



**PARK CITY MUNICIPAL CORPORATION
HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD
MINUTES OF SEPTEMBER 1, 2021**

BOARD MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE: Lola Beatlebrox, Puggy Holmgren, Jack Hodgkins, John Hutchings, Douglas Stephens, Tana Toly

EX OFFICIO MEMBERS: Gretchen Milliken, Planning Director; Aiden Lillie, Planner; Rebecca Ward, Planner; Mark Harrington, City Attorney

1. ROLL CALL

MOTION: Board Member Stephens moved to appoint Board Member Beatlebrox as Chair Pro Tempore for the September 1, 2021, Historic Preservation Board Meeting. Board Member Hodgkins seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Board.

In the absence of Chair Randy Scott, Chair Pro Tempore Lola Beatlebrox called the meeting to order at 5:07 p.m. and conducted a roll call.

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

Determination of the Health and Safety Risk under the OPMA

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

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

2. MINUTES APPROVAL

A. Consideration to Approve the Historic Preservation Board Meeting Minutes from June 2, 2021.

Chair Pro Tem Beatlebrox noted that the first item on the Park City Historic Preservation Board Meeting agenda was approval of minutes. Board Member Hodgkins pointed out that the Meeting Minutes for June 2, 2021, were approved the previous month. He wondered why they were back on the agenda. Chair Pro Tem Beatlebrox suggested that the minutes be approved again for clarity. Planning Director, Gretchen Milliken apologized for the confusion and explained that she would look into the issue.

MOTION: Board Member Hodgkins moved to APPROVE the Minutes of June 2, 2021, as written. Board Member Holmgren seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

B. Consideration to Approve the Historic Preservation Board Meeting Minutes from July 7, 2021.

MOTION: Board Member Holmgren moved to APPROVE the Minutes of July 7, 2021, as written. Board Member Stephens seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

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

Board Member Hodgkins noted that there were some highlighted areas in the Meeting Minutes. Director Milliken explained that there may have been audio issues when recording the meeting. Chair Pro Tem Beatlebrox recalled that there was difficulty with the audio during that portion of the August 4, 2021 meeting.

Board Member Stephens wondered if approval of the minutes should be postponed in order for Board Members to fill in the highlighted areas based on their recollections. That would result in a more complete document. City Attorney, Mark Harrington approved of the suggestion. Board Member Hodgkins believed he made the motion to approve the 1060 Park Avenue agenda item. Board Member Holmgren noted that she seconded the motion on that item.

MOTION: Board Member Stephens moved to CONTINUE approval of the Minutes of August 4, 2021, to a date uncertain. Board Member Hutchings seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

3. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS

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

4. STAFF/BOARD COMMUNICATIONS AND DISCLOSURES

A. Landscaping in the Historic Districts.

City Planner, Aiden Lillie, reported that the Historic District Grant Program applications closed on August 15, 2021. The Planning Department had been reviewing the applications and those that qualified under the competitive grant would be shared with the Historic Preservation Board at the October 6, 2021, meeting. Planner Lillie would present the applications at that time and the Board would make a recommendation to City Council. She noted that City Council would have final approval.

City Planner, Rebecca Ward, reported that there were two other items to discuss as part of the Staff/Board Communications and Disclosures. There was a Staff Report related to Landscaping in the Historic Districts. Staff planned to schedule a Work Session to discuss the possibility of improving the preservation of landscaping for Historic Sites.

The other item related to an emergency repair work waiver that was granted for 427 Main Street. Planner Ward explained that the bricks on the non-functioning chimney at the location had begun started to fall. There were pedestrian accesses and parking spaces below the chimney. It was required that the area be secured and the property owner complete a Structural Engineer's Report as soon as possible. Additionally, the Parking Department blocked spaces near the chimney. Planner Ward showed various photos of the building as well as the chimney. She shared the following additional details regarding the building:

- 427 Main Street is designated as a Landmark Historic Structure on the Historic Sites Inventory;
- The site was listed as a contributing building on the National Register of Historic Places in 1979 as part of the Park City Main Street Historic District; and
- 427 Main Street was constructed in 1939 and reflects the Public Works Administration Moderne, with a symmetrical façade, smooth wall surfaces, heavy massing, framed entrance with Art Deco motifs, and a monumental scale.

Planner Ward reported that the Structural Engineer's Report determined the following:

- The flashing failed and moisture is entering the wall;
- Mortar and bricks are cracking apart during freeze and thaw cycles;
- Falling pieces of brick could be a safety hazard;
- The damage at the top is substantial and voids can be seen through the entire wall thickness;
- There is a small section of reinforcing with angle iron at the top and mid-section that is not sufficient;
- The chimney appears to have no vertical bars or horizontal bars; and

- The chimney will continue to support its own dead load as is, but it is unknown if it will continue to hold in a seismic event without reinforcement.

It was noted that the Planning Director issued a waiver letter so that construction to take down the chimney could begin. There would be future discussions with the Historic Preservation Board about whether or not the chimney contributed to the historic integrity of the structure and whether it should be reconstructed. Planner Ward noted that the chimney appeared to have been built at the same time as the building.

Director Milliken explained that if the chimney does fall, it could damage surrounding buildings or hurt someone passing by. The chimney needed to be taken down now and a decision could be made at a later date regarding reconstruction. Board Member Stephens wondered if action the Historic Preservation Board was needed during tonight's meeting. Director Milliken noted that this was simply an informational item. Due to the current condition of the chimney, the emergency removal had been approved. Board Member Stephens assumed that the chimney would be removed, the bricks would be retained, and that there would be a decision made about the reconstruction in the future. Director Milliken confirmed that that was the case.

Chair Pro Tem Beatlebrox asked if the chimney was operational. Planner Ward reported that it was a non-functioning chimney. The property owner was aware that there was a possibility the chimney would need to be rebuilt. One of the conditions of the emergency repair work was that as much of the material as possible must be salvaged.

Board Member Hodgkins believed the chimney was integral to the design of the building, considering the size and mass and how it stands alone. The fact that the chimney was built with the building suggested that it should be rebuilt. Board Member Toly believed the building was recently sold to new owners. She asked if there were any plans to renovate the building. Planner Ward was not sure. Chair Pro Tem Beatlebrox thanked staff for sharing information with the Historic Preservation Board.

5. CONTINUATIONS

Chair Pro Tem Beatlebrox noted that item 7A on the Regular Agenda was a continuation.

6. WORK SESSION

A. Woodside Phase II – Work Session – The City Proposes to Deconstruct an Early 1900s Shed to Construct Affordable Housing on 1302 Norfolk Avenue.

Planner Lillie presented the Staff Report and explained that the item related to the City's Proposal to Deconstruct and store two early 1900s sheds, to later be incorporated into the Affordable Housing Building proposed for the Affordable Housing Development, Woodside Park Phase II. Planner Lillie explained that the two sheds are on City-owned

property, but they were not mentioned on the Historic Sites Inventory. The updated project was still in the early conceptual stages. Planner Lillie stated that the intention of the Work Session was to inform Historic Preservation Board Members, receive input about what Board Members would like to see at the site and receive recommendations related to the historic materials that were currently on the site.

Planner Lillie shared an aerial photograph of the site from 1941. She reported that on May 17, 2016, the Planning Department applied for a Determination of Significance for 1302 Norfolk Avenue and recommended designating the Structure a Significant Historic Structure on the Park City Historic Sites Inventory. This was for the house and neither of the sheds were mentioned. Planner Lillie noted that the relevant Meeting Minutes were included in the Staff Report for reference.

On June 6, 2017, the Historic Preservation Board voted unanimously to designate 1302 Norfolk Avenue to the Historic Sites Inventory as Significant. However, there was an appeal. One reason the City wanted to acquire the site was to redesignate it. That item was included on the Regular Agenda and would be presented by Planner Ward later in the meeting. Planner Lillie shared a photograph to highlight the existing condition of the sheds. She commented that they were not in the best condition as there had been some water damage and some of the structural boards seem to have collapsed.

Terracon Consultants, Inc. prepared an Asbestos, Lead, and Hazardous Materials Survey on August 24, 2021. They concluded that lead-containing coatings were identified during the assessment that took place on August 19, 2021. Asbestos-containing materials, universal waste, or other hazardous materials were not identified during the assessment. Planner Lillie reported that the lead-containing coatings were located on the south shed, also referred to as Shed #1. The beige part on the wood wall exterior and the beige part around the door, both interior and exterior, contained lead concentrations greater than or equal to 0.04 mg/cm².

Staff concluded that the shed materials were historic and requested that the Historic Preservation Board share recommendations about whether those materials should be preserved and incorporated into the Woodside Park Phase II project. Planner Lillie noted that the lead-containing coatings would be mitigated. Additionally, she stated that Staff had given thought to the accessory dwellings that remained undesignated in Park City. They would like to move forward and get those sites the designation they deserve. Planner Lillie reported that the issue would be discussed at a future Work Session.

Board Member Hutchings asked if the intent was to rebuild the sheds or incorporate the materials into a new building. Planner Lillie explained that the materials would be disassembled and then stored on-site at first. There was not currently a specific plan for storage, but the idea was that the materials would be protected. The materials could then be incorporated into either a single-family dwelling or a multi-unit structure. It was also possible that the materials could be incorporated into an accessory structure. However,

the intent was to receive input from the Historic Preservation Board about how the materials should be incorporated.

Board Member Hutchings believed that from a historical preservation perspective, it would be best if the shed rebuild was incorporated into the site design. Board Member Stephens felt that if the materials were incorporated into a single-family residence, they would lose all context. To have the materials incorporated into a building would make no historical or contextual sense. If they could be incorporated into some kind of outdoor building, like a shed, that would make more contextual sense.

Chair Pro Tem Beatlebrox asked how Board Members would feel about having the materials moved to incorporate them into a new footprint. Board Member Stephens commented that they may be able to take the two sheds and make one shed out of the materials. He noted that it might be difficult to take off and reuse all of the materials as it seemed that they had become warped over time. Board Member Stephens pointed out that the sheds were not listed on the Historic Sites Inventory. If this were a private applicant rather than the City, the private applicant would likely ask whether the sheds could be demolished rather than asking to repurpose them.

Board Member Hodgkins was under the impression that the Historic Preservation Board was considering all structures that were 50 years old. He felt the sheds seemed to fit into the mining era. Whether or not they were included on the Historic Sites Inventory list did not seem important as they would likely be eligible for it. Board Member Hodgkins stated that the Historic Preservation Board had previously discussed changes to the Land Management Code and had talked about receiving a heads up for buildings that were 40 years old to look at preserving some of the early ski history structures as well. He was uncertain why it was a foregone conclusion that the sheds needed to come down. Board Member Stephens noted that he did not say it was. However, he did state that they were not listed on the Historic Sites Inventory.

Board Member Hodgkins wondered if it was possible for the sheds to remain. Chair Pro Tem Beatlebrox noted that they were in poor condition. She believed the Historic Preservation Board may want to see an outdoor building created out of the material that was able to be salvaged, rather than the materials incorporated into a private home. Board Member Stephens commented that since this project was still in the conceptual stage, it might be possible to keep the sheds in the same location for the time being while the future use is determined. Board Member Holmgren believed the sheds were an important part of Park City's history.

Planner Lillie addressed earlier comments made by Board Member Hodgkins. The way the Land Management Code was written, sites that were not included on the Historic Sites Inventory did not have demolition protections. She referenced his comment that structures 50 years or older would come to the Historic Preservation Board. That information may have come from the time when the contributory portion of the Historic Sites Inventory was put in place in 2018 when the ski era structures were discussed.

Board Member Hodgkins felt that was correct. Planner Lillie explained that when the issue went before City Council, the demolition protections were removed for contributory sites. The contributory was a site that could be placed on the inventory but it was still eligible for demolition. She asked Mr. Harrington to share additional information.

Mr. Harrington suggested that another Work Session take place to refresh Board Members on the current status of the Historic Sites Inventory. He clarified that protections were not removed from contributory sites. The third level of protection had been created to capture the ski areas buildings. However, this did not give them the same level of protection as a Significant or Landmark Site. Some of the terminology had shifted, but they had never protected more than two classes of properties from demolition. Due to changes in State law, they had to adopt an affirmative list. That list had to be adopted by City Council as a zoning overlay by Ordinance. They were severely limited in how that list could be expanded going forward.

Mr. Harrington explained that staff brought the matter to the Historic Preservation Board under the Purposes Section of the code that allowed the Board to provide direct input to the City for City properties. He felt that the Board would be able to share input and also ask for more information. There was nothing imminent on the application as it was in a formative phase. As a result, there would be plenty of opportunities for the Historic Preservation Board to meet with the project manager and receive additional information as it related to the sheds. Planner Lillie thanked Mr. Harrington for the clarification and noted that the current Work Session was intended for direction purposes. Earlier comments made by Board Members about the materials being placed in context on the site were beneficial.

Chair Pro Tem Beatlebrox wondered if a formal motion needed to be made with a recommendation or if a set of statements would be preferable. Mr. Harrington noted that it would be up to the Historic Preservation Board. If the Board needed more background information to make a recommendation, there was time for that.

Board Member Toly believed the City already had an architecture plan for what they wanted to do as it related to affordable housing in the area. Mr. Harrington explained that they were forced to revisit the plan due to an appeal. He did not believe that a new application had been fully submitted. Board Member Toly felt it would be beneficial to know what the plan was for affordable housing in the area. Chair Pro Tem Beatlebrox agreed. The Board needed more information in order to proceed.

Planner Lillie noted that there was currently no application. They were in the process of focusing on the plat for the property and were not at the stage that required architectural drawings. The Project Manager wanted to start with the Work Session to see what the Historic Preservation Board direction would be as it related to the sheds. She would request more information from the Project Manager. Board Member Stephens asked that Staff keep the Historic Preservation Board informed of all progress. He also suggested that the Board take a site visit, if possible, to determine if it would be possible to retain the

materials for either one or two sheds. There were discussions about affordable housing. Board Member Toly noted that it was an important issue.

Board Member Hodgkins liked the suggestion made by Board Member Stephens to visit the site. He also wanted to understand why the structures could not remain. Saving the materials and discussing possible reconstruction were alternatives to consider when the structure could not remain. He did not feel the reasons why the structures could not remain had been adequately addressed. Board Member Stephens did not feel the Board had enough information at the current time to make a decision.

Chair Pro Tem Beatlebrox suggested the following language:

- The Park City Historic Preservation Board would like to conduct a site visit on a date uncertain, to assess the sheds as a Board. The Historic Preservation Board would also like to have an informational meeting, where more of the plans and ideas are shared by the applicant.

Board Member Toly wondered if it was possible to go into the sheds. Planner Lillie reported that when she first visited the site two months prior the sheds were untouched and she was able to enter. Currently, they are boarded up. However, she could inquire to see if they could enter the sheds during the Board visit. Planner Lillie reported that she took photographs of the shed interiors during her first visit. There were modern 2x4s placed inside as well as insulation in the interior. She explained that she first visited the structure to determine whether or not it was historic. She was able to see construction methods and materials that dated the structure. Additionally, the findings of the lead-coatings and old photographs also determined that the sheds were historic. Those photographs would be shared with the Board.

Planner Lillie thanked the Board Members for their input. She would bring additional information to the Historic Preservation Board in the future. Another Work Session would be held with the Project Manager to provide the Board with further details.

7. REGULAR AGENDA

A. 1302 Norfolk Avenue – Historic Design Review – The Applicant Proposes Disassembly and Reassembly and Temporary Relocation to Accommodate a New Addition to a Landmark Historic Structure. PL-21-04761.

Planner Lillie reported that the Staff Report outlined the reasons for the continuation. The applicant was unable to provide a Licensed Structural Engineer's Report stating that the Historic Building could be successfully relocated by the deadline for the current meeting. The applicant had since been able to obtain the report.

Chair Pro Tem Beatlebrox opened the public hearing. There were no public comments. The public hearing was closed.

MOTION: Board Member Holmgren moved to CONTINUE 1302 Norfolk Avenue – Historic Design Review, to October 6, 2021. Board Member Hodgkins seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

B. Land Management Code Amendments – Park City Historic Sites Inventory – The Historic Preservation Board will Consider Amendments to Land Management Code Section 15-11-10, the Park City Historic Sites Inventory, to Update Address Changes to the Landmark Historic Sites on Rossie Hill Drive, and to Update the Status of 1302 Norfolk Avenue, which was Formerly Under Appeal. PL-21-04939.

Planner Ward presented the Staff Report and explained that the item involves a Land Management Code amendment. The proposed amendments would update the Historic Sites Inventory, which the City Council codified in 2017. The updates would:

- Reflect new addresses for the Rossie Hill Landmark Historic Structures;
- Update the current status of 1302 Norfolk Avenue.

No substantive changes were proposed. Planner Ward reported that in 2020, the City Council approved the Lilac Hill East Subdivision, which subdivided the area with the Rossie Hill Landmark Historic Structures into five lots. She noted that on the map shown to Board Members, the green lots were the historic lots and the orange lots would be accessed from a private driveway off of Rossie Hill Drive. The Summit County GIS specialist redid the addressing for those properties:

- What was formally 622 was now 755 Rossie Hill Drive;
- What was formally 652 was now 729 Rossie Hill Drive;
- What was formally 660 was now 741 Rossie Hill Drive.

Staff recommended a Land Management Code amendment to Section 15-11-10 to reflect the new addresses for those properties. The other update related to 1302 Norfolk Avenue. Planner Ward shared background information. In 2016, the Planning Department nominated 1302 Norfolk Avenue to the Historic Sites Inventory. On January 24, 2017, the property owner applied to demolish the structure. Staff denied the Demolition Permit pending Historic Preservation Board action. The property owner requested a review by the Utah Property Rights Ombudsman to determine if the structure should be demolished. The advisory opinion found that the Demolition Permit application was entitled to approval.

On June 7, 2017, the Historic Preservation Board designated 1302 Norfolk Avenue as a Significant Historic Site on the Historic Sites Inventory. On June 17, 2017, the property

owner appealed the designation. To prevent demolition of the structure, the City purchased the property and was now the current owner. As the City moved forward with the affordable housing development on the adjacent property, Staff recommended clarifying that the Significant Historical Structure was no longer under appeal.

Staff recommended that the Historic Review Board consider the following actions:

- Review the proposed Land Management Code amendment to update the Historic Sites Inventory in Section 15-11-10;
- Conduct a public hearing; and
- Consider forwarding a positive recommendation to the Planning Commission for consideration on September 22, 2021, and to the City Council for consideration on October 28, 2021.

Board Member Hutchings asked about the significance of the address changes. Planner Ward explained that those homes were under construction and all of the current approvals were under the new addresses. This would provide consistency moving forward and make it easier to trace documents. The Historic Sites Inventory would now reflect the current property addresses.

Chair Pro Tem Beatebrox opened the public hearing. There were no public comments. The public hearing was closed.

MOTION: Board Member Toly moved to forward a positive recommendation to the Planning Commission for consideration on September 22, 2021, and to the City Council for consideration on October 28, 2021. Board Member Hutchings seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

8. ADJOURN

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

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

Approved by _____
Randy Scott, Chair
Historic Preservation Board