

PARK CITY MUNICIPAL CORPORATION
HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD
MINUTES OF OCTOBER 3, 2018

BOARD MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE: Douglas Stephens, Puggy Holmgren, Jack Hodgkins, John Hutchings, Randy Scott, Jordan Brody

EX OFFICIO: Bruce Erickson, Anya Grahm, Mark Harrington, Liz Jackson

ROLL CALL

Chair Stephens called the meeting to order at 5:02 p.m. and noted that all Board Members were present except Lola Beatlebrox.

ADOPTION OF MINUTES

August 1, 2018

MOTION: Board Member Holmgren moved to APPROVE the minutes of August 1, 2018 as written. Board Member Hutchings seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS

There were no comments.

STAFF/BOARD COMMUNICATIONS AND DISCLOSURES

Planner Grahm stated that they were looking for projects to be nominated for the Historic Preservation Board Award. Projects must be completed within the 2018 calendar year.

Director Bruce Erickson introduced Bruno Barbe the Planning Director from Courcheval France who will be working in the Park City Planning Department as part of a sister city employee exchange program.

REGULAR AGENDA – Discussion, Public Hearing and Possible Action

The first portion of the meeting did not record. The Minutes for 1062 Park Avenue were prepared from notes and the Staff report.

1. 1062 Park Avenue – HDDR Material Deconstruction— Landmark Site. The applicant is proposing to impact the following materials including post 1980's rear yard shed; post-1941 south (side) addition; c. 1922 exterior

wood siding; c. 1922 historic front porch; contemporary asphalt shingles on roof; c. 1922 original roof pitch and shape; c. 1922 historic brick chimney; historic and contemporary wood doors and windows.
(Application PL-18-03851)

Planner Liz Jackson reported that the Historic District Design Review application for the property at 1062 Park Avenue was deemed complete on June 27, 2018. The Historic District Design Review application has not yet been approved pending the HPB review and approval for Material Deconstruction and the request for a rehabilitation and addition to a Landmark Site. She noted that the exploratory demo for this site had not been completed.

Planner Jackson reported that the home was built in 1922 and it appears in Sanborn maps in 1929. It is a unique Park City home with a low pitch gable roof, and exposed roof rafters. A south side addition was added some time between 1941-1952. An accessory shed structure was also built, on the east side from the rear of the house. The Staff believes this building is from the 1990s based on construction materials.

Planner Jackson stated that the current owner purchased the home in 2018 and they were proposing to rehabilitate the historic house and add a new addition to the rear. The historic material will be saved as much as possible. The historic material that cannot be saved will be replaced with matching materials.

Planner Jackson noted that the exploratory demo will show the condition of the roof. The chimney was updated between 1941-1942. The applicant proposes to restore the chimney to its original design, location, scale, and dimension utilizing the existing historic bricks that are still usable and not crumbling. The Staff had added a Condition of Approval to ensure the restoration of the original chimney and that no historic materials are removed unnecessarily.

Planner Jackson stated that the house is a wood frame structure and the applicant proposes to only repair and replace rotted siding and trim where necessary. The Staff had added a condition ensure that no historic siding and trim is removed unnecessarily.

Planner Jackson noted that the exploratory demo will determine whether foundation exists on the house or the condition of the concrete slab. If there is no, the applicant will lift the house to add a foundation. The house will be raised 24" from its current location, consistent with the Design Guidelines. The Staff had added a condition of approval to ensure that no damage shall occur to the historic house should it become necessary to lift the house to add a foundation.

Planner Jackson stated that the front porch on the west side shall be maintained. If the porch cannot be lifted with the house the applicant will meet with the Chief

Building Official regarding any deconstruction of the porch. There are no historic doors on the home.

Planner Jackson reported that there are There are a total of seven historic wood windows. The Physical Conditions Report notes that the windows vary in condition from good to poor. The historic window on the east elevation will be blocked by the new addition. There may be an opportunity to salvage and re-use the existing historic wood windows if they are able to be rehabilitated. The Staff had added a Conditions of Approval to ensure that every effort is made to not discard historic materials unnecessarily. A condition also requires that an independent window evaluation specialist assess and report on the existing window conditions and outline options for rehabilitation or replacement.

The Staff recommended that the Historic Preservation Board review and discuss the application and consider approving the material deconstruction of non-historic and non-contributory materials at 1062 Park Avenue per the following findings of fact, conclusions of law, and conditions of approval in the Staff report.

Board Member Hutchings asked how the Staff had determined that the south side addition was not historic. Planner Jackson stated that the addition was not shown on the Sanborn Maps. Planner Grahn explained that the exploratory demolition would tell more about the addition. They believe it was built in 1941, which is outside of the historic era.

Board Member Hutchings referred to Condition #14 and asked why the condition was tied to the building permit. Planner Grahn stated that this is done in order to track how long the homes are lifted. It is a priority to watch the 45-day clock closely when houses are lifted.

Board Member Scott commented on the process of preserving the roof internally vs. externally. Planner Grahn explained the process. She clarified that the prefers to preserve the roof internally to maintain as much of the structure as possible.

Board Member Scott asked whether the structural beams on the porch are considered part of the house if the house needs to be lifted. Planner Grahn answered yes; however, whether the porch could be lifted with the house would be further investigated by the Chief Building Official.

Chair Stephens opened the public hearing.

There were no comments.

Chair Stephens closed the public hearing.

Board Member Hutchings thought the south addition may be a historic component that might be worth saving. Chair Stephens stated that many historic homes have had more than one addition. The question is to what time period in history should the home be restored. Based on past ruling, they leave it to the homeowner and the designer to decide the best approach.

Jonathan DeGray, the project architect, stated that if the addition has significance it may be important, but typically they follow the mining era designs.

Board Member Hutchings asked if it needed to be a more formalized process. City Attorney Mark Harrington stated that the over 50 years old is only one of four criteria and it was used as a catch-all prior to the Historic Sites Inventory. The criteria are tied to the Mining Era. The Staff has additional criteria for additions with regards to historic details. Mr. Hutchings asked if they could ignore the fifty-year requirement by reviewing the other three criteria. Mr. Harrington replied that it depends on the Staff's review and the characteristics they are trying to protect.

Planner Grahn remarked that the Staff struggles with this issue in terms of where to draw the line for historic sites that have had so many additions over many years.

Board Member Hodgkins asked for clarification on removing the siding. Planner Jackson reviewed plans to show how they would be creating a breezeway and totally removing the siding. Mr. Hodgkins asked how the breezeway would tie into the roof line. Director Erickson suggested that the Board focus on the material deconstruction this evening rather than questions related to the HDDR.

MOTION: Jack Hodgkins moved to APPROVE the material deconstruction of non-historic and non-contributory materials at 1062 Park Avenue pursuant to the Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Conditions of Approval as found in the Staff report. Board Member Scott seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

Findings of Fact – 1062 Park Avenue

1. The property is located at 1062 Park Avenue.
2. The site is designated as Landmark on the Historic Sites Inventory.
3. On June 15, 2018, the Planning Department received a Historic District Design Review (HDDR) application for the property at 1062 Park Avenue; it was deemed complete June 27, 2018. The HDDR application has not yet been approved as it is dependent on the HPB's Review for Material Deconstruction approval.
4. The house was constructed c.1922. It is believed to be the only extant bungalow in Park City that reflects the Craftsman influence.

5. The Historic Site Form has identified this site's era of historical significance as the Mature Mining Era, 1894 to 1930. The Historic Site Form has identified this site as part of the Park City Mining Boom Era Residences Thematic District.
6. The house first appears on the 1929 Sanborn Fire Insurance map as a simple one-story house, facing west toward Park Avenue. The front porch is shown on the Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps.
7. The first photograph of the house was taken as part of the c.1940 tax assessment. The one-story bungalow house is visible with a wire fence along the west (front) side. A ribbon driveway is also visible to the south of the home, which has since been replaced with a gravel driveway, concrete apron, wood slat fence, and the south (side) addition.
8. Prior to 1982, an addition on the south (side) elevation was added with a small shed extension from the main gable to create a laundry and storage room.
9. In 1984, the house was nominated to the National Register of Historic Places.
10. The applicant proposes to remove the existing concrete apron, a gravel driveway leading to a wood slat fence gate, a wood slat fence in the rear yard, a stone paver pathway connecting to a concrete pathway leading to the front door, and stone bordered planter areas in the front yard. The landscaping includes 7 mature trees, 6 of which will be removed and replaced in-kind. Any material deconstruction involved in the landscaping improvements does not impact the historical importance of the house located on the property or adjacent parcels. These later additions to the site do not contribute to its historical integrity or historical significance.
11. Based on physical evidence, the applicant has demonstrated that the south (side) addition was constructed on the historic house after 1941, and likely c.1980. This addition is proposed to be removed and the south elevation restored to replicate the c. 1940 tax assessment photo. The proposed scope of work mitigates any impact that will occur to the historical significance of the house and impact to the architectural integrity of the house.
12. The applicant proposes to stabilize the house structure from the interior by adding new framed walls on the interior, where necessary. The proposed interior changes will not damage or destroy the exterior architectural features of the subject property which are compatible with the character of the historic site and are not included in the proposed scope of work.
13. The applicant proposes to restructure the roof from the interior, replace the non-historic asphalt shingles, and is subject to approval or denial by the Planning Director and the CBO in accordance with applicable guidelines within Design Guidelines for Historic Sites in Park City and the International Residential Code. The proposed scope of work mitigates any impacts that will occur to the historical significance of the house and any impact that will occur to the architectural integrity of the house.
14. The applicant is proposing to restore the chimney to its original design, location, scale, and dimension utilizing the existing historic bricks that are still usable. The proposed scope of work mitigates any impacts that will occur to the

historical significance of the house and any impact that will occur to the architectural integrity of the house.

15. The exterior walls are to remain. The applicant only proposes to repair and replace rotted siding where necessary. Staff finds the proposed exterior changes will not damage or destroy the exterior architectural features of the subject property which are compatible with the character of the historic site.

16. Approximately 14.2 linear feet of the east (rear) elevation will be removed in order to accommodate the new addition. The proposed exterior changes shall not damage or destroy the exterior architectural features of the subject property which are compatible with the character of the historic site.

17. The applicant has not been able to verify the condition of the slab foundation. The existing foundation walls are to be maintained. Should they be found to be in poor condition, the applicant proposes to replace the foundation with a new slab foundation, and is subject to approval or denial by the Planning Director and the CBO in accordance with applicable guidelines within Design Guidelines for Historic Sites in Park City and the International Residential Code. The proposed exterior changes will not damage or destroy exterior architectural features of the subject property which are compatible with the character of the historic site.

18. There are no historic doors on the house, but the location of the front door and the doorway inside of the non-historic south (side) addition matches the c. 1940 tax assessment photo. The applicant proposes to replace these doors on the west (front) and south (side) elevations with doors that abide by the Historic District Design Guidelines and will be consistent with the Craftsman style of the house. The door located on the non-historic south (side) elevation addition, facing east (rear), will be removed. There are a total of 7 historic wood windows on the house. The applicant's Physical Conditions Report notes they range from good to poor condition, and proposes to replicate and replace 6 of the windows. The window on the east (rear) elevation will be removed by the new addition. The proposed exterior changes shall not damage or destroy the exterior architectural features of the subject property which are compatible with the character of the historic site.

Conclusions of Law – 1062 Park Avenue

1. The proposal complies with the Land Management Code requirements pursuant to 15-2.4 Historic Residential-Medium Density (HRM) District.
2. The proposal meets the criteria for material deconstruction pursuant to LMC 15-11-12.5 Historic Preservation Board Review for Material Deconstruction.

Conditions of Approval – 1062 Park Avenue

1. Final building plans and construction details shall reflect substantial compliance with the HDDR proposal stamped in on September 14, 2018 Any changes, modifications, or deviations from the approved design that have not

been approved by the Planning and Building Departments may result in a stop work order.

2. The applicant is responsible for notifying the Building Department if changes are made.
3. Replacement doors shall exactly match the historic doors in size, material, profile, and style.
4. An independent window evaluation specialist will assess and report on the existing window conditions and outline options for rehabilitation or replacement in satisfaction of the Planning Director.
5. Should the original wood windows not be able to be restored, the replacement windows shall exactly match the historic window in size, dimensions, glazing pattern, depth, profile, and material.
6. The applicant shall maintain the original bungalow, shallow-gable roof form. If reconstruction is needed, structural stabilization shall occur by adding new structural members to the interior of the roof.
7. Should restructuring the roof from the interior not be possible due to the condition of the existing roof structure, the applicant shall schedule a site visit with the Chief Building Official and Planning Director to evaluate the condition of the roof structure. The applicant shall also submit a structural engineer's report to the Planning Director outlining the defects in the roof that prevent the new structure from being added alongside the existing roof members. The Physical Conditions Report and Preservation Plan shall be amended to document the condition of these walls and provide an updated scope of work to the satisfaction of the Planning Department. Any changes, modifications, or deviations from the approved scope of work shall be submitted in writing for review and approval/denial in accordance with the applicable standards by the Planning Director prior to construction.
8. The applicant shall salvage the existing chimney bricks. Any bricks that can be made safe and/or serviceable shall be reused to reconstruct the chimney. The applicant shall provide construction details documenting the historic chimney at the time of the building permit. The reconstruction shall exactly match the historic chimney and its detailing in size, material, profile, and style.
9. 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 Project 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 Project Planner.
10. Should the applicant choose to construct a new foundation beneath the historic house, the applicant shall schedule a site visit with the Chief Building Official and Historic Preservation Planner to evaluate the current foundation. The applicant shall also submit an amendment to the Physical Conditions Report documenting the existing foundation structure as well as an amendment to the

Historic Preservation Plan to reflect a change in the scope of work and the applicant's intent to temporarily raise the historic house, construct a new foundation, and set the house on the new foundation. The revised scope of work shall be submitted in writing for review and approval/denial in accordance with the applicable standards by the Planning and Building Departments as part of the building permit application.

11. The Preservation Plan must include 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.

12. An encroachment agreement may be required prior to issuance of a building permit for projects utilizing soils nails that encroach onto neighboring properties.

13. Within five (5) days of installation of the cribbing and shoring, the structural engineer will inspect and approve the cribbing and shoring as constructed.

14. Historic buildings which are lifted off the foundation must be returned to the completed foundation within 45 days of building permit issuance.

15. 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, he determines that 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, exist, or in an effort to reduce impacts on adjacent properties.

16. The applicant is responsible for notifying the Building Department if changes are made. If the cribbing and/or shoring plan(s) 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 alterations within five (5) days of any relocation or alteration to the cribbing and/or shoring. The applicant shall also 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 financial guarantee for historic preservation or ACE could take place.

17. All excavation work to construct the foundation shall start on or after April 15th and be completed on or prior to October 15th. 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 that it is necessary based upon the need to immediately stabilize an existing Historic property, or specific site conditions such as access, or lack thereof, exist, or in an effort to reduce impacts on adjacent properties.

18. Should lifting the historic porch with the house not be possible due to the structural instability of the porch, the applicant shall schedule a site visit with the

Chief Building Official and Historic Preservation Planner to evaluate the condition of the porch structure. The applicant shall also submit a structural engineer's report to the Project Planner outlining the defects in the porch that prevent the porch from being lifted with the historic house. The Physical Conditions Report and Preservation Plan shall be amended to document the condition of the porch structure and provide an updated scope of work to the satisfaction of the Planning Department. Any changes, modifications, or deviations from the approved scope of work shall be submitted in writing for review and approval/denial in accordance with the applicable standards by the Planning Director and Chief Building Official prior to any deconstruction of the porch.

2. 422 Ontario Avenue —Reconstruction—Significant House. The applicant is proposing to reconstruct the north, east, and west walls of the existing historic house. (Application PL-15-02819)

Planner Grahn reported that the Historic Preservation Board previously approved the material deconstruction of this house. The historic structure has been reconstructed and the HPB needed to talk about reinstalling the panels. Planner Grahn stated that in going through the process, the applicant realized there were site constraints that prevented re-installing panels on the reconstructed structure of the house.

Planner Grahn stated that the applicant was requesting to do more of a reconstruction, where they would salvage the siding from the panels and put the siding back on the house.

Planner Grahn noted that the Staff and the applicant disagree. For that reason, she intended to limit her comments to give the applicant ample time to present their case.

Planner Grahn stated that in order to be reconstructed, the first criteria is that the structure must be found to be hazardous by the Chief Building Official. She noted that when this house was approved for panelization in 2017 it was found to be hazardous. In addition to the condition of the actual building, another concern was that the structure was on a hill. If the house was lifted intact, there was concern that due to seismic activity or weather related conditions, the house could slide down and fall onto Ontario damaging the house and impacting the historic materials. Therefore, panelization was the best solution from a health and safety standpoint, but also to ensure salvaging the most amount of historic material.

Planner Grahn stated that when the applicant submitted his request, The Staff discussed it with Chief Building Official, Dave Thacker. They determined that there was a way to install some of the panels on the house.

Planner Grahn noted that the second criteria is whether or not the historic building can be made safe and/or serviceable through repair. Planner Grahn explained that often times when houses are panelized, they find that the interior wall has totally rotted out and there is actually no structure behind the panels. However, she had looked at the panels for this house and while the panels have wear and tear and show their age, they were still in fairly good condition and were mostly intact.

Planner Grahn stated that the third criteria is whether or not the building would be accurately depicted. She noted that the applicant had moved forward with reconstructing the structure of the house. Planner Grahn explained that when she talks about the structure she was only referring to the exterior walls and the actual framing. The Staff found that in only salvaging the historic siding they not only lose historic material; but they also lose the ability to talk about construction methods used in Park City. Panelization projects allow for keeping the vertical timbers as well as the horizontal siding. If the structure is demolished or looked at closely in the future, they would know it was a single wall house. If only the siding is salvaged, it does not tell the story of the house.

Planner Grahn noted that the Historic Preservation Board needed to review the applicant's request and make a determination. She believed the Staff's position was clear in the Staff report and by her comments this evening.

Garrett Strong, general contractor for the project, stated that he has been working on the house for almost a year. They have been very cautious during construction to make sure the house is put back to its previous historic state. Mr. Strong remarked that during construction and working the site, they found that Ontario is a steep hill and they were not able to safely set a crane on it without it sliding. At one point they were able to utilize one of the empty spots, but the crane was not able reach the front of the house. They were using a crane that was designed for back fill.

Mr. Strong stated that during framing they had a 12-ton gradall on site for a short period of time, and they were able to set some of the closer beams on the house. However, it became apparent that it is extremely difficult to get the panels back in place. When he measured from the street, the closest corner on the south side of the house is 30'. The wall on that side is actually 24' long. They would need at least 42' to set the panel back on the side of the house. Mr. Strong pointed out that there is also a very large pine tree in the way and that adds to the difficulty. Mr. Strong noted that over the past month a forklift from another contractor rolled off the side from Ontario while working on a house on the street.

Mr. Strong stated that his preference would be to deconstruct the wall panels one at a time, take each piece of siding off the wall, number each piece, and then eventually reapply those pieces. He believed the fit and finish on the walls would actually be better than replacing the entire panels one at a time.

Bill Mammen, the project architect, stated that he disputed the Chief Building Official's comment that this issue was driven by poor planning and not the poor condition of the materials. Mr. Mammen stated that since the day they took the walls down, he and Mr. Strong have struggled with how could put the walls back and tried to find some way to do it. Mr. Mammen believed there was no safe way to get the panels back up on the hill. They originally thought a crane would work, and that was how they intended to take them down. However, as Mr. Strong had explained, the crane was set up and as soon as they moved the boom the crane started to slide down the hill. He pointed out that there is not enough width to put on the outriggers that they normally do for a crane. Mr. Mammen noted that the crane was set up on Echo Spur, but they could do it at that time because the houses under construction only had foundations. Those houses are now built, which eliminates that avenue.

Mr. Mammen noted that a condition is if its hazardous or dangerous. He thought it would be extremely dangerous or hazardous to try to lift the panels up from Ontario onto the hillside. In addition to the huge evergreen, there are other trees as well. Mr. Mammen stated that they would have to remove significant vegetation to reinstall the front panel because it would be right behind the large evergreen.

Mr. Mammen was excited with the idea of taking off the siding and numbering each piece. The siding would come off the existing panels and go right back on the corresponding location of the new house. He noted that the boards are full of nail holes because the house had been sided several times over the top of the historic siding. Mr. Mammen stated that they could fill the nail holes and refinish both sides of the wood. Currently, it is raw on the inside and it has multiple layers of paint on the outside. It was later covered with two different sets of siding and the nail holes were everywhere. Mr. Mammen remarked that they could repair each board and put them back. He believed that method would end with a better result.

Mr. Mammen stated that he originally favored the panelization, but he is now convinced that removing the siding is the best way to achieve a good historic restoration.

Chair Stephens noted that the Staff report only contained one page of the letter that Mr. Thacker submitted to the contractor in September. He asked Mr. Mammen to explain what he found or discovered. Mr. Thacker appreciated the

concerns. The HPB heard from the contractor and the architect about the challenges of panelization and how the requested method would be an easier pathway. Mr. Thacker did not disagree that it would be an easier pathway. However, Ontario is a steep hill, but throughout the City there are other subdivisions and roads that are steep as well. There are ways to get hot tubs lifted and shingles and heavy equipment onto roofs. Mr. Thacker stated that his comment about poor planning was not intended to be derogatory; but there are ways to get pieces of a building into place prior to other elements being put into place. Homes were able to be built and cranes were able to be used. Mr. Thacker did not think all the necessary steps had been taken to preserve the historic nature of this home. That was the reason for making the determination that there are still ways to reinstall the panels. Mr. Thacker had talked to Mr. Strong about ways to bring in some lifts, recognizing that it will be not be ideal or easy. Mr. Thacker clarified that he was not trying to create an unsafe situation. He was only asking that they try other means and if it becomes an unsafe situation he would re-evaluate and discuss other alternatives. Other alternatives might include pulling off the siding or modifying the panels so they can be maneuvered into place and restored.

Chair Stephens understood that at this point there was no way to have equipment on the hill. He asked if the gradall was earlier in the construction process. Mr. Strong replied that early on in the construction process had a gradall onsite. However, the predominant part of the reconstruction was done by hand. He remarked that 98% of the construction was being without machinery. All the boards were put up by hand.

Chair Stephens asked if Ontario was the only access to the job site. Mr. Strong replied that the only access is from Ontario.

Board Member Hutchings wanted to know how the panels were removed. Mr. Strong stated that the panels were removed during the excavation process when an excavator was on site at the level of the existing house. They were able to take off the existing panels and lower them down onto a truck because they had excavated back into it. There is no way to get an excavator in there because the excavator access was where the garage is now.

Chair Stephens asked Mr. Thacker if he could give the Board an idea of how this could be done without dismantling the panels. Mr. Thacker stated that his initial discussions with Mr. Strong were related to the gradall. If that has been proven not to work, his only other thoughts relate to historic ways and by-hand movements of some type of pulley system. Mr. Thacker believed there were other alternatives, although they might not be ideal. He stated that if they were in agreement with the original conditions that these panels be preserved, there might be other alternatives that need to be explored. That was his direction at this point.

In response to Mr. Thacker, Mr. Strong was concerned about the damage that might occur if they try to put the panels back on before looking at other alternatives. He reiterated that on the south side there was only 3 to 4 feet to slide a 24' panel along the side with the trees and other hindrances.

Chair Stephens understood that the Staff had inspected the panels. Planner Grahm answered yes. The panels are stored in Oakley and they are tarped and being preserved correctly. Chair Stephens commented on two historic homes that were part of the Deer Valley affordable housing project on Deer Valley Drive a number of years ago. Panelization was taking place on both homes and the siding was dry. He recalled that in the process of pulling off the siding, a substantial amount of the siding was left because it was dry. Chair Stephens recognized that those homes had not been covered up like 422 Ontario has for the past few years. He asked if the Staff had noticed the condition of the wood when they inspected the panels. Planner Grahm stated that the panels were stacked so they were not able to look at the edges closely. However, they did notice minor dry rot. As Mr. Mammen had stated, the home was covered with several layers of siding and there are nail holes. Planner Grahm stated that overall a fairly good length of historic siding could be preserved. Chair Stephens remarked that typically, siding over the historic material helps protect it from drying out.

Chair Stephens stated that the HPB not only has to address this situation, but also how it impacts other situations and how they can prevent it from becoming an issue in the future. He asked if the Staff believed this was a unique situation or whether it would set a precedent. Director Erickson replied that the lesson learned with this project is that within the preservation plan and the material deconstruction plan, they would do a better job of timing when the panels get replaced. He noted that the infills are all on steep sites, but this was one of the first they had tried. Planner Grahm had done a good job, but he did not believe the Staff had worked closely enough with the contractor on when the panels should have been replaced. He speculated that it should have been before the garage was built.

Director Erickson stated that each façade has a priority in terms of giving it a try. The west façade or the street side façade is in two or three pieces because of how the house was done. The east façade is in the back. If they had to prioritize, Director Erickson thought it would be the west side, north side, south side, east side. He stated that if even if one or two of the west facing panels could be reinstalled, it would provide the historical context for the method of construction, and potentially reduce the damage to the siding when it comes off.

Board Member Holmgren stated that before the HPB makes a quick decision she thought they should exhaust all other possibilities to put the panels back up. Director Erickson stated that there is a mechanism to address that. The HPB

could uphold the existing material deconstruction and allow the Chief Building Official and the Historic Preservation Planner to make the decision to change the methodology; rather than coming back to the HPB. Allowing the Chief Building Official and the Historic Preservation Planner to make the decision would speed up the process for getting the panels back on the house. Director Erickson preferred to have the panelization completed before there is snow on Ontario.

Mr. Mammen thought this all started with Mr. Thacker's comment about poor planning. He has been doing preservation work in Park City for over 37 years. He was on the original Historic Preservation Board and he was part of the team that wrote the first Historic Preservation Guidelines. Mr. Mammen stated that he is not new to this process and he has restored over two dozen homes in this community. He wanted the HPB to understand that they have been trying to find a way to do this. Mr. Mammen did not believe there was ever a time when the panels could be brought in safely. If there had been a time they would have done it. They have been very careful with the panels in how they were taken down, how they were handled, and how they were stored and preserved. Mr. Mammen emphasized that they have not slighted the importance of the historic nature of this project. He pointed out that it would be totally in compliance with National Historic Preservation rules. He noted that this house was not eligible for historic tax credits because it will not be used for commercial purposes. However, the techniques being used are in compliance with standard historic preservation rules and regulations. Mr. Mammen was upset by the implication that he was not trying to be careful about preserving this structure.

Chair Stephens clarified that the HPB was not questioning Mr. Mammen's intentions. As a Board, they not only have to look at the situation before them, but also how it will impact future situations. It is not uncommon for someone to try to get around the design guidelines based on a previous decision.

Mr. Mammen stated that where they are on Ontario is only the second steepest section of Old Town in all of Old Town. The other steepest section is the other end of Ontario. He thought the HPB would be safe in making a decision without setting a precedent.

Chair Stephens clarified that whether or not it was due to poor planning was not a matter for the HPB to consider. Their decision is based on how to get the house restored to the historic level they originally intended. It is not up to the Board to decide the appropriate way to resolve this problem. The Board would discuss what is within their purview after the public hearing. He recognized the good work Mr. Mammen has done in the past and he felt this was an awkward situation for everyone.

Chair Stephens opened the public hearing.

Ruth Meintsma, a resident at 305 Woodside, asked about the storage of the historic panels. She understood that the panels are supposed to be stored vertically if possible.

Planner Grahn explained that there is not a distinction. The Staff looks at how the contractor plans to store the panels, and as long as the panels will be safe, vertical or horizontal is not an issue. She noted that they do look for flat ground because there have been issues in the past where the panels were stored on a hillside and they tend to warp. In this case, the panels were stored on flat ground.

Ms. Meintsma commented on the difference between the panels and taking off the siding. The applicant indicated that they would be willing to number every siding, take the pieces of carefully and replace them in their original place. She noted that it was a requirement of the City; therefore, it was not actually being offered. Ms. Meintsma remarked that it is preservation standards to save the house if nothing else can be done to save the siding in that manner. However, that is the last choice and the least sought after way to preserve. The goal is to save as much material as possible. Ms. Meintsma stated that the applicant is not always as diligent about saving material as the City. In this situation, she favored a good try to see if some portion of the panels could be saved. She thought it was better to make an effort rather than move directly to the least sought after way to save historic material.

Chair Stephens closed the public hearing.

Board Member Scott echoed previous comments that the HPB had approved panelization, and the panels were taken off and stored appropriate. The HPB was now in an unusual situation because the contractor is saying it is not safe and cannot be done; but the Chief Building Official is saying there are other options. Mr. Scott thought that all options should be exhausted, and the last possible option should be to preserve it piece by piece. He recommended that the HPB allow Planner Grahn and David Thacker to make the determination on what can and cannot be done.

Board Member Hodgkins stated that he was struggling with the issue. They had already gone to the extreme of panelization, and the applicant was proposing to put it all back in smaller panelizations. He personally felt that in the end it was all the same, because historically the panels were removed and the pieces were replaced to the best of their capability in the same form that was there originally. Mr. Hodgkins thought there was tension between the City and the applicant, and the HPB was stuck in the middle.

Board Member Hutchings had the same struggle. However, he agreed with Board Member Scott that all possible options should be explored to replace the

panels. If that could not be safely accomplished, then they could talk about other options.

Board Member Holmgren agreed with Board Member Scott. Planner Grahn and Mr. Thacker should be the ones to consider the options and make the final decision. Ms. Holmgren noted that this has already been before the HPB.

Board Member Brody thought it was out of the hands of the HPB and that the Board had already done what they could do.

Chair Stephens stated that whatever they decide this evening, he would not want the applicant to have to come back to the HPB. He also believed that time was of the essence in order to do something as quickly and efficiently as possible while they still had options.

Mr. Mammen appreciated the sentiment because they have waited three weeks for this Board Meeting. If Planner Grahn had made the decision to go ahead, the siding would be up. Chair Stephens pointed out that Planner Grahn had the authority to make the decision because of how the panelization was approved.

Chair Stephens suggested that Planner Grahn and Dave Thacker work with the applicant and the architect to come up with a solution. It could be a hybrid solution or it could be partial panelization and partial removal. Chair Stephen thought the method would be whatever is determined to be the most efficient within the time constraints and the current situation.

Planner Grahn suggested adding a condition of approval to address their direction this evening. Director Erickson stated that Finding #18 would not be met. He stated that the proposed condition of approval would be, "The Historic Preservation Board upholds the reconstruction of the historic house at 422, consistent with the panelization, with the provision that the Chief Building Official and Historic Preservation Planner can make a determination as to the safety of the panelization, or board by board replacement consistent with City standards".

City Attorney Harrington understood that there was consensus to uphold the Staff's recommendation to deny, but leave a window open for the Building Official and the Staff to determine that another option could be employed. Mr. Harrington stated that the Chief Building Official would have the authority to allow partial or full panelization, depending on that effort. Mr. Harrington clarified that the applicant would still have the right to request an appeal to the HPB if they disagreed with the ultimate determination. The HPB could call a special or emergency meeting to accommodate an appeal if necessary.

Mr. Harrington summarized that the HPB was directing the Staff and the applicant to look at all the options for full panelization. If there are no options, the

decision stands. If the Chief Building Official changes his position based on whatever options were tried, the Staff could permit the modified panelization.

Director Erickson stated that the motion would be the language shown on page 30 in the Staff report, with an additional condition of approval stating, "The Chief Building Official and the Historic Preservation Planner may vary the panelization on the determination of safety of the installation".

Mr. Hutchings suggested "safety and feasibility" or "safety and preservation of the historic material". City Attorney Harrington suggested saying "Standards 1 and 2 that are currently codified". The first is hazardous and dangerous pursuant to 116 of the Building Code. The second is the historic structure cannot be made safe or serviceable through repair.

Director Erickson modified the proposed condition to read, "The Chief Building Official and the Historic Preservation Planner may vary the reconstruction technique for the panels consistent with Criteria #1 and 2."

MOTION: Board Member Scott moved to DENY the reconstruction of the historic house at 422 Ontario Avenue pursuant to the Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Conditions of Approval as found in the Staff report; and as amended this evening per language drafted by Director Erickson. Board Member Holmgren seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

Finding of Fact – 422 Ontario Avenue

1. The property is located at 422 Ontario Avenue.
2. The site is designated as Significant on the Historic Sites Inventory.
3. Based on Sanborn Fire Insurance maps and historic research analysis, the house was likely constructed c.1906 by Amelia and Theodore Neimuth. The house first appears on the 1907 Sanborn Fire Insurance Map as a cross-wing with partial-width front porch and rear addition. This rear addition may have originally served as an open porch, but was enclosed by 1907. The overall form of the house remained unchanged through 1941.
4. Elden "Shorty" (1907-1998) and Ella Sorensen (1918-2009) purchased the house in 1941. Between 1941 and 1949, they constructed a side-gable addition to the north half of the historic cross-wing and relocated the front door from the north-south stem wing of the historic house to the addition. When the addition was constructed, a new roof form was built over the addition and historic house, so that only the gables of the historic c.1906 cross-wing were visible. The Sorensen's also clad the house first in asbestos shingle siding (prior to 1958) and then later cement shingle siding, rebuilt the porches with concrete foundations and metal and wood handrails, and installed the metal roof.

5. On July 20, 2016, the Planning Department received a Historic District Design Review (HDDR) application for the renovation of the historic house and construction of a new addition at 422 Ontario Avenue; the application was deemed complete on October 17, 2016.
6. The Historic Preservation Board (HPB) approved a request for an exterior exploratory demolition permit under the August 2015 pending ordinance on October 21, 2015.
7. On June 21, 2016, the Board of Adjustment (BOA) granted variances to (1) LMC Section 15-2.2-3 (E), to the required twelve foot (12') side yard setbacks to allow a zero foot (0') setback to the front property line, is hereby granted; (2) LMC Section 15-2.2-3 (H), to the required five foot (5') side yard setbacks to allow a three foot (3') setback to the north property lines, is hereby granted; and (3) LMC Section 15-2.2-5 (A) to the required maximum height of thirty five feet (35') to allow a maximum height of forty-one feet (41') measured from the lowest finish floor plane to the point of the highest wall top plate that supports the ceiling joists or roof rafters is hereby granted.
8. On February 11, 2016, the Planning Commission approved a Steep Slope Conditional Use Permit (SS-CUP) for this project.
9. On March 1, 2017, the Historic Preservation Board (HPB) approved the Disassembly and Reassembly ("Panelization") of the historic house in accordance with Land Management Code (LMC) 15-11-14 as the proposal would prevent the demolition of the historic house and the applicant would preserve eight (8) original wall panels of the historic c.1906 cross-wing form. At the time of the application, the Chief Building Official also found that the building was hazardous and dangerous pursuant to Section 116.1 of the International Building Code. Additionally, the Planning Director and Chief Building Official found that there are problematic or structural conditions preclude temporarily lifting or moving a building as a single unit; the physical conditions of the existing materials prevent temporarily lifting or moving the building and the disassembly and reassembly will preserve a greater amount of historic materials; and all other alternatives have shown to result in additional damage or loss of historic materials.
10. The house was panelized in 2017 and the reconstruction of the historic structure is currently under construction.
11. On September 4, 2018, Planning Department staff conducted a site visit to Oakley, Utah, to inspect the storage of the historic panels. At that time, staff noted that the panels had been stacked and stored horizontally on the ground. A tarp was used to protect the panels from the elements. The panels were in fair condition.
12. On September 6, 2018, Contractor Garrett Strong informed staff that the panels would not be able to be reinstalled due to site constraints and the difficulty of setting up a crane on Ontario Avenue. The applicant proposed to salvage the siding from the panels, number the siding and installing it directly on the house as it was removed.

13. On September 10, 2018, Architect Bill Mammen submitted an addendum to the Historic Preservation Plan. It states that there is no way to lift the existing wall panels into place as single walls.

14. The proposal to only salvage the historic siding and apply it to the reconstructed house structure exceeds the Historic Preservation Board's approval for Disassembly/Reassembly (Panelization) of eight historic wall panels; the scope of work proposed is consistent with Reconstruction of an Existing Historic Building.

15. On September 24, 2018, Chief Building Official Dave Thacker found that the panels were not in such hazardous or dangerous condition that reinstalling the historic panels was improbable and total reconstruction of the historic house was not necessary.

16. The Historic Building was found by the Chief Building Official to be hazardous and dangerous, pursuant to Section 116.1 of the International Building Code on February 9, 2017.

17. The historic wall panels are not in such a poor condition that they cannot be made safe and serviceable through repair. The historic wall panels are in fair condition and could be installed in whole.

18. Reapplying salvaged siding or a whole wall panel will not diminish the overall form, placement, orientation, and location of the Historic Building; however, it will diminish the single-wall features and detailing of the original single-wall construction used to build this house. By only salvaging the historic siding and not preserving the entire wall panel, historic materials will be lost. The wall structure in itself is significant to our understanding of historic single-wall construction methods and craftsmanship of our vernacular architecture. Furthermore, historic materials will be unnecessarily lost.

Conclusions of Law – 422 Ontario Avenue

1. The proposal does not meet the criteria for Reconstruction pursuant to LMC 15-1115 Reconstruction of an Existing Historic Building or Historic Structure.

Conditions of Approval – 422 Ontario Avenue

1. The Chief Building Official and Historic Preservation Planner may vary the reconstruction technique of the panels consistent with Criteria 1 and 2 of LMC 1511-15 Reconstruction of an Existing Historic Building or Historic Structure.

3. 180 Daly Avenue—Material Deconstruction—Significant Site. The applicant is proposing to impact the following materials including the contemporary picket and privacy fences; c.1992 two-car garage; contemporary wood deck; contemporary wood and cinder block retaining walls; post-1949 root cellar; c.1992 roofing materials; c.1992 wood siding

on the south, east, and west elevations; historic and contemporary wood doors; and non-historic aluminum and wood sliding and picture windows.
(Application PL-15-02961)

Planner Grahn stated that this house was originally built as a hall-parlor. It shows up as early as the 1889 Sanborn Fire Insurance Map. The house was expanded early on to become a T-shaped addition. Planner Grahn stated that based on other projects in Park City, it was not uncommon that the way to expand these houses in Park City was to add another wing onto the hall-parlor.

In 1900 the house had a little porch. She indicated additions off the back and a small addition off the corner. Over time the house continued to grow and expand. At some point the corner addition was lost. Planner Grahn stated that after the 1930s the porch was removed. It is unclear why the porch was removed, but it is documented in the Sanborn. At the same time, possibly because the craftsman style was popular, a lot of details were added to the house. French casement windows were added, a craftsman style door was added, as well as other details that were more synonymous with the craftsman bungalows being built in Salt Lake at the time. Planner Grahn noted that by 1941 the porch area was filled in.

Planner Grahn stated that the house retains a lot of its integrity. Comparing what exists today with the 1941 photograph, it is fairly intact. Modifications were made in replacing the doors and windows. In the 1990s the siding was replaced because by that time it likely had rotted. The only historic siding that remains is on the north elevation. They know this because it maintains the shadow line of where the rear addition was added.

Planner Grahn thought it was important to note that the project contains two lots. The applicant has been working with the Staff for a while to bring this project into compliance with the LMC and the Design Guidelines. A non-historic 1990s garage sits on the adjacent lot, and the applicant has approval to demolish the garage. The applicant proposes to redevelop the site by adding an addition on the back.

Planner Grahn stated that the applicant was making an effort to retain the mature trees on the property that goes along the Daly Avenue streetscape. A number of fences, walkways, and a wood deck in the front yard will all be removed and the applicant plans to restore the historic character to the yard.

Planner Grahn commented on non-historic additions. A root cellar shown on the survey disappears into the back of the hillside. The Historic Preservation Board previously found that these elements are not architecturally significant. The applicant was proposing to remove the root cellar in order to add a transitional element that will lead to a much larger addition.

Planner Grahm stated that the building is single-wall construction. The applicant had not yet done exploratory demolition, but they anticipate being able to add framed walls and tie it into the structure. The roof has a shallow roof pitch. The roof pitch has not changed over time. Historically there were wide crimped metal roof metals that have been replaced. The roof does not meet snow loads, which is typical of historic houses. The applicant believes they can restructure the roof from the interior. The Staff understands that it might not be possible depending on the condition of the structural members. A number of conditions of approval were added to insure that the original cross-gable form will be maintained. If they cannot restructure from the interior, the applicant will be required to demonstrate the reason through a structural engineer. Planner Grahm noted that she and the Chief Building Official will work with the applicant if that is the case.

Regarding the exterior walls, Planner Grahm reiterated that the siding has been replaced over the time and only the north wall has historic siding. The applicant was proposing to use this siding as a profile to replicate it on the other walls. On the west wall, the wall acts as a retaining wall for the canyon wall. The material has rotted and changed over time. There are new wood siding materials, metal, and concrete. It is a hodge-podge as the area rotted out. The applicant was proposing to remove those materials and put in new wood siding. The new addition will help retain the hillside and prevent the wall from rotting out again. Planner Grahm believed the window openings were original; however, she understood that as they get further into it, they might find that the slider windows are not the original opening. The Staff asked the applicant to document any original openings that they find as they go through the siding replacement. Priority should be given to restoring any original openings on the front of the house. Planner Grahm stated that there could be more leniency on the sides because they are not visible from the right-of-way.

Planner Grahm stated that the applicant was proposing to remove 17'8" of the back wall in order to add the transitional element for the new addition. They would also be removing a portion of the wall for the French doors. She emphasized that it would be on the back. It will not be visible and will not impact the integrity of the historic house.

Planner Grahm noted that the historic house does not have a foundation and it sits directly on the dirt. The applicant was proposing to lift the house 2' as permitted by the Design Guidelines. The applicant was proposing to pour a new foundation and basement. Planner Grahm stated that typical conditions of approval were added in terms of not lifting the house for more than 45 days, making sure the structural engineer looks at the cribbing to keep the house from falling, and keeping the house safe. Planner Grahm stated that there were only two historic door openings on the house. The front door was replaced and the applicant was proposing to reconstruct the original door as shown in the

photographs. On the north elevation, the door is no longer in use; however, but the applicant was proposing to use it as siding. Planner Grahn stated that the majority of the windows were replaced over time with new aluminum windows. The applicant was proposing to replace the aluminum windows with new wood windows to match the historic photograph.

Kevin Horne, the project architect, was present to answer questions.

Chair Stephens clarified that the HPB was only looking at deconstruction of historic materials; and that the garage was not part of this review. He summarized that they were looking at the historic addition on the rear of the house and the French doors that will exit from the rear of the house to the west. Planner Grahn stated that they could also discuss the repair work of the siding on the north elevation. These were probably the only historic materials affected. She reiterated that the window openings were historic but the windows themselves have been lost.

Board Member Hutchings wanted to know why the Board was given information about lifting the house if their scope was limited to the specific items just mentioned. He understood that the HPB was only looking at material deconstruction and the HDDR review would come later. Planner Grahn replied that the HDDR was ongoing. In 2015 when the Code was amended in 2015 and included the material deconstruction, one reason was to ensure a review by the Historic Preservation Board. The Staff always provides the HPB with all the changes so if there is disagreement with the Staff, the Board has the opportunity to have a discussion and apply the criteria. It is helpful if the Board can see what work is impacting the historic house and whether it will impact the historic materials.

Director Erickson recalled that when the HPB revised the Design Guidelines, they wanted to make sure they were made aware of the houses that would be lifted. Therefore, the Staff includes it in the Staff report even though it is part of the HDDR process. Chair Stephens thought the Staff also includes it to make sure the other conditions of approval do not get missed with regards to lifting the home.

Chair Stephens opened the public hearing.

There were no comments.

Chair Stephens closed the public hearing.

MOTION: Board Member Hutchings moved to APPROVE the Material Deconstruction of Non-historic and Non-Contributory Materials at 180 Daly Avenue, pursuant to the Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Conditions of

Approval found in the Staff report. Board Member Holmgren seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

The motion passed unanimously.

Findings of Fact – 180 Daly Avenue

1. The property is located on 180 Daly Avenue.
2. On July 12, 2018, the Park City Council approved the Daly Delight Plat Amendment located at this address through Ordinance 2018-37; the plat has not yet been recorded.
3. The property is located within the Historic Residential (HR-1) District and meets the purpose of the zone.
4. Following recordation of the plat, Lot A at 180 Daly Avenue will contain a total of 3,986 square feet.
5. A single family dwelling is an allowed use in the HR-1 District.
6. A Historic District Design Review (HDDR) application is currently under review.
7. On October 3, 2018, the Historic Preservation Board approved the applicant's proposed Material Deconstruction.
8. On January 20, 2016, the City received an application for a Steep Slope Conditional Use Permit; the application was deemed complete on December 12, 2017.
9. Access to the property is from Daly Avenue, a public street.
10. The neighborhood is characterized by a mix of historic and non-historic residential structures, single family homes, and duplexes. The streetscape on the west side of the road, is dominated by historic garages, sheds, and pedestrian entryways.
11. The proposal will create a single family dwelling of 3,276 square feet, including the basement area.
12. An overall building footprint of 1,568 square feet is proposed following construction of the addition. The maximum allowed footprint for this lot is 1,593 square feet.
13. The proposed addition complies with all setbacks. The minimum front and rear yard setbacks are 12 feet. The minimum side yard setbacks are 5 feet.
14. The historic house currently has a front yard setback of 11 feet, less than the required 12 feet. Per Land Management Code 15-2.2-4 Existing Historic Structures that do not comply with the Building Footprint, Building Height, Building Setbacks, Off-Street parking, and driveway location standards are valid Non-complying Structures.
15. The proposed addition complies with the twenty-seven feet (27') maximum building height requirement measured from existing grade. Portions of the house are less than twenty-seven feet (27') in height and the tallest portion of the building is 18.4 feet above existing grade.

16. The applicant submitted a visual analysis, cross valley views, and a streetscape showing a contextual analysis of visual impacts of this house on the cross canyon views and the Park Avenue streetscape. Staff finds that the proposed house is compatible with the surrounding structures based on this analysis.

17. The lot has an average slope of 43.5% and in some areas, the slope is as much as 83%. The front portion of the lot where the historic house sits is relatively flat; however, the grade quickly steepens to form the wall of the canyon directly west of the historic house.

18. The development is located and designed to reduce visual and environmental impacts of the Structure. Because the historic house sits at the front of the lot and on a flat portion of the lot, much of the bulk and mass of the new addition is buried in the hillside and is not visible from Daly Avenue. On the north and south sides of the new addition, only one to two stories will be visible above Final Grade. Retaining walls will be used to terrace the grade in four foot segments within the side yards.

19. A visual analysis has been provided and it has been determined that the potential impacts for the project have been mitigated through screening, slope stabilization, erosion mitigation, vegetation protection, and other methods. The proposed addition fits within the context of the slope, neighboring structures and existing vegetation. According to the survey, there are five (5) existing trees on the lot. The applicant proposes to retain the three (3) trees at the front of the site and replace the other two (2) trees with seven (7) new white pine trees. The visual analysis has demonstrated that the proposed design is visually compatible with the neighborhood and is similar in mass and scale to surrounding structures.

20. Access points have been designed to minimize Grading of the natural topography and reduce overall Building Scale. No new driveway or vehicular access to the site is proposed. The site will continue to be accessible from Daly Avenue, and the front door of the building is on the historic house.

21. The applicant has incorporated terraced retaining walls to regain Natural Grade. Finished Grade will be within 4 feet of existing grade following completion of the project. The retaining walls do not exceed 4 feet in height and vegetation will be planted on the terraces to further minimize the visibility of the retaining walls.

22. The buildings, access, and infrastructure have been located to minimize cut and fill that would alter the perceived topography of the site. The new structure's building pad has been located to minimize cut and fill. Though taller than the historic house, the new addition will be set back at least 10 feet from the rear wall of the historic house to help further visually separate it from the historic house. A long shed roof on the façade will help reduce the perceived size of the new addition and make the addition appear to be stepping up the hill. The applicant has been able to hide much of the bulk and mass of the addition underground.

23. The building has is oriented along the Lot's existing contours, and the main ridge of the new three-story addition will be parallel to the grade. This allows the east side of the gable roof to slope down with the grade. The tallest portion of

the structure is 18.4 feet above existing grade, and some portions of the new addition will be only 6.4 feet above existing grade. The proposed design complies with the Design Guidelines for Historic District and Historic Sites as exterior elements of the new development are of human scale and compatible with the neighborhood.

24. The design of the new addition has prevented a “wall effect” along the Street. The mass of the new addition has been staggered so that the three-story addition is visually separated from the historic house and much of its mass and bulk has been buried in the hillside. The articulation of the massing pattern reduces the overall perceived mass of the structure.

25. The volume of the Structure has been limited in order to minimize its visual mass and mitigate the differences in scale between the existing Historic House and the new addition. The taller portions of the new addition are physically and visually separated from the historic house. Setback variations and lower building heights have further reduced the overall mass and scale. The proposed mass and architectural design components are compatible with both the volume and massing of other single family dwellings in the areas. By burying much of the mass underground, the differences in scale between the new addition and surrounding structures have been minimized.

26. The proposed new addition has a height of 18.4 feet above Existing Grade, much lower than the maximum zone height of 27 feet. The roof of the new addition has been designed to allow for a long shed roof to slope downhill towards Daly Avenue. The mass of the roof form has been broken up by gable-roofed dormers. The overall interior height of the structure is 34.6 feet.

27. No lighting has been proposed at this time. Lighting will be reviewed at the time of the HDDR and Building Permit application for compliance with the LMC lighting code standards.

28. The property was posted and notice was mailed to property owners within 300 feet on October 17, 2018. Legal notice was also published in the Park Record in accordance with requirements of the LMC on October 6, 2018.

29. The property is located outside of the Soils Ordinance.

30. The findings in the Analysis section of this report are incorporated herein.

Conclusions of Law – 180 Daly Avenue

1. The CUP, as conditioned, is consistent with the Park City Land Management Code, specifically section 15-2.2-6(B).
2. The CUP, as conditioned, is consistent with the Park City General Plan.
3. The proposed use will be compatible with the surrounding structures in use, scale, mass, and circulation.
4. The effects of any differences in use or scale have been mitigated through careful planning.

Conditions of Approval – 180 Daly Avenue

1. All Standard Project Conditions shall apply.
2. City approval of a construction mitigation plan is a condition precedent to the issuance of any building permits. The CMP shall include language regarding the method of protecting adjacent structures.
3. City Engineer review and approval of all lot grading, utility installations, public improvements and drainage plans for compliance with City standards is a condition precedent to building permit issuance.
4. No building permit shall be issued until the Daly Delight Plat Amendment is recorded with the Summit County Recorder's Office.
5. This approval will expire on October 24, 2019, if a building permit has not been issued by the building department before the expiration date, unless an extension of this approval has been requested in writing prior to the expiration date and is granted by the Planning Director.
6. Plans submitted for a Building Permit must substantially comply with the plans reviewed and approved by the Planning Commission on October 24, 2019, and the Final HDDR Design.
7. Residential fire sprinklers will be required for all new construction per requirements of the Chief Building Official.
8. All exterior lighting, on porches, decks, garage doors, entryways, etc. shall be shielded to prevent glare onto adjacent property and public rights-of-way and shall be subdued in nature. Light trespass into the night sky is prohibited. Final lighting details will be reviewed by the Planning Staff prior to installation.
9. Construction waste should be diverted from the landfill and recycled when possible.
10. All excavation work to construct the foundation shall start on or after April 15th and be completed on or prior to October 15th. 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, he determines that it is necessary based upon specific site conditions such as access, or lack thereof, exist, or in an effort to reduce impacts on adjacent properties.
11. Final landscape plan shall be provided at the time of the building permit and shall include existing vegetation, and include a replacement plan for any significant vegetation proposed to be removed.
12. The property is located outside the Park City Landscaping and Maintenance of Soil Cover Ordinance (Soils Ordinance) and therefore not regulated by the City for mine related impacts. If the property owner does encounter mine waste or mine waste impacted soils they must handle the material in accordance to State and Federal law.

Historic Preservation Board Meeting
October 3, 2018

The Meeting adjourned at 6:23 p.m.

Approved by _____
Douglas Stephens, Chair
Historic Preservation Board