



---

## HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES November 18, 2019

---

City Hall Council Chambers \* 290 North 100 West Logan, UT 84321 \* [www.loganutah.org](http://www.loganutah.org)

The meeting of the Logan City Historic Preservation Committee convened in regular session on Monday, November 18, 2019. Chairman Lewis called the meeting to order at 12:00 p.m.

Committee Members Present: Amy Hochberg, Gary Olsen, David Lewis, Keith Mott, Thomas Graham, Christian Wilson

Committee Members Excused: Viola Goodwin

Staff Members Present: Holly Daines, Mike DeSimone, Amanda Hovey, Aaron Smith, Russ Holley, Kymber Housley, Craig Carlston, Tom Dickenson, Kirk Jensen, Debbie Zilles, Mike Miller, Paul Lindhardt, Paul Taylor

Minutes as written and recorded from the November 11, 2019 meeting were reviewed. Amy Hochberg moved that the minutes be approved as submitted. Christian Wilson seconded the motion. The motion was approved.

**HPC 19-005 Emporium Demolition** (Certificate of Appropriateness) Logan City Municipal Corp/Tom Dickinson, owner/authorized agent request demolition of 41, 45, 47, 55, 67 N Main Street in the Town Center 1 District (TC-1) zone; TIN 06-025-0011, -0009, 06-028-0016, -0015.

**STAFF:** Aaron Smith reviewed the proposed demolition of 41, 45, 47, 55, and 67 N Main. The site footprint is approximately 174' wide along Main Street, 152' in depth, and approximately .6 acres in size. On the site of the proposed demolition will be a public plaza, and mixed-use building.

41 N Main was built in 1911. The building is a two-story commercial building. The building has large picture windows on the main floor, large rectangular windows on the second floor, and a heavy cornice supported by double brackets. In the 1978 Survey the building is listed as "Contributory." The 1999 Reconnaissance Level Survey (RLS) gives the building a "B" evaluation, built within the historic period, but has had alterations. The 2011 RLS gives the building a "B" evaluation.

45 N Main was built in 1881 and was the first three story building in the city. By the time of the historic district survey in 1978, the front façade had been sheathed in aluminum. In 1997, the façade and building were extensively renovated. The renovation of the façade produced a facsimile of the original building façade and detailing. In the 1978 Survey the building is listed as "Contributory." The 1999 RLS gives the building a "B" evaluation. The 2011 RLS gives the building a "C" evaluation, and no longer retains historic integrity.

47 N Main was built in 1898. The 1978 survey noted that the façade was clad in aluminum. In 1984 the aluminum was removed, and stucco was applied to the façade. In the 1978 survey the building is listed as "Contributory" with minor alterations. The 1999 Survey gives the building a "C" evaluation. The 2011 Survey gives the building a "C" evaluation.

55 N Main was built in 1977. Originally, the site had consisted of two buildings. The Emporium remodel consisted of a complete façade redesign and gutting of the interior. In the 1978 survey the building was listed as “Not Contributory.” The 1999 and 2011 RLS also gave the building a “D” evaluation, meaning the building was constructed outside the historic period and is not considered contributory.

67 N Main was built in 1890 the two-story building features large picture windows on the first floor, and large rectangular windows on the second floor. In the 1978 survey the building is listed as “Contributory.” The 1999 and 2011 RLS gives the building a “B” evaluation.

Based on the survey evaluations, 41 N and 67 N Main are considered contributory. 45 N, 47 N, and 55 N Main are considered Non-Contributory. Non-contributory structures are required to obtain a Certificate of Appropriateness from the Director (LDC 17.20.050.B.2); however, because the buildings are internally and structurally interconnected, staff felt that it would be appropriate for the HPC to review and consider the Certificate of Appropriateness for all buildings at the same time.

The project plan to replace the existing collection of buildings (41 – 67) includes a public gathering element, a commercial element, a residential element, and a structured parking element, all of which will help to stimulate new life in the historic core of Logan.

Mike DeSimone reviewed the following standards of review for demolition projects.

**The historic resource is in such a deteriorated condition that it is not feasible to preserve or restore.** The two book end buildings, 41 and 67 are “B” grade, the center three are a “C” and “D” grade are not contributory and are not considered historically significant. The interiors are functionally obsolete. Any restoration is going to require a complete foundation replacement.

**The physical integrity of the resource is no longer evident.** The early remodels eliminated the historical integrity of the buildings.

**The demolition would not adversely affect the Historic District due to the surrounding noncontributing structures.** Based on the 2011 survey, many of the surrounding buildings on Main are also non-contributory structures.

**The plan for new construction is applicable with city goals and objectives.** The primary focus of Logan’s Downtown plan is to bring new economic development, revitalization, residential development, mixing of uses, and a community gathering space. To be a successful downtown you must have a mixture of uses. The proposed project at the Emporium site will help to achieve several of those goals. We want to create a place that people will gather and stimulate the surrounding businesses.

**The denial for demolition would cause an “economic hardship.”** There are both public and private investors that would be at risk. Delaying jeopardizes RDA funding as well as our demolition contract. There are also ongoing building maintenance costs. Renovation the building is not feasible for an economic return, and it doesn’t give us that sense of place in downtown. These buildings lack historical integrity, they don’t contribute to the downtown, they don’t revitalize downtown, they don’t create a place downtown, they don’t provide for a mixture of uses, they don’t create something new, and it doesn’t stimulate new investment to downtown.

**The option for a public or private acquisition has been sought out and is not feasible.** Logan City purchased the property back in 2016 when it had been vacant for some time. We put out an RFP for redevelopment on June 1, 2016; there was one response that was later withdrawn. We

did another one a year later, with no response. We did a third RFQ in 2018 and this was when Cowboy Partners was selected to work with the city to come up with viable project.

**Economic incentives to avoid the demolition are not available.** Economic incentives are available for new construction and are not available for restoration of the Emporium.

**The building proposed for demolition is no longer considered historically significant due to a variety of factors such as incompatible or historically inaccurate additions, renovations, modifications, etc.** These buildings are not historically significant due to extensive changes over time.

This is an opportunity to keep downtown relevant. This is about place making and redefining downtown. A plaza will bring people downtown, it will be good for all the businesses down there, it complements our redesigned center street, and helps downtown compete with other commercial areas in the city.

Christian Wilson asked if there has been a seismic study done. Tom Dickinson replied that Cartwright Engineering was hired to provide just a plan for demolition.

David Lewis asked about the structural integrity of the buildings. Paul Taylor explained that the plaza 45 building is the only one that has had a structural remodel and upgrade. The other buildings would need a structural engineer to do a seismic analysis to determine what needs to be done to bring the buildings up to code. Christian Wilson said that all the masonry does not have any rebar or reinforcing in it and could come down in an earthquake fast. The basements/Foundations are all rock; it does not meet, and has not met building code for years

**PROPONENT:** Holly Daines stated this property has been vacant for some time, and that location across from the historic tabernacle is the heart and soul of our historic downtown and we need to do something meaningful that will benefit the citizens. Even when the Coppermill was doing well, the retail spaces in the building did not work. Downtowns are changing these days; you can click a mouse and have about anything delivered to your doorstep. People want an experience, a gathering place, something they can't get online. A plaza has been one method that cities have used to help revitalize downtowns. Bringing housing downtown is something that has been important as well. We started 2 years ago to try and find a partner to help us redevelop and we thought that we would have a full set of plans ready for these meetings, but we have received a lot of concerns, and have been through several iterations of the plans as we continue to address those concerns. We do have a demolition bid that came in under the engineers estimate, but there is a deadline if we want to move forward and not lose that bid. We will continue to work with the business owners around the block to try and make a meaningful project happen for downtown. As things happen on ether end of town it is important that we keep this area strong. The city has been saving up money in its redevelopment fund, which is specifically for redevelopment, were not using general fund tax dollars. We have a significant amount reserved for such a project and I think the time is now, we have the capacity to do it and right now were only asking you to consider the plaza portion because were not prepared on the rest, we hope to come back with that soon. The city's contribution is to create a synergy of some private development that would be significant, and in addition, we have been reserving a couple million dollars in housing funds from the state that this would be an excellent use for.

Keith Mott asked how long it would be until there is a more concrete plan for the block. Holly Daines said that within the next two weeks there should be a new revision, there have been 3 or 4 versions since September. We are looking for some guidance from the Historic Preservation Committee on what is appropriate to do.

David Lewis opened the meeting up to the public for comments.

**PUBLIC:** Gene Needham stated that he is opposed to tearing the building down, and presented two different petitions opposed to the demolition. There has been a constant concern over the parking since the 1950's. In 1968 there was an agreement made between the city and the property owners that the city would maintain the parking lot and the business owners would own it. There have been several buildings taken down to create parking. Putting apartments on top of this parking is not going to do retail any good. I would be prepared to buy the emporium; the city doesn't need to be in the business of owning a building downtown.

Lee Gylinskog stated he was adamantly opposed to the destruction of the emporium, if this was in the Salt Lake, Orem, or Provo area, this building would be worth a bazillion dollars to new business. Old business brought into a new building where the emporium is will not bring in more money. You need to have new business brought in to compliment the old businesses there. Putting in a skating rink is not going to bring in new money to the downtown area, it's going to bring in fun, fun can be put somewhere else in a park downtown. The amphitheater is a great idea; it does bring business to the downtown. Bringing in a lot of apartments to the downtown area is not going to work in Logan; it may work for the Gateway, but not here. Parking is an issue; we need to figure out parking for all these people that will come to all the new business in the emporium.

Nancy Burr read a letter from Julie Hollis Terril, Director of the Cache Valley Visitors Bureau. (Letter is part of the record)

Micah Daines said that action is needed to preserve and improve the center block including the five buildings owned by the city, however if such action is demolition the city is obligated to adhere to the requirements of the design standards. The report from Community Development in support of demolition is not responsive to the eight requirements in chapter 11 of the design standards. We do not have a structural analysis yet completed. The report contains a number of requirements that are not addressed, and the application is incomplete. For the committee to consider this application they should insist on elevations and plans of the proposed project, so the committee can assess its compliance with the design standards of chapter 11.

Gene Needham said there is wisdom in leaving the buildings as they are temporarily, providing more time to make the right decision. Once the plan is adopted and understood as we proceed, I'm all for development and anxious to see these buildings come down, if there is a better plan. Renovation is a plausible option and can be reviewed closer.

Bryce Bozzworth said I am in opposition as it stands right now. I would like to see the vision of the full plan before we start the project. I respect the fact that we can save money by acting with RDA and bids for demolition. Let's take our time and make the right decision.

John Booth said we started talking about the parking issue at the first downtown meeting I went to in 1980 and there has still been nothing done really to alleviate the parking problems. I think you should let them go ahead and get started, if you don't, in 40 years our grandkids will be standing here talking about the same issues.

Jeff Needham gave four examples of his life experiences that influence my feelings on the project. We need to create space and be like Maverik, old buildings need to come down, and we need a space where people can come that is enjoyable. We don't need to protect retail, it will take care of itself, and if there are people the retail will come. The buildings need to come down, we need to create space that's public enjoyed by everyone and the restaurants and retail will come.

Chris Sands stated his experience working in many communities in the Wasatch front, including downtown Ogden on the historic district management plan. There is not much in the way of integrity here to be concerned about or to be interested in protecting. This is heading in the right

direction. I've been pleased with the responsiveness of the city listening to the land and property owners, I feel like we are being heard, every iteration of the plan that comes back has addressed several concerns that I've been hearing from property owners. There is a huge lack of residential opportunities for young people in the downtown area.

Gary Saxton said since the Coppermill moved out he has been tasked with finding tenants to move into the space and has been unsuccessful.

Kent Hair said the last time I was in the emporium was to get a travel brochure from the travel agent that was there. That shows how irrelevant the emporium has been for a long time.

Mike Miller discussed building maintenance issues concerns including sewage floods, water leaks, a 1930's boiler, heating pipes and heat exchangers plugged, electrical problems, sewer line problems, floor problems, etc.

Keegan Garrity said I conducted an informal pole with the public, 318 are in favor of the demolition and 224 wanted to renovate, that's without knowing the cost involved.

**COMMITTEE:** David Lewis said we have heard a lot of pertinent comments on both sides, pros and cons. Everyone wants to see the downtown expand and maintained, both the historic integrity, as well as retail, and residential. It's really a question of how we get there. For our purpose it is about the structures themselves and the process involved.

Christian Wilson said that we are here to make sure the integrity of historic downtown remains and whether these have any historical part that we should keep and maintain.

Keith Mott said it really comes down to building 41 and 67 which are the only two "B" Structures, we don't have that many "A" and "B" structures left. All the other structures can go, but do we make a trade and demolish the two "B" structures for a somewhat nebulous plan. It would be easier to vote yes if I knew what that plan was. When can we expect to see something a little more concrete.

Thomas Graham said I'm not opposed to the development of these properties into something else. I am opposed to the plans that have been submitted, there is a traditional pattern set up on main street, a bunch of soldiers set up side by side on the business side facing the tabernacle square. What they are proposing it to cut out a tooth of that. I would be opposed to any demolition until we see a plan that respected the relationship between the commercial buildings and what is across the street. A missing tooth in the plan violates the historic president that has been set. I'm not opposed to demolishing the Coppermill and the two other buildings, but there are two contributing buildings there that need to be saved.

Amy Hochberg said It is hard to vote if we don't know what's coming in its place. I support the change, I love the idea of having a public space.

Mike DeSimone asked by way of project do you mean the project on the entire site or just on that front part of the block. Keith Mott said were mostly concerned with the façade, but also it should address business parking.

Thomas Graham said a public plaza takes away from that wall of commercial that has always been there. If you look at the street scape from the 1920's and 1940's it's a continuous wall of commercial that has always been there, that's how Logan developed, that's a part of its history.

Christian Wilson said just because it has always been a wall doesn't mean that's historically the answer.

Gary Olsen asked if the concept of bridging that opening with apartments running above the opening and going back into the area has been thought of to maintain a façade across that line

Mike DeSimone said we want to see something there that has presence along the street. We want to have a public plaza there, we want it to be inviting to the public, we want people to see it.

Holly Daines said this is part of the process to get there. Part of what we were hoping to accomplish today, is if we are even heading in the right direction. We were looking for direction from you and will certainly peruse directions that you do have.

David Lewis asked if the city would still consider a private sale. Holly Daines said that the city purchased the property because we wanted to have control of what happened there and to do something that benefited the citizens. The city will not consider a private sale at this point.

Gary Olsen said that no one is opposed to the project in general, or the plaza. The fear is the unknown, and what we're not seeing.

Christian Wilson said the city is spending all this money to maintain the property right now, they have a good bid, why are we delaying the inevitable.

Thomas Graham said I am ok if they take down the Coppermill and the other two buildings that are not contributory. I do not see a reason to take the two "B" buildings, I'd like to see an effort to use those two buildings.

Keith Mott asked is it possible to see plans in two weeks. Holy Daines said that Cowboy Partners is already working on them.

**MOTION:** Thomas Graham Proposed that the discussion of HPC-19005 be continued for an additional two weeks until we have more information from the design professionals on what is exactly going to replace 41-67 N Main Street. Keith Mott seconded the motion

Moved: Thomas Graham    Seconded: Keith Mott    **Passed: 6-0**  
Yea: Hochberg, Olsen, Lewis, Mott, Graham, Wilson    Nay:    Abstain:

There was a brief recess then the meeting continued with informal discussion regarding plans for the Emporium site.

**OTHER DISCUSSION:** The committee discussed requested modifications made to approved project HPC 17-004, 89 N Main façade remodel. The HPC approved the requested change with the following modification; align the middle upper window with the rest of the windows. With that change it was determined there was no need to bring the project back to the committee

Meeting adjourned at 2:32 p.m.

---

Minutes approved as written for the Logan City Historic Preservation Committee meeting held on November 18, 2019.

---

Michael A. DeSimone  
Community Development Director

---

David Lewis  
Historic Preservation Committee Chairman

---

Amanda Hovey  
Secretary II