



**PARK CITY MUNICIPAL CORPORATION
HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD
MINUTES OF OCTOBER 6, 2021**

BOARD MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE: Randy Scott-Chair, Lola Beatlebrox, Puggy Holmgren, John Hutchings, Tana Toly

EX OFFICIO MEMBERS: Gretchen Milliken, Planning Director; Rebecca Ward, Assistant Planning Director; Aiden Lillie, Planner; Mark Harrington, City Attorney; Julie Schultz, Executive Office Administrator

1. ROLL CALL

Chair Randy Scott called the meeting to order at 5:00 p.m. and a roll call was conducted.

The Historic Preservation Board meeting was conducted virtually via Zoom. The public was able to submit comments during the meeting.

Determination of the Health and Safety Risk under the OPMA

Chair Scott read the Determination of Health and Safety Risk under OPMA. Notice of electronic meeting and how to comment virtually.

The Chair issued a written determination that because of the public health emergency, conducting a meeting with an anchor location presents a substantial risk to the health and safety of those who may attend in person. This determination is based on the ongoing risks and infection rates statewide and in Summit County. For these reasons, this meeting will be an electronic meeting without an anchor location. Planning Commission members will connect electronically. Public comments will be accepted virtually. To comment virtually, use eComment or raise your hand on Zoom. Written comments submitted before or during the meeting will be entered into the public record but will not be read aloud. For more information on attending virtually and to listen live, please go to www.parkcity.org

2. MINUTES APPROVAL

A. Consideration to Approve the Historic Preservation Board Meeting Minutes from August 4, 2021.

Board Member Holmgren believed that Historic Preservation Board Members needed to be more diligent about stating their names when speaking. She pointed out that there were places in the Meeting Minutes that were missing the names of those speaking.

MOTION: Board Member Beatlebrox moved to APPROVE the Minutes of August 4, 2021, as written. Board Member Holmgren seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

B. Consideration to Approve the Historic Preservation Board Meeting Minutes from September 1, 2021.

Board Member Beatlebrox reported that she served as the Chair Pro Tempore at the September 1, 2021, Historic Preservation Board Meeting. As a result, she believed she would need to sign off on the minutes rather than Chair Scott. This was verified by Chair Scott.

MOTION: Board Member Beatlebrox moved to APPROVE the Minutes of September 1, 2021, with the change that the Chair Pro Tempore sign the Meeting Minutes. Board Member Holmgren seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

3. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS

No eComments were submitted and no hands were raised on Zoom.

4. STAFF/BOARD COMMUNICATIONS AND DISCLOSURES

Board Member Hutchings reported that a historic home on Park Avenue, between 10th and 11th Streets, had the front siding ripped off. He did not recall seeing that item come before the Board. Chair Scott noticed the same thing. When the owners restored the home, the paint would bubble on the front. He suspected there may have been water issues because the paint continued to bubble. Board Member Hutchings pointed out that it is a historic home built from historic material and it would make sense that approval from the Board would be required before the siding was removed. City Planner, Aiden Lillie noted that there were no Historic District Design Review ("HDDR") applications from that property. However, Staff would contact the homeowners and look into the concerns expressed by the Board.

5. REGULAR AGENDA

A. Historic District Grant Program.

Planner Lillie reported that the Historic District Grant Program discussions were originally scheduled to take place at the current Historic Preservation Board Meeting. However, there was a great amount of interest and Staff wanted to ensure that the applications were presented in an efficient manner. As a result, the request was to continue the item until the November 3, 2021, Historic Preservation Board Meeting.

MOTION: Board Member Beatlebrox moved to CONTINUE the Historic District Grant Program discussion to the November 3, 2021, Historic Preservation Board Meeting. Board Member Hutchings seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

B. 1002.5 Norfolk Avenue – Historic District Design Review – The Applicant Proposes Temporary Relocation and Disassembly and Reassembly to Accommodate a New Addition to a Landmark Historic Structure. PL-21-04761.

Planner Lillie presented the Staff Report and reported that the item was a proposal for temporary relocation, disassembly, and reassembly for 1002.5 Norfolk Avenue. The applicant was proposing partial disassembly and reassembly, as well as temporary relocation for the Landmark Historic Structure to accommodate structural upgrades and a rear addition on the property. Planner Lillie shared a photograph from 1941 and a more recent photograph of the structure for context.

At the August 4, 2021, Historic Preservation Board Meeting, the Board approved material deconstruction of a portion of the rear to accommodate the addition. However, the Board tabled the proposal to panelize the structure. After that discussion, the conclusion was that temporary relocation and partial disassembly and reassembly of a small portion of the west elevation would be a preferable option. Planner Lillie explained that the reason panelization was initially proposed was to accommodate excavation machinery and to enable construction on the rear addition.

Staff recommended the Historic Preservation Board approve the temporary relocation of the Landmark Historic Structure. Once the addition is constructed, the landmark structure will return to the original location. Planner Lillie shared a site plan to show where the building would be placed temporarily during construction.

On September 28, 2021, the Planning Director and Chief Building Official determined that the temporary relocation would help to avoid hazardous conditions and enhance the preservation of the structure. On August 25, 2021, a licensed Structural Engineer wrote a report related to findings on the site. That report concluded that if the building was lifted it would need to be braced prior to lifting. The Structural Engineer proposed that a bracing

plan be submitted for review and approval. This would allow for proper evaluation of the structure and a bracing plan based on existing conditions.

Staff also recommended that the Historic Preservation Board approve the partial disassembly and reassembly of a portion of the west elevation. Elevation drawings were shared that depicted Panels A and B on the south elevation and Panel C on the north elevation. Planner Lillie explained that in the Land Management Code, Chapter 15-11-14, the Historic Preservation Board is required to find that the proposal complies with certain requirements. For instance:

- A licensed Structural Engineer certified that the Historic Structure could not reasonably be moved intact:
 - Shen Engineers, Inc. visited 1002.5 Norfolk Avenue on February 19, 2021, and determined the following on August 25, 2021:
 - The exterior and interior walls were 1x12 installed vertically. They had no capacity for wind, seismic, or gravity loads.

Planner Lillie explained that the Historic Preservation Board was able to determine, with input from the Planning Director and Chief Building Official, that the unique conditions and the quality of the Historic Preservation Plan warranted the proposed disassembly and reassembly. She explained that unique conditions included but were not limited to:

- Problematic site or structural conditions that precluded temporary lifting or moving of the building as a single unit;
- Physical conditions of the existing materials prevented temporary lifting or moving of the building and the applicant had demonstrated that panelization would result in the preservation of a greater amount of historic material; and
- All other alternatives have been shown to result in additional damage or loss of historic materials.

On September 28, 2021, the Planning Director and Chief Building Official determined that partial panelization would help enhance the preservation of the structure. The Historic Preservation Board has the authority to approve the proposal by taking input from the Planning Director and Chief Building Official and determine that the unique conditions warranted the proposed partial disassembly and reassembly. Planner Lillie noted that Staff had not received any public input on the item.

The applicant's representative, Jonathan DeGray reported that the agenda item was a follow-up to previous discussions. It would move the building to the side to allow sufficient room on the east side for equipment. To do that, the four-foot section with three walls would need to be panelized. Board Member Beatlebrox had questions about the porch. Mr. DeGray explained that the porch roof would be reconstructed due to the structural condition of the roof. Board Member Beatlebrox pointed out that there were also the railing and porch supports to consider. Mr. DeGray believed that those materials were in

good shape and could potentially be saved. He suggested that there be a Condition of Approval for Staff to evaluate the materials.

Chair Scott opened the public hearing. There were no public comments. The public hearing was closed.

MOTION: Board Member Holmgren moved to APPROVE the temporary relocation and disassembly and reassembly to accommodate a new addition to a Landmark Historic Structure at 1002.5 Norfolk Avenue, subject to the following:

Findings of Fact

Background

1. 1002.5 Norfolk Avenue is a one-story cross-wing house built around 1893.
2. 1002.5 Norfolk Avenue is a Landmark Historic Structure on the Park City Historic Sites Inventory.
3. On May 12, 2021, the Applicant submitted a Historic District Design Review (HDDR) Application.

Temporary Relocation

4. The Applicant proposes the temporary Relocation of the Landmark Historic Structure to protect the Landmark Structure during the construction of a rear addition. After the addition is constructed, the Landmark Structure is proposed to be returned to its original location.
5. On August 25, 2021, a licensed structural engineer, Henry Shen of Shen Engineers, Inc., wrote a report of findings based on a February 19, 2021 site investigation (Exhibit F). Shen concluded the following, "Considering the age and rotted condition of the building, and the differential settlement of 6", if the building is to be lifted, it will require the building be braced prior to lifting it. We propose to provide a bracing plan for review and approval by the chief building official once the interior of the building is demolished. This will allow us to do a proper evaluation of the structure and a bracing plan based on actual existing conditions".
6. The Historic Preservation Board approved the temporary Relocation to protect the Landmark Historic Structure during the construction of a rear addition, subject to the Conditions of Approval below.

Panelization

7. On February 19, 2021, Shen Engineers, Inc. visited 1002.5 Norfolk Avenue and completed a Physical Conditions Report.
8. The report determined the following:
 - a) It is assumed the main roof existing joists are 2x4 at 24" on center on a sloped roof spanning 8'-0" to 12'-0". The 12'-0" roof joists are 12% capacity of the code. The 8'-0" roof joists are 16% capacity of the code. If so, they need to be upgraded or replaced with new roof joists. It is suggested to reframe the roof ridge and valley beams and installing new roof joists.
 - b) The existing roof deck is 1x wood plank installed perpendicular to the existing joists. It doesn't have any capacity of shear diaphragm value. Suggest installing new 5/8" plywood or OSB with 10d @ 6" on center nailing.
 - c) The existing main and crawl space floor joists are 2x6 @ 24" on center spanning 12'-0. Most of them were rotted out. They have to be replaced.
 - d) All the existing headers need to be upgraded. We will review each one when the design is available.
 - e) The whole exterior and interior walls are 1x12 installed vertically. They have no capacity for wind, seismic, or gravity loads. Most of the 1x12 plank walls are rotted.
 - f) The north side of the existing building is supported by sandstone foundation walls. The south side of the existing building doesn't have any footing. On the basement area, the footing is sandstone. On the non-basement portion, the existing foundation walls were built with woodpiles and sandstone. 90% of them were rotted out. We suggest tearing off the existing foundation walls. New reinforced concrete footing and foundation walls need to be poured for supporting the existing building and forming the frost depth of 40" minimum.
 - g) Due to the age and rotted condition of the building, the differential settlement of 6". To move the building and straighten it would cause the structure to fail and collapse. Based on these observations, we feel the building cannot be reasonably moved intact.
9. On February 19, 2021, the Chief Building Official, Planning Director, and Building and Planning staff visited 1002.5 Norfolk Avenue.

10. The Chief Building Official and Planning Director determined that this unique condition and the quality of the Historic Preservation Plan warrant the proposed panelization.
11. The Historic Preservation Board approved panelization of the Landmark Historic Structure.

Conclusions of Law

1. The proposal complies with Land Management Code § 15-11-14, Disassembly and Reassembly Of A Historic Building Or Historic Structure; and Land Management Code § 15-11-13, Relocation and/or Reorientation of a Historic Building or Historic Structure, and § 15-11-9, Preservation Policy; § 15-13-2; and Design Guidelines For Historic Residential Sites.

Conditions of Approval

1. The Applicant must submit a preservation plan and construction mitigation plan which demonstrate that a licensed, professional building mover will move the building and protect it while being stored. Both plans shall include documentation from a structural engineer certifying that the temporary Relocation will not have a detrimental effect on the structural soundness of the Landmark Structure. The Applicant shall complete a Historic Preservation Plan, subject to Chief Building Official and Planning Director approval prior to issuance of a building permit.
2. The historic structure shall be secured and protected from adverse weather conditions, water infiltration, and vandalism before, during, and after the relocation/reorientation process.
3. If rehabilitation of the historic structure is delayed, temporary improvements, that are to be approved by the Planning Department, such as roof repairs, secured and/or covered windows and doors, and adequate ventilation shall be made to the structure to protect the historic fabric until rehabilitation can be accomplished.
4. The preservation plan detailing the steps and procedures for relocation or reorientation of a historic building shall be completed and approved by the Planning and Building Departments. This plan shall outline, step by step, the proposed work to relocate and/or reorient the building to ensure that the least destructive method of moving the building will be employed.
5. A historic building shall be moved in one piece whenever possible. When problematic structural or relocation route conditions preclude moving a building as a single unit, then partial disassembly into large sections may

be acceptable. Total disassembly of building components shall be avoided except under extreme situations.

6. Buildings and their components shall be protected from damage during the moving process by adding bracing, strapping, and by temporarily infilling door and window openings for structural rigidity.
7. The setting for a relocated historic building shall be selected for compatibility with the character of the structure and with the character of the original site.
8. The applicant is responsible for notifying the Building Department prior to proposing any changes to this approval.
9. The Applicant shall submit in writing any changes, modifications, or deviations from the approved scope of work for Planning Director review and approval/denial in accordance with the applicable standards prior to construction.
10. Where the Historic exterior materials cannot be repaired, they shall be replaced with materials that match the original in all respects: scale, dimension, texture, profile, material, and finish. Prior to removing and replacing Historic materials, the applicant shall demonstrate to the Planning Director and Historic Preservation Planner that the materials are no longer safe and/or serviceable and cannot be repaired to a safe and/or serviceable condition. No Historic materials may be disposed of prior to advance approval by the Planning Director and Historic Preservation Planner.
11. A Soils Report completed by a geotechnical engineer as well as a temporary shoring plan, if applicable, will be required at the time of building permit application.
12. The Historic Structure shall be returned to its original grade following construction of a foundation. When the original grade cannot be achieved, generally no more than six inches (6") of the new foundation shall be visible above final grade on the primary and secondary facades. The site shall be re-graded so that all water drains away from the Structure and does not enter the foundation. A plinth, or trim board at the base of the Historic Structure, shall be added to visually anchor the Historic Structure to the new foundation.
13. The Applicant shall provide the City with a financial Guarantee to ensure compliance with the conditions and terms of the Historic Preservation Plan prior to submission of a building permit.

14. The addition shall be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future the essential form and integrity of the Landmark Historic Structure could be restored.
15. The addition shall be visually subordinate to Historic Structures when viewed from the Right-of-Way.
16. The Applicant shall complete Historic District Design Review and approval prior to issuance of a building permit.
17. Where the addition abuts the Historic Structure, a clear transitional element between the old and new should be designed and constructed.
18. In-line additions shall be avoided.
19. Panelization shall be done using recognized preservation methods.
20. The Applicant shall complete measured drawings of the structure or element to be disassembled/reassembled.
21. The Applicant shall submit a thorough photographic survey of the interior and exterior elevations as well as architectural details of the structure, including site and location views from all compass points, exterior elevations, and interior elevations of each room.
22. Written plans detailing the disassembly and reassembly steps and procedures shall be completed and approved by the Planning and Building Departments.
23. Structures shall be disassembled in the largest workable pieces possible.
24. To ensure accurate reassembly, all parts of the Building, Structure, or element shall be marked as they are systematically separated from the Structure. Contrasting colors of paint or carpenter wax crayons shall be used to establish a marking code for each component. The markings shall be removable and shall be made on surfaces that will be hidden from view when the Structure is reassembled.
25. Important architectural features of a Historic Building or Structure shall be removed, marked, and stored before the Structure or element of the Structure is disassembled.
26. The process of disassembly of a Historic Structure shall be recorded through photographic, still, or video.

27. Wall panels and roof surfaces shall be protected with rigid materials, such as sheets of plywood when there is a risk of damage during the disassembly/storage/reassembly process.
28. Disassembled components—trim, windows, doors, wall panels, roof elements, etc.— shall be securely stored on-site in a storage trailer or off-site in a garage/warehouse/trailer until needed for reassembly.
29. The original orientation and siting shall be replicated as closely as possible.
30. New foundations and additions shall follow the Design Guidelines.
31. The Landmark Historic Structure must be reassembled in the original form, location, placement, and orientation.
32. Staff shall visit the site and evaluate whether the material on the porch railing can be preserved.

Board Member Toly seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Board.

C. 1129 Park Avenue – Historic District Design Review – The Historic Preservation Board Approved Material Deconstruction and Lifting of the Significant Historic Structure. During Initial Construction, the Applicant Discovered the Structure is not Sound and Proposes Reconstruction. PL-21-04978.

Assistant Planning Director, Rebecca Ward reported that Mr. DeGray, the Project Architect, and Wendy Smith, the property owner, were both present at the Historic Preservation Board Meeting to answer questions. Director Ward presented the Staff Report and explained that the item was a proposal for the reconstruction of a Significant Historic Structure at 1129 Park Avenue. On June 2, 2021, the Board reviewed the project and approved lifting the structure for a new foundation. However, during the initial work, the applicant uncovered the original log construction. The log wall construction sat directly on soil. The bottom logs and floor system framing were rotted. In addition, there was no connection between the walls and the floor system. It was noted that the walls were built with stacked logs sandwiched between framed walls.

The applicant was requesting a modification to the HDDR to reconstruct the Significant Historic Structure based on the as-built floor plans, roof plans, and elevations. Assistant Director Ward reported that Chapter 15-11-15 of the Land Management Code, established the following three criteria for the Board to consider for reconstruction:

- The Chief Building Official would determine whether the Significant Historic Structure was hazardous or dangerous, pursuant to Section 116.1 of the International Building Code;
- The Significant Historic Structure could not be made safe and/or serviceable through repair; and
- The form, features, detailing, placement, orientation, and location of the Significant Historic Structure would be accurately depicted by means of new construction, based on as-built measured drawings, historic records, and/or current or historic photographs.

The Planning Director and Chief Building Official visited the site and it was determined that based on the findings, the structure was dangerous, pursuant to Section 116.1 of the International Building Code. The Chief Building Official also determined that due to the state of the material, the structure could not be made safe or serviceable through repair. Assistant Director Ward explained that this was due to the primary log structure and the base layer logs that had deteriorated and were not attached to a floor. It was recommended that the structure be demolished and reconstructed based on the as-built measured drawings, historical records, and historical photographs.

Assistant Director Ward reported that as part of the HDDR application, the applicant submitted as-built floor plans, roof plans, and elevations. The as-built plans showed the covered front entry porch, which was constructed after 1949. The Board's determination for the original approval required that the front entry porch be removed so the home would be restored to an early 1900s structure. As a result, Staff recommended Condition of Approval 1, that the reconstruction of the Significant Historic Structure not include the front entry porch. Assistant Director Ward stated that the Historic Site Form established the details related to the construction of the structure. Condition of Approval 9 requires that the applicant submit an updated Historic Preservation Plan to reflect the reconstruction. This would need to be approved by the Planning Director and Chief Building Official before moving forward with work on the structure.

Staff recommended that the Historic Preservation Board conduct a public hearing and consider approval of the reconstruction of 1129 Park Avenue, subject to the Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Conditions of Approval outlined in the Draft Final Action Letter. No public input was received on the item.

Chair Scott opened the public hearing. There were no public comments. The public hearing was closed.

Discussions were had about the history of the structure and the proposed reconstruction. Planning Director, Gretchen Milliken read a letter that the new owner received from the descendants of Mable Larsen Sundstrom. The home property was purchased by Albert Sundstrom in 1930. It had been the property of his parents since 1909. When Mr. Sundstrom purchased the property there was a log building at 1129 Park Avenue. It was used as a stable for horses at one time. After Mr. Sundstrom purchased the property, he

turned the log building into his machine shop. On December 25, 1932, Mr. and Ms. Sundstrom were married. In the early 1930s, Mr. Sundstrom sold his machines to purchase materials to turn the log building into their home. A material called Celotex was placed over the logs to give them a smooth surface. A kitchen was built on the back of the log home, which was completed between 1943 and 1944. In 1945 and 1946, an additional bedroom was added and in the early 1950s, a third bedroom was placed in the back of the home. Mr. Sundstrom passed away in 1979 and Ms. Sundstrom lived in the home until she turned 100.

Board Member Toly believed the intention was to bring the structure back to a time period in the 1940s. Board Member Beatlebrox wondered if it was possible to have a condition about where the materials end up. Director Milliken explained that they could ask that the materials be properly documented so that photographs, construction methods, and the Sundstrom history could be added to the Historic Sites Inventory. Ms. Smith reported that the material would be opened up to artisans so they could utilize the material. Additionally, she was in contact with Dalton Gackle from the Park City Museum. She wanted to see that the materials were used in some way.

MOTION: Board Member Beatlebrox moved to APPROVE the reconstruction of 1129 Park Avenue subject to the following:

Findings of Fact

1. 1129 Park Avenue was built sometime before 1901 and appears on the 1889 Sanborn Insurance map, the first map for this area.
2. On May 13, 2021, the City Council enacted Ordinance No. 2021-23, approving the Jupiter Moons Plat Amendment to create a 4,699.50-square-foot Lot for 1129 Park Avenue to accommodate a Duplex, with access from Woodside Avenue.
3. A Duplex is a Conditional Use in the Historic Residential – 1 Zoning District. Planning Department
4. On June 9, 2021, the Planning Commission approved a Conditional Use Permit for a Duplex on the site.
5. On June 2, 2021, the Historic Preservation Board approved lifting the Significant Historic Structure for a new foundation and the Material Deconstruction of a portion of the rear façade to accommodate an addition.
6. The Historic Preservation Board denied retention of the covered front entry porch, which was constructed after 1949.

7. During initial work, the Applicant uncovered the original log construction of the Significant Historic Structure and discovered the following:

Once interior demolition exposed the perimeter walls of the historic form, it was found that the log wall construction was sitting directly on soil. The bottom logs and floor system framing are rotted. Similar to the conditions found at 909 Woodside, there is no connection between the walls and floor system that would allow sufficient structural integrity for the building to be lifted as a unit.

Furthermore, because of the way the walls have been built, stacked logs sandwiched between framed walls, panelization of walls as units is unlikely to be successful due to the weight and lack of connection between logs and between logs and the framed walls.

Based on these observations, we propose to reconstruct the historic form per the drawings in the permit application set.

8. The Applicant requested modification to the June 2, 2021, Historic Preservation Board approval of the lifting of the Significant Historic Structure and Material Deconstruction of a portion of the rear façade to request Reconstruction of the Significant Historic Site.
9. The Chief Building Official determined the Significant Historic Structure is hazardous or dangerous pursuant to Section 116.1 of the International Building Code:

Based on the findings of an inspection performed by the Chief Building Official and Deputy Planning Director on August 26, 2021, the 1129 Park Avenue structure has been determined to be considered dangerous pursuant to section 116.1 of the 2018 International Building Code: Planning Department "...the structure is dangerous to human life and or the public welfare...."

10. The Chief Building Official determined the Significant Historic Structure cannot be made safe and/or serviceable through repair:

Due to the state of the material and structural members the building cannot be made safe or serviceable through repair. The structure is primarily a log structure, and the base layer logs are deteriorated and not attached to a floor or foundation creating the impossibility of lifting or panelizing the structure. Staff's recommendation would be to demolish and reconstruct the building based on the as-built measured drawings and historical records/photographs.

11. The form, features, detailing, placement, orientation, and location of the Significant Historic Structure will be accurately depicted by means of new construction based on as-built measured drawings, historic records, and current or Historic photographs.

Conclusions of Law

1. The proposal meets the criteria outlined in Land Management Code Section 15- 11-15, Reconstruction Of An Existing Historic Building Or Historic Structure.
2. The proposal meets the criteria outlined in Land Management Code Section 15- 13-4, Reconstruction, as conditioned below.

Conditions of Approval

1. Reconstruction shall be guided by the as-built floor plans, roof plans, and elevations, but the covered front entry porch constructed after 1949 shall not be Reconstructed (See Attachment 1).
2. Reconstruction shall include recreating the documented design of exterior features such as roof shape, architectural detailing, windows, entrances, steps, and doors, and the historic spatial relationships of the early 1900s Structure.
3. Reconstruction shall include measures to preserve and reuse any remaining historic materials found to be safe and/or serviceable.
4. The Reconstructed Significant Structure shall accurately duplicate the appearance in materials, design, color, and texture.
5. The Reconstructed Significant Structure shall duplicate the setting, placement, and orientation of the original Structure.
6. The Reconstruction shall re-establish the Historic relationship between the building and historic site features. Planning Department
7. The Significant Historic Structure shall not be reconstructed on a location other than the original site.
8. Significant Vegetation shall be protected and preserved during and after construction.
9. The Applicant shall submit an updated Historic Preservation Plan reflecting reconstruction. The Planning Director and Chief Building Official must

review and approve the updated Plan prior to any demolition of the Significant Historic Structure.

Board Member Holmgren seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Board.

D. 1274 Park Avenue – Historic District Design Review – The Applicant Proposes Material Deconstruction of the Significant Historic Structure to Accommodate Structural Upgrades and an Addition. PL-20-04632.

Assistant Director Ward reported that Architect, Bruce Taylor, and property owner, David Beador were both present to answer questions. She presented the Staff Report and explained that the item was a proposal for the material deconstruction of a Significant Historic Structure, which would accommodate structural upgrades and an addition to 1274 Park Avenue. The structure was constructed in 1911 and was originally a hall-parlor house but was modified between 1907 and 1929 to resemble a gable front. The home was clad with aluminum siding, except for the front façade, which was clad with board-and-batten siding underneath the wraparound porch.

On June 24, 1999, the property owners and the City entered into a Preservation Easement for the front and side facades, with modifications approved by the Historic District Commission on September 14, 1998. Part of that approval allowed for the removal of the aluminum siding and the restoration of the drop-lap wood siding. However, the restoration of the wood siding was never completed. As a result, the applicant now requested material deconstruction approval to remove the aluminum siding, restore and reconstruct the wood siding, replace doors and windows, complete structural upgrades with a new foundation as well as add an addition to the rear.

Assistant Director Ward stated that the property is a single-family dwelling but is part of the Alpine Retreat @ Park City Condominium, a six-unit condominium that included two Significant Historic Structures, 1266 and 1274 Park Avenue. 1274 Park Avenue was Unit 1 of the Alpine Retreat @ Park City Condominium. It was noted that the Alpine Retreat Homeowners Association approved expansion for 1274 Park Avenue to include a garage, which was proposed to be located at the rear of the property, along with a rear entry foyer, mudroom, and laundry area as well as an upper-level bedroom.

The applicant submitted an HDDR application and a Condominium Plat Amendment application. Assistant Director Ward reported that the City Council approved the Condominium Plat Amendment in 2020 to reflect the additional square footages. Since that time, the property was sold and the HDDR application was put on hold. The new owner now wanted to proceed with the project.

Several applicant proposals were shared with the Board. For instance, the applicant proposed replacing the windows and doors. The side and rear façade windows were less than 50 years old and aluminum. The doors were also less than 50 years old and non-

historic. The applicant proposed replacing the vinyl and aluminum windows with Code-compliant wood-clad windows. At the front of the structure, no changes were proposed. There were two single-pane wood windows and stained-glass historic windows on the front façade. Condition of Approval 16 required the protection, preservation, and restoration of those stained-glass windows.

The applicant also proposed removing the aluminum siding to restore and reconstruct the drop-lap wood siding. Assistant Director Ward reported that the Preservation Easement allowed for the removal of the aluminum siding and Condition of Approval 3 required the repair of deteriorated or damaged wood siding using recognized preservation methods. Where historic exterior materials could not be repaired, they needed to be replaced with materials that matched the historic in all aspects, such as scale, dimension, profile, material, texture, and finish.

Assistant Director Ward stated that the applicant also proposed to lift the Significant Historic Structure for upgrades to the foundation. The Historic Site Form for 1274 Park Avenue stated that the foundation material was unknown but the applicant's Physical Conditions Report determined that the structure did not have a continuous foundation, as there were portions of stacked rock and other portions with poured concrete. Additionally, the structure was at grade, and drainage issues had damaged the structure. The proposal was to lift the structure to accommodate upgrades to the foundation as well as raise the structure six inches for improved drainage. Assistant Director Ward overviewed some of the Conditions of Approval with the Board:

- Condition of Approval 7 required the site to be re-graded so the water would drain properly from the structure;
- Condition of Approval 8 required a plinth or trim board at the base of the Significant Historic Structure to be added to visually anchor the structure to the updated foundation; and
- Condition of Approval 17 required the applicant to submit a Structural Engineer Report to verify the structural integrity of the structure for Planning Director and Chief Building Official review and approval, prior to the submission of a Building Permit application.

The applicant proposed to remove a portion of the rear façade to accommodate an addition. Assistant Director Ward explained that this was at the rear of the property and will be accessed by Sullivan Road. The Preservation Easement recorded against the property allowed for changes to the rear façade. Photographs taken from Sullivan Road were shared with Board Members to provide additional context.

Assistant Director Ward reported that Chapter 15-11-9 in the Land Management Code required the applicant to complete a Financial Guarantee to ensure compliance with the conditions and terms of the Historic Preservation Plan. This would be required prior to the submittal of a Building Permit application. Staff recommended the Board conduct a public hearing and consider approval of the material deconstruction for 1274 Park

Avenue, subject to the Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Conditions of Approval outlined in the Draft Final Action Letter.

Board Member Holmgren asked to see the photograph of the area where the addition would be. She wanted to know whether the trees would be removed. Assistant Director Ward explained that the trees were part of the discussion during the Plat Amendment process. The trees along the property line would not be removed. During the platting process, the applicant worked on preservation of the vegetation. One tree would be removed as part of the project, but under the Code, the applicant is required to replace that tree with a like tree on the site.

There was discussion regarding the addition. Assistant Director Ward shared photographs and stated that there would not be any changes to the front or the side facades. The garage and bedroom would be at the rear of the property along Sullivan Road. Board Member Hutchings asked about the material that would be removed from the back. Assistant Director Ward shared drawings taken from the Physical Conditions Report. The proposal was for a transitional element that would connect to the garage and bedroom near Sullivan Road.

Board Member Hutchings noted that usually the packet identifies the portion of the house being removed during a material deconstruction. He wondered if that should be made clear in the information presented. Assistant Director Ward explained that it would be specified within the Historic Preservation Plan. However, a Condition of Approval could be added to ensure that the Historic Preservation Plan outlined the deconstruction on the rear façade.

Board Member Toly asked if the wood underneath the aluminum siding was intact. Assistant Director Ward reported that there had been some water damage to portions of the siding. Mr. Taylor explained that the owner peeled back a few small areas of siding. Aside from nail hole damage, the siding looked decent, but toward the ground, there was evidence of water damage and rot in the lower boards. Assistant Director Ward stated that there was a Condition of Approval that said all of the wood siding that could be salvaged and restored was required to be saved.

Board Member Holmgren asked for more details about the drainage issues. Mr. Taylor explained that the back kitchen door was the low point on the site. All of the surface water ended up at that back door. Changing the grade by six inches would allow the water to drain around the back of the property towards Sullivan Road.

Further discussions were had about the wood underneath the aluminum siding. Chair Scott noted that it was not uncommon for the bottom few rows to have water damage. Mr. Taylor stated that the areas of exploration on the property were fairly minimal, so he could not make a universal statement about the level of damage. However, his expectation was that there would be water damage on the bottom few rows.

Chair Scott opened the public hearing.

Lisa Plain identified herself as the owner of 1265 Sullivan Road at the Alpine Retreat. She fully supported Mr. Beador and the project.

There were no further public comments. The public hearing was closed.

Assistant Director Ward wondered if the Board wanted to add Condition of Approval 18, which would specify that the limited material deconstruction on the rear façade must be included as part of the Historic Preservation Plan. All Board Members were in support of the added condition.

MOTION: Board Member Hutchings moved to APPROVE the material deconstruction of 1274 Park Avenue subject to the following:

1. Replace windows and doors.
2. Remove aluminum siding and restore drop-lap wood siding.
3. Lift the Significant Historic Structure for upgrades to the foundation for improved drainage and remove a portion of the rear façade to accommodate an addition.

Findings of Fact

1. 1274 Park Avenue was constructed circa 1911.
2. Based on the Historic Site Form, the Significant Structure was originally a hall parlor house but was modified between 1907 and 1929 to resemble a gable front with an addition to the south side.
3. The home is clad with aluminum siding, except for the front façade, which is clad with board-and-batten siding under the wraparound porch.
4. On June 24, 1999, the property owners and the City entered into a Preservation Easement for the front and side facades, with modifications approved by the Historic District Commission on September 14, 1998 (Summit County Recorder Entry No. 546937).
5. The 1998 Historic District Commission approval allowed for removal of the aluminum siding and for the restoration of drop-lap wood siding. The approval expired on September 14, 1999, and it appears the restoration of the wood siding was never completed.

6. Access to the Significant Historic Structure will continue to be from the rear via Sullivan Road.
7. 1274 Park Avenue, while a detached Single-Family Dwelling, is part of the Alpine Retreat @ Park City Condominium, a six-unit condominium that includes two Significant Historic Structures, 1266 and 1274 Park Avenue.
8. 1274 Park Avenue is Unit 1 of the Alpine Retreat @ Park City Condominium.
9. On March 6, 2020, the Alpine Retreat Homeowners Association approved the expansion of 1274 Park Avenue, Unit 1, to include a ground-floor 336-square-foot garage and 15-square-foot entry foyer/mudroom/laundry area, and 521 square feet of upper-level space that includes a wet bar, sitting area, bathroom, closet, and sleeping area.
10. On July 9, 2020, the City Council adopted Ordinance No. 2020-33, approving an amended Alpine Retreat @ Park City Condominium Plat to reflect the additional square footage for 1274 Park Avenue.
11. The Applicant requests Material Deconstruction approval to replace non-historic windows and doors, to remove aluminum siding and restore and reconstruct the drop-lap wood siding, to lift the Significant Historic Structure for upgrades to the foundation and to raise the Historic Structure six inches, and to remove a portion of the rear façade to accommodate an addition.
12. The front façade has two single-pane wood and stained-glass historic windows. The Applicant does not propose any changes to these windows. The side and rear façade windows are less than 50 years old, and the Applicant proposes replacing these vinyl and aluminum double-hung and sliding windows with code-compliant aluminum wood-clad windows, subject to Historic District Design Review approval.
13. 1274 Park Avenue is primarily clad in non-original aluminum siding. Aluminum siding is not allowed in Historic Districts. Planning Department
14. The removal of the aluminum siding and the repair, restoration, and reconstruction of the original drop-lap wood siding is allowed pursuant to the Preservation Easement, which protects the front and side facades, but allows for modifications based on the 1998 Historic District Commission approval, including removal of the aluminum siding and restoration of the original drop-lap wood siding.
15. The Applicant proposes to complete the removal of the aluminum siding to restore the original drop-lap wood siding.

16. LMC § 15-13-2(B)(2)(a) requires the repair of deteriorated or damaged historic exterior materials using recognized preservation methods. When historic exterior materials cannot be repaired, they must be replaced with materials that match the historic in all respects: scale, dimension, profile, material, texture, and finish.
17. The Applicant proposes to lift the Significant Historic Structure for upgrades to the foundation.
18. The Historic Site Form for 1274 Park Avenue states the foundation material is unknown.
19. The Applicant's Physical Conditions Report determined the Structure does not have a continuous foundation with portions of stacked rock, and other portions with poured concrete. The Significant Historic Structure is at grade and drainage issues have damaged the Structure.
20. The Applicant proposes lifting the Significant Historic Structure to accommodate upgrades to the foundation.
21. The new foundation shall not raise or lower the Significant Historic Structure more than two feet from its original floor elevation and the historic placement, orientation, and grade of the Historic Structure must be retained.
22. The Applicant proposes to remove a portion of the rear façade to accommodate an addition.
23. Additions to a Significant Historic Structure are considered only on non-character-defining facades, usually tertiary facades.
24. The Preservation Easement for 1274 Park Avenue protects the front and side facades but allows for changes to the rear façade.
25. Additions must be visually subordinate to the Significant Historic Structure when viewed from the primary public right-of-way and not obscure, detract from, or modify historic roof forms.
26. In-line additions should generally be avoided, and a transitional element is required. Planning Department
27. The rear façade is 31 feet wide, and the proposed addition includes a six-foot-wide and nine-foot-long transitional element that is set back three feet from the historic side façade.

Conclusions of Law

1. The proposal complies with Land Management Code Section 15-11-12.5, Historic Preservation Board Review For Material Deconstruction.
2. The proposal complies with Land Management Code Section 15-13-2, Design Guidelines For Historic Residential Sites.

Conditions of Approval

1. The applicant is responsible for notifying the Building Department prior to proposing any changes to the approval.
2. The applicant shall submit in writing any changes, modifications, or deviations from the approved scope of work for Planning Director review and approval/denial in accordance with the applicable standards prior to construction.
3. Where historic exterior materials cannot be repaired, they shall be replaced with materials that match the original in all respects: scale, dimension, texture, profile, material, and finish. Prior to removing and replacing historic materials, the applicant shall demonstrate to the Planning Director and Historic Preservation Planner that the materials are no longer safe and/or serviceable and cannot be repaired to a safe and/or serviceable condition. No historic materials may be disposed of prior to advance approval by the Planning Director and Historic Preservation Planner.
4. A soils report completed by a geotechnical engineer as well as a temporary shoring plan, if applicable, will be required at the time of building permit application.
5. The new foundation shall not raise or lower the Landmark Historic Structure more than two feet from its original floor elevation.
6. The Historic Site shall be returned to its original grade following the construction of a foundation. When the original grade cannot be achieved, generally no more than six inches of the new foundation shall be visible above Final Grade on the primary and secondary facades.
7. The site shall be re-graded so all water drains away from the Structure and does not enter the foundation.
8. A plinth or trim board at the base of the Historic Structure shall be added to visually anchor the Historic Structure to the new foundation. Planning Department

9. The form, material, and detailing of a new foundation shall be similar to foundations of nearby historic structures.
10. The applicant shall submit a cribbing and excavation stabilization shoring plan reviewed and stamped by a State of Utah licensed and registered structural engineer prior to issuance of a building permit. Cribbing or shoring must be of engineer-specified materials. Screw-type jacks for raising and lowering the building are not allowed as primary supports once the building is lifted.
11. Historic structures which are lifted off the foundation must be returned to the completed foundation within 45 days of the date the building permit was issued.
12. The Planning Director may make a written determination to extend this period up to 30 additional days if, after consultation with the Historic Preservation Planner, Chief Building Official, and City Engineer, determines it is necessary. This would be based upon the need to immediately stabilize an existing historic property, or specific site conditions such as access or lack thereof, or in an effort to reduce impacts on adjacent properties. The applicant is responsible for notifying the Building Department if changes are made. If the cribbing and/or shoring plans are to be altered at any time during the construction of the foundation by the contractor, the structural engineer shall submit a new cribbing and/or shoring plan for review. The structural engineer shall be required to re-inspect and approve the cribbing and/or shoring alternatives within five days of any relocation or alteration to the cribbing and/or shoring.
13. The applicant shall request an inspection through the Building Department following the modification to the cribbing and/or shoring. Failure to request the inspection will be a violation of the Preservation Plan and enforcement action through the Historic Preservation Financial Guarantee or ACE could take place.
14. The applicant shall complete a Historic Preservation Plan—subject to Chief Building Official and Planning Director approval—prior to issuance of a building permit.
15. The applicant shall provide the City with a Financial Guarantee to ensure compliance with the conditions and terms of the Historic Preservation Plan prior to issuance of a building permit.
16. The historic stained-glass windows on the front façade shall be protected, preserved, and restored.

17. The Applicant shall submit a structural engineer report verifying the Structural integrity of the Significant Historic Structure for Planning Director and Chief Planning Department Building official review and approval prior to submitting a building permit application.
18. The limited material deconstruction on the rear façade must be included as part of the Historic Preservation Plan.

Board Member Beatlebrox seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

E. 427 Main Street – Historic District Design Review – The Planning Department Issued a Historic District Design Review for Emergency Repair Work to Remove a Chimney with a Condition of Approval the Applicant Come Before the Historic Preservation Board to Determine Material Deconstruction or Reconstruction. PL-21-04957.

Assistant Director Ward reported that the Applicant, Mimi Kim, and the Applicant's Representative, Gretchen Amerongen was present at the Historic Preservation Board Meeting to answer questions. She presented the Staff Report and explained that the item was a proposal for the material deconstruction and permanent removal of a non-functioning chimney at 427 Main Street. Assistant Director Ward explained that 427 Main Street was a Landmark Historic Structure on the Park City Historic Sites Inventory. It was also known as the War Veteran's Memorial Building. It had a non-functioning chimney located at the rear of the structure along Park Avenue.

On August 20, 2021, the applicant reached out to inform the City that bricks from the chimney were crumbling and falling, which created a hazard as there is parking next to the chimney as well as walkways at the rear of the building. The applicant submitted an HDDR application to request a Waiver Letter for emergency repair work. The applicant obtained a Structural Engineer Report on August 30, 2021, that outlined some of the structural issues with the chimney. The Planning Director issued an HDDR Waiver Letter for the emergency repair work with the following conditions:

- As much material as possible be salvaged and stored, pending the Historic Preservation Board determination regarding the non-functional chimney and its contribution to the Landmark Historic Status;
- The roof be restored as soon as possible;
- The area be secured to protect the public until the non-functional chimney was completely removed; and
- The Historic Preservation Board would make the final determination on whether the non-functional chimney was required to be reconstructed.

The applicant removed the chimney and the Building Department went to the site to assist with salvaging bricks and material. Assistant Director Ward explained that the applicant

was requesting that the Historic Preservation Board approve the permanent removal of the non-functional chimney.

Background information was shared with the Board. Assistant Director Ward reported that 427 Main Street is a 1 ½-story concrete central block with wings that was constructed circa 1939. It reflected the Public Works Administration Moderne with a symmetrical façade, smooth wall surfaces, heavy massing, a framed entrance with Art Deco motifs, and a monumental scale. The site was listed as a contributing building on the National Register of Historic Places in 1979 as part of the Park City Main Street Historic District. It was also associated with the era of mining decline. She pointed out that the Historic Site Form for 427 Main Street did not mention the chimney. The rear of the building was along Park Avenue and there were several parking spaces there. Example images of the chimney were shared with the Board. The photographs indicated that the chimney was original to the structure and remained over the years.

According to Chapter 15-15-1 of the Land Management Code, in some instances, the removal of historic construction materials or building components that were beyond repair could be approved by the Board. Staff recommended that the Historic Preservation Board determine whether the chimney contributed to the historic integrity of the Landmark Historic Structure. Assistant Director Ward explained that there were seven aspects or qualities as defined by the National Park Service that determined historic integrity, which included the following:

- Location: the place where the historic site was constructed;
 - The chimney was most visible from the vantage points of Park Avenue, Woodside Avenue, and Marsac Avenue, but was not a prominent feature along Main Street.
- Design: the combination of physical elements that created the form, plan, space, structure, and style of a site. The design includes considerations such as massing, textures, and colors of surface materials and ornamental detailing;
 - The Historic Site Form highlighted the front façade but did not mention the chimney or the brick.
- Setting: the physical environment, either natural or manmade, of a Historic Site and the relationship between structures and other features or open space;
 - The chimney was a prominent element when viewed from certain vantage points, including Park Avenue, Woodside Avenue, and Marsac Avenue. However, it was not always visible from Main Street.
- Materials: the physical elements that were combined or deposited during a particular period of time in a particular configuration to form a Historic Site;
 - The bricks were not mentioned in the Historic Site Form, but reflect masonry of the 1930s and 1940s.
- Workmanship: the physical evidence of crafts of a particular culture or people during any given period of history;
 - The Landmark Historic Structure features two art deco-style base relief panels above the entryway of the front façade.

- Feeling: a site's expression of the aesthetic of a particular period of time;
 - Example photos were shown.
- Association: the direct link between an important historic era, person, or site;
 - At some point, the chimney became non-functional, but Staff was unable to identify that period of time. There were many important uses associated with the site over the years, including a community center, recreation center, and offices.

Chapter 15-3-3 of the Land Management Code, Design Guideline for Historic Commercial Sites stated that historic chimneys and their decorative features were important character-defining features of historic structures and should be preserved and maintained. However, if the historic materials had deteriorated or contained structural defects, and the applicant could show that they were no longer safe, removal may be approved by the Board. On August 30, 2021, the applicant submitted a Structural Engineer Report, which evaluated the structural integrity of the chimney. The report identified the following issues:

- The flashing had failed and moisture was entering the wall, causing the mortar and bricks to crack apart during freeze and thaw cycles;
- The falling pieces of brick could be a safety hazard to those walking below;
- The chimney did not have sufficient reinforcement, as there were no vertical bars or horizontal bars;
- The lower portions of the chimney seemed to be unaffected, but damaged bricks should be replaced with new bricks; and
- The chimney would continue to support its own dead load, but it was unknown whether it would continue to hold in a seismic event without reinforcement.

The applicant completed the removal process while preserving as many of the bricks as possible. Only 10% of the bricks were able to be preserved as many had been damaged. Staff recommended that the Board open a public hearing and consider approving the permanent removal of the non-functioning chimney.

Board Member Toly reported that the applicant co-hosted an event for her campaign for City Council. City Attorney, Mark Harrington believed that it would be best for her to recuse herself from voting on the item. However, he noted that there was not a direct economic interest, so it was technically her decision to make. Board Member Toly wondered if the Board would still have a quorum if she recused herself. Attorney Harrington confirmed that there would still be a quorum. Board Member Toly stated that she would recuse herself from the vote.

Ms. Amerongen, the Applicant's Representative, reported that she had been the property manager since 2006. Board Member Holmgren believed that the chimney was crumbling because it had been neglected. She felt it could be repaired. Ms. Amerongen reported that the contractor who was working on the project stated that the way the chimney was constructed was not safe and unfortunately could not be reconstructed the way it was. It

also appeared that the chimney was not originally as tall as it was at the time of deconstruction but the contractor was unable to definitively determine that. As long as Ms. Amerongen had managed the building, the chimney had not functioned. She performed roof maintenance and inspections of the building but issues began to occur after the rain and hail storm.

Board Member Beatlebrox suggested that the Historic Preservation Board go over the seven aspects of historic integrity one by one. Location was discussed first. Ms. Amerongen clarified that the chimney was located behind the structure and did not come out of the roof the way a traditional chimney did. The construction of the building was atypical based on the way it was laid out compared to other structures along Park Avenue. There was a below-grade walkway that went all the way around the perimeter of the building. Ms. Amerongen also noted that snow removal was challenging for the building. The hope was to cover the back area at some point in order to make snow removal easier and the area safer.

The location of the chimney was discussed further. Board Member Beatlebrox pointed out that it was not a prominent feature along Main Street. Chair Scott agreed. He did not feel it was a primary feature on Main Street or Park Avenue. Board Member Hutchings disagreed. He felt it was a prominent historic feature that is visible from Park Avenue and Woodside Avenue. Chimneys are historic structures and the Historic District is not limited to Main Street.

The second criterion was discussed. Board Member Beatlebrox pointed out that in terms of design, there was no ornamental detailing. The front of the building had art deco, but the chimney itself was just a large rectangle made of bricks. Board Member Holmgren stated that although the chimney was non-functional currently, the chimney was functional at one time. It was there when the building was constructed. Board Member Hutchings agreed with the comments made by Board Member Holmgren. Chair Scott did not believe the chimney contributed to the design of the primary façade.

The third criterion was discussed. Board Member Beatlebrox stated that though the chimney was functional at one time, she was neutral on the chimney. Board Member Hutchings stated that chimneys were prominent historic features in Park City. He felt strongly that it contributed to the setting. Chair Scott noted that the chimney likely had a story, but it did not contribute to the setting on the Main Street side. On the other hand, it likely contributed to the setting on the Park Avenue side. Board Member Holmgren did not want to see the chimney permanently removed simply because it was non-functioning.

The fourth criterion was discussed. In terms of the materials, Board Member Beatlebrox noted that it was a large brick structure. She wondered whether the chimney had always been painted. Ms. Amerongen reported that it had been painted since she had managed the building. The paint actually contributed to the deterioration as it trapped the moisture on one side.

The fifth criterion was discussed. Board Member Beatlebrox felt that workmanship was the most important. Everything on the front façade on Main Street was a work of art and it was clear to her that an artist did not create the chimney. She believed the workmanship for this particular chimney was not significant. Board Member Holmgren disagreed and stated that it was a nicely set brick chimney.

The sixth criterion was discussed. In terms of the feeling, Board Member Hutchings pointed out that the physical presence of the chimney was clear based on the photographs included in the Staff Report. He felt the various vantage points showed the historical significance of the chimney. Board Member Toly asked to see the oldest photograph of the chimney. Assistant Director Ward shared a photograph from 1949. From what Staff could determine, the chimney had been a consistent structure. Chair Scott explained that his thinking had changed due to the historical photographs that were shared. He felt that the chimney was a prominent structure that told a story and could be seen from multiple angles.

The final criterion was discussed. Board Member Beatlebrox stated that the association was with the entrance of the building and not the chimney. She had not known there was a chimney associated with the building until the Historic Preservation Board learned that it was falling down. She was not certain that this particular historic chimney met all of the seven criteria. Board Member Hutchings believed that it did meet all of the criteria and that it was an important historic structure. Board Member Beatlebrox pointed out that if the chimney was permanently removed, the site would still retain its identity and convey significance. Board Member Hutchings believed an argument could be made that the chimney did not contribute if the Board only considered the impact from Main Street. However, it contributed to other areas. Chair Scott agreed that from the backside of the building, it contributed historical value.

Chair Scott opened the public hearing. There were no public comments. The public hearing was closed.

MOTION: Board Member Holmgren moved to DENY the application to consider permanent removal of the chimney located at 427 Main Street and direct Staff to return with findings consistent with the majority statements about the seven aspects of historic integrity, as defined by the National Park Service. Those statements determined that the structure contributed to the historic integrity of the Landmark Historic Structure. Board Member Hutchings seconded the motion. Vote on Motion: Board Member Holmgren-Aye; Board Member Hutchings-Aye; Board Member Beatlebrox-Nay; Board Member Toly-Abstained; Chair Scott-Aye. The motion passed 3-to-1 with one abstention.

6. ADJOURN

MOTION: Board Member Hutchings moved to adjourn. Board Member Holmgren seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Board.

Historic Preservation Board Meeting
October 6, 2021

The Historic Preservation Board Meeting adjourned at 7:00 p.m.

Approved by _____
Randy Scott, Chair
Historic Preservation Board

APPROVED 01.05.2022