

ATTACHMENT L: PUBLIC PROCESS AND COMMENTS

Meetings

The following is a list of meetings that have been held, and other public input opportunities, related to the proposed project.

Greater Avenues Community Council – The applicant presented the proposal to the GACC on June 2, 2021. GACC provided written comment in a letter sent to Staff (attached).

Planning Staff sent a letter outlining the proposal and soliciting input to the chairs of the Capitol Hill Neighborhood Council, the Downtown Community Council, the Central City Community Council in addition to the GACC. Staff received no comments or questions from representatives of these community councils.

Work Session – The applicant presented the proposal to the Historic Landmark Commission on March 4, 2021. The focus of this work session was primarily an overview of the project scope, the proposed changes to the Elks Building, and the proposed demolition of 120 1st Avenue. In general, comments received regarding the overall project from the Historic Landmark Commission were favorable. Feedback on the proposal for the Elks building changes was also generally favorable, with the exception of the proposed changes to the front entrance and plaza.

Second Work Session – The applicant presented additional elements of the proposal to the Historic Landmark Commission on April 1, 2021. The focus of this work session was the design of the new South Temple residential building, and proposed alterations to the 1st Avenue houses. However, much of the discussion and feedback at this meeting again focused on the entrance to the Elks Building, with the Commission's comments generally negative on the design treatment presented for the Elks Bldg entry plaza. Commissioners suggested that the applicants rework their approach. Commission feedback on the proposed changes to the 1st Avenue buildings was positive, with the informal agreement that this work could be reviewed and approved administratively. More limited comments and discussion focused on the design of the new South Temple building. Staff incorporated comments on specific design issues in the key issues sections of this Staff Report. In addition, the minutes from this meeting are included as Attachment E.

Public Notice

Early Notification of a Proposal Received by the City – An early notification letter was mailed March 20, 2021, to all property owners and residents within 300 feet of the subject property, with information on how to obtain the project narrative and plans on the Citizen's Access Portal and/or how to contact Planning Staff for information. Approximately 250 notices were sent.

Notice of HLC Work Session – A notification was mailed on February 18, 2021, to all property owners and residents within 300 feet of the subject property, with information regarding the Work Session on March 3, 2021. Approximately 250 notices were sent.

Notice of Second HLC Work Session – A notification was mailed on March 18, 2021, to all property owners and residents within 300 feet of the subject property, with information regarding the Work Session on April 1, 2021. Approximately 250 notices were sent.

Notice of the Historic Landmark Commission public hearing for the proposal include:

- Notices mailed on July 1, 2021.
- Property posted on July 2, 2021.

- Agenda posted on the Planning Division and Utah Public Meeting Notice websites on July 1, 2021

Public Comment

Public comments sent to Staff prior to the di V]W]cb XH are attached to this report.

Comments received after the publication date will be forwarded to the Commission under separate cover.



The Greater Avenues Community
Council
PO Box 1679
Salt Lake City, UT 84110
www.slc-avenues.org

Nelson W. Knight
Planning Division
Salt Lake City

Dear Mr. Knight

On June 2nd, 2021, architect David Davis presented an overview of plans for the Elks Block Project at the General Meeting of the Greater Avenues Community Council. Mr. Davis showed the plans for a new building on S. Temple, the refurbishment of the Elks Building, and refurbishment of the Parking Garage and homes on 1st Avenue, and the demolition of one of the homes on 1st Avenue.

A vote was not held to determine support or opposition to the project. However, several questions were raised and answered by Mr. Davis. The main reasons for notifying the community council were related to the demolition of the contributing structure on 1st Avenue and some height exceptions for the S. Temple buildings. No major concerns were raised during the meeting regarding these issues.

There were questions raised concerning affordability, energy efficiency and sustainability.

We appreciate the opportunity to comment. Please contact me at gaccchair@slc-avenues.org with any questions.

Regards

David H. Alderman

David H. Alderman
GACC Chair

From: [Knight, Nelson](#)
To: [CLippincott](#)
Subject: RE: (EXTERNAL) Elks Development
Date: Monday, June 7, 2021 7:16:40 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

Ms. Lippincott,

As proposed, the Elks Lodge would be renovated into commercial offices. The floor plans show a small area (about 700 square feet out of 8,000 square feet on the first floor) for retail space in the first floor lobby. It seems to be about the right size for a small café or coffee shop.

As for the white shaft on the north side, the renderings of the building aren't really clear, but the floor plans show that it is a service elevator and emergency stairwell. Hopefully you can see the image below. You can also find a large packet of information on the building here:

<http://www.slcdocs.com/Planning/HLC/2021/04.%20April/Elks%20B%20-%20Part%202%20Elks%20Building%20and%20Garage.pdf>

Hope this is helpful,
Nelson

NELSON W. KNIGHT

From: CLippincott <cslippin@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, June 6, 2021 8:50 PM
To: Knight, Nelson <Nelson.Knight@slcgov.com>
Subject: (EXTERNAL) Elks Development

I recently watched the June 2, 2021 GACC meeting when David Davis explained the project. Afterwards I reviewed the proposal. Here are my questions: What will the Elks Lodge be used for: residential or commercial or a combination of both? When will that be decided? Also, I could not determine from the plans what the white shaft at the north side of the building was. Elevators? Offices?

Thanks for your help.

Cynthia Lippincott

From: [Casey McDonough](#)
To: [Knight, Nelson](#)
Subject: RE: (EXTERNAL) FW: SLC Planning Division: Historic Landmark Commission - Elks Block Redevelopment Case numbers PLNHLC2020-00816, PLNHLC2020-00915 & PLNHLC2020-00916
Date: Wednesday, June 2, 2021 12:40:06 PM

Nelson,

I wanted to send these follow up comments to the Elk's Block Redevelopment Project.

While it looks like a great project overall, I take serious issue with the removal of the granite wall, tunnel entry, etc. at the South Temple sidewalk. In my opinion, that part of the original construction is as significant and relevant as the building itself. I believe requiring the applicant to keep the wall, stairs, and archway, then open up everything behind it like their proposal shows, is a reasonable one. The archway with carded skull above will make a wonderful entry into the newly exposed basement level open area.

Please relay my comments to the Historic Landmark Commission letting them know that I would like them to require the applicant to keep the archway, stair, and wall as part of their new project, but allow them to open up the basement and property behind it to meet them in the middle of what they propose, and what is best for maintaining the significance of this part of this not only historic, but significant property on South Temple.

Casey O'Brien McDonough
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

From: Casey McDonough
Sent: Wednesday, April 14, 2021 2:47 PM
To: Knight, Nelson <Nelson.Knight@slcgov.com>
Subject: RE: (EXTERNAL) FW: SLC Planning Division: Historic Landmark Commission - Elks Block Redevelopment Case numbers PLNHLC2020-00816, PLNHLC2020-00915 & PLNHLC2020-00916

Nelson,

I just became aware that part of the Elk's Block Redevelopment includes removing the granite entry, tunnel, wall, etc. along the sidewalk frontage.

This is a horrible idea. At the very least, they should leave the granite construction and open the ground level space between it and the building façade they wish to create at that level.

Now that I understand this detail about the proposed project, I believe this is one of the most significant issues about the project as I understand it.

Thank you for taking my input, I will continue to pay attention as this project processes and let you know if I have any other public comments.

Casey O'Brien McDonough
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

From: Knight, Nelson <Nelson.Knight@slcgov.com>
Sent: Monday, February 22, 2021 5:55 PM

To: [REDACTED]

Subject: RE: (EXTERNAL) FW: SLC Planning Division: Historic Landmark Commission - Elks Block Redevelopment Case numbers PLNHLC2020-00816, PLNHLC2020-00915 & PLNHLC2020-00916

Hi Casey,

Great to hear from you. Hope all is well in your world these days.

You can access the petitions via the [Citizen Access Portal](#) by searching for the petition numbers. Let me know if you have issues and I will get you copies.

I'm revising the staff report but it will be available at the HLC's meeting page on Thursday or Friday this week.

Thanks for the comment about the sidewalk and wall – I thought about that a while ago but there are so many issues involved with this project I forgot to include that. Your reminder is timely and I will mention it.

This meeting is a work session for the project and the HLC won't review a final proposal for a while. There is at least one more work session planned before formal review.

Thanks again, and best to you and your family,
Nelson

NELSON W. KNIGHT

Senior Planner

PLANNING DIVISION
DEPARTMENT of COMMUNITY and NEIGHBORHOODS
SALT LAKE CITY CORPORATION

MOBILE (PREFERRED) 385-226-4493
DESK 801-535-7758
EMAIL nelson.knight@slcgov.com

WWW.SLC.GOV/PLANNING
WWW.SLC.GOV/HISTORICPRESERVATION

WWW.OURNEIGHBORHOODSCAN.COM

Disclaimer: The Planning Division strives to give the best customer service possible and to respond to questions as accurately as possible based upon the information provided. However, answers given at the counter and/or prior to application are not binding and they are not a substitute for formal Final Action, which may only occur in response to a complete application to the Planning Division. Those relying on verbal input or preliminary written feedback do so at their own risk and do not vest any property with development rights.

From: comdesigned@gmail.com <comdesigned@gmail.com>

Sent: Thursday, February 18, 2021 4:18 PM

To: Knight, Nelson <Nelson.Knight@slcgov.com>

Subject: (EXTERNAL) FW: SLC Planning Division: Historic Landmark Commission - Elks Block Redevelopment Case numbers PLNHLC2020-00816, PLNHLC2020-00915 & PLNHLC2020-00916

Nelson,

I wanted to give my input on the proposed Elks Block Redevelopment.

Firstly, can you send me a copy of or link to the PLNHLC2020-00816, PLNHLC2020-00915 &

PLNHLC2020-00916 applications.

Second, I think my comments will be specific to the 1st Avenue implications of this proposal. While the home that they are asking to demolish is more recent, there is an obviously distinctive and historic wall along the sidewalk in front of that home. I would give my comments that if the HLC concludes that home can be demolished that they require the wall to be reconstructed as part of what looks like a parking or walkway entry to into the project from 1st Avenue.

I will watch for your reply on getting copies of the application.

Thank you for your time.

Casey O'Brien McDonough

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

From: Salt Lake City Planning Division <zoning@slcgov.com>

Sent: Thursday, February 18, 2021 3:35 PM

To: [REDACTED]

Subject: SLC Planning Division: Historic Landmark Commission Meeting Agenda for March 4, 2021

**SALT LAKE CITY PLANNING DIVISION
HISTORIC LANDMARK COMMISSION MEETING AGENDA
This meeting will be an electronic meeting pursuant to the
Salt Lake City Emergency Proclamation**

March 4, 2021 at 5:30 p.m.

(The order of the items may change at the Commission's discretion)

This meeting will be an electronic meeting pursuant to the Chair's determination that conducting the Historic Landmark Commission Meeting at a physical location presents a substantial risk to the health and safety of those who may be present at the anchor location.

We want to make sure everyone interested in the Historic Landmark Commission meetings can still access the meetings how they feel most comfortable. If you are interested in watching the Historic Landmark Commission meetings, they are available on the following platforms:

- YouTube: www.youtube.com/slclivemeetings
- SLCTv Channel 17 Live: www.slctv.com/livestream/SLCtv-Live/2

If you are interested in participating during the Public Hearing portion of the meeting or provide general comments, email; historiclandmarks.comments@slcgov.com or connect with us on Webex at:

- <http://tiny.cc/slc-hlc-03042021>

Instructions for using Webex will be provided on our website at SLC.GOV/Planning

HISTORIC LANDMARK COMMISSION MEETING WILL BEGIN AT 5:30 PM
Report of the Chair and Vice Chair
Director's Report

Public Comments - The Commission will hear public comments not pertaining to items listed on the agenda.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. New Construction & Special Exception at approximately 738 S. Green St. - Matt Hintze, of Matthew Hintze Architecture, on behalf of the property owner, Matt Fletcher, is requesting approval from the City to construct a single-family residence and accessory dwelling unit at 738 S. Green Street. The property is currently

From: [cindy.cromer](#)
To: [Knight, Nelson](#)
Subject: (EXTERNAL) Fw: comment on the Elks Building
Date: Thursday, May 6, 2021 4:58:25 PM

Nelson-Please forward to Property Reserve. Thanks, cindy

From: cindy cromer
Sent: Thursday, May 6, 2021 4:48 PM
To: michaela.oktay@slcgov.com <michaela.oktay@slcgov.com>
Subject: comment on the Elks Building

Comment to the Landmarks Commission
May 6, 2021
From cindy cromer
Re the proposed alterations to the Elks Building

The earlier schedule had the Elks Building potentially on your agenda at the May meeting. I am going to begin my comments tonight any way.

When you held a Work Session regarding the project at your last meeting, Commissioner DeLay suggested separating the proposal into portions that the Commission could support and issues upon which there was not agreement, as she said the Planning Commission had done with the City Creek Center years ago. Commissioner DeLay's suggestion was constructive and accurate. It was also the catalyst for my own recognition that the Landmarks Commission was dealing with the same relentless resistance that I had observed during the approval of the City Creek Center. The approval process for the City Creek Center went on for a year. I probably attended every public discussion. At the end of it all, I said to the members of the City Council, "This is less bad." It wasn't as good as it could have been, or should have been. The process wasn't so much consensus as it was erosion.

The second train of thought I've had comes from former Commissioner Polly Hart who had a guideline regarding alternations stemming from her days in grad school. If the original designers would not recognize their own work, then the proposed changes had crossed the line. I am arguing that if Scott and Welch were standing on the sidewalk on South Temple, they would not recognize their own design. Certainly if they viewed their building from the upper floors of a nearby building, they would make the connection, but from the sidewalk, looking straight at the building, the structure is so radically different that I believe that they would not recognize it as their own work.

What I have been observing in your Work Sessions about the Elks Building is very similar to the process with the City Creek Center: resistance to feedback, "my way or the highway," from the developer, who is admittedly the most powerful developer in the State. I have watched

this wrestling match before at the City Creek Center. That project is "less bad" than it would have been without the input from the Planning staff, the Planning Commission, and the public, but certainly not as good as it could have been. South Temple deserves the best.

From: [Ken Wheadon](#)
To: [Knight, Nelson](#)
Subject: (EXTERNAL) Elks Block Redevelopment Project
Date: Tuesday, May 4, 2021 7:07:51 PM

Petition PLNHLC2020-00816, PLNHLC2020-00915 & PLNHLC2020-00916

It appears that the applicant Property Reserve, Inc. plans on removing the south stair and tunnel. As a contributing feature that defines the south façade and streetscape this direction is a mistake. As stated in the petition options have been considered to adapt and re-use, however to alter the prominent feature that would alter the character defining feature on the south façade is in not good stewardship of maintaining the historic nature of the context along south temple. The developer needs to go back to the drawing board and adjust the new plans to include the stair and tunnel. Their argument does not hold muster to providing a technically feasible solution.

Kenneth E Wheadon | Architect

175 South Main Street, Ste 300 SLC UT 84111

D: 801.746.4979 **C:** 801.706.7128 **O:** 801.355.5915

ENR 2021 INTERMOUNTAIN DESIGN FIRM OF THE YEAR

From: [Gretchen Devine](#)
To: [Knight, Nelson](#)
Subject: (EXTERNAL) Elks Block Redevelopment Project
Date: Monday, April 19, 2021 1:39:10 PM

Hello!

The design of the residential building was described as "a look that does not stand as an abrupt contrast, but as a complementary contribution to the street". But the overall design with the light exterior color makes it look incongruous with the rest of the block. The facades of the neighboring buildings have several colors and exterior materials while the new building plans just are just essentially black and white.

Are there alternative color or exterior material options they are considering? Seems out of place. Otherwise, seem like exciting plans that would be a great change to the street.

Thank you!
Gretchen

From: [melissa fryer](#)
To: [Historic Landmark Comments](#)
Subject: (EXTERNAL) Elks Building
Date: Thursday, April 1, 2021 4:31:40 PM

So much of a city's character is experienced at the street level. The sidewalk level stair and tunnel are integral to the building's ability to speak to its historical significance, and even sets it apart from other historic Elk Lodges throughout the country. Removal of this landmark destroys the final distinguishing feature that stands sentinel to his interesting and unique past in Salt Lake City. The design and approach to the project as a whole is a welcome addition to South Temple, but do not destroy its most irreplaceable component.

Thank you,
Melissa Fryer

From: [Laura Smith](#)
To: [Historic Landmark Comments](#)
Subject: (EXTERNAL) Elk's Building Proposal
Date: Thursday, April 1, 2021 4:15:02 PM
Attachments: [Outlook-tgead5m1.png](#)


Dear Historic Landmarks Commission -

I am appalled by the recent proposal to demolish the tunnel and stairs in front of the Elk's Building on South Temple. As you know, this landmark holds a special place in the collective heart of our city and is one of this most photographed historical landmarks taken by pedestrians as they experience SLC from the sidewalk. The stairs and berm in front of the Elk's Building are part of the historic fabric of South Temple and tie into the streetscape language seen at other properties along the corridor sites including the Madeleine, the First Presbyterian Church, and many historical homes. Removing this berm, streetscape feature, and associated trees would destroy the existing buffer that exists between pedestrian and road, and make the pedestrian experience unremarkable and unpleasant. In a city that touts walkability and a reverence for historical culture, the proposal to remove this landmark is a slap in the face to the values that SLC claims to uphold.

The proposal cites that keeping the stairs would require guardrails and a stair wall, to which I say - "Add a guardrail and stair wall." The proposal also cites that the berm is part of a historical feature that no longer exists. This is simply not true as it does exist in many places but not in others due to poor design decisions like this one. Numerous architects and landscape architects have solved this specific issue before this proposal, and they found design solutions that retain our historical landmarks, speak to the streetscape, and successfully modernize existing spaces for current use. My suggestion to the design team is - "Try harder." Losing this important part of our city would be an incomprehensible loss to our collective identity. As stewards of our historical culture, I hope you will approach this with the consideration it deserves. It would be tragic to lose the things that our city unique in pursuit of something easy.

Please look into the link below. I am surprised South Temple hasn't been documented already. Maybe it is time.

<https://www.nps.gov/hdp/hals/>



[About HALS | HABS/HAER/HALS - National Park Service](#)

HALS Mission The Historic American Landscapes Survey (HALS) mission is to record historic

From: [Zach Clegg](#)
To: [Historic Landmark Comments](#)
Subject: (EXTERNAL) Elks Building - April 1st HLC
Date: Thursday, April 1, 2021 1:15:50 PM

Salt Lake City Historic Landmarks Commission,

I am writing in regards to the proposed alterations to the historic Elks Building in Downtown SLC. The removal of the front tunnel/bermed stair entrance would be an explicit destruction of arguably the building's most character defining feature. While it can be argued that the feature does not meet the accessible standards of today, it does not eliminate the possibility for alternate solutions that avoid the removal of such a defining feature. Its removal would completely eradicate the historic experience users get in interacting with the building, not to mention it would redefine the building's street and pedestrian presence into something entirely different with little attempt to reference the original condition. South Temple is lined with bermed landscaping and hardscape processions (the Madeline, many homes, Masonic Temple) that give the street much of its historic feel and reference to the sloping topography...one might say this building is largely identifiable by its tunnel and elevated entrance. Deletion of the tunnel and stairs would create a lowered ground plane - exposing a non-historic new street facade that, as shown in proposed renderings, has little reference to the historic late-gothic facade that currently exists. Its existence offers crucial terminology to the architectural language of Salt Lake City, especially its historic connection to establishments such as the Masons, Alta Club, and other fraternal organizations that largely helped shape this city. As stated in the proposal, "...the design proposal is to recover the best parts of the original building, expose the valued details and materials, and augment the traditional with a fresh modern top and interior." This does neither and contradicts their stated purpose of designing to exemplify the historic nature of the building. Instead it seems to reassemble it into something unrecognizable. In an area of the city known for its brilliant presence of historic architecture, such a removal would be a disheartening and dangerous precedent for future work to come.

Sincerely,
Zach - Marmalade District

From: [Alex Hooper](#)
To: [Knight, Nelson](#)
Subject: (EXTERNAL) Elks Block Redevelopment
Date: Monday, April 12, 2021 6:38:21 PM

I have two comments about the developments

1) I support the changes to the Elks Building, reconstructed parking garage, and the new residential building

2) I'm disappointed in the color choice for the historic homes on first ave. Currently, they are vibrant colors that match the historic avenues with their victorian characteristics. The new colors wash out the homes. This will be even more apparent with the new large white building that will be constructed behind the historic homes. I encourage Property Reserve, and ask that the council also encourage them, to keep the existing colors of the home. They can be refreshed, but ideally in similar or identical tones.

From: cindy cromer <3cinslc@live.com>

Sent: Friday, March 5, 2021 7:05 AM

To: Knight, Nelson <Nelson.Knight@slcgov.com>; Oktay, Michaela <Michaela.Oktay@slcgov.com>

Subject: (EXTERNAL) in a snit...again

Nelson and Michaela-I listened in horror last night as the Commissioners talked about everything except the possibility of moving Brigham and the application of white paint to masonry.

Please let the developers know that I will not have any time to say something nice about the project if they persist with the white paint on 1st Avenue. It doesn't matter if the paint is actually a breathable masonry coating. The parking structure is approaching 50 years old. For the HLC to PUT ITS BLESSING on the use of paint to "update" this parking structure will not only violate best practices. It will be impossible to enforce on painting masonry in the future.

I will rant about this issue at every opportunity. I want to cry about 1253 E 100 S, which was one of my favorite buildings in the City until Susan Mickelsen messed it up. Now it is drenched in white paint. I can bump my next rant on RMF-30 and talk about why Property Reserve would be lumped with the bad actors.

I have no problem with the application of a veneer on the parking structure. I understand that painting it is the most cost-effective approach in the short run. This is not J.C. Penney's parking structure on Block 57. I am not asking that the developers tear down the parking structure and create astronomically expensive parking stalls, as was the case with Block 57 (now Gallivan). I am saying that these developers cannot engage in worst practices unless they want to mount an advertising campaign about why the only way to paint brick is with a very expensive paint.

c