

**SALT LAKE CITY HISTORIC LANDMARK COMMISSION MEETING**  
**This meeting was held electronically pursuant to the**  
**Salt Lake City Emergency Proclamation**  
**Thursday, November 5, 2020**

A roll is being kept of all who attended the Historic Landmark Commission Meeting. The meeting was called to order at [5:30:27 PM](#). Audio recordings of the Historic Landmark Commission meetings are retained for a period of time.

Present for the Historic Landmark Commission meeting were: Chairperson Kenton Peters; Vice Chairperson Robert Hyde; Commissioners Babs De Lay, John Ewanowski, Aiden Lillie, Victoria Petro-Eschler, David Richardson, and Michael Vela.

Planning Staff members present at the meeting were: Nick Norris, Planning Director; Michaela Oktay, Planning Deputy Director; Paul Nielson, Attorney; Kelsey Lindquist, Senior Planner; and Nelson Knight, Senior Planner.

Chairperson Peters read the declaration to hold an electronic meeting without an anchor site.

**APPROVAL OF THE OCTOBER 1, 2020, MEETING MINUTES. [5:35:51 PM](#)**

**MOTION [5:35:57 PM](#)**

Commissioner Richardson moved to approve the October 1, 2020 meeting minutes. Commissioner Petro-Eschler seconded the motion. The three new commissioners abstained from voting. Commissioners Hyde, Richardson, Petro-Eschler, and Vela voted "Aye". The motion passed unanimously.

**REPORT OF THE CHAIR AND VICE CHAIR [5:37:18 PM](#)**

Chairperson Peters welcomed our three new commissioners!

Vice Chairperson Hyde stated he had nothing to report.

**REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR [5:38:17 PM](#)**

Michaela Oktay let the commission know that we can make badges for HLC members to wear so if they visit a site they can show official credentials. Marlene will send out an email and each commissioner can contact HR to have one made.

**Public Comment-** Chair Peters asked if there were any members of the public who wanted to provide public comments. There were no responses from the public. Director Norris showed a presentation how to "raise the hand" on webex, he also went through all the ways the public can alert the commission and staff how to participate.

The Chair introduced Kelsey Lindquist. Commissioner Ewanowski recused himself before the item and left the meeting.

**[5:41:20 PM](#)**

**Fisher Mansion Carriage House Chemical Coating at approximately 1206 West 200 South** - CRSA, on behalf of Salt Lake City Parks and Public Lands, is requesting a Major Alteration to the Carriage House associated with the Fisher Mansion. The applicant is requesting approval to administer an anti-graffiti coating to the exterior of the Fisher Mansion Carriage House located at 1206 W. 200 S. The anti-graffiti coating is associated with the approved adaptive reuse of the carriage house as a River Recreation and

Community Engagement Hub. The subject property is located at 1206 W. 200 S., which is designated as a Salt Lake City Landmark Site. Both structures, the mansion and the carriage house, are listed as contributing to the landmark site. The subject property is located within the I (Institutional) zoning district and within Council District 2, represented by Andrew Johnston. (Staff Contact: Kelsey Lindquist at (385) 226-7227 or kelsey.lindquist@slcgov.com) **Case number PLNHLC2020-00509**

Kelsey Lindquist, Senior Planner, reviewed the petition as outlined in the Staff Report (located in the case file). She explained that the coating was to protect the building from graffiti. Staff's main concern was the impact of the coating to affect the sheen. However, after a test area, it was difficult to see a change on the masonry. She stated Staff recommended that the Historic Landmark Commission approve the application.

Parks and Public lands is worried about the carriage house being tagged. The tag removal team tries to remove tags gently but they have done it before on the Fischer mansion and it had an effect. The carriage house is somewhat vulnerable. The coating is sacrificial and appropriate.

The Commission and Staff discussed the following:

- Questions about the sacrificial coating, did it need to be reapplied. Coating gets removed when the building is tagged. It isn't permanent, it's a surface coating.
- What is the coating called? Why would we be opposed to it? Kelsey explained generally on masonry we discourage coating it for several reasons where it may damage the integrity of the bricks such as moisture issues.
- Wonderful history of the city buying it and what is the city doing with the mansion itself? Kelsey explained the history of the carriage house since the mansion isn't part of the project, there is no funding to work on a use for the main building first.

Zach Clegg, applicant, explained the reasoning and specifics of the Prosoco coating product.

Commissioner DeLay asked if we use it on other buildings. Mr. Clegg said it came recommended by Parks.

Tyler Murdock, explained we use the product in Parks but not sure how many historic buildings have used this coating. He shared some slides and spoke about graffiti issues and how removal without a coating can damage the brick. Pitting occurred, the brick used on the mansion and the carriage house is soft in composition. The coating does change the brick slightly but they think it is a necessary and minimal intervention.

The Commission, Staff and Applicant discussed the following:

- Questions were asked about other security measures being taken on the site? Site now fenced, there will be a gate from the Jordan Parkway trail to the carriage house. There will be cameras but there will eventually be an office there which will be good for more eyes on the street. There are also some patrols of the parkway trail.
- What is the long term operational idea? There will be a new boat ramp that will help activate the space next to the carriage house. Long term there will be kayak rental.
- A light power wash removes the graffiti according to the staff report. However, there are two other products mentioned to remove the coating. What is going to be used? Water or the other products? The applicant stated that the first step is to use a simple water soap mixture, in extreme graffiti cases, they will move into using the other removal products.
- How is Parks removing graffiti at the moment? They have been using high pressure water which has resulted in some pitting.

- What is the nature of the brick on the mansion? The applicant explained it is a soft clay brick that hasn't been sand blasted, at least since the City has owned the building. The brick has been weathered a bit just due to age. The brick is in good condition and the city has incorporated a deal of masonry repair such as tuckpointing. Even with the earthquake, the building is in good condition.
- Does the City wanted to use the Prosoco on the mansion, would they do so? Applicant thought it to be a good idea.

#### **PUBLIC HEARING [6:06:38 PM](#)**

Chairperson Peters opened the Public Hearing;

Soren Simonsen, Executive Director of Jordan River Commission – Stated he is excited to see this project moving forward. Acknowledges concern about coating but project itself will be an active deterrent to graffiti. Significant initiative of Rocky Mountain Power to slowly decommission the power plant west of the property. Hopeful the area will transition to a vibrant urban neighborhood. Preserving this site is important to the future.

Seeing no one else wished to speak and there were no emails; Chairperson Peters closed the Public Hearing.

Peters asked the applicant if they wished to respond. Zach Clegg said they hope one day, the coating won't be needed. Hoped they approved it.

Chair Peters said they were moving into executive session. Asked Babs if she wanted to make a motion.

Commissioner Richardson wanted to expand the coating to expand to the rest of the property, that it should be allowed to be applied to the entire property. Paul Nielson explained the scope of the petition is important, the notice indicated the carriage house only.

#### **MOTION [6:13:22 PM](#)**

**Commissioner Richardson stated, based on the analysis and findings listed in the staff report, the information presented, and the input received during the public hearing, I move that the Commission approve petition PLNHLC2020-00509, a request for a Certificate of Appropriateness for the Major Alteration (chemical coating) of the carriage house structure at 1206 W. 200 S. with the following condition.**

**Commissioner Vela moved to second the motion. Commissioners DeLay, Hyde, Lillie, Petro-Eschler, Richardson, and Vela voted “Aye”. The motion passed unanimously.**

#### **[6:14:48 PM](#)**

**Harvard Avenue Landscape Alterations at approximately 1362 E Harvard Avenue** - Dean Anesi, Landscape Designer, on behalf of the property owners, Joan Hammond, and Joe Dick, is requesting approval from the City for site grading, landscaping, and a 20” high, stone veneer wall installed in the front yard without a Certificate of Appropriateness at the above-listed address. This type of project must be reviewed as a minor alteration to a property in a historic district. The house is a contributing building within the SLC Harvard Heights Historic District and is zoned R-1-7,000 Single-Family Residential District. The subject property is within Council District 6, represented by Dan Dugan. (Staff contact: Nelson Knight at (801) 535-7758 or nelson.knight@slcgov.com) **Case number PLNHLC2020-00692**

Nelson Knight, Senior Planner, reviewed the petition as outlined in the Staff Report (located in the case file). He stated Staff recommended that the Historic Landmark Commission deny the petition and went through the reasoning and the history of the designation and mention of the importance of landscape features when the neighborhood was planned and developed. 42 out of 26 buildings are considered contributing when the district was created. Project site was built in 1938. Explained that the applicants have had several different approvals but what is before the HLC tonight is the front yard landscaping and the wall. Discussed the enforcement case. Deed restrictions speak to the sloping.

Discussed pattern of sloping yards and the intentional design of the subdivision. Reflected the picturesque style. Major point of issue is the project and that grade changes according to the Design Guidelines, should be considered in immediate and when it disturbs the historic context, should be discouraged. Showed photos. Still sloping character evident on this side of the street. Some other examples in the district and there have been changes in the area on the time. One distinguishing characteristic in the nomination is the importance of the streetscape and site features. Staff found conflicts with several standards, referred to staff's report.

The Commission and Staff discussed the following:

- You can see the slope history on google. Interesting to know the sloping was intentional.
- Importance of the standards and guidelines and the options if the project was denied.
- Street trees and the storm. Cul-de-sac across the street? They are all in the same National Register District, all of Yalecrest. City has a local designation process resulting in several smaller local historic districts within Yalecrest National Register Historic District.
- The other walls in the neighborhood, like across the street, were they done before or after the local district was established? Ones across the street were done, to staff's knowledge prior to the district adoption.
- When enforcement came, wall wasn't done, told applicant they were continuing at their own risk.

Joe Dick, applicant, was in attendance and shared a presentation and discussed the chronology of the projects he's done on site, particular water issues on his site. They accept the historic district regulations. Because of communication errors, this project came under enforcement. They accept that ultimately it is their responsibility. Trying to make modifications that would match the original on the entire site, be appropriate. Discussed water issues on the site, showed sidewalk sinking and causes ice buildup. Discussed that the wall was really more of an elevated French drain, discussed how that is to function. Issues generally always come down to water.

The Commission, Staff and Applicant discussed the following:

- Chair Peters clarified the issue with the water moving down the west towards the other neighbor.
- Applicant clarified some work they did on both sides of the property to resolve issues.

#### **PUBLIC HEARING [6:54:44 PM](#)**

Chairperson Peters opened the Public Hearing;

Amy Powell, west neighbors – Stated that the applicants have been incredibly respectful of the 1920 property they own. There is still a slope despite the 20 inch barrier they created. They appreciate them dealing with water issues. She has water issues too. This barrier deals with water that won't be flowing in their yard.

Cindy Cromer – Stated that the issue of historic landscapes and its context. Historic Landscapes are part of the context. Disconnect between the materials of the wall aren't in sync with the historic house. National

Register denied in past when a site had the historic landscape is gone. It is a key element. City needs to put more emphasis on these historic landscapes in the future.

Lynn Pershing - Stated she is familiar with French drains. Curious why the French drain wasn't installed without having to put up the wall? Would like the applicant to expand on that.

Dean Anesi - Stated it is possible to do without a wall.

Michaela Oktay read an email from Danielle Wolfe, it was also forwarded to the HLC.

Mr. Dick responded to the public's comments. He explained the French drain and didn't have a way to exit the water above grade.

Commissioner Lillie asked the applicant what other options were discussed other than a wall. Mr. Dick didn't see any other option. It was intended to bring the water forward quickly, back yard is hardscaped. Worried about public safety in the ROW and water near the historic house. There were alternatives, below and above.

Seeing no one else wished to speak; Chairperson Peters closed the Public Hearing.

The Commission made the following comments:

- If it was historically done, it would have cock ups. Hard because agree with staff but also agree with the applicants dealing with water issues.
- HLC is not the drainage commission. Here to review historical aspects of work done.
- Landscaping is a defining feature, visual continuity was wanted in the beginning of the neighborhood. This is a violation but you see other walls on both sides of the street. Some vines covering other walls that softens things a bit.
- General Acknowledgement of good points and negative points to the project. No ill intent on side of the applicant. Several are torn on how to move forward. It's a balancing act, this decision.
- Commend applicant on their work on the site. Well done.
- We should consider how to stop people from continuing to do this work since it is in the historic district.
- House restored, wall isn't visually obtrusive but contradicts the letter of the law. They got a number of approvals and this one fell between the cracks.
- It is important to deal with water issues in older neighborhoods, their dealing with water is important.
- Is there a way to approve this, the some of the standards are quite problematic in finding a way.
- Discussed ways in which they need to make alternative motion to staff's recommended motion. Landscapes get changed. There is a way to add landscape to not modify a wall. Something can be planted to drape over the wall. There is a middle ground to acknowledge visual continuity.

The commission discussed ways in which the commission can approve, table or deny the petition.

**MOTION [7:42:47 PM](#)**

**Commissioner Richardson stated, I move that we table this item and ask the applicant specifically, to revisit the design objectives 1.1 and 1.6.**

**Commissioner Vela seconded the motion. Commissioners Vela, Richardson, Petro-Eschler, Lillie, Hyde, Ewanowski, and DeLay voted "Aye". The motion passed unanimously.**

[7:46:31 PM](#)

**Special Exception Text Changes** - Deleting Special Exceptions from the Zoning Ordinance and Associated Ordinance Changes. Mayor Erin Mendenhall, at the request of the Planning Division, is requesting amendments to the zoning ordinance regulations regarding special exceptions. The proposal would delete and eliminate the special exception process from the zoning ordinance. A special exception is a minor alteration of a dimensional requirement of the zoning ordinance or addresses accessory uses and structures. There are more than forty special exceptions authorized in the zoning ordinance. The proposal addresses each special exception and results in each special exception being deleted, permitted, or authorized through a different process in the zoning ordinance. Some special exceptions that will become permitted include changes to standards to add flexibility and reduce impacts. Special exceptions are approved by staff of the Planning Division, the Planning Commission, or Historic Landmark Commission. The ability to make exceptions to bulk and lot dimensional requirements in local historic districts will be retained through the processes outlined in 21A.34.020 of the City Code. The proposed amendments involve multiple chapters of the Zoning Ordinance. Related provisions of Title 21A-Zoning may be amended as part of this petition. The changes would apply Citywide. (Staff contact: Nick Norris at (801) 535-6173 or [nick.norris@slcgov.com](mailto:nick.norris@slcgov.com)) **Case number PLNPCM2020-0606**

Nick Norris, Planning Director, reviewed the petition as outlined in the Staff Report (located in the case file).

The Commission and Staff discussed the following:

- Retention of HLC authority when it pertains to special exceptions
- The importance of addressing the multiple special exceptions authorized and fixing the code
- Overall a valuable and well thought out amendment.

**PUBLIC HEARING** [8:11:00 PM](#)

Chairperson Peters opened the Public Hearing;

Cindy Cromer – Stated that the importance of the special exceptions authorized by the HLC. She mentioned projects of different use and magnitude that were only possible since the institution of HLC authorization of special exceptions. A well done project.

Seeing no one else wished to speak; Chairperson Peters closed the Public Hearing.

The Commission made the following comments:

- All for simplifying the process. All HLC authorities are maintained, simplified and a step in the right direction.
- Supportive of all the changes, a great idea.

**MOTION** [8:14:33 PM](#)

**Commissioner Hyde stated, based on the information in the staff report, the information presented, and the input received during the public hearing, I move that the Historic Landmark Commission recommend that the City Council approve the proposed text amendment, PLNPCM2020-00606 Special Exception Text Amendment.**

**Commissioner Richardson seconded the motion. Commissioners Lillie, DeLay, Richardson, Ewanowski, Vela, Petro-Eschler, and Hyde voted “Aye”. The motion passed unanimously.**

Nick stated this is version 18 of the project. All city departments have worked on this and that work should be acknowledged.

[8:17:00 PM](#)

**Chairperson and Vice Chairperson elections**

Kenton stepping down after two years of being the Chair.

[8:17:29 PM](#) Commissioner Richardson moved that Robert Hyde be the Chairperson and Michael Vela be the Vice Chair.

Both commissioners were willing to serve. All were in favor; the vote was unanimous.

Michaela will set up a check in meeting to be scheduled with the new Chair and Vice Chair.

Many thanks to Kenton serving as Chair so long!

**The meeting adjourned at [8:21:02 PM](#)**