

PARK CITY MUNICIPAL CORPORATION
HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD
MINUTES OF SEPTEMBER 2, 2020

BOARD MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE: Lola Beatlebrox, Puggy Holmgren, Jack Hodgkins, Randy Scott, Tana Toly

EX OFFICIO: Bruce Erickson, Caitlyn Barhorst, Hannah Tyler, Mark Harrington

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

ROLL CALL

Vice-Chair Scott called the meeting to order at 5:00 p.m. and noted that all Board Members were present except Doug Stephens and John Hutchings, who were excused.

Determination of the Health and Safety Risk under the OPMA

Vice-Chair Scott read the Determination of Health and Safety Risk under OPMA. Notice of electronic meeting and how to comment virtually. The meeting will be an electronic meeting without an anchor location as permitted by Utah Code Open and Public Meetings Act Section 52-4-207(4) as amended June 18, 2020, and Park City Resolution 18-2020 adopted March 19, 2020. The written determination of a substantial health and safety risk, required by Utah Code section 52-4-207(4) attached as Exhibit A.

The Historic Preservation Board Members will connect electronically. Public comments will be accepted virtually. To comment virtually, use eComment or raise your hand on Zoom. eComments submitted before the meeting date will be attached to the packet as appendices. eComments submitted on HPB meeting days will be read aloud. For more information on participating virtually and to listen live, please go to www.parkcity.org

Vice-Chair Scott read from Exhibit A, Determination of Substantial Health and Safety Risk. On September 2, 2020, the Board Chair determined that conducting a meeting with an anchor location presents a substantial risk to the health and safety of those who may be present at the anchor location. Utah Code Section 52-4-207(4) requires this determination and the facts upon which it is based, which include the percent of positive Covid-19 cases in Utah has been on the rise since May 27, 2020. Positive cases from testing have increased from 4.96% to 9.23% during the month of June, and COVID-19 patients in Utah hospitals have increased during the same time period. As of June 25, 2020, there have been 158 deaths in Utah due to COVID-19. Summit County has the third highest case rate of COVID-19 in the state.

This determination is valid for 30 days and is set to expire on October 2, 2020.
Dated September 2, 2020.

ADOPTION OF MINUTES

August 5, 2020

Board Member Beatlebrox referred to the top of page 3 and changed The Montague to correctly read **The Montage**.

Board Member Hodgkins referred to page 2, the motion to approve the Minutes from the July meeting. He noted that he made the motion and John Hutchings seconded it. The Minutes reflect that Mr. Hutchings made the motion and seconded it and that should be corrected.

MOTION: Board Member Beatlebrox moved to APPROVE the minutes of August 5, 2020 as corrected. Board Member Hodgkins seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS

There were no comments.

STAFF/BOARD COMMUNICATIONS AND DISCLOSURES

There were no reports or disclosures

REGULAR AGENDA

- 5.A. 1128 Park Avenue – Historic District Design Review Historic Preservation Board Review for Material Deconstruction of a Landmark Historic Site – The Applicant is Proposing Material Deconstruction for the Landmark Historic Site consisting of removal of the Historic foundation for the construction of a new basement foundation and removal of the rear wall and possible Historic addition to accommodate a New Addition.
(Application PL-20-04484)

Planner Caitlyn Barhorst stated that this item was the material deconstruction review for 1128 Park Avenue, which is a Landmark site. The reason for review was removal of historic material to accommodate new additions, new construction, or structural upgrades as proposed in this project. The Staff would be reviewing all routine maintenance, as well as the removal of non-historic features.

Planner Barhorst noted that the proposal in the packet was broken into two items. The first proposal was the historic foundation. The applicant was

proposing to lift the structure and raise it from the existing elevation by 2' to accommodate a new basement addition. The applicant will regrade with only 6" of foundation shown with the new structure. This would accommodate Park Avenue being slightly higher than it was historically and for drainage issues.

Planner Barhorst presented the as-built drawings with the USGS elevation called out, as well as the current and the proposed elevations.

Planner Barhorst suggested that the Board discussed this first part of the proposal and conduct a public hearing before moving to the second part.

Vice-Chair Scott thought this was a standard request and he could see nothing out of the ordinary. He had no issues or clarifying questions. Board Member Holmgren concurred.

Vice-Chair Scott opened the public hearing.

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

Vice-Chair Scott closed the public hearing.

Board Member Beatlebrox thought this was a straightforward application and complied with the LMC criteria.

MOTION: Board Member Hodgkins moved to APPROVE the material deconstruction of the historic foundation, in accordance with the Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Conditions of Approval as found in the Staff report. Board Member Holmgren seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

Planner Barhorst reviewed the next proposal in the application, which was the rear wall and the possible historic addition. She requested that the HPB discuss this item, open a public hearing, and provide direction to the Staff. No action was required this evening.

Planner Barhorst presented the existing floor plan showing additions in the rear. The applicant was proposing to remove the area identified in red and construct an addition at the rear that connects at the rear wall highlighted in red. Planner Barhorst stated that when she was doing her review, the determination of non-historic addition versus historic addition proposed to be removed was unclear. She noted that the area in green was not shown on any historic maps within the historic period. However, the area in red, which has a small shed addition, does show on the maps.

Planner Barhorst presented a photo and noted that the original structure was a street facing shotgun gable house. The south facing gable was added on to. Planner Barhorst stated that typically in Park City it was the hall and parlor form and the front gable was added onto to. This structure is unique. She presented the phasing of the areas of the footprint that are shown on the historic Sanborn maps. The yellow identified the original footprint. The map jumps from 1907 to 1929 and shows a footprint in blue and the south facing gable addition, as well as a form of the shed addition in the rear, which is in question.

Board Member Hodgkins asked for the year of the area identified in green. Planner Barhorst replied that it was after the 1941 footprint. She believed the historic period was through the Mature Mining Era, but she could not find any specific record. Planner Barhorst stated that the green area did not show up in the Sanborn map and was logged as a non-historic addition.

Planner Barhorst indicated the exterior wall in question highlighted in yellow, which could potentially have been an original exterior wall if the south facing gable was constructed prior to the shed addition. She was requesting direction this evening to make findings for approval or denial, or a continuation to request additional information to determine the removal of the shed in the red section.

Board Member Holmgren pointed out that it is well over 50 years. Planner Barhorst stated that the applicant restored it back to this period and they were in between the 1907 Sanborn and the 1929 Sanborn with the green footprint non-existent at that time. She clarified that the applicant was restoring the structure back to the footprint of its historic period. However, the shed addition is still in question. Planner Barhorst stated that there has been no interior demolition of the wall at this time. As seen in the past, these building have been added onto in phases and that was very common. If there is evidence such as exterior siding or ghost framed-in window that would give substantial evidence of that being an exterior wall, it would be an appropriate restoration to bring it back to just the T-shaped cottage.

Vice-Chair Scott acknowledged that when he read through the packet, he got the timing wrong. He jumped to the conclusion that the red area was put on after 1929. Vice-Chair Scott understood from Planner Barhorst that it is important to understand what is behind the wall, because if it is historic, it presents the applicant with potential options on what to do with the southeast corner.

Board Member Hodgkins asked why they believe the red was not there in 1929. Planner Barhorst replied that a discrepancy is a little jog in the exterior wall that could be seen in the Sanborn map. Mr. Hodgkins stated that looking at the elevation, it suggests that the two parts are slightly different. He suggested that someone may have drawn in the jog because of the elevation and not necessarily because of the floor plan. Planner Barhorst agreed. She thought

another possibility is that there might have been a jog and the little foot section was added on and the roof was extended or rebuilt. Vice-Chair Scott asked if there is an inconsistency with the Sanborn maps where the red could have just been a shed. Planner Barhorst clarified that she had added the shed in red. Mr. Hodgkins did not think the 1941 map looked any different than the 1929 map.

Board Member Holmgren stated that even 1941 makes the structure 79 years old.

Board Member Toly asked for the difference because both are historic. Planner Barhorst explained that the applicant was proposing to restore the footprint back to a selected period of significance within the Mature Mining Era. On the Historic Sites Form the 1894-1930 period is the era of Significance for this structure.

Board Member Hodgkins asked if there were any maps between 1907 and 1929. Planner Barhorst answered no. Vice-Chair Scott recalled previous situations where it was not unusual for a historic home to have several additions over a period of time. In those cases, the HPB typically sticks with the period of the original historic home, and if an addition was done in the 1940s or 1950s that is not consistent with the look and feel, it is looked at differently. Board Member Hodgkins thought it would also depend on the historic significance of the structure. If someone lived there during a specific time period it could be viewed differently than straight architectural history.

Board Member Beatlebrox stated that this house reminded her of the house on Crescent Tram that the Board previously approved because the front facade of this particular house will remain the same. The little shed structure that was put in for whatever reason does not affect the Landmark footprint. Board Member Hodgkins thought the discussion was whether the red area is also part of the blue area. The question is whether they were built at the same time and go together. Chair Scott agreed because it is not clear through the Sanborn maps.

Board Member Hodgkins asked if there was an elevation of the north side and if the applicant intended to keep that side at the current elevation. Planner Barhorst pulled up the north elevation. Mr. Hodgkins assumed from the drawing that the elevation of the red addition would not be kept. Board Member Beatlebrox thought it looked like part of the connecting structure to the addition.

Board Member Holmgren thought it was clearly shown on the 1929 Sanborn map. Chair Scott thought it was clear that there was some type of structure, which is the red part in question; however, it is not clear what it was. He asked if any exploratory work was done in the red section. Planner Barhorst was not aware of any exploratory work. Board Member Hodgkins believed the question is what was there and replaced when the green part was added. In looked at the

current plan, the red and the green all flow as one room. He thought it was possible that whatever was there was replaced or added on to.

Kevin Horn, representing the applicant, was on the line to answer questions. However, Mr. Horn was having trouble with his audio. An associate on the line, Peter, stepped in until the audio issue was fixed.

Peter stated that exploratory work was done inside the home and he confirmed that the shed was added. He noted that page 8 of the Physical Conditions Report and Historic Preservation Plan showed a photo of roofing materials underneath the shed roof, which suggested a subsequent addition. Planner Barhorst pulled up the Physical Conditions Report and indicated the roof structure of the shed. Peter explained that it was the roof over the blue section.

Kevin Horn, representing the applicant, stated that from the Sanborn map it is clear that they went to the trouble of drawing the addition in offset from the south facade. He did not believe that could be overlooked. Secondly, as the photos show, they looked up in the attic and noticed that it was roofed in the attic for the south facing gable before the shed went on. He pointed out that the construction wood was newer than the construction material on the left, which indicates that it was built since the 1941 Sanborn map. Mr. Horn stated that they also noticed that the brick chimney is at the edge of the offset shown on the Sanborn map. It was enlarged with the addition, which is why they believe it was not part of the original historic residence or the subsequent addition. Mr. Horn remarked that in the south elevation, a seam is visible where the siding was connected and does not align. Also, the window shape is not a historic form. Mr. Horn stated that based on those items, it is not contributory and most likely was put in since the later Sanborn map.

Mr. Horn stated that once in the kitchen, it was evident that the addition does not meet Code requirements. In terms of constructability and livability, it is non-usable space because it was not built to Code standards and was probably built without a permit. It is clear that the addition is substandard and not part of the historic nature of the home. Mr. Horn noted that the photos and the full report were included in the Staff report.

Board Member Beatlebrox thought it would be helpful to review those pages. Peter pulled up the pages Mr. Horn had referenced. He indicated the south exterior photo and pointed out the seam Mr. Horn mentioned. Peter pointed to the shingle roof and the hole from inside this area. He stated that horizontal slider window was another obvious reason why this was not a historic addition. Mr. Hodgkins thought the foundation looked different as well. Peter agreed that there was clearly a seam in the foundation. He noted that the house originally had a stone rock cellar. Mr. Hodgkins pointed out that there is also a break between the two sidings which would indicate that the red and the blue were not

built at the same time. Peter indicated an area where the siding was extended further and does not line up.

Planner Barhorst stated that the historic era for this structure is the Mature Mining Era, which is 1894 to 1930. Since the red shed addition in shows up on the Sanborn maps within that historic period, The Staff interpretation determined that the removal restoration of the footprint was in question. She was not able to determine whether or not removing that was an appropriate restoration of the structure's footprint. Planner Barhorst believed they had clearly established that the shed was an addition. However, the question is since this shed piece at the south corner of the T-cottage did exist in the historic period, whether restoring that back to just the T-cottage was appropriate for this Landmark historic site.

Board Member Beatlebrox stated that she looks at the many additions that occur over time. Since the roofline is still there, she believes that the Landmark portion is the original T. The shed may have accommodated a growing family, but it is not necessarily part of the Mature Mining Era.

Planner Barhorst stated that the Board needed to direct her to draft findings based on that issue.

Board Member Hodgkins thought the Board was focused on the shed. However, if he looks at the proposal for deconstruction, it appears that a large portion of the original 1895 building was being proposed for material deconstruction. Planner Barhorst replied that he was correct. He did not believe anyone was questioning whether or not the yellow wall was historic.

Mr. Horn stated that the rear wall does not exist as a historic wall because everything historic was removed and it was finished off as part of the kitchen. Planner Barhorst noted that it attaches where the other non-historic addition already connects to that exterior wall. They were using the same wall area of the original 1890 structure for that attachment.

Board Member Hodgkins understood they were making the assumption that it is a historic or original wall, and that someone made the decision to attach the addition in the same place as the addition being pulled off. Mr. Horn stated that if Mr. Hodgkins was talking about the northeast corner, he believed there were photographs of that corner in the packet. Peter remarked that because of the green and red additions, that section of yellow wall does not exist today because there is an opening of contiguous space between the red and the green. Mr. Hodgkins agreed; however, he believed the yellow wall still exists. Peter pointed out that the yellow wall was opened to create a single room in the existing home. Mr. Hodgkins clarified that the wall he was questioning is from the 1895 building. He did not think the currently proposed addition was pulling back from the original house and creating a true transitional element the way the HPB intended

through the Code change. It seemed to be pushed up very tight to the original building, making it difficult to read the original structure on the site.

Mr. Horn asked if Mr. Hodgkins was suggesting that the addition would not be connected to the east wall. Mr. Hodgkins stated that it needs to be connected at some point, but he thought there was a lot of connection space. Mr. Horn stated that the Code provides very specific dimensions in terms of how far back it can go and the percentage of the width of the addition. They followed those dimensions leaving the step back for the transition element. Mr. Horn stated that the treatment of the transition element sets the addition off from the single-story transition element.

Board Member Hodgkins could see the transition element, however, he thought a large percentage of the wall of the original 1895 house would get lost inside the addition. Mr. Horn reiterated that they followed the dimensions defined in the Code for the setback.

Director Erickson stated that the Board could rely on the LMC setbacks. He pointed out that the addition and the transition element will not be addressed until the HDDR is submitted for Staff review. Director Erickson remarked that it was more critical for the HPB to look at the yellow wall that may or may not be there, and whether the shed in red could be removed as part of the material deconstruction.

Planner Barhorst reiterated that the focus this evening is for the Board to direct the Staff to make findings of approval or denial, or to continue this item for additional information and review. She stated that either way, final action would be scheduled for the next meeting. No action was being requested this evening.

Board Member Beatlebrox stated that visiting the site really made a difference in helping them to understand the Crescent Tram property. She believed the Board could have a socially distant site visit to this property. Board Member Holmgren agreed. She thought a site visit would be very helpful. Planner Barhorst noted that the Planning Commission held a socially distant site visit, and she was willing to work with the applicant to plan a site visit to this property.

Vice-Chair Scott asked if the Board was comfortable voting to continue this item this evening with direction to Planner Barhorst to set up a site visit. The Board members concurred.

Vice-Chair Scott re-opened the public hearing for comment. There were no comments. Vice-Chair Scott continued the public hearing.

MOTION: Board Member Beatlebrox moved to CONTINUE the discussion and public hearing on 1128 Park Avenue to October 7, 2020 and to direct the Staff to

Historic Preservation Board Meeting
September 2, 2020

schedule a site visit prior to that meeting. Board Member Holmgren seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

The Historic Preservation Board Meeting adjourned at 6:10 p.m.

Approved by _____
Douglas Stephens, Chair
Historic Preservation Board

APPROVED 10.07.2020