

Provo City Design Review Committee  
**Report of Action**  
February 28, 2008

ITEM 1 Cooper, Roberts, Simonsen and Associates request a Landmarks Commission Certificate of Appropriateness and Design Review Committee project plan approval for an 11-story office building, as well as a 3-story mixed use building on approximately 0.65 acres of property generally located at 50 North University Avenue and 25 East Center Street (respectively) within the Provo Historic Commercial District and the CBD (Central Business District Commercial) zone. ***Central Business District Neighborhood*** 07-0054PPA & 07-0005LMDR

---

The following action was taken by the Design Review Committee on the above described item at a joint meeting with the Landmarks Commission on November 15, 2007

## CONDITIONAL APPROVAL

On a vote of 4:0, the Design Review Committee approved the above noted application, with the following conditions:

### Conditions of Approval:

1. That the architect re-examine the street level facade of the tower's first two stories along University Avenue and return with a modified rendering that better relates this facade with the architecture of surrounding historic structures. Such modifications should include a cornice line that ties into and mimics the architectural style of the cornice line on the Knight Block building.

Motion By: Ken Harris

Second By: Mike Raymond

Votes in Favor of Motion: Mike Raymond, Roger Knell, Ken Harris and Scott Bingham

Votes Opposed to Motion: None

*Roger Knell* was present as Chair.

### RELATED ACTIONS

Landmarks Commission approved the project's design and granted a Certificate of Appropriateness (case file # 07-0005LMDR, November 15, 2007 & February 28, 2008).

### APPLICANT PRESENTATION & RESPONSE

Key points addressed in the applicant's presentation to the Design Review and Landmarks Commission included the following:

1. Several structural changes had been incorporated into the building design since the last joint meeting. These changes included the addition of an 11<sup>th</sup> floor, modification of the interior connection between the tower and the 25 E Center St building, and modification of the main stairwell - now to be contained entirely within the main tower portion of the development.
2. The applicant mentioned that the residential building on 25 E Center St was now structurally independent from the office tower. As a result, the foot print of the office tower had decreased which was the reason an 11<sup>th</sup> story was added to the building.
3. In regards to the building on 25 E Center St, the applicant mentioned that they had created 6" french balconies on the upper stories, recessed the building entries on the ground level, and added some more architectural detail to

- the roof cornice, as was requested by the Design Review Committee.
4. The applicant reminded the public groups that the two cornice lines on the University Avenue facade were created to tie into the existing cornice lines of the Wells Fargo and Knight Block buildings. He also mentioned that the building entries on University Ave would be sheltered entries.
  5. Responding to a question about building step backs, the applicant mentioned that the second level step back was 5-6 feet deep, the third level step back was 20 feet deep, and the building step back at the eighth floor on University Avenue was 8-10 feet deep.
  6. Responding to a question about window tinting the applicant mentioned that the window glaze is a fairly clear glaze that would allow visible light through the street level windows so that pedestrians can look into the retail pads, but at the same time the window glazing will prevent heat from penetrating the windows and increasing the cost of cooling the building.
  7. In response to the Design Review Committee's request to provide more detailed renderings of the upper tower, the applicant presented a drawing that clearly illustrated the reveal bands and other architectural details near the top of the tower facade.
  8. The applicant also mentioned that as the tower progressed upward, the building stepped back in every direction in order to be sensitive to existing structures and views.
  9. The applicant informed the public groups that the parking garage would be constructed out of formed in place concrete and that the detailing would be the same as the gypsum paneling on the building.
  10. Additionally, the applicant said that the retail pads would be 25-30 feet in depth and that the internal walkway between the 25 E Center St building and the main tower was open to the sky in the courtyard areas but covered in the hallway areas.

#### **NEIGHBORHOOD AND PUBLIC COMMENT**

- The Dixon Neighborhood Chair was present and addressed the Design Review Committee.
- Neighbors or other interested parties were present and addressed the Design Review at the hearing

#### **CONCERNS RAISED BY PUBLIC**

Key issues raised public comment during the public hearing included the following:

1. Judy Kelsch, Area Representative, asked if the 9' high awnings on University Avenue would comply with code. In response staff indicated that they would.
2. Judy also asked where deliveries would be made and suggested that they not be made on University Ave. In response the applicant indicate that deliveries would be made from the back of the building.
3. The Area Representative also inquired as to the width of the pedestrian walkway. In response, the applicant indicated that the walkway was 10-20 feet in width. Judy then shared concerns about parking and snow removal and staff responded that those concerns would be more appropriately addressed at the Planning Commission hearing because the public bodies at this meeting were only tasked with reviewing the project's architectural design.

#### **DESIGN REVIEW COMMISSION DISCUSSION**

Key points discussed by the Design Review Commission included the following:

1. Scott Bingham mentioned that he appreciated the french porches and store front facade on the 25 E Center St building but suggested that the roof cornice was out of place because it was neither modern nor historic in nature. In response to this staff mentioned that one of the goals of the Landmarks Commission was to prevent the creation of a false sense of history in the downtown historic district. In other words, historic buildings should look historic and modern buildings should look modern. Adding to this comment, Steven Hales, of the Landmarks Commission, said that he thought the roof cornice on the 25 E Center St building looked just fine the way it was currently being presented and discouraged additional Victorian detail being added to it.
2. Mike Raymond mentioned that the massing, details and proportions of the project had improved. He also mentioned that while others might not like the style of the facade on University Avenue, that it was a good design

for the style, and that the canopy shading, lintels, decorative lighting, proportion of mullions and window glazing were all appropriately designed for the particular facade style.

3. Ken Harris mentioned that he still preferred the original rendering and disliked the loss of Victorian architectural detail on the tower's current design.
4. Both Ken Harris and Roger Knell suggested that the facade of the first two stories along University Avenue be redesigned to mimic the architectural facade of the Knight Block building and that a Victorian cornice be added to the building step back that ties into the Knight Block building. Staff also mentioned that part of the challenge of this project was to create a design that provided an appropriate transition from the downtown historic district to the more modern CBD zone. The applicant mentioned that he recognized the change in building scale and design from the historic downtown to the modern CBD area and that through the use of cornice and railing lines, window rhythm, recessed window bays, lintel details, and decorative lighting, he had tried to create a building design that tied into the historic themes of the Knight Block building without creating a false sense of history that masked the modern nature of the building. Steven Hales, of the Landmarks Commission, again reiterated that the building design was appropriate as presented and that adding a Victorian cornice to the building facade along University Avenue would be taking the design in the wrong direction.



---

Design Review Committee Chair

If changes are made to the plans (Building or Landscaping) which have been approved by the Design Review Commission, a revised plan will need to be reviewed and approved by the Commission. Unauthorized changes to the approved plan are subject to a \$500.00 fee as outlined in Provo City Code Section 14.43.010.

If the applicant does not agree with the above condition(s) and wishes to appeal the decision, the applicant must file a notice to the Community Development Department. The appeal will then be placed on the next available Planning Commission agenda.

**BUILDING PERMITS MUST BE OBTAINED BEFORE CONSTRUCTION BEGINS.**