

**SALT LAKE CITY HISTORIC LANDMARK COMMISSION**  
**Meeting Minutes**  
**451 South State Street, Room 326**  
**February 1, 2018**

A roll is kept of all who attended the Historic Landmark Commission Meeting. The meeting was called to order at [5:31:00 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 Charles Shepherd, Vice Chairperson Kenton Peters; Commissioners Sheleigh Harding, Victoria Petro-Eschler, David Richardson, Esther Stowell and Paul Svendsen. Commissioners Stanley Adams, Robert Hyde, Thomas Brennan and Rachel Quist were excused.

Planning Staff members present at the meeting were: Michaela Oktay, Planning Manager, Kelsey Lindquist, Principal Planner; Katia Pace, Principal Planner; Michelle Poland, Administrative Secretary and Paul Nielson, Senior City Attorney.

**FIELD TRIP NOTES:**

A field trip was held prior to the work session. Historic Landmark Commissioners present were: Esther Stowell. Staff members in attendance were Michaela Oktay, Kelsey Lindquist, and Katia Pace.

- **772 E. 2nd Avenue** - Staff gave an overview of the proposal.
- **Pioneer Park** - Staff gave an overview of the proposal
- **Liberty Park** - Staff gave an overview of the proposal

**APPROVAL OF THE JANUARY 4, 2018, MINUTES.** [5:32:12 PM](#)

**MOTION** [5:32:22 PM](#)

**Commissioner Harding moved to approve the minutes from the January 4, 2018. Commissioner Peters seconded the motion. Commissioners Harding, Petro-Eschler, Stowell and Svendsen voted “aye”. Commissioner Richardson abstained from voting as he was not present at the subject meeting. The motion passed unanimously.**

**REPORT OF THE CHAIR OR VICE CHAIR** [5:32:51 PM](#)

Chairperson Shepherd reviewed the presentation regarding architectural transformation on South Temple that would be held February 14. He welcomed the Commissioners to attend and stated he would forward the information via email.

Vice Chairperson Peters stated he had nothing to report.

**DIRECTOR’S REPORT** [5:34:07 PM](#)

Ms. Michaela Oktay, Planning Manager, reviewed the briefings on the Demolition and New Construction Text Amendments that would be presented to the City Council in February. She reviewed the Appeals Hearing for the Otherside Academy demolition and

the final decision should be returned in the next few weeks.

The Commission asked for an update on the final appeal decision to be sent out when it was final.

**PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD [5:35:22 PM](#)**

Chairperson Shepherd opened the Public Comment Period.

The following individuals spoke:

Ms. Cindy Cromer invited the public and Commissioners to attend an event at the Tenth East Senior Center to celebrate the buildings architecture. She reviewed the activities that would be at the event and offered cards with the event information.

Chairperson Shepherd closed the Public Comment Period.

[5:38:29 PM](#)

**Reconstruction at approximately 772 E. 2nd Avenue - Steve Scoville, on behalf of JD Redevelopment LLC, is requesting approval to reconstruct the second story, rear addition, front porch, four dormers and additional exterior elements that were damaged after a structural failure of the second story. The subject property is located at the above listed address. The subject property is zoned SR-1A (Special Development Pattern Residential) and is within the Avenues Local Historic District and within Council District 3, represented by Council Member Chris Warton. (Staff Contact: Kelsey Lindquist at (801)535-7930 or [Kelsey.lindquist@slcgov.com](mailto:Kelsey.lindquist@slcgov.com)).**

- a. **Proposed reconstruction and addition - Requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for the restoration of the second story, rear addition and various exterior elements. Case number: PLNHLC2017-00791.**
- b. **Two Special Exceptions: Case number PLNHLC2017-00792.**
  - I. **Request to reconstruct a noncomplying segment of a structure. The addition is considered noncomplying in regards to the western interior side yard and the southern rear yard.**
  - II. **Request to restore the second story to a height of 26'10".**

Ms. Kelsey Lindquist, Principal Planner, gave an overview of the proposal as outlined in the Staff Report (located in the case file). She stated Staff was recommending that the Historic Landmark Commission approve the request as presented.

Mr. Steve Scoville, architect, reviewed the process of obtaining and recreating the historic features of the home.

Mr. Daryl Thomas, property owner, introduced himself.

The Commission and Applicant discussed the following:

- The issues with the easement to the west that prevent the applicant from reconstructing the home to the original design.
- The approval needed to build in the easement.
- The recreation/modification of the front dormer and if a smaller version was considered.

**PUBLIC HEARING [5:52:25 PM](#)**

Chairperson Shepherd opened the Public Hearing.

The following individuals spoke to the petition: Mr. Brian O'Neal

The following comments were made:

- The western wall was a concern as the bricks were in bad shape therefore, could the western wall be repaired or did it need to be completely rebuilt.
- A ten foot right of way was required, to be maintained, for the property located at 77 M Street.
- There were issues with the rear fence line and a foundation support at the west that would need to be addressed before the final construction was complete.
- The neighboring property owners will not allow an easement on the property as it may affect the use of their properties.

The Commission and Mr. Brian O'Neal discussed the following:

- The reason the easement would not be allowed for the home.
- The esthetic that would be missing from the subject home if the easement were not allowed.
- If there was a way the easement could be allowed.
  - There was no way the easement would be allowed as it would affect the use of the neighboring property.

The Commission and Staff discussed the Commission's purview over the easement.

Chairperson Shepherd closed the Public Hearing.

The Applicants stated he agreed with the Commission that the overhang would enhance the structure if the easement could be granted.

The Commission discussed and stated the following:

- Why the eave extension was being addressed as it was not the Commission's purview.
- The proposal was not complete without knowing if the easement could be granted.
- If the current proposal was approved that would be the final product.
- The windows in the gable needed to be addressed with the building code official prior to approval.
- The windows that were allowed on the west elevation under the building code.
- The process of review for building code and if exceptions could be made.

- If the petition should be tabled to address the issues prior to approval.
- Cannot hold the petition on issues that were uncertain.
- Language could be added to the motion to require the proposal return to the Commission if substantives changes were made.
- The reconfigured dormer on the north elevation seemed dominant and may not be necessary.

**MOTION** [6:06:11 PM](#)

**Commissioner Richardson stated based on the information in the Staff Report, the information presented, and the input received during the public hearing, he moved that the Historic Landmark Commission approve the request for a Certificate of Appropriateness and associated Special Exceptions to reconstruct the second story, rear addition, front porch and additional exterior elements, petition numbers PLNHLC2017-00791 & PLNHLC2017-00792, with the following conditions:**

1. **The Commission had a strong preference and approved the north elevation as shown on sheet A201 and the west elevation as shown on sheet A204.**
2. **Final plan details be delegated to Staff.**

**Commissioner Harding seconded the motion. Commissioners Peters, Harding, Petro-Eschler, Richardson and Stowell voted “aye”. Commissioner Svendsen voted “nay”. The motion passed 5-1.**

[6:09:29 PM](#)

**Pioneer Park Alterations at approximately 350 South 300 West - Salt Lake City Parks and Public Lands Division is requesting approval to remove non-historic elements, make changes to the interior layout of the park, including creating a multi-purpose field and removing and replacing trees. Pioneer Park is a Salt Lake City Landmark Site. The site is in the OS (Open Space) zoning district, in City Council District 4, represented by Derek Kitchen. (Staff contact: Katia Pace at (801)535-6354 or [katia.pace@slcgov.com](mailto:katia.pace@slcgov.com).) Case number: PLNHLC2017-01070**

Ms. Katia Pace, Principal Planner, gave an overview of the proposal as outlined in the Staff Report (located in the case file). She stated Staff was recommending that the Historic Landmark Commission approve the petition as presented.

Ms. Kristin Riker, Parks and Public Lands, stated the proposal was a great opportunity to improve the park and funding had been delegated for the improvements.

Ms. Nancy Monteith, Parks and Public Lands, reviewed the parks role in the community and the history of the park. She reviewed the public support, layout, use and how the changes would benefit the area and the city as a whole.

The Commission and Staff discussed the following:

- The City’s policy on tree replacement.
- Which trees would and would not be kept.

- If the finish could be changed to a dark bronze on the field lights.
- The Commission stated there were reservations about adding storm water collection to the park as the park was historically flat.
- The rationale for departing from the original design.
- The driving factor and justification for the proposal.
  - Trying to push loitering to the exterior of the park where police could patrol the activities.

**PUBLIC HEARING [6:34:19 PM](#)**

Chairperson Shepherd opened the Public Hearing.

The following individuals spoke to the petition: Ms. Cindy Cromer, Mr. Marc Coles-Ritchie, Mr. Elliot Mott and Mr. Matt Loveland.

The following comments were made:

- A thirty five year life span on improvements to the park was not acceptable.
- The loss of trees was not acceptable.
- As the perception of the park became that of a safer place more people would use the playing field for an off leash dog park.
- Adding a water retention pond would affect the water table and the topography of the park.
- Supported the changes and the proposed use would help the area.
- The change in the number of trees was not a concern as there were many trees in the park.
- The proposal was a good project that would improve the city.
- Encouraged the Commission to support the proposal.
- The park would fit with the coming developments in the area.
- Pioneer Park was the only urban park in the area and played a huge part in the community.
- Need to plan for future growth while maintaining the park.
- The proposed changes would promote the same sense of gathering as the pioneers once felt.

Chairperson Shepherd closed the Public Hearing.

Staff stated the water retention basin was not part of the proposal it was only an idea after the proposal was reviewed by other departments and would require future review from the Commission.

The Commission and Applicants discussed the following

- If the soccer goals would be temporary or permanent.
  - They would be temporary
- If there was a scheme where the entire design was centered.
- The design should be classical.
- The historic designs of the park and which was considered historical as the park

changed many times over the years.

- The changes that would be made in various phases of the proposal.
- The subsequent phases and how all of the phases would tie together.
- Needed more information on the pathway shapes and how they would fit with the future plans for the park.

The Commission discussed and stated the following:

- Would like to see the scheme expanded to reflect how the other phases would fit together.
- Would there be accommodations for dogs in the park.
- Would hate to lose the aspects of the park that are currently in place.
- The defining features of the park and what was important to keep.

**MOTION [6:58:10 PM](#)**

**Commissioner Svendsen stated based on the information in the Staff Report, the information presented, and the input received during the public hearing, he moved that the Historic Landmark Commission approve PLNHLC2017-01070 for a Certificate of Appropriateness for a Major Alteration subject to the following condition:**

- 1. That any revisions are delegated to staff for subsequent review and approval.**

**Commissioner Stowell seconded the motion. Commissioners Peters, Harding, Richardson and Svendsen voted “aye”. Commissioner Harding voted “nay”. Commissioner Petro-Eschler abstained from voting. The motion passed 4-1.**

**[6:59:15 PM](#)**

**Liberty Park Fitness Court at approximately 600 East 900 South - Salt Lake City Parks and Public Lands Division is requesting to locate a Fitness Court in Liberty Park. The Fitness Court is an outdoor gym that is designed for multiple body weight exercises and fitness routines. The court includes several fixtures that are secured in place on a rubber surface on top of a concrete pad that is 38 feet by 38feet. The applicant has provided two possible locations: (Site 1) generally located in the vicinity of the playground located in the northeast area of the park and (Site 2) generally located in the vicinity of the Rotary playground located in the northwest area of the park. Liberty Park is a Salt Lake City Landmark Site. The site is in the OS (Open Space) zoning district, in City Council District 5, represented by Erin Mendenhall. (Staff contact: Katia Pace at (801)535-6354 or [katia.pace@slcgov.com](mailto:katia.pace@slcgov.com).) Case number: PLNHLC2017-00924**

Ms. Katia Pace, Principal Planner, gave an overview of the proposal as outlined in the Staff Report (located in the case file). She stated Staff was recommending that the Historic Landmark Commission approve the petition as presented.

The Commission and Staff discussed the following:

- The public outreach for the proposal.

Ms. Kristin Riker, Parks and Public Lands, reviewed the materials and layout of the fitness court, the benefits of the gym for the community, the app for people to use to work out in the court, the color and concept for the fitness court. She reviewed who would have access to the facility, the funding, daily and long term maintenance, reasoning for the location of the fitness court and the public outreach for the proposal.

Mr. James Lee Bollwinkel, Associate Director for Public Lands, introduced himself.

The Commission and Applicants discussed the following:

- Why the City would want a facility that required maintenance instead of something that would be sustainable.
- The need to discuss the facility with Risk Management prior to implementation.

### **PUBLIC HEARING [7:18:46 PM](#)**

Chairperson Shepherd opened the Public Hearing.

The following individuals spoke to the petition: Ms. Cindy Cromer, Ms. Nina Baker and Mr. Chris Crofts.

The following comments were made:

- It was very important to keep the historic factors of the park in place.
- The park was not big enough to take on everything.
- It was impossible to change the site/plans after approval was given therefore, more information and public input was needed before it was approved.
- Proposal should be tabled and examples should be given of similar facilities and operations.
- Loved the green space but not thrilled about a wall and more pavement being added to the park.
- Some of these facilities are built and then never used.
- There are other locations in the park that could be used for the fitness court.
- This was an invitation for homeless people to sleep on a soft surface.
- Would like the open space kept open.
- Supported the facility as there were not many areas for outdoor fitness.
- The proposed facility was more complex than necessary.
- Not sold on the location but liberty park was a good option for the court.

Chairperson Shepherd read the following cards:

- Mr. Elliot Mott- Public spaces need to be repurposed; should these be a public outcry for this I see no reason this project doesn't go forward
- Mr. Bill Shorter - Money for Canyon Fountain instead of expensive equipment.

Chairperson Shepherd summarized the emailed public comments stating there were a number of comments in support and several in opposition. He stated most had similar

comments as heard previously regarding the public process, the wall, vandalism and maintenance.

Chairperson Shepherd closed the Public Hearing.

The Applicants stated public outreach needed to be done and could be made a condition of approval. They wanted to know if the Commission felt the proposal was right for Liberty Park prior to spending time and money on the public outreach. They stated this was not a proposal that had to move forward but an opportunity they wanted to explore.

The Commission and Applicants discussed the following:

- Would another less expensive options be researched and reviewed.
- If another location could be considered.
- If the proposal should be tabled or moved forward.
- The timeline for the grant and use of the funding.

The Commission discussed and stated the following:

- If the petition should be tabled or moved forward.
- The issue of the six foot wall and if there was another option for placement.
- The issues with homeless sleeping in the facility.
- If the court was really a necessity.
- The Commission's purview over the proposal and the standards for review.
- The fitness court was not inappropriate for the park.
- The process felt backwards as the public outreach should be done prior to approval.
- What would be on the backside of the wall?
- A number of issues needed to be addressed prior to approval.

#### **MOTION [7:38:34 PM](#)**

**Commissioner Harding stated based on the information in the staff report, the information presented, and the input received during the public hearing, she moved that the Historic Landmark Commission table petition PLNHLC2017-00924 for a Certificate of Appropriateness for a Minor Alteration to a future meeting. Commissioner Richardson seconded the motion. Commissioners Peters, Harding, Petro-Eschler, Richardson, Stowell and Svendsen voted "aye". The motion passed. Unanimously.**

**The meeting adjourned at [7:40:01 PM](#)**