns - Design Objective The urban residential patterns created by the street and alley network, lot and building scale and orientation, are a unique characteristic of every historic setting in the city, and should provide the primary design framework for planning any new multifamily building.</p> <p>12.4 The pattern and scale of lots in a historic district should be maintained, as the basis of the historic integrity of the intricate ‘fine grain’ of the neighborhood.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Avoid assembling or subdividing lots where this would adversely affect the integrity of the historic settlement pattern. <p>12.5 A new apartment or multifamily building should be situated and designed to reinforce and enhance the established character, or master plan vision, of the context, recognizing its situation and role in the street block and building patterns.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Respect and reflect the scale of lots and buildings associated with both primary and secondary street frontages. • Site a taller building away from nearby small scale buildings. • A corner site traditionally might support a larger site and building. • A mid-block location may require careful design consideration to integrate a larger building with an established lower building scale. • Respect and reflect a lower scale where this is characteristic of the inner block.

ATTACHMENT H: STANDARDS FOR NEW CONSTRUCTION IN A HISTORIC DISTRICT

H Historic Preservation Overlay District – Standards for Certificate of Appropriateness for New Construction (21A.34.020.H)

In considering an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness for new construction in a historic district, the Historic Landmark Commission shall find that the project substantially complies with all of the general standards that pertain to the application and that the decision is in the best interest of the City.

Design Guidelines for Historic Apartment & Multifamily Buildings in Salt Lake City, Chapter 12 New Construction, are the relevant historic design guidelines for this design review. The Design Objectives and related design guidelines are and are referenced in the following review where they relate to the corresponding Historic Design Standards for New Construction (21A.34.020.H), and can be accessed via the links below.

[Historic Apartment & Multifamily Buildings in Salt Lake City](#)

[Historic Apartment & Multifamily Buildings in Salt Lake City, Chapter 12 New Construction](#)

Standard	Analysis	Finding
<p>1. SCALE & FORM 1.a Height & Width: The proposed height and width shall be visually compatible with surrounding structures and streetscape;</p>	<p><u>Height</u> MF NC DG Design Objective – Height: <i>The maximum height of a new multifamily building should not exceed the general height and scale of its historic context, or be designed to reduce the perceived height where a taller building might be appropriate to the context.</i> <i>MF NC DG 12.48, 12.50, 12.51, 12.52</i></p> <p>The immediate South Temple context for this proposed apartment development comprises buildings ranging from 1 story to 3.5 stories. The RMU base zoning maximum of 75 ft is not compatible with the scale and character of this immediate historic context. The proposal, at 6 stories across the site, rising to 7 stories plus at the southern site boundary with the falling topography, would be between 5 stories and 3.5 stories higher than its immediate context. In a broader South Temple context the proposed height of the building can be more readily equated with several of the street’s taller buildings. Stepping down by two floors adjacent to the Piccadilly Apartments makes a concession to this immediate setting. Recent revisions to reduce the height of the SW wing help to integrate the proposed height with building scale towards the center of the block in relation to “surrounding structures and streetscape.”</p> <p><u>Width</u> MF NC DG Design Objective – Width: <i>The design of a new multifamily building should articulate the patterns established by the buildings in the historic context to reduce the perceived width of a wider building and maintain a sense of human scale.</i> <i>MF NC DG 12.53</i></p> <p>Existing buildings in this setting generally occupy smaller sites and thus are narrower than the proposed development. Previous design review concurred on the need to revise the massing of the proposed building and to reduce the width of the street façade on South Temple. Recent revisions to the proposals reconfigure the massing of the building to create two projecting wings framing a recessed entrance range, thus equating more readily with established and traditional apartment building modulation and massing, and also helping to integrate the scale of the proposal more readily within this setting. The revised proposal, as perceived in South Temple would more readily equate with the characteristic façade widths in this context. The revised massing helps to address the objectives of this standard.</p>	<p><u>Height</u> The height of proposed development, stepping down towards the SE and latterly the SW corners acknowledges more of the established scale and enhances the degree to which the proposals accord with the objectives of this standard.</p> <p><u>Width</u> The revised massing of the proposal and resultant width of the street facades to South Temple would generally accord with the objectives of this standard.</p>

<p>1.b Proportion of Principal Facades: The relationship of the width to the height of the principal elevations shall be in scale with surrounding structures and streetscape;</p>	<p><u>Façade Proportion</u> MF NC DG Design Objective – Character of the Street Block: <i>The form, scale and design of a new multifamily building in a historic district should equate with and complement the established patterns of human scale characteristics of the immediate setting and/or broader context.</i> MF NC DG 12.42, 12.43, 12.45</p> <p>The proposal is for a corner building with two primary facades. Of these, the most important is that to South Temple. Façade proportion, the relationship of width to height, as recently revised, reconfigures the modulation of the building along South Temple, achieving greater affinity with traditional apartment forms, while creating more appropriately proportioned street facades framing a recessed central range of the frontage. The perceived scale of the proposed building would consequently be tempered by the reconfigured massing and the South Temple façade proportions. Height reduction of the SW corner wing of the proposal also helps to address the relative importance of façade proportions. The building would more readily equate with “scale with the surrounding structures and streetscape”.</p>	<p><u>Façade Proportion</u> The façade proportions and perceived scale of the revised massing can be regarded as according with the objectives of this standard.</p>
<p>1.c Roof Shape: The roof shape of a structure shall be visually compatible with the surrounding structures and streetscape;</p>	<p>MF NC DG 12.54, 12.55</p> <p><u>Roof Shape</u> Roof shape in this context varies, with many flat roof buildings combining with shallow pitch and one more steeply pitched historic apartment building profile. The proposals are notably in excess of the average height, and in excess of the range of heights established by buildings in this immediate context. Current flat roofed buildings are smaller in scale (height and width), with the effect that a general sense of human scale prevails in this context. The revised massing of the development would help to break the previously unrelieved volume and scale along South Temple. With the recent reduction in the height of the SW corner, and the step down in height adjacent to the Piccadilly Apartments, the proposal responds to the topography of the site as it slopes to the south. The proposals, as revised, are more visually compatible with the immediate setting</p>	<p><u>Roof Shape</u> Massing along South Temple, stepping the proposal down at its SE corner and the SW corner creates a series of roof planes that acknowledge some of the topographical context. The design accords in part with the objectives of this standard.</p>
<p>1.d Scale of a Structure: The size and mass of the structures shall be visually compatible with the size and mass of surrounding structures and streetscape.</p>	<p><u>Building Façade Composition, Proportion & Scale</u> MF NC DG Design Objective - Height <i>The maximum height of a new multifamily building should not exceed the general height and scale of its historic context, or be designed to reduce the perceived height where a taller building might be appropriate to the context.</i> MF NC DG Design Objective – Width: <i>The design of a new multifamily building should articulate the patterns established by the buildings in the historic context to reduce the perceived width of a wider building and maintain a sense of human scale.</i> MF NC DG 12.48, 12.50, 12.51, 12.52, 12.53, 12.54, 12.55</p> <p>This context is composed of smaller scale (height and width) buildings. Where these are larger in scale, e.g. on the east side of 500 East, modules of the building set back significantly from the street thus reducing the actual and the apparent scale. Massing of particular volumes helps to reduce the scale and apparent bulk further. With revised massing, stepping back along S Temple and reducing height to the SE and SW corners, the proposed development begins to reflect building volumes and massing associated with the scale of South Temple. The two wings of the street façade and corner height reductions establish a more compatible relationship and help to reduce the perception of the overall scale of the building.</p>	<p><u>Scale of a Structure</u> The size and mass of the proposed building, with recent revisions, more readily accord with the objectives of this standard.</p>

<p>2. COMPOSITION OF PRINCIPAL FACADES 2.a Proportion of Openings: The relationship of the width to the height of windows and doors of the structure shall be visually compatible with surrounding structures and streetscape;</p> <p>2.b Rhythm of Solids to Voids in Facades: The relationship of solids to voids in the facade of the structure shall be visually compatible with surrounding structures and streetscape;</p>	<p><u>Building Character & Scale</u> MF NC DG Design Objective - Solid to Void Ratio, Window Scale & Proportion <i>The design of a new multifamily building in a historic context should reflect the scale established by the solid to void ratio traditionally associated with the setting and with a sense of human scale.</i> MF NC DG Design Objective - Rhythm & Spacing of Windows & Doors - Fenestration <i>The window pattern, the window proportion and the proportion of the wall spaces between, should be a central consideration in the architectural composition of the facades, to achieve a coherence and an affinity with the established historic context.</i> <i>MF NC DG 12.60, 12.61, 12.62, 12.63</i></p> <p>The solid to void ratio proposed generally equates with the character of the more historic buildings in this setting helping to establish a general sense of human scale. With recent design revisions the commercial and apartment fenestration pattern achieves greater stature at street level of the building facing South Temple. Above first floor level the fenestration adopts a 'hole in the wall' and strip window form, varying between vertical and horizontal in proportion. With the exception of patio doors where proposed at second level, there is no hierarchy in window proportion rising through the floors of the facade. Achieving this would help to enhance the façade composition and reduce the perceived scale of the building. With the latter exception, as revised, the proposals tend to be compatible with the proportions of the fenestration and relationship of solids to voids in this context. Overall, the solid to void ratio appears to be compatible with this context.</p>	<p><u>Proportion of Openings</u> While the introduction of a hierarchy in the fenestration would enhance this proposal, overall, the window proportions are generally compatible with neighboring historic buildings, and in accord with the objectives of this standard.</p> <p><u>Rhythm of Solids to Voids</u> Overall, the rhythm of solids to voids accords with the objectives of this standard.</p>
<p>2.c Rhythm of Entrance Porch and Other Projections: The relationship of entrances and other projections to sidewalks shall be visually compatible with surrounding structures and streetscape;</p>	<p><u>Building Character & Scale</u> MF NC DG Design Objective - Façade Articulation, Proportion & Visual Emphasis <i>The design of a new multifamily building should relate sensitively to the established historic context through a thorough evaluation of the scale, modulation and emphasis, and attention to these characteristics in the composition of the facades.</i> MF NC DG Design Objective - Balconies, Porches & External Escape Stairs <i>The design of a new multifamily building in a historic context should recognize the importance of balcony and primary entrance features in achieving a compatible scale and character.</i> <i>MF NC DGs 12.57, 12.58, 12.59, 12.64, 12.65</i></p> <p>The proposed development is on a corner site, with two primary street facades. The entrance to the apartment building is situated symmetrically on South Temple, and recessed between the two more prominent corner wings of the building. This would be a characteristic of established and traditional apartment building forms. As revised, the proposal is designed with a variation in balcony forms and dimensions, which helps to articulate and detail the sequence of vertical bays across the building façade. The rhythm of projecting balconies on both street facades would help to articulate a sense of human scale and a degree of tertiary modeling and design interest, depending upon how they are detailed and the materials used. Recent revisions have enhanced the articulation, rhythm and variety in the design of the commercial street level frontage, and the coherence of the street level façade to 500 East.</p> <p>Parking access ramps on 500 East however are not compatible with a definition of human scale vitality on this street.</p>	<p><u>Rhythm of Porch & Projections</u> The proposed rhythm of apartment entrance porch, articulated bays and projecting balconies, and the design of commercial street level frontage would accord with the objectives of this standard</p> <p>Parking use and vehicle access ramps on 500 East would not accord with the objectives of this standard.</p>

<p>2.d Relationship of Materials: The relationship of the color and texture of materials (other than paint color) of the facade shall be visually compatible with the predominant materials used in surrounding structures and streetscape.</p>	<p><u>Building Materials, Windows, Elements & Detailing</u> MF NC DG Design Objective - Materials <i>The design of a new multifamily building should recognize and reflect the palette of building materials which characterize the historic district, and should help to enrich the visual character of the setting, in creating a sense of human scale and historical sequence.</i> MF NC DG 12.67, 12.68, 12.69, 12.70 MF NC DG Design Objective - Windows <i>The design of a new multifamily building should include window design subdivision, profiles, materials, finishes and details which ensure that the windows play their characteristic positive role in defining the proportion and character of the building and its contribution to the historic context.</i> MF NC DG 12.71, 12.72, 12.73, 12.74 MF NC DG Design Objective – Architectural Elements & Details <i>The design of a new multifamily building should reflect the rich architectural character and visual qualities of buildings of this type within the district.</i> MF NC DG 12.75, 12.76, 12.77</p> <p><u>Materials & Detailing</u> The setting of this corner site in the historic district and in this part of South Temple is defined in part by the quality, detail and character of traditional and contemporary masonry, including brick, stone, concrete and stucco, in buildings constructed across a 50 to 60 year time span. The proposed development adopts a palette of the materials that includes hard coat stucco, architectural concrete paneling, and brickwork. The proportion and variety of brickwork used has again been recently revised, retaining the relatively contemporary design idiom. The degree of variety in brickwork has been reduced, and the proportion of brickwork on the 500 East façade has been reduced. As a result some of the visual focus and strength created by brickwork has been lost. Across the apartment levels the detailing of much of the brickwork lacks definition and will be important. Recent revisions have defined some of the design detail and interest at street level. Such detailing and refinement will be important in establishing the visual interest, human scale and character of the proposal across the principal facades.</p> <p><u>Windows</u> The detail of the proposal as revised indicates little in terms of window reveals above street level of the building. Aluminum window framing is proposed for the ground level commercial frontage. Vinyl window framing is proposed for the rest of the building, after initial consideration of a higher quality and more durable aluminum-clad wood framing. The lack of durability and frame profiles of vinyl framing could not be considered a characteristic of, nor compatible with, this historic context in South Temple.</p> <p><u>Elements & Details</u> Where brick is used it could be detailed to define the vertical hierarchy of the facades through contrasting courses, projection and/or the use of a complimentary brick color or texture. Ground level commercial frontage and canopies provide the opportunity for refined detail and interest to the most public level of the building. Balcony design detailing and materials should enhance the refined detail of the design of the entire building, while helping to define its human scale. Detailed design and the use of materials has been identified as an important focus of review in recent discussions, which to date have primarily focused on more basic characteristics of building form, scale, massing and design.</p>	<p><u>Relationship of Materials</u> As revised, the proportion of durable traditional masonry is inconsistent with this setting and begins to accord with the objectives of this standard.</p> <p><u>Windows</u> The proposed use of vinyl window framing does not equate well with the South Temple historic character and would not be regarded as being in accord with the objective of this standard.</p> <p><u>Elements & Details</u> Considered detailing of the masonry and metalwork could really enhance the immediate and long term character of this building. With that degree of consideration the proposals could accord with the objectives of this standard.</p>
--	---	---

<p>3. RELATIONSHIP TO THE STREET</p> <p>3.a Walls of Continuity: Facades and site structures, such as walls, fences and landscape masses, shall, when it is characteristic of the area, form continuity along a street to ensure visual compatibility with the structures, public ways and places to which such elements are visually related;</p>	<p>Site Design Guidelines <u>Settlement Patterns & Neighborhood Character</u> MF NC DG Design Objective - The Public Realm <i>A new multifamily building should respect the characteristic placement, setbacks, massing and landscape character of the public realm in the immediate context and the surrounding district.</i> <i>MF NC DG 12.6, 12.7, 12.8, 12.9</i> MF NC DG Design Objective - Building Placement, Orientation & Use <i>A new multifamily building should reflect the established development patterns, directly address and engage with the street, and include well planned common and private spaces, and access arrangements.</i> <i>MF NC DG 12.10, 12.11, 12.12, 12.13, 12.14, 12.15</i> MF NC DG Design Objective - Site Access, Parking & Services <i>The site planning and situation of a new multi-family building should prioritize access to the site and building for pedestrians and cyclists, motorized vehicular access and parking should be discreetly situated and designed, and building services and utilities should not detract from the character and appearance of the building, the site and the context.</i> <i>MF NC DG 12.17, 12.24, 12.25</i></p> <p>Streetscape context drawings for this development and site define the street frontage setting along South Temple and 500 East, and also identify the largest buildings in the general vicinity of this context, although outside the South Temple Historic District. The scale of the façade as revised for the South Temple frontage appears to establish a visual compatibility in terms of placement, setbacks and massing. The proposal however relates less well to the scale, character and setting of the adjacent Piccadilly Apartments. Recent revisions articulate the design of the upper three floors immediately adjacent to the latter and the building line and apartment façade have been pulled slightly further away from the Piccadilly. There remains an unrelieved two story blank stucco wall facing the building. The two entrances to the parking decks would have an adverse effect upon the character of 500 East street frontage and its associated public realm. Recent revisions help to soften this impact through attention to revised fenestration pattern, and forms of landscaping on 500 East. Parking presence in the wrong location can only be disguised, while continuing to compromise the character of the frontage. Compatibility may be achieved in some respects, although not in others.</p>	<p><u>Relationship to the Street – Walls of Continuity</u> In one respect a new building on this site would help re-establish continuity on this corner, and would accord with the objectives of this standard. Revised design and massing on South Temple are positive, and would accord with these objectives.</p> <p>With the use proposed for the 500 East frontage, recent revisions help to integrate this frontage in design terms, although the proposed use for parking deck and access points would conflict with the objectives of this standard.</p>
<p>3.b Rhythm of Spacing and Structures on Streets: The relationship of a structure or object to the open space between it and adjoining structures or objects shall be visually compatible with the structures, objects, public ways and places to which it is visually related;</p>	<p>MF NC DG Design Objective - Building Placement, Orientation & Use <i>A new multifamily building should reflect the established development patterns, directly address and engage with the street, and include well planned common and private spaces, and access arrangements.</i> <i>MF NC DGs 12.10, 12.11, 12.12, 12.13</i></p> <p>The proposed development steps back from nearby historic buildings and sites to the west on South Temple. Recent height reduction at the SW corner helps the relative importance and stature of the front section of the building. On 500 East, immediately adjacent to the historic apartment building, the building and apartment lines have been moved further away. While the proposal steps down in height by two floors. The parking access entrance and ramp remain close to the adjacent boundary. The proximity of the adjacent blank wall proposed to the Piccadilly Apartments would adversely affect the setting and the amenity of that building.</p>	<p><u>Rhythm of Spacing & Structures on Streets</u> The height and proximity of the proposal to the existing historic apartment building present design challenges at this scale. Recent revisions help to improve accord with the objectives of this standard.</p>

<p>3.c Directional Expression of Principal Elevation: A structure shall be visually compatible with the structures, public ways and places to which it is visually related in its orientation toward the street; MF NC DGs 12.10, 12.11, 12.12, 12.22, 12.23, 12.24, 12.25, 12.12.43, 12.44</p>	<p>MF NC DG Design Objective - Building Placement, Orientation & Use <i>A new multifamily building should reflect the established development patterns, directly address and engage with the street, and include well planned common and private spaces, and access arrangements.</i> MF NC DG 12.10, 12.11, 12.12, 12.22, 12.23, 12.24, 12.25, 12.12.43, 12.44</p> <p>This is a corner site within the historic district. The revised proposal effectively changes the orientation of the building to more obviously face South Temple, with a perpendicular orientation more characteristic of a large apartment building. Recent height reductions at the SW corner help to compliment this relationship</p> <p>Concerns remain on how the proposal would relate to 500 East in terms of street vitality, which is also a street of importance within the South Temple Historic District.</p>	<p><u>Directional Expression</u> In its current configuration the proposed development would accord in part with the objectives of this standard.</p>
<p>3.d Streetscape; Pedestrian Improvements: Streetscape and pedestrian improvements and any change in its appearance shall be compatible to the historic character of the landmark site or H historic preservation overlay district.</p>	<p>Settlement Patterns & Neighborhood Character MF NC DG Design Objective - Block & Street Patterns <i>The urban residential patterns created by the street and alley network, lot and building scale and orientation, are a unique characteristic of every historic setting in the city, and should provide the primary design framework for planning any new multifamily building.</i> MF NC DG 12.10, 12.11, 12.12</p> <p>MF NC DG Design Objective - The Public Realm <i>A new multifamily building should respect the characteristic placement, setbacks, massing and landscape character of the public realm in the immediate context and the surrounding district.</i> MF NC DG 12.6, 12.7, 12.8, 12.9</p> <p>MF NC DG Design Objective - Building Placement, Orientation & Use <i>A new multifamily building should reflect the established development patterns, directly address and engage with the street, and include well planned common and private spaces, and access arrangements.</i> MF NC DG 12.11, 12.12, 12.22, 12.23, 12.24, 12.25</p> <p>Recent revisions have improved the design of the streetscape on both South Temple and on 500 East. Commercial frontage extending into 500 East helps to soften the character of this frontage.</p> <p>Design revisions to 500 East help to integrate this street level façade with the overall character of the building. The fenestration pattern and detail has also been improved. Use and parking access ramps remain a discordant factor impacting the pedestrian compatibility of this part of the street, with potentially negative gravitational effect.</p>	<p><u>Streetscape & Pedestrian Improvements</u> Recent revisions enhance the relationship between proposed use on 500 East and the streetscape. Proposed street level parking use and access would not be compatible with the historic character of the context and in that respect would not readily accord with the objectives of this standard.</p>

<p>4. Subdivision Of Lots: The planning director shall review subdivision plats proposed for property within an H historic preservation overlay district or of a landmark site and may require changes to ensure the proposed subdivision will be compatible with the historic character of the district and/or site(s).</p>	<p><u>Settlement Patterns & Neighborhood Character</u> <i>MF NC DG Design Objective - Block & Street Patterns</i> <i>The urban residential patterns created by the street and alley network, lot and building scale and orientation, are a unique characteristic of every historic setting in the city, and should provide the primary design framework for planning any new multifamily building.</i> <i>MF NC DG 12.4, 12.5</i></p> <p>The site of the proposed development comprises two existing lots, reflecting the scale of previous buildings and uses, and to an extent the current character and scale of this part of the historic district. Proposals would involve the consolidation of those lots and a building which would increase the scale, relative to the current scale of the majority of lots and buildings in the historic district. The increase in lot width with a lot consolidation for this site would also be reflected in an increase in height. The design approach, as revised, would help to reduce the proposed perceived scale of the building facing South Temple.</p>	<p><u>Subdivision of Lots</u> Revisions to the massing configuration of this proposal begin to recognize the street scale as reflected in the original lot widths, and hence to characteristic scale of development.</p>
---	--	--

ATTACHMENT I: PUBLIC PROCESS AND COMMENTS

Notice of the public hearing for the proposal include:

- Notice mailed on January 22, 2016
- Agenda posted on the Planning Division and Utah Public Meeting Notice websites on January 22, 2016
- Site notice posted on January 25, 2016

Public Inquiries

A number of inquiries have been received, either seeking additional information on the proposals, or expressing concerns. See attached Record of Public Inquiries & Comments. Four members of the public addressed the Historic Landmark Commission during the Public Hearing on 1/7/16, and one member of the public during the Public Hearing on 12/3/15.

Any additional correspondence or comment received after the publication of this staff report will be forwarded to the Historic Landmark Commission.

Development Review Team Comments - 11/23/15 See Attached

SALT LAKE CITY HISTORIC LANDMARK COMMISSION
Meeting Minutes
451 South State Street, Room 326
January 7, 2015

A roll is being kept of all who attended the Historic Landmark Commission Meeting. The meeting was called to order at [5:31:24 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, Kenton Peters and David Richardson. Commissioner Heather Thuet and Rachel Quist were excused.

Planning Staff members present at the meeting were: Nora Shepard, Planning Director; Michaela Oktay, Planning Manager; Carl Leith, Senior Planner; Michael Maloy, Senior Planner; Lex Traughber, Senior Planner; Anthony Riederer, Principal Planner; Tracy Tran, Principal Planner; Kelsey Lindquist, Associate 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 Thomas Brennan and Kenton Peters. Staff members in attendance were Michaela Oktay, Carl Leith, Tracy Tran, Anthony Riederer, Michael Maloy and Kelsey Lindquist.

The following sites were visited:

- **454-466 E. South Temple** – Staff gave an overview of the proposal.
- **205 E 1st Avenue** - Staff gave an overview of the proposal.
- **683 6th Avenue** - Staff gave an overview of the proposal.
- **279 North J Street** - Staff gave an overview of the proposal.
- **Harvard Heights Local Historic District**- Staff gave an overview of the proposal.

REPORT OF THE CHAIR OR VICE CHAIR [5:31:48 PM](#)

Chairperson Brennan stated he had nothing to report.

Vice Chairperson Shepherd stated he had nothing to report.

DIRECTOR'S REPORT [5:32:00 PM](#)

Ms. Michaela Oktay, Planning Manager, reviewed the location of the Yalecrest Hillside Park Open House and the Utah Heritage Foundation and RDA competition for a house on Arctic Court.

APPROVAL OF THE DECEMBER 3, 2015, MINUTES [5:33:55 PM](#)

MOTION [5:34:20 PM](#)

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

PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD [5:34:32 PM](#)

Chairperson Brennan opened the Public Comment Period,

Mr. Kirk Huffaker, Utah Heritage Foundation, reviewed the Utah Heritage Competition for Arctic Court and the rehabilitation project for the area.

Chairperson Brennan closed the Public Comment Period.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

[5:36:19 PM](#)

Utah Division of State History Request for Comment - A request by the Utah Division of State History for comment from the Historic Landmark Commission for the removal of Hotel Albert from the National Register of Historic Places, due to its recent demolition. Hotel Albert (Arrowpress) was located at approximately 121 S. West Temple. The subject property is within Council District 4, represented by City Council member Derek Kitchen. (Staff contact: (801)-535-7930 or kelsey.Lindquist@slcgov.com.)

Ms. Kelsey Lindquist, Associate 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 forward a favorable recommendation to the Board of State History to remove the Hotel Albert from the National Register of Historic Places.

PUBLIC HEARING [5:38:34 PM](#)

Chairperson Brennan opened the Public Hearing, seeing no one wished to speak to the petition; Chairperson Brennan closed the Public Hearing.

MOTION [5:38:50 PM](#)

Commissioner Richardson stated in the case of Hotel Albert, based on the analysis and findings listed in the memorandum and public testimony, he moved that the Historic Landmark Commission forward a favorable recommendation to the Board of State History to remove the Hotel Albert from the National Register of Historic Places. Commissioner Shepherd seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

[5:39:34 PM](#)

New Apartment Building at approximately 454-466 E. South Temple - A request by Chris Huntsman, CRSA, on behalf of owner Garbett Homes, for a Certificate of Appropriateness from the City to construct a new apartment building at the southwest corner of 500 East and E. South Temple. The property is currently vacant. The proposed development would be approximately six stories and include 5,000 SF of commercial space, 166 apartment units and provision for parking 212 vehicles. The site is zoned R-MU (Residential/ Mixed Use) and is located in the South Temple

Local Historic District and City Council District 4, represented by Derek Kitchen. (Staff contact: Carl Leith, (801) 535-7758 or carl.leith@slcgov.com.)

- a. New Construction – In order to build the proposed apartment building a Certificate of Appropriateness for the building must be approved by the Historic Landmark Commission. Case Number PLNHLC2015-00930.**
- b. Special Exception – In order to construct the proposed development, special exception approval is sought for an encroachment of 20 feet into the required rear yard setback on the west side of the development to accommodate part of the building, two stair ways and an ADA ramp that are greater than 4 feet in height. In conjunction to the encroachment, the applicant is seeking a special exception for approximately 6 feet 8 inches in additional building height for a portion of the west elevation and a portion of the south elevation at the southwest corner of the site. A grade change greater than four feet is also requested in order to accommodate the parking access ramp. Case Number PLNHLC2015-00931**

Mr. Carl Leith, 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.

The Commission and Staff discussed the following:

- The changes to the balconies.
- If the flag lot was historically associated with the main parcel.
- The concerns over the vinyl windows.

Mr. Bryson Garbett reviewed the changes to the plan and how the design was improved. He asked the Commission to approve the petition as presented and allow the project to move forward.

Mr. Wally Cooper reviewed the elevations of the building and how it would impact the surrounding area. He reviewed the grade changes for the property and the issues those changes created for the pedestrian views of the building.

The Commission and Applicant discussed the following:

- If the balconies were increased in size
 - Yes the balconies were increased from three to five feet wide and in some places thirteen feet long.
- The building materials and where each type of material would be used on the façade.
- The windows for the proposal.
- The parapet height versus the solar panel height.
- The style of solar panel proposed for the project.
- If other considerations were given to the building height adjacent to the Piccadilly Apartments.
- Applying the guidelines for Multifamily Buildings to the proposal.

- How to entice retail businesses to the area.
- The issues with parking for businesses in the area.

PUBLIC HEARING [6:27:09 PM](#)

Chairperson Brennan opened the Public Hearing.

Ms. Cindy Cromer stated the changes to the windows, and court yard on the front were great improvements. She stated the 500 South side needed more attention and asked what the boxes along the street would look like. Ms. Cromer stated the frontage on the southwest corner was awkward and language restricting mechanical systems on balconies should be included as a condition.

Mr. Kirk Huffaker stated it was great to see progress on the proposal but this was a missed opportunity, as any design on South Temple should reflect the greatness of the street. He stated there were also missed opportunities on E Street as it was a terminal vista that would now end at a building. Mr. Huffaker stated the building had a classical form but did not communicate with the street like other buildings in the area. He stated the plaza helped with the design, but could be better; the viability of the commercial spaces should be reviewed and addressed as there was too much uniformity and consistency.

Mr. Scott Anderson stated he agreed with Kirk Huffaker that this was a missed opportunity. He asked the Commission why they were so afraid of classic architecture that would make the building match the existing structures in the area. Mr. Anderson asked if the retail spaces would be viable and why should the street level space not be a lobby or open space that was more inviting.

Mr. Bradford Houston stated the building should reflect the area at a higher level. He said the reason the area businesses died was the lack of design and detailing in the ground levels.

Chairperson Brennan closed the Public Hearing.

The Commission made the following comments:

- The proposal was greatly improved but there were still areas that needed improvement.
- The height on the southwest corner was an issue.
- Need to make sure there are no missed opportunities to make the building reflect the area.
- There was a need for a greater level of refinement and some prominence given to aspects of the proposal such as the entrance and street level openings.
- South Temple is one of the great streets in the US and it is the responsibility of the Commission to help protect that status.
- The “H” design of the proposal fit with the area but the additional height on the southwest corner took away from the symmetry of the building.

- Mechanical on balconies should not be allowed and included in the motion.
- Vinyl windows are not appropriate for South Temple.
- Corten Steel was out of character for the street.
- The building should be momentary.

The Commission discussed the following:

- The façade design on 500 East, the openings to the parking and commercial areas.
- The items of the proposal that could be changed to better fit with the area.
- The mass of the Southwest tower and options for lessening its impact.
- The Commission's purview over the design of the building.
- How to further development the Plaza, 500 East frontage and retail space.
- Moving the height of the south tower to the center of the building to reduce the massing.
- The setbacks of the building and making them better fit with the area.
- If the proposal was ready to be approved or needed to be tabled to allow the Applicant to make further improvements.

The Commission, Staff and Applicant discussed the following:

- If the petition should be tabled, denied or approved with the conditions.
- The massing of the Southwest corner and if a Special Exception was required for that corner of the building.
- The conditions of approval listed in the Staff Report.

MOTION [7:01:02 PM](#)

Commissioner Peters stated in the case of PLNHLC2015-00930 and PLNHLC2015-00931, New Apartment Building at approximately 454-466 E. South Temple, 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 application for a Certificate of Appropriateness for New Construction, and the application for associated Special Exception approvals, subject to the following conditions:

- 1. That the design for the façade of the ground levels facing 500 East be revised to address concerns as identified in this report and/or defined by the commission.**
- 2. That the design of the façade walls facing the Piccadilly Apartments be revised to address concerns as identified in this report and/or defined by the commission.**
- 3. That the materials and their detailed design are defined and/or revised as identified in this report and/or defined by the commission.**
- 4. That the approval of all design details in accordance with commission conclusions are delegated to staff for approval.**
- 5. That the height of the Southwest block of the building be consistent with the standards set in the Multifamily Design Standards.**

Commissioner Shepherd seconded the motion. Commissioners Harding, Richardson and Brennan voted “nay”. Commissioners Shepherd and Peters voted “aye”. The motion failed 3-2.

The Commissioners and Staff discussed the next steps for the proposal and how to move forward with the petition.

MOTION [7:10:05 PM](#)

Commissioner Peters stated in the case of PLNHLC2015-00930 and PLNHLC2015-00931, New Apartment Building at approximately 454-466 E. South Temple, 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 application for a Certificate of Appropriateness for New Construction, and the application for associated Special Exception for setbacks, subject to the following conditions:

- 1. That the design for the façade of the ground levels facing 500 East and South Temple be revised to address concerns as identified in the Staff Report and/or defined by the Commission.**
- 2. That the design of the façade walls facing the Piccadilly Apartments be revised to address concerns as identified in the Staff Report and/or defined by the Commission.**
- 3. That the materials and their detailed design are defined and/or revised as identified in the Staff Report and/or defined by the Commission.**
- 4. That the approval of all design details in accordance with the Commission’s conclusions are delegated to staff for approval.**

The Special Expectation for the height would be denied subject to standard one scale and form subsection “A” height and width as the proposed height of the proposed southwest section of the building appears too high in relation to the surrounding structures and the streetscape, the height of the proposed development does not accord with the objectives of this standard as per the findings of the Staff Report. Commissioner Shepherd seconded the motion.

Chairperson Brennan asked that the Staff work with the Applicant on the materials as outlined in the design guidelines for multifamily buildings.

Commissioner Peters amended his motion to state the South Temple and 500 East façade should be considered in the detailed design, that the materiality of the building should be in keeping with the standards as outlined in the design guidelines for Multifamily Buildings and the mechanical units are not allowed on balconies. Commissioner Shepherd seconded the motion. Commissioners Harding, Richardson and Brennan voted “nay”. Commissioners Shepherd and Peters voted “aye”. The motion failed 3-2.

The Commission discussed the next steps for the proposal. It was stated that the Applicant had requested to have a yes or no motion and to not table the petition.

MOTION [7:17:40 PM](#)

Commissioners Harding stated in the case of PLNHLC2015-00930 and PLNHLC2015-00931, New Apartment Building at approximately 454-466 E. South Temple, she moved that the Historic Landmark Commission deny the petition based on the following:

- 1. Standard 1 -The proposed height and width should be visually compatible with surrounding structures and streetscape.**
 - The proposal did not meet this standard due to the fact that it would be built to the sidewalk, the massing of the structure was not compatible with the area and the building did not decrease in size as it went further into the interior of the block.**
- 2. Standard 1D- The size and mass of the structure shall be visually compatible with the size and mass of surrounding structures and streetscape.**
 - The proposal loomed far above the smaller buildings on either side, although there are larger buildings further out on the block, the proposal was on a corner and therefore the massing was more problematic.**

Commissioner Richardson seconded the motion. Commissioners Harding, Richardson and Brennan voted “aye”. Commissioners Shepherd and Peters voted “nay”. The motion passed 3-2.

which was applied for and thanked Carl Leith, Senior Planner for moving this forward.

PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD [5:42:22 PM](#)

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

PUBLIC HEARINGS

[5:42:50 PM](#)

New Apartment Building at approximately 454-466 E. South Temple - Chris Huntsman, CRSA, on behalf of owner Garbett Homes, is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness from the City to construct a new apartment building at the southwest corner of 500 East and E. South Temple. The property is currently vacant. The proposed development would be approximately six stories and include 5,000 SF of commercial space, 176 apartment units and provision for parking 226 vehicles. The site is zoned R-MU (Residential / Mixed Use) and is located in the South Temple Local Historic District and City Council District 4, represented by Luke Garrott. (Staff contact: Carl Leith, (801) 535-7758 or carl.leith@slcgov.com.)

- a. **New Construction - In order to build the proposed apartment building a Certificate of Appropriateness for the building must be approved by the Historic Landmark Commission. Case Number PLNHLC2015-00930.**
- b. **Special Exception Approval - In order to construct the proposed development, special exception approval is sought for an encroachment of 20 feet into the required rear yard setback on the west side of the development to accommodate part of the building, two stair ways and an ADA ramp that are greater than 4 feet in height. In conjunction to the encroachment, the applicant is seeking a special exception for approximately 6 feet 8 inches in additional building height for a portion of the west elevation and a portion of the south elevation at the southwest corner of the site. A grade change greater than four feet is also requested in order to accommodate the parking access ramp. Case Number PLNHLC2015-00931**

Mr. Carl Leith, 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 table the petition to enable further review.

The Commission and Staff discussed the following:

- How the side yard and corner yard were determined for the lot.
- If the building was required to reflect the side yard and front yard.
- If the standards had been formalized regarding equipment on balconies.
- The Commission's purview over the lot consolidation proposal.
- The glazing on the first floor windows.

Mr. Wally Cooper stated they would like to address the concerns for the proposal. He read from the presentation (contained in the case file) regarding the following:

- How the proposal affected and fit within the South Temple Historic District.
- Height and scale of the proposal.

- Ground level parking in the area.
- Piccadilly Apartments.
- The mixed use character.
- Palette of materials.
- Building massing and configuration of open space.

Mr. Chris Huntsman, CRSA, reviewed the building façade and the glazing on the first floor windows. He reviewed the open space for the proposal.

The Commission and Applicant discussed the following:

- The first floor fenestration and if the windows were operable.
- The size of the balconies.
- Height of the proposed building.
- The width of the landscape median on South Temple.
- The challenges with the site and the previous uses.
- The fabric of the district and if the building fit with the area.
- If moving the court yard to the north had been considered.

PUBLIC HEARING [6:39:39 PM](#)

Chairperson Brennan opened the Public Hearing.

Ms. Cindy Cromer thanked the Applicant for attending the Community Council meetings and hoped that they would present the revised designs to them as well. She stated she supported the applicant in his designs and past work to support historic preservation however, this proposal needed to be better. Ms. Cromer reviewed the historically significant buildings in the area. She stated the issue was to ensure the building proposed for the area fit with the historic buildings and did not detract from the character of the street, which was one of the great boulevards in the country. Ms. Cromer stated she agreed with flipping the courtyard and possibly adding a courtyard on each building face would be a better amenity for the residences of the building.

Chairperson Brennan closed the Public Hearing.

The Applicant did not wish to speak.

The Commission made the following comments:

- If the building was in an “H” shape it would break up the massing on South Temple and preserve the advantages of sun and open space to the rear of the site.
- It was better to have the development and improve the area than for it to remain in its current state.
- The height ~~was~~ might not be a concern if the massing was appropriate.
- The glazing versus opening on 500 East was not an issue as openings without glass helped to break up the façade, although glazing would animate the windows.
- Concerned over the sheer mass coming straight up from South Temple.

- The buildings listed as reference were important to the area and worked because of their step backs that broke up the massing.
- The rendering with the ground level façade, given more depth, worked well.
- The materials should not try to look historical or it would devalue the historic buildings in the area.
- The new renderings were a step in the right direction.
- Setbacks should reflect those of the neighboring buildings.
- More brick than stucco should be used.
- The first floor did not need the setbacks as it reflected the retail use however, the upper floors should be stepped back.
- The balconies should be wider to allow better use.

The Commission discussed the following:

- How the Commission felt about the building being set back further and built taller.
- How to make the building fit with the surrounding area.
- The Commission reviewed each of Staff's six concerns (listed in the Staff Report) and how their comments (listed above) addressed the concerns.
- If the Commission wanted to table the petition or hold a subcommittee to address the issues with the Applicant.

MOTION [7:09:08 PM](#)

Commissioner Harding stated in the case of PLNHLC2015-00930 and PLNHLC2015-00931, New Apartment Building at approximately 454-466 E. South Temple, based on the analysis and findings listed in the Staff Report, testimony and the proposal presented, she moved that the Historic Landmark Commission table the application for further consideration to enable the Applicant to review and revise the proposals to address the matters identified as key issues, reserving a final decision until these issues have been addressed. Commissioner Thuet seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

[7:10:09 PM](#)

Warehouse National Historic District Expansion - Salt Lake City has engaged Sherri Murray Ellis, Certus Environmental Solutions, LLC, to evaluate buildings in the study area, and prepare a National Register nomination that would expand the existing boundary of the Warehouse National Historic District. The Historic Landmark Commission will review the National Register nomination and forward a recommendation to the Utah State Board of History. The proposed expanded boundary is roughly bound by 50 South, West Temple/300 West, 1000 South, and Interstate 15 (I-15) and is located in City Council District 4, represented by Luke Garrott. (Staff contact: Amy Thompson at (801) 535-7281 or amy.thompson@slcgov.com.)

Ms. Amy Thompson, 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 forward a positive recommendation to the Board of State History regarding the petition.

Ms. Sherri Murray Ellis, Certus Environmental Solutions LLC, reviewed the area and the significance of the buildings in the proposed area.

The Commission, Staff and Applicant discussed the following:

- If the district boundaries needed to be in line or could be discontinuous.
- If there would be issues in the future with not having continuous boundaries.

PUBLIC HEARING [7:39:51 PM](#)

Chairperson Brennan opened the Public Hearing, seeing no one wished to speak to the petition; Chairperson Brennan closed the Public Hearing.

The Commission discussed the following:

- Notification of the property owners in the proposed district to see if there was interest in a local historic district.
 - Staff met with the property owners but were not advocating for for a local historic district designation.

MOTION [7:42:09 PM](#)

Commissioner Thuet stated in the case of Warehouse National Historic District Expansion, based on the analysis and findings listed in the Staff Report, testimony and the proposal presented, she moved that the Historic Landmark Commission forward a favorable recommendation to the Board of State History to expand the Warehouse National Historic District. Commissioner Peters seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

[7:43:01 PM](#)

University Historic District Reconnaissance Level Survey (RLS) Update - Salt Lake City has engaged Beatrice Lufkin to update the survey of existing buildings within the University Local Historic District. The Historic Landmark Commission will consider the survey updates, findings and consider accepting the final report of the survey. The district is roughly bound by South Temple, 500 South, 1100 East to 1300 East and is located in City Council District 4, represented by Luke Garrott. (Staff contact: Lex Traughber at (801) 535-6184 or lex.traughber@slcgov.com .)

Mr. Lex Traughber, 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 and adopt the University Historic District Survey as presented.

The Commission and Staff discussed the following:

- The notification that was sent to the property owners regarding the proposal.

PUBLIC HEARING [7:49:49 PM](#)

Chairperson Brennan opened the Public Hearing.

RECORD OF PUBLIC INQUIRIES & COMMENTS

Received by 1/28/16

PLNHLC 2015-00930 & 00930 454-466 South Temple

PLNHLC 2016-00027 & 00029 454-466 South Temple

Kori Laurel, Adjacent Resident to the development site 11/23 & 25/15

- Concerns on traffic increase, accidents, a mixed use property with chain restaurants. See attached email.

Roger Cooke, Manager, Medical Dental Plaza Owners

34 South 500 East #102, SLC, UT 84102

12/2/15

- Concern relating to leaning retaining wall – boundary between the two properties towards SW corner of development site. See attached email.

Elizabeth Giraud, City Resident

11/30/15

- Inquiry

Kirk Huffaker, Executive Director, Utah Heritage Foundation

12/3/15

- Agree with staff recommendation & urge Commission to continue the Public Hearing for further consideration of the proposals.

Kirk Huffaker, Executive Director, Utah Heritage Foundation

HLC 1/7/16

- Concerns - See Report & HLC Draft Minutes of Meeting

Cindy Cromer – Resident

HLC 12/3/15

- Concerns on height, massing & scale. See HLC Minutes of Meeting

Cindy Cromer – Resident

HLC 1/7/16

- Acknowledged improvements but concerns remain. See HLC Minutes of Meeting

Scott Anderson – Resident

HLC 1/7/16

- Concerns. See HLC Minutes of Meeting

Bradford Houston – Resident

HLC 1/7/16

- Concerns. See HLC Minutes of Meeting

Sam ? - Voicemail (name not legible)

1/25/16

- No information & no conversation – called back & left voicemail reply

- | | |
|---|---------|
| Lee White, South Temple Resident | 1/25/16 |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Phone conversation & follow-up email - see attached.• Concerned about the impact on S Temple | |
| Travis Williamson – Email Inquiry | 1/25/16 |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Reply with copy of current proposals | |
| Kori Laurel, Adjacent Resident to the development site | 1/26/16 |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Inquiry on timing of the next HLC meeting | |
| Derek Kitchen – City Council Member for the district | 1/27/16 |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Phone call & request for latest drawings• Copy of the drawings emailed | |

Leith, Carl

From: Lee White [eleewhite@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, January 25, 2016 1:55 PM
To: Leith, Carl
Subject: Proposed New Construction on South Temple

Carl,

Please know that I do not feel the proposed size and aesthetics of the proposed building fit in with the South Temple Historic District.

Thank you.

E. Lee White
South Temple Resident

Leith, Carl

From: Leith, Carl
Sent: Monday, January 25, 2016 5:21 PM
To: 'Travis Williamsen'
Subject: RE: New Apartment Building 454-466 E South Temple
Attachments: HARDISON RESUBMITTAL 2016-01-25.pdf

Hi Travis,

Thank you for your inquiry. I attach the latest drawing set for the apartment proposals as revised. The staff report on these proposals should be available by later Thursday and will be posted on the Historic Landmark Commission website at the following link.

<http://www.slcgov.com/planning/planning-2016-historic-landmark-commission>

Please let me know if there are any follow up questions you think I can address.

Thanks,

Carl

CARL O LEITH
Senior Historic Preservation Planner
801 535 7758
carl.leith@slcgov.com

From: Travis Williamsen [<mailto:twilliamsen@chasebrookco.com>]
Sent: Monday, January 25, 2016 3:29 PM
To: Leith, Carl
Subject: New Apartment Building 454-466 E South Temple

Hello Carl-

We received the notice concerning this new apartment building going across the street from us. Do you have a current site plan or renderings you could send me for this?

Thanks,

Travis Williamsen
801-364-2602

Leith, Carl

From: korilaurel [korilaurel@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, January 26, 2016 6:09 PM
To: Leith, Carl
Subject: Re: 454-466 South Temple

Hi Carl,

Just wanted to see when the next meeting about this site would be?

kori laurel | korilaurel.com
e: korilaurel@gmail.com | p: 801.513.9696

On Nov 25, 2015, at 9:48 AM, Hardkori <korilaurel@gmail.com> wrote:

Thank you so much Carl. I appreciate it!

Have a great holiday.

--

KORI LAUREL | korilaurel.com

e: korilaurel@gmail.com

p: [801-513-9696](tel:801-513-9696)

On Nov 25, 2015, at 09:31, Leith, Carl <Carl.Leith@slcgov.com> wrote:

Good Morning Kori,

Thank you for your comments. My apologies for not being back to you sooner. I have been out of the office for the last week.

At this point I am getting back in touch with this proposed development and some recent information which has come in from the applicants. The staff report on this has to be finalized and goes out today, so will be able you forward you a copy later in the day.

I will be back in touch.

Thanks,

Carl

CARL O LEITH
Senior Historic Preservation Planner

801 535 7758
carl.leith@slcgov.com

From: Hardkori [<mailto:korilaurel@gmail.com>]
Sent: Monday, November 23, 2015 10:35 PM
To: Leith, Carl
Subject: 454-466 South Temple

Hello Carl,

My name is Kori Laurel and I am a resident right behind this proposed mixed use lot. Can you please send me more information on this? I'm concerned about the traffic it would be adding to this already busy intersection. This intersection is already one that is very riddled with weekly accidents. I know that as a citizen I have very few rights in terms of fighting this but I would love to know if there is anything that I could do in terms of making a small impact. South temple is the last gem of main roads in Salt Lake City. It hosts the beautiful Cathedral, the Governors mansion, and beautiful historic properties. I'd hate to see a mixed use property with chain restaurants, and over crowding of vehicles on this road.

Thank you so much for letting me vent. I look forward to hearing from you.

<image001.jpg>

--

KORI LAUREL | korilaurel.com

e: korilaurel@gmail.com

p: [801-513-9696](tel:801-513-9696)



Work Flow History Report

466 E SOUTH TEMPLE St

DRT2015-00372

Project:

Project Description: Review of new six-story, 176 unit apartment building.

The Development Review Team (DRT) is designed to provide PRELIMINARY review to assist in the design of the complete site plan. A complete review of the site plan will take place upon submittal of the completed site plan to the Permits Counter.

Date		Task/Inspection	Status/Result	Action By	Comments
11/23/2015	0	Application Acceptance	Accepted	Aguilar, Bonny	
11/23/2015	0	Engineering Review	Comments	Drummond, Randy	See SLC Planning for lot consolidation process. At the time of application for Building Permit, the applicant should complete an inventory of the condition of the existing street and/or access-way improvements. Once the condition of said improvements has been determined, we recommend that any sub-standard improvements (curb, gutter, sidewalk-we recommend that any trip hazards on the public sidewalk be removed-, drive approach, etc.) be either repaired or replaced. Certified address required prior to building permit issuance. See Alice Montoya at 801-535-7248. Public Way Permit is required for project completion. Licensed, bonded and insured Contractor to obtain permit to install or repair required street improvements. (removal of dead approaches, new drive approaches, water/sewer service kills/installations, storm drain service, etc.) Approved site plan required. Submit approved site plan to Engineering Permits Office @ 349 South 200 East. (Contact SLC Engineering @ 801-535-7995 for Permit information) Any street tree installations and/or tree removals require the approval of the SLC Arborist.

11/23/2015	0	Fire Review	Comments	Itchon, Edward	<p>Fire hydrants shall be within 400 feet of all exterior walls of the first floor and 100 feet of a fire department connection (FDC). FDC shall be installed on the address side of the building. Fire department access shall be within 150 feet of all exterior walls of the first floor. If the building is built on property line then an alternative means and methods may be applied for. Fire department access roads shall be a minimum of 26 ft. clear width and clear height of 13 ft. 6 inches. Fire department access roads shall be design HS20 with turning radius of 45 ft. outside and 20 ft. inside. The access road shall Have no utility lines over the road or between the building and the access road. Two fire department access roads shall be provided when the number of living units exceed 200. When two access roads are provided then one of the roads shall not be closer than 15 ft. to the building and greater than 30 ft. from the building.</p>
11/23/2015	0	Public Utilities Review	Comments	Draper, Jason	<p>DRT Review - 466 East South Temple - November 23, 2016 There are 3 water services from the 12" main in South Temple and one 1.5" service on 500 East connected to a 6" main in 500 East. One meter may be used for culinary service and one for irrigation. Kill all unused meters at the main. Provide meter sizing calculations and average daily flows if a service 4" or larger is needed. There is a sewer service on the south east side of the property that was abandoned in 2003. Cap this lateral at the main. There is a sewer main in South Temple and 500 East. These are both 8" There is storm drain in South Temple with a inlet and connection to the main on south temple. The site will require detention based on the SLC Design Process Guide requirements. Submit a Technical Drainage Study for review. A complete SWPPP document is required along with a State and City NOI. A construction groundwater discharge permit will be required prior to any groundwater discharge. Additional discharge must meet the DERR guidelines and City discharge requirements for petroleum and TSS. Filtration and aeration may be required. If the discharge can not be treated to stormwater discharge requirements, special permission by the wastewater treatment facility will be required prior to discharge to the sanitary sewer. If continuous groundwater discharge is expected, approval of treatment and monitoring program with DERR and SLC PU will be required. All permit, connection, meter, survey, and inspection fees will apply. Service agreements and fire line petitions will need to be signed prior to plan release.</p>

11/23/2015	0	Transportation Review	Comments	Barry, Michael	<p>Provide a site plan, drawn to scale and fully dimensioned, showing any off street parking or loading facilities to be provided; see also: • General Off Street Parking Regulations (21A.44.020) • Driveway Standards (21A.44.020.F.7) • Driveway construction per 2012 APWA Standards; specify driveway type (example: Plan 225) • Parking Restrictions in Required Yards (21A.44.060) • Regulation of Fences, Walls, and Hedges: Height Restrictions and Gates (21A.40.120.E) Provide complete parking calculations on site plan indicating the following: • Each type of use and associated parking ratio per Table 21A.44.030; and square footage (or other specified basis of measurement) of each type of use. • Minimum number of ADA parking spaces required (21A.44.020.D) • Minimum number of passenger vehicle parking spaces required (21A.44.030.G) • Maximum number of passenger vehicles parking spaces required (21A.44.030.H) • Minimum number of electric vehicle parking spaces required (21A.44.050.B.2) • Minimum number of bicycle parking spaces required (21A.44.050.B.3) • Minimum number of loading berths required (21A.44.080) • Number of parking spaces provided • Any modifications to parking requirements (21A.44.040) Provide the following details: • ADA parking stall dimensions, signage, pavement markings, and ramps. • Signage and/or pavement markings for electric vehicle parking spaces indicating exclusive availability for electric vehicles (see 21A.44.050.B.2). • Bike rack installation (See SLC Transportation Standard Detail, F1.f2, "Bicycle Parking" @ http://www.slcdocs.com/transportation/design/pdf/F1.f2.pdf. Please feel free to contact me if you have any questions. Michael Barry, PE SLC Transportation Division 801-535-7147 michael.barry@slcgov.com</p>
------------	---	-----------------------	----------	----------------	--

11/23/2015	0	Zoning Review	Comments	Brown, Ken	<p>R-MU Zone / Historic District - Review of new six-story, 176 unit apartment building that involves combining of parcels. The parcel combining process can be initiated with the Planning Desk in the Building Permits Office. PLNHLC2015-00930 is an application for Certificate of Appropriateness - PLNHLC2015-00931 is an application for rear yard encroachment for access to the southwestern portion of the parcel. This proposal will need to be discussed with the building code personnel in Room #215. A Certified Address is to be obtained from the Engineering Dept. for use in the plan review and permit issuance process. This proposal will need to comply with the provisions of 21A.24.010 and 21A.24.170 - the uses as allowed in 21A.33.020 - any appropriate provisions of 21A.34 – the provisions of 21A.36 in regards to use of land and buildings, conformance with lot and bulk controls, environmental performance standards, a permanent recycling collection station, construction waste management plan, and any other appropriate sections within this chapter. This proposal will need to comply with any appropriate provisions of 21A.40 – the provisions of 21A.44 for parking and maneuvering, with parking calculations provided that address the minimum parking required, maximum parking allowed, number provided, bicycle parking required/provided, electric vehicle parking required/provided, off-street loading required/provided and any method of reducing or increasing the parking requirement - the provisions of 21A.48 for landscaping. To download the construction waste management plan handout, see http://www.slcgov.com/slcgreen/constructiondemo). Waste Management Plans should be filed by email to the Streets and Sanitation Division at constructionrecycling@slcgov.com and the approval documentation included in the new construction permit package. Questions regarding the waste management plans may be directed to 801-535-6984.</p>
11/24/2015	1	Closure	Emailed Notes to Applicant	Robinson, DeeDee	

ATTACHMENT J: MOTIONS

Consistent with Staff Recommendation (approval with conditions)

Based on the analysis and findings listed in the staff report, testimony and the proposal presented, I move that the Commission approve this application for a Certificate of Appropriateness for New Construction, and the application for associated special exception approvals, subject to the following conditions:

1. That the design for the façade to 500 East be revised to address concerns as identified in this report and/or defined by the commission.
2. That the design of the façade walls facing the Piccadilly Apartments be revised and refined to address concerns as identified in this report and/or defined by the commission.
3. That the materials and their detailed design are defined and/or revised as identified in this report and/or defined by the commission.
4. That no mechanical systems/air conditioning units be located on the balconies.
5. That the approval of all design details in accordance with commission findings and conclusions are delegated to staff for approval.

Not Consistent with Staff Recommendation (Denial):

Based on the analysis and findings listed in this staff report, testimony and the proposal presented, I move that the Commission deny the request for a Certificate of Appropriateness for:

- A. **New Construction** –Case Number PLNHLC2015-00930; and,
- B. **The Special Exceptions** sought for an encroachment of 20 feet into the required rear yard setback on the west side of the development to accommodate part of the building, two stair ways and an ADA ramp that are greater than 4 feet in height including approximately 6 feet 8 inches in additional building height for a portion of the west elevation and a portion of the south elevation at the southwest corner of the site, including a grade change greater than four feet in order to accommodate the parking access ramp in Case Number PLNHLC2015-00931;and

Specifically, the Commission finds that the proposed project does not comply with the review standards based on the following findings (Commissioner then states findings based on the following Standards to support the motion):

1. Standard 1: Scale and Form:

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

2. Standard 2: Composition of Principal Facades:

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

3. Standard 3: Relationship to Street:

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

4. Standard 4: Subdivision of Lots:

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

Special Exception Denial

Specifically, the Commission finds that the proposed project does not comply with the review standards based on the following findings (Commissioner then states findings based on the Special Exception Standards to support the motion):

21A.06.050 C.6

- g. Any modification to bulk and lot regulations of the underlying zoning district where it is found that the underlying zoning would not be compatible with the historic district and/or landmark site;

21A.52.060

- A. Compliance With Zoning Ordinance And District Purposes: The proposed use and development will be in harmony with the general and specific purposes for which this title was enacted and for which the regulations of the district were established.
- B. No Substantial Impairment Of Property Value: The proposed use and development will not substantially diminish or impair the value of the property within the neighborhood in which it is located.
- C. No Undue Adverse Impact: The proposed use and development will not have a material adverse effect upon the character of the area or the public health, safety and general welfare.
- D. Compatible With Surrounding Development: The proposed special exception will be constructed, arranged and operated so as to be compatible with the use and development of neighboring property in accordance with the applicable district regulations.
- E. No Destruction Of Significant Features: The proposed use and development will not result in the destruction, loss or damage of natural, scenic or historic features of significant importance.
- F. No Material Pollution Of Environment: The proposed use and development will not cause material air, water, soil or noise pollution or other types of pollution.
- G. Compliance With Standards: The proposed use and development complies with all additional standards imposed on it pursuant to this chapter.