

**SALT LAKE CITY HISTORIC LANDMARK COMMISSION MEETING**  
**This meeting was held electronically pursuant to the**  
**Salt Lake City Emergency Proclamation**  
**Thursday, January 7, 2021**

A roll is being kept of all who attended the Historic Landmark Commission Meeting. The meeting was called to order at approximately 5:30 pm. Audio recordings of the Historic Landmark Commission meetings are retained for a period of time. These minutes are a summary of the meeting. For complete commentary and presentation of the meeting, please visit <https://www.youtube.com/c/SLCLiveMeetings>.

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

Planning Staff members present at the meeting were: Wayne Mills, Planning Manager; Molly Robinson, Planning Manager; Paul Nielson, Attorney; Mayara Lima, Principal Planner; and Kelsey Lindquist, Senior Planner.

Chairperson Robert Hyde read the emergency proclamation.

**APPROVAL OF THE DECEMBER 3, 2020, MEETING MINUTES.**

**MOTION**

**Commissioner Richardson moved to approve the December 3, 2020 meeting minutes.**

**Commissioner De Lay seconded the motion. All were in favor, the motion passed unanimously.**

**REPORT OF THE CHAIR AND VICE CHAIR**

Chairperson Hyde stated he had nothing to report.

Vice Chairperson Vela stated he had nothing to report.

**REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR**

Michaela Oktay, Planning Deputy Director, stated Wasatch Community Gardens contacted Planning Staff stating they are excited about their property and extended an invitation to the Commission for a tour.

**Rezone at approximately 860 and 868 East 3rd Avenue** - Remarc Investments, representing the property owner, is requesting a Zoning Map Amendment from CN (Neighborhood Commercial) and SR-1A (Special Development Pattern Residential) to R-MU-35 (Residential/Mixed Use) at the above-listed addresses. The applicant would like to rezone the properties to allow a multi-family development on the lots, however the request is not tied to a development proposal. The properties are located within the Avenues Local Historic District and any future demolition or new construction must be approved by the Historic Landmark Commission. This is a work session only to solicit Historic Landmark Commission input. The Planning Commission voted to forward a positive recommendation to the City Council on December 2, 2020 and the City Council will make the final decision at a later date. The property is located within Council District 3, represented by Chris Wharton (Staff contact: Mayara Lima at (385) 377-7570 or [mayara.lima@slcgov.com](mailto:mayara.lima@slcgov.com)) **Case number PLNPCM2020-00703**

Mayara Lima, Principal Planner, reviewed the petition as outlined in the Staff Report (located in the case file).

The Commission and Staff discussed the following:

- Current use of the property East of the gas station
- Clarification on whether the existing property will be demolished
- Clarification on conceptual plan
- Whether there has been a study on how removing the gas station would affect the community

Marcus Robinson, Kevin Blalock and Ren Hillel, applicants, provided a presentation along with further information.

The Commission, Applicants and Staff discussed the following:

- Clarification on whether the property will be condo units or rentals
- Clarification on whether the property is a PUD
- Whether the buildings would be zero setback to lot lines
- Landscape area and whether there are any common areas
- Parking
- Distance between the proposed development and the existing contributing structure
- Clarification on the distance to nearest gas station
- Clarification on height of historic house that's part of the development
- Proposed footprint of the individual six units
- Whether a flat roof will be used

The Commission made the following comments:

- I believe that the proposal has been respectful in two directions to the existing property
- I don't see any issue with the compatibility with the surrounding neighborhood
- I don't think adding retail is necessary
- I think the commercial component is critical to the Avenues
- I think requiring the developer to put in mixed use with commercial residential is unrealistic

The commission were all in favor that they are not opposed to the rezone, but they do have concerns about height and mass. They intend to address them at their later approval process and hope the Council will take it into account when making their own decision.

**Saxton-Bartlett Addition at approximately 732 East 200 South** - The petitioners Nancy Saxton and Jan Bartlett are requesting a Major Alteration and Special Exception approval for the construction of a new rear addition to a contributing structure on the Freeze Mansion Landmark Site, located at 732 E. 200 S. The subject property is listed on the Salt Lake City Register of Cultural Resources as a Landmark site. The proposed addition is approximately 726 square feet in size and would result in an overall building height of 22'9" feet. The property is located within the RMF-45 (Moderate/High Density Multi-Family Residential) Council District 4, represented by Ana Valdemoros (Staff contact: Kelsey Lindquist (385) 226-7227 or kelsey.lindquist@slcgov.com) **Case numbers PLNHLC2019-01151 & PLNHLC2019-01088**

Kelsey Lindquist, Senior Planner, reviewed the petition as outlined in the Staff Report (located in the case file).

The Commission and Staff discussed the following:

- Clarification on previous work session

Commissioner Maw recused herself due to possible conflict of interest.

Wayne Gordon, applicant, provided a presentation with further details.

Jan Barlett, Nancy Saxton and Angela Dean were also available or questions.

The Commission, Staff and Applicant discussed the following:

- Clarification on whether all structure on landmark sites are considered to be contributing
- Clarification on the rear addition to the structure and whether it has gained historic significance
- Clarification on attachment D

The Commission made the following comments:

- What is being shown now is a lot more respectful to the existing original front structure than what was proposed in March of 2020
- I'm wondering if it's not in the Commission's best interest to give the applicant a little more relief with setbacks

The Commission and Applicant further discussed the following:

- Height of fence separating the lot line from the condo

The Commission further made the following comments:

- I agree with previous comments; I don't have an issue with this proposal
- I just want to say thank you to the owners and architects for really taking to heart some hard things to hear from the previous work session

**The meeting adjourned.**