



**PARK CITY MUNICIPAL CORPORATION
HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD MEETING
MARSAC MUNICIPAL BUILDING
COUNCIL CHAMBERS
445 MARSAC AVENUE
PARK CITY, SUMMIT COUNTY, UTAH
MINUTES OF NOVEMBER 1, 2023**

BOARD MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE: Randy Scott-Chair, Lola Beattiebrox, Puggy Holmgren, John Hutchings, Jack Hodgkins

EX OFFICIO MEMBERS: Rebecca Ward, Assistant Planning Director; Caitlyn Tubbs, Senior Historic Preservation Planner; John Robertson, City Engineer; Dave Thacker, Chief Building Officer; Jaron Ehlers, Planning Technician; Mark Harrington, City Attorney

1. ROLL CALL

Chair Randy Scott called the meeting to order at 5:02 p.m. and conducted a roll call. All Board Members present were in chambers with the exception of Board Member Jack Hodgkins, who participated remotely, and Board Member Alan Long, who was absent.

2. MINUTES APPROVAL

A. Consideration to Approve the Historic Preservation Board Meeting Minutes from October 4, 2023.

Board Member Holmgren noted a repeated error in identifying Board Member Douglas Stephens as "Mayor Pro Tem" when in fact he served as Chair Pro Tem.

MOTION: Board Member Holmgren moved to APPROVE the Historic Preservation Board Meeting Minutes from October 4, 2023, as corrected. Board Member Hutchings seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Board.

3. STAFF AND BOARD COMMUNICATIONS AND DISCLOSURES

There were no Staff or Board Communications or Disclosures.

4. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS

There were no public communications.

5. REGULAR AGENDA

A. 2024 Regular Meetings - Consideration to Adopt the Historic Preservation Board Regular Meeting Dates for 2024.

Chair Scott reported that a calendar invite had, or shortly would, go out for the 2024 Historic Preservation Board Meeting dates. He asked if there were any issues with the dates.

MOTION: Board Member Beatlebrox moved to APPROVE the Calendar of Regular Meetings for 2024. Board Member Holmgren seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Board. Chair Scott noted that he could not hear Board Member Hodgkins' vote, however, a quorum was present and the vote was unanimous.

B. 1003 Norfolk Avenue - Material Deconstruction - The Applicant Seeks Approval for Material Deconstruction for a Portion of a Landmark Historic Structure to Facilitate the Construction of a Rear Addition in the HR-1 Zoning District. PL-23-05845.

Senior Historic Preservation Planner, Caitlyn Tubbs reported that the above item previously came before the Board. 1003 Norfolk Avenue is within the Historic Residential – 1 (“HR-1”) Zoning District and is located at the corner of Norfolk Avenue and 10th Street. She presented a current photograph of the front façade of the home. With regard to the history of the home, she reported that the 1900 Sanborn Maps show that it has a smaller footprint than exists today with a wrap-around porch at the front corner of the house. The presented photograph showed a seam in the wall that indicates where the porch was walled off sometime between 1900 and 1907. Planner Tubbs stated that there was an addition to the rear of the home in 1907 and a further addition to the rear of the home, circa 1941.

In November 2020, a complete Historic District Design Review application was received for the property. In February 2021, the Board approved the proposed Material Deconstruction. Thereafter, in April 2022 the Planning Director at that time approved the Historic District Design Review. Because the applicant did not apply for a Building Permit within one year of these approvals, the approvals expired pursuant to the provisions in the Land Management Code. She stated that the current proposal was the same and no changes were made to what was previously approved.

Planner Tubbs reminded the Board that the applicant is proposing to remove the post-1900 additions performed in 1907 and 1941 and restore the 1900 footprint of the home. The applicant also proposed to remove the gambrel roof overbuild that covers the rear additions. The proposal also sought to restore the wrap-around porch as seen in the original 1900 Sanborn Map. She added that the applicant also proposed to convert an Accessory Building into a detached garage. The garage had been on the site since the 1940s and was considered Historically Contributing to the site. The applicant also sought to construct a rear addition and replace some windows and the front door.

Planner Tubbs presented a diagram showing the original 1900 footprint of the home, as well as the 1907 and 1941 additions. She explained that the applicant proposed to restore the footprint highlighted in purple. With regard to the gambrel-overbuilt roof that sits on top of the two additions, Planner Tubbs noted it was not one of the more common roof shapes seen in Old Town. She showed an image that depicted how the previously existing roof remained underneath the overbuild. The applicant would remove the gambrel roof and restore the historic roof form.

Planner Tubbs next presented images of the detached garage that reflected both the current conditions and historical conditions of that garage. With regard to the front door, she advised that it had suffered severe water damage. The applicant proposed to document the front door and diagram all of its features in order to create a custom replication of that door. There would be no alteration of the door location or opening dimension; rather, there would be a like-for-like replacement.

Planner Tubbs reported there are seven historic window openings proposed to be replaced. Staff recommended the windows be surveyed before removal to ensure that they were not salvageable in any way. If any windows can be salvaged, they would need to be kept in place; however, based on the Physical Conditions Report attached to the Packet, the windows had also sustained some fairly severe water damage and some were inoperable.

Staff recommended that the Board review the proposed Material Deconstruction, conduct a public hearing, and consider approving the Material Deconstruction request for 1003 Norfolk Avenue, based on the Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Conditions of Approval outlined in the Draft Final Action letter. The Historic District Design Review application would continue past this point and is subject to another public hearing before the Interim Planning Director.

On behalf of the applicant, Jonathan DeGray, AIA apologized for having to bring the matter back before the Board. He noted that the current Board Members were on the Board when the application was originally approved. The owner simply was not able to get to it because of his schedule.

Chair Scott opened the public hearing. There was no public comment. Chair Scott closed the public hearing.

Board Member Holmgren noted that she loves the door. Board Member Beatlebrox felt it was a great project. The other Board Members agreed.

MOTION: Board Member Hutchings moved to APPROVE 1003 Norfolk Avenue – Material Deconstruction – subject to the following:

Findings of Fact

1. The property is located at 1003 Norfolk Avenue in the Historic Residential – 1 (HR-1) Zoning District.
2. The Site is designated a Landmark Historic Site on Park City's Historic Sites Inventory.
3. The Property is also known as Lot 1 of the 1003 Norfolk Avenue Amended Plat.
4. Development on this Site has spanned across three of Park City's designated Historic eras, including the Settlement and Mining Boom Era (1868-1893), the Mature Mining Era (1894-1930), and the Mining Decline and Emergence of Recreation Industry Era (1931-1962).
5. The house first appears on the 1900 Sanborn Fire Insurance Map as a simple, one-story T/L Cross-wing cottage-style house with a single-story L-shaped front porch and footprint to the southwest corner of the T cottage.
6. The 1907 Sanborn Fire Insurance Map shows an addition to the west, which brought the footprint closer to the accessory structure on site and enclosed the southern side of the L-shaped porch.
7. A series of non-historic additions took place after the 1941 Sanborn Fire Insurance Map, including a gambrel roof overbuild that can be seen protruding from the historic ridgeline.
8. On November 1, 2020, the Planning Department received a complete Historic District Design Review (HDDR) application.
9. The Historic Preservation Board approved Material Deconstruction at 1003 Norfolk on February 3, 2021.
10. The Applicant obtained Historic District Design Review approval from the Planning Director on April 7, 2022.

11. This approval expired on April 7, 2023. The Applicant did not seek an extension prior to expiration of the approval.
12. On September 5, 2023, the Applicant submitted a new HDDR application with the same proposal.

Conclusions of Law

1. The proposal complies with the Land Management Code requirements pursuant to LMC § 15-11-12.5 Historic Preservation Board Review for Material Deconstruction.

Conditions of Approval

1. Final building plans and construction details shall reflect substantial compliance with the Historic Preservation Board's November 1, 2023 approval for the Material Deconstruction of the 1907 addition and the siding enclosing a portion of the original L-shaped front porch. Any changes, modifications, or deviations from the approved Material Deconstruction that have not been approved in advance by the Planning and Building Departments may result in a Stop Work Order.
2. The applicant is responsible for notifying the Planning and Building Departments prior to making any changes to approved plans.
3. 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 or their Designee prior to construction.
4. The applicant shall obtain HDDR approval from the Planning Director, or their designee, prior to submitting a building permit application.
5. The applicant shall provide the City with a Financial Guarantee, in accordance with LMC § 15-11-19, to be recorded with the Summit County Recorder's Office prior to submitting a building permit application.
6. An Encroachment Agreement may be required prior to the issuance of a building permit for projects utilizing soil nails that encroach onto neighboring properties.
7. A Soils Report completed by a geotechnical engineer as well as a temporary shoring plan, if applicable, will be required at the time of building permit application.

8. The site shall be re-graded so that all water drains away from the Structure and does not enter the foundation.
9. Historic materials removed from the Structure that are salvageable or in otherwise good condition shall be used to repair/replace irreparable materials on the Site.
10. The form and pitch of the 1900 roof shall be preserved and maintained.
11. The Applicant shall provide to the Planning Department a determination of the existing historic windows detailing their operability and salvageability prior to proceeding to the Historic District Design Review public hearing.

Board Member Beatlebrox seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Board.

- C. **844 Empire Avenue - Material Deconstruction - The Applicant Seeks Material Deconstruction Approval to Construct a Side Addition on a Significant Historic Structure in the Historic Residential - 1 Zoning District. PL-22-05350.**

Planner Tubbs reported that the above request for Material Deconstruction was being made for a Significant Historic Structure on a very uniquely shaped lot with frontage along the 9th Street public Right-of-Way, Empire Avenue, and Crescent Tram Road. The property is located in the HR-1 Zoning District. A photograph was presented depicting what is currently serving as the front entrance for the home; however, historically this was the rear of the property.

Referencing a tax photograph, Planner Tubbs advised that at some point after 1941, the front porch was removed and the roof was extended to create more living space on the ground floor. At that time, this became the rear of the house. She noted that in 1900, the home was a fairly simple form, and by 1907 a rear porch was added. Sometime after 1941, the porch was removed and altered to allow for the new entrance.

Planner Tubbs explained that the applicant proposed to lift the Historic Structure and construct a new foundation. It would then be set back onto the foundation within two feet of its current elevation. The applicant proposed to remove the non-historic northern roof form and restore the historic front porch. The request also included the removal of approximately 308 square feet of siding on the east-facing façade in order to accommodate an addition. The applicant was also looking to modify approximately 277 square feet of the southern roof to accommodate a dormer addition on the historic rear of the home where the roof form was already altered to accommodate the original porch and current front door.

Planner Tubbs reported that the applicant was looking to construct a detached single-car garage near Empire Avenue. She noted this would be new construction and outside of the Board's scope of review this evening. Photographs were presented that showed the approximate area where the siding would be removed to accommodate the proposed addition. She also presented a rendering of the front of the home with the restored front porch and the 9th Street Right-of-Way continuing downhill in front of the home.

Planner Tubbs presented a rendering of the proposed dormer modification on the rear of the roof. She noted there were some existing dormers in place, and the applicant sought to modify that roof form in order to accommodate some additional living space and some headroom on the second story. Staff recommended the Board review the proposed Material Deconstruction, open a public hearing, and consider approving the request for 844 Empire Avenue.

Architect DeGray, on behalf of the applicant, pointed out that there was a fire some years ago and the structure was condemned and deemed uninhabitable. The fire damage to the roof was fairly extensive on the southern side of the gable to the first dormer. He stated that the reality was that the roof would need to be reframed because there was nothing they could save. This led them to propose the dormer. He noted there was also a desire to utilize the upper floor, and the shed dormer would provide additional headroom.

Board Member Hutchings asked if the roof form had changed from its historic form. Planner Tubbs explained that the roof form had been modified over the years with what was historically the rear porch. It was also modified with the removal of that porch and the centralized entryway. She added that overall, the pitch of the main component of the roof was Historic; however, the roof form itself had been modified over time. She stated that in response to an inquiry that they did not have any tax photographs of the rear of the home to determine if the dormers were Historic.

Board Member Beatlebrox commented that this structure has been neglected over time and it is a challenge to make it right. She felt this plan was excellent, especially for the façade on the other side, and was grateful that it would be restored.

Chair Scott opened the public hearing.

Linda McReynolds identified herself as the neighbor to the east of the home. Her home is located along the applicant's western property line, which looks directly at the east façade. Speaker McReynolds presented a view from her patio that showed an engineered stacked stone wall. She expressed concern about the wall's integrity given that the addition to this structure would be located five feet from this stacked stone wall. In response to Board Member Beatlebrox's request, Speaker McReynolds passed her photographs along to the Board so they could view them. Speaker McReynolds commented that she did everything right when she built the stacked stoned wall, and she expressed concern that a foundation five feet away from the wall might crumble it.

Chair Scott acknowledged this concern and expressed that her concerns were likely a Planning Department issue. He explained that the Board only addressed Historic Materials. Planner Tubbs stated that this proposal has not yet gone to Planning for Final Action on the design review. She stated that would be scheduled, and another public hearing notice would be issued to surrounding neighbors. She explained to the speaker that she could include an email or letter to be included as part of the official record.

Speaker McReynolds understood that the Board was only focused on the deconstruction of the house. Chair Scott added that the Board was focused on projects involving Historical Materials. Speaker McReynolds encouraged the salvage of any materials that could be salvaged. She noted numerous resources show how Historic windows could be restored. Board Member Beatlebrox referenced the photograph showing a path to the porch and much more room as shown in the photographs provided by the speaker. Speaker McReynolds provided off-microphone comments on the photographs.

Mike Morse gave his address as 835 Norfolk Avenue, which is on the southeast side of the subject property. His property runs along Crescent Tram where the applicant would access the front door. He expressed concern about the scope and size of the proposed project. Based on the renderings, he felt the project appeared somewhat off-scale and noted there was not that much room there. He added that he has a bank of trees that separates the two properties that provide great privacy from Crescent Tram Road and this property. Speaker Morse expressed concern that it would be completely torn apart with a project like this.

There was no further public comment. Chair Scott closed the public hearing.

Board Member Hutchings reported that he had quite a few concerns about this project. The return of the Historic form on the front was great and consistent with what they wanted to do. However, he felt the addition needed some sort of separation or transition, yet acknowledged that might not be within the Board's purview. He did not see the sliding door on the porch as part of the Material Deconstruction, and he felt they were adding a door to a Historic part of the home, which he would not approve. On the back of the home, he was unaware of any situation where they had ever allowed a change in the Historic roof pitch similar to what was proposed. He felt it would add an entirely new second level to a Historic Structure, and he would not support that either.

Board Member Beatlebrox understood that the area shown on a presented photograph was added much later and because the owner was planning to return to the 1900 version of the home, that was Historic as well. Chair Scott noted that there were no Sanborn Maps for them to review.

Planner Tubbs presented an image from the Sanborn Maps and explained that the Historic front of the home looked onto the 9th Street stairs Right-of-Way and Crescent Tram Road run diagonally across each of the Sanborn Maps. Therefore, historically the

front of the home faced north. Over time as the addition was added to accommodate the ground floor living space, the front of the home essentially flipped. She added that what was historically a rear porch was taken down and modified to be an entry stoop projecting roof. The photograph before the Board showed what had been historically the rear of the house, even though it was currently used as the front entrance. The modification to the roof was again modified, and the projecting stoop cover was added.

Architect DeGray referenced another photograph and noted the ghost line of a roof shape off the back of the roof. He commented that the roof had gone through a number of renovations, and the ghost line would indicate that the roof was much smaller at one point and had a very steep pitch coming to a point. He then referenced another photograph that showed the roof at one point in time actually had a flat top and the back was built out towards the entry porch. Architect DeGray stated that the current roof was actually built on top of the flat area and created another peak that was even higher. He could not tell whether the dormers were there but clarified that the roof had evolved over time. He explained that they pursued modifications to the rear of the building, as it is a secondary façade that would enhance the usability of the existing second floor.

Board Member Hutchings agreed it was a secondary façade but noted that this property was unique in that it borders three streets. He stated that everyone who drives up Crescent Tram Road would see the back of this Historic Structure.

Chair Scott noted that the Code was written in terms of what could be done with a primary façade versus a secondary façade, and offered that the back was not even considered secondary, but rather tertiary. He stated that the Board had allowed more modifications to Historical Material on the backside of a house. He commented that this structure had a Historic front and back, and a current front and back.

Board Member Hodgkins did not feel the back was really the back in this case, and noted that prior approvals had truly been in a backyard. He felt that it seemed as though the owner would continue to use this façade for the main entrance, even if they restored the other side to the original front façade. He agreed with Board Member Hutchings' comments regarding the dormers and felt as though it was not in keeping with historic character and was large. He added that something like this was not there before, regardless of whether the small dormers existed. He suspected they were added in kind or at the same time as the smaller dormers seen in the 1942 photograph that would remain. Board Member Hodgkins was not in support of allowing the demolition of the roof on this façade to the extent proposed.

With respect to the east façade, the proposal would remove a significant percentage of Historic Material for an addition. He noted the Land Management Code added transitional items to be able to pull additions back and allow Historic Structures to be seen or viewed in their original shape. He stated it often depended on whether an applicant was grandfathered into requiring a transitional element. He stated that perhaps a transitional

element would not be required here, but stressed the significant percentage of the Historic façade that would be demolished and he was not in favor of that.

Chair Scott noted that usually when additions to the side of the primary façade are proposed, transitional elements are required.

Board Member Hodgkins added that in this case, he could not tell whether this was the side or the back, as it depended on where you looked or what public way you were standing on. He commented that because it was the only side that did not face a public way perhaps it was the back.

Architect DeGray clarified that transitional elements were required only if the proposed addition exceeded 50% of the footprint of the original house. Based on this, the subject project would not require a transitional element.

Chair Scott commented that in situations like this, the Board really wanted to follow and comply with the Land Management Code. Board Member Hodgkins understood that this project likely did not require a transitional element, but his objection was to the high percentage of Historic Material that would be lost. It was confirmed that the material referenced by Board Member Hodgkins was Historic Material. Board Member Beatlebrox understood that the garage on the right was freestanding.

In response to an inquiry from Board Member Hutchings regarding the requirement for a transitional element, Planner Tubbs stated that the Land Management Code required a transitional element if the proposed addition is 50% or more of the footprint of the Historic Structure, or if the addition is over the Historic ridgeline of the Historic Structure. She did not have the square footage with her, but she stated that it was less than 50 percent, and the addition would sit below the ridgeline.

Chair Scott liked the fact that the Historic primary façade was being restored to its Historic form. He found it difficult to get his arms around which façade would be considered primary. He stated that the dormer on the south side was difficult to accept, and offered that this was a really important façade regardless of whether it would be considered primary or secondary since it was the most visible façade.

Chair Scott visited the site before the meeting and looked at the dormers pointing north and south. He noted that the Historic dormers were at a different level, which told him that the entire other side was probably done at a different time and probably did not contain Historic Material. He acknowledged that he did not know what to recommend on this application, but he could not accept the dormers on the south side.

Board Member Holmgren stated she was torn because the Board was not to get into design review. She felt very strongly that the presented rendering was not appropriate as far as allowing Material Deconstruction. She felt as though a lot of that material from the wall with the windows could be saved.

Chair Scott assumed one of the primary objectives was to have this house taken care of and Board Member Beatlebrox agreed. She noted the hodgepodge currently existing was not as clean as it was originally.

Chair Scott requested guidance from Senior City Attorney Mark Harrington regarding the scope of the Board's purview in this matter. He stated that currently, it was potentially the opinion of the Board, but asked if the Board was required to approach it as suggested by Architect DeGray; that is, that the primary façade was the Historic façade being restored.

Board Member Hutchings referenced the Staff Report citation to Land Management Code Section 15-3-2 and offered that with respect to the roof, it would seem to prohibit modifications from Historic roof forms. He did not believe that the section mentioned primary façades or secondary façades. He expressed that the point was well taken that this roof had likely been modified, and if the applicant wanted to bring it back to its original form he would be in support of that. However, the applicant's proposal was not in its original form. The fact that the house had undergone several structural changes did not impact his decision that this house should have a historic feel to it.

Senior City Attorney, Mark Harrington reported that the Board could provide direction to Staff in terms of the concerns raised. This could give the applicant a chance to either address the Board's concerns or make counter-arguments. He noted there were three primary concerns raised by the Board, and suggested allowing Staff and the applicant to address those. If Staff and/or the applicant return and argue that the proposal meets the Code, the Board would then have to decide whether they were in a definitional fight or rely on other provisions under the Design Guidelines as suggested by Board Member Hutchings.

City Attorney Harrington suggested determining whether there was consensus on the three concerns that the Board felt should be addressed to achieve compliance. The applicant could either address those or not and call for a vote at the next meeting. Depending on the outcome, the applicant could also appeal.

Chair Scott summarized that the first of the three issues or concerns was restoring the structure to its Historic form on the Historic primary façade. The second was the addition to the east.

At this point, Board Member Beatlebrox stated that one of the key problems was that there were three different views because of the unique lot shape. She stated no Land Management Code provision addressed a home with three sides bordered by roads. If they could say the façade that faced 9th Street was the primary façade, then the Land Management Code would work because the rear façade would not be seen, and would be deemed tertiary. Board Member Beatlebrox felt this presented a difficult issue, and if they could resolve it, then everything else would fall into place. She agreed that there seemed to be a lot of wall taken down, but on the other hand, it was less than 50 percent.

Board Member Hutchings stated the Board was being asked to approve two separate Material Deconstructions. One was on the east side for the addition, and the other was on the south side for the roof. Board Member Hodgkins added they were also being asked to approve the demolition of the current entry porch on the south façade. Architect DeGray clarified that the modification was to the roof on the south side, but the footprint of the porch would remain as is. Board Member Hodgkins understood but noted that clearly the roofline would change, and questioned whether the Board would have to approve demolition of the roofline of the porch.

Planner Tubbs advised that the porch was an addition from the 1970s, and was outside the historic period of significance. She also referenced the Staff Report Packet that included a figure illustrating the Setback determination made by former Planning Director Bruce Erickson, which showed that from a Setback standpoint, this property has three front yards, one side yard, and one rear yard. That determination was made as part of the original Plat Amendment application.

Board Member Hutchings asked if that meant this property had three primary façades. Planner Tubbs stated it was determined to have three front yards, however, whether that equated to three primary façades was still in question as it was not part of that prior determination. Board Member Hutchings stated his two issues for the Board were the volume of the Material Deconstruction on the east side and the Material Deconstruction on the south side. He did not recall ever considering a volume issue as part of Material Deconstruction for an addition.

Chair Scott commented that typically the Board had seen homes with an addition on the rear with transition elements where large parts of the back of the home were removed. The volume of this proposal did not stand out to him because he viewed it as the backyard. It was noted that it was on the side.

Board Member Hodgkins did not recall that that the Board ever approved 75% of a rear yard façade and reiterated that this application was asking for demolition of a much higher percentage of a Historic façade than the Board had typically seen. Board Member Hutchings agreed.

Assistant Planning Director, Rebecca Ward reported that the Land Management Code addressed Additions to Primary Structures for Historic Structures, and read the provision as follows: "Additions to Historic Structures shall not contribute significantly to the removal or loss of Historic Material." She asked Architect DeGray about the Setbacks from the façade. Architect DeGray responded that he would need to get those plan views to provide a response. Assistant Director Ward noted that the cited Code section was 15-13-2(B)(4)(a)(5).

Architect DeGray stated that the addition off of 9th Street was 10 feet back from the front façade, and at the rear off of Crescent Tram Road it was 5'-4" from the porch to the wall of the addition.

It was noted by Board Member Hodgkins that this was from the lower level and at the upper level the Setback on the front was even less because of the porch. Architect DeGray stated the porch was five feet, so the addition was set back from the wall at 5 feet on each side of the building.

Board Member Hutchings felt there were a lot of issues with the addition. Architect DeGray commented that the issue seemed to be whether or not the proposal for the addition and the dormer were Code-compliant. He suggested the applicant meet with Staff and bring this back to the Board at the next meeting with a determination from Staff along with any corrections required to make it work. He mentioned that although the Board was getting somewhat into design review if the Design Review came back and stated the design met the Code, then the Board would focus on the Historic Material to be removed.

There was consensus from the Board to proceed in this manner. There was then discussion on the standards the Board could rely upon to determine whether it would be appropriate to remove that much Historic Material. Chair Scott referenced the Code section read by Assistant Director Ward. He noted within that section there was a definition of "significantly," which to him was over 50 percent. He agreed it would be up for discussion as to how the 50% would be calculated.

Board Member Hutchings observed that the removal of Historic Material seemed significant to him. Architect DeGray reiterated his suggestion to take this to Staff for a determination of what they would be willing to support. The applicant would then bring this back before the Board and he would argue it one way or another at that point.

Board Member Hodgkins asked if there was ever a determination of whether the Board was being asked to approve demolition of the upper dormer for a door. Architect DeGray stated that would be part of the scope of the Material Deconstruction and would be discussed with Staff.

Planner Tubbs stated that this item could return to the Board on December 6, 2023.

MOTION: Board Member Holmgren moved to CONTINUE 844 Empire Avenue – Material Deconstruction – to December 6, 2023. Board Member Hutchings seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Board.

- D. **218 Sandridge Road - Material Deconstruction - The Applicant Seeks Material Deconstruction to Remove Approximately 200 Square Feet of the Original 1889 Roof Form and a 1941 Roof Addition to**

Accommodate the Construction of an Addition to a Significant Historic Structure located in the Historic Residential - 1 Zoning District. PL-23-05692.

Planner Tubbs reported that 218 Sandridge Road is located in the HR-1 Zoning District. She presented an image showing the location of the parcel highlighted in red, and explained that it sat just below Sandridge Road to the east of Marsac Avenue. The property has frontage along Sandridge Road and the public stairs Right-of-Way that head to Swede Alley. She presented a photograph of the Historic front of the home as viewed from Sandridge Road and looking south. The property had undergone several modifications over the years. It was originally constructed circa 1889. In 1900, the Sanborn Maps showed a westerly addition with a Bay window. In 1907, a portion of the eastern side of the building was removed while the western addition remained. She noted that the western addition remained through the 1929 Sanborn Maps, and was expanded sometime between 1929 and 1941. Also in 1941, there was a rear porch that spanned approximately two-thirds the width of the Historic Structure. Since then, she reported that the rear porch had been enclosed and was currently used as living space.

Planner Tubbs presented a tax photograph showing the 1889 roof form. She pointed out a steeper projection that reflected the 1907 addition. She also highlighted the shed roof that extended toward the south, which reflected the 1941 addition. At this point in time, the rear porch was still open; however, it had since been closed off for additional living space. She reported that the applicant proposed to remove the 1941 roof form addition to accommodate a new addition to the structure. As part of this, they would restore the 1907 roof form, which is the steeper portion of the roof shown on the left of the tax photograph.

The applicant also proposed to modify approximately 200 square feet of the 1889 roof form to provide access to a proposed rooftop deck. The applicant proposed to replace five windows on the southern façade. She stated these windows were noted on the Existing Conditions Report as not necessarily being original windows but were 50 years or older.

Planner Tubbs presented an aerial view of the property that highlighted the 1889 roof form in blue. The 1907 roof form addition was shown in orange, and the 1941 addition was shown in purple. She also pointed out the portion of the approximate area of the 1889 roof form that would be modified to accommodate the rooftop deck. She presented some additional images to illustrate the proposal. She noted that one of the images showed a good view of the 1907-peaked roof form and the 1941 shed addition. These would be removed and replaced with the rooftop deck, and she pointed out the proposed access from the 1889 roof form to the rooftop deck.

With respect to the windows, Planner Tubbs advised that Staff recommended that if these windows were replaced, they be surveyed to determine whether they were absolutely beyond salvage. If they are determined to be inoperable and unsalvageable, replacement

windows could be appropriate; however, they would like to see those windows remain if they are deemed salvageable.

Staff recommended that the Board review the proposed Material Deconstruction, conduct a public hearing, and consider approving the request to restore the 1907 roof form through the removal of the 1941 roof form based on the Draft Final Action Letter. Staff also recommended the Board consider denying in part the request to modify approximately 200 square feet of the 1889 roof form.

Planner Tubbs reported that Molly Guinan from Elliott Workgroup was present on behalf of the applicant. Architect Guinan advised that she prepared a presentation, and noted that some of the information presented by Planner Tubbs was not entirely consistent with the latest submittal. Architect Guinan presented some images of the home and reported that 218 Sandridge Road was originally built in 1889, with its most visibly accessible façade being the east façade that sits on Sandridge Road. The east façade was the only one that had not been modified over time. The home underwent substantial contemporary additions and modifications in 1907, 1941, and in the late 1960s. She explained that they viewed the south façade as the original entrance façade and the north façade as the contemporary entrance. She advised that they had no historic images of the rear façade, but it was clear that it had been substantially modified numerous times. For purposes of this discussion, their main focus was the proposed modification to the 1889 and 1907 roof forms.

Architect Guinan explained that the elements of the roof that had not been modified were the original ridgelines, roof slopes, and some eaves and fascia. They believed that the proposed solution would minimize the impact of these Historic elements and would preserve the ridgelines, existing slopes, eaves, and fascia. The 1889 roof was modified in 1907 when the second gable was added, and again in 1941 with the addition of a shed roof. She advised that this took away 55 square feet of the 1889 roof slope and 125 square feet of the 1907 roof slope. She explained that the proposed design would remove the 1941 roof, and add a roof deck and a flat roof dormer. They would re-establish 90 square feet of the 1907 roof slope and remove an additional 114 square feet of the 1889 roof slope that was previously modified twice. This would help to re-establish the original LT design.

Architect Guinan stated that the proposed solution would not add any square footage to the upper floor of the residence; rather, it would simply add ceiling height to accommodate a bedroom. The proposed addition would sit at the original roof edge to help define that existing line. She presented images of the 1941 square footage proposed to be removed, along with the portion they proposed to pop up from that space that reflected the additional 114 square feet of the 1889 roof form referenced earlier. The proposed addition would have an 8-foot ceiling and she illustrated the portion of the roof that had a 6'-7" ceiling height.

She referenced the comments in the Staff Report that it would be highly visible from the City stairs and Swede Alley, and presented photographs from both of those locations that showed the views. They also prepared rendered views to show the visibility from the stairs. She noted that from the stairs one would see the removal of the 1941 roof, but the pop-up flat roof dormer was recessed to the point where it would not be visible from those locations.

Architect Guinan next presented the updated submittal without the chimney and the concrete material at the bottom. In response to an inquiry, she reported that they had gone through one meeting with the Design Review Board. Planner Tubbs added that the first iteration of the design was included in the Packet to illustrate the access to the rooftop deck. Chair Scott understood that the focus for the Board was the rooftop deck. Architect Guinan stated that the second part of the proposal involved the windows on the south side, and noted those windows were not Historic.

Board Member Holmgren asked for clarification on what was before the Board. Chair Scott understood the focus was on the windows and the Material Deconstruction of the 1941 modified roof to accommodate a rooftop deck. Architect Guinan added that it also involved a portion of the 1889 slope.

Board Member Hutchings referenced a prior slide showing a blue highlighted area that represented an area proposed for removal. He also understood the request involved the Material Deconstruction of the 1889 roof behind that area to accommodate the roof deck. It was noted the removal of windows was also part of the request.

Architect Guinan stated that in addition to the window removal on the south side, there would also be additional Material Deconstruction. She explained that the windows on the south façade were not Historic. The only Historic windows remaining were on the east façade, which is the Sandridge Road side. The windows on the Historic façade would remain, but the applicant would make them operable, as they were currently all painted shut. She advised that the applicant proposed an addition to the south façade, which contains an entrance and stair that would be set back and subservient to the existing entrance and stair on the east façade. It would rest below the existing 1889 roof, which would clearly delineate the new construction from the once-historic façade.

She stated that none of the south façade was currently Historic, as all windows had previously been replaced and the porch filled in between 1940 and the 1960s. The proposal also included a detached garage as shown in the rendering, and she noted that they moved the contemporary addition to a separate mass so as to not overpower the original forms. Architect Guinan explained that this addition would require the removal of some material on the south side, but they did not believe that any of it was Historic Material.

Chair Scott opined that based on what was presented, this application would likely come back to the Board based on modifications to the new submittal. He suggested addressing the windows when it comes back because it reflected a new design approach.

Assistant Director Ward understood that once there was clarification on the roof, the design would then be revised and reviewed by the Design Review Team. She clarified that the first question was about the roof form and to what degree alterations to the roof form would be allowed. Chair Scott confirmed that would be the focus of discussion at tonight's meeting.

Chair Scott opened the public hearing. There was no public comment. Chair Scott closed the public hearing.

Board Member Hutchings expressed no concerns about removing the 1941 portions of the roof and returning it to the 1907 roof form. He did have concerns about removing the big section of the 1889 roof.

Chair Scott looked at the Design Guidelines and stated that Section 15-13-2(7)(A) provides that "New balconies and roof decks on Historic Structures shall be visibly subordinate to the Historic Structure from the primary Right-of-Way. Installing a balcony in a Historic Structure's primary façade is not allowed, however, a balcony may be considered on a secondary or tertiary façade." He noted that was the only thing in the Code that he found that would relate to this request. He stated that the side facing west was not primary. Architect Guinan added that the west side had always been a tertiary façade.

Board Member Hutchings suggested focusing on the "significant" aspect and wondered if the proposal sought to remove a significant portion of the Historic roof. He felt this proposal would remove three-quarters of the roof.

Architect Guinan stated that looking at the whole roof, it would be approximately one-quarter, but almost half of the west side of the roof. She advised that she calculated that by removing the 1941 roof, they would re-establish square footage but also take square footage away.

Board Member Hutchings understood but stated if the proposal were to remove less of the roof he might support it, but he felt a lot of Historic Material would be removed.

Board Member Beatlebrox commented that the proposal would very much change the character of the Historic Structure. Chair Scott mentioned that it was difficult to stay out of the design conversation. It was noted by Board Member Holmgren the Board had been advised to stay out of the design conversation.

Board Member Holmgren added that the Board was here to respect the original material and to determine if it was possible to be saved and used.

Board Member Hodgkins agreed that it was difficult to see the original house in this design. He had questions about what actually would be removed as part of this proposal and mentioned the yellow door on the presented image.

Architect Guinan advised that that part of the house would remain intact. She added that they would like to change the windows because they were single-pane, but they would remain to look as they are. It was noted that the deck would be above the four windows, and the proposal would only remove the 1941 roof. The 1889 gable pitch would remain to the bottom, which was the portion that would be restored following the removal of the 1941 portion. The roof deck above the four windows would be flat and the pop-out dormer would be set back from that.

Board Member Hodgkins sought clarification that the original siding would remain in place. He felt the rendering showed something very modern, whereas if they kept the siding it would look different than the rendering.

Architect Guinan confirmed that all of the siding would remain. She added that they tried to use a different material for the flat roof dormer to separate it from the visual aspects of the Historic Structure. She recognized that the renderings looked quite glaring, and perhaps showing a different material or scaling it down some would be helpful. She explained that the idea was to show it as a new portion and separate from the original building.

Board Member Hodgkins appreciated that, and returned to the original question of the high percentage of roof to be removed and agreed with Board Member Hutchings' position that it would be significant.

Architect Guinan advised that they had a drone view, although it was not included because she wanted to show the visuals from more of a street view.

There was discussion about the images that showed the location of the areas of removal. Planner Tubbs showed the approximate location of the area of the roof to be modified. Board Member Hodgkins felt that the actual area of removal was larger than that depicted in the image.

Chair Scott stated that in terms of the Historic Material, it would be everything above the 1941 roof. He noted that it was not on the primary façade, and the Design Guidelines would allow for this proposal as long as it was not visible from the primary façade. He felt that he could move forward with this application. He understood there was more design work to be done, and if there was a way to minimize it that would be easier for the Board to swallow.

Board Member Hodgkins agreed that this area would not be visible from any vantage point, except for possibly across the valley, which is an important consideration because the materials would scream non-historic.

Board Member Holmgren queried whether they could reuse the materials from the roof. She saw this addition as something completely different.

In response to an inquiry from the Board, Planner Tubbs explained that since there was no Historic period that prevailed over another in Park City, a 1907 addition was considered just as significant as an 1889 form. Therefore, the restoration of one significantly historic period over another was allowable per the Land Management Code.

However, when dealing with the modification of an original roof form that has not been modified over time, that is where the prohibition of those changes would be applied. She noted that the applicant found some evidence that might point to some modifications over time, which the Board could also take into consideration.

Planner Tubbs continued by stating that the utilization of this area of the roof to access the rooftop deck was central to the proposed design. The applicant wanted feedback from the Board on the amount of Historic Material, if any, that could be removed.

Assistant Director Ward requested clarification on the proposed changes to the 1889 roof form and queried whether the addition would be higher than the 1907 roof form.

Planner Tubbs responded that the addition would be higher than the 1907 roof form, but would sit below the 1889 ridgeline. Assistant Director Ward then asked whether the addition would be allowed per the Code or whether it would be required to be two feet below the 1907 ridgeline. Planner Tubbs stated she would have to look into that prior to responding.

Assistant Director Ward explained that was another reason for the recommendation of no changes to the 1889 roof form because the Code recommended that additions be constructed below the Historic ridgeline. There was discussion regarding the images and Board Member Beatlebrox observed that the addition did not appear to sit below. Chair Scott noted that would be a Design Review issue with Staff.

Board Member Hutchings stated that the Material Deconstruction would occur above the 1907 ridgeline.

Board Member Beatlebrox asked if there was a transitional element between the original building and the addition. Architect Guinan responded there was not on this roof form, but there was a transition element for the addition on the side. She expressed a transitional element was not required on this roof, but they would be open to including one if it meant they could have a normal height space in that location.

Assistant Director Ward opined that the applicant was seeking a decision on the roof form specifically; so that as they go through the design process they know what parameters they would be working within.

Chair Scott asked Planner Tubbs to show on a photograph the angle of the existing roof so the Board could get a feel for the Historic Material sought to be removed. Planner Tubbs noted the 1907 and the 1889 ridgelines with her cursor.

Using the rendering, Chair Scott observed that the Historic Material to be removed would be located in the area where the railing meets the facing roof.

Planner Tubbs marked up the image showing the various editions of the roof. Board Member Hodgkins felt that the proposal would take out a chunk of both original rooflines, and in his mind, too much Historic Material would be removed. He agreed with Staff's recommendation to deny the proposal. He acknowledged the applicant could return with a revised plan.

Board Member Hutchings asked whether the applicant would achieve the design they wanted should the Board approve Material Deconstruction of the 1889 roof. He noted the applicant did not propose the removal of any part of the 1907 roof. Architect Guinan confirmed and stated it would come right up against the 1907 roof in the back corner, but they could pull it off of that and make it just the 1889 roof. She explained the current proposal was closer to the orange line shown on the presented slide. Chair Scott identified the area of the roof that would be restored.

Board Member Hodgkins asked if they were just taking action on the roof. Chair Scott confirmed the Board would vote on the roof only, and then would talk briefly about the windows.

Chair Scott felt the Board was generally agreeable with the roof deck, but would likely not approve this application as is, with a statement that it might consider approval if the removal of Historic Material from the roof were minimized.

Board Members Hutchings understood the vote would be to approve the restoration to the 1907 roof and deny the Material Deconstruction on the 1889 roof. Board Member Hodgkins thought they were approving the removal of the 1941 roofline.

City Attorney Harrington explained there were two ways the Board could proceed. First, they could formally deny that part they want to deny, or, they could indicate consensus on the first item and see if the applicant wanted to return with a comprehensive approval if they are going to modify the proposal. He stated that if they deny it now, the applicant would be required to file a separate application. He expressed that he would lean toward the former [sic] and just provide consensus direction that they were agreeable with the 1941 roof, but would want changes that minimize removal of Historic Material. The

applicant was agreeable to this proposal. Assistant Director Ward asked if January 3, 2024, would be agreeable.

MOTION: Board Member Hutchings moved to APPROVE the restoration of the 1907 roofline, which is Material Deconstruction of the 1941 roofline, and CONTINUE the issue of Material Deconstruction of approximately 200 square feet of the 1889 roof to January 3, 2024. Board Member Holmgren seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Board.

City Attorney Harrington clarified that they would have one Final Action Letter for the January 3rd meeting. He stated they would not have to re-vote on that component unless the applicant proposed a modification. He stated they would not have two separate Final Action Letter dates for purposes of appeal.

Architect Guinan did not know if they needed to discuss the windows since they are non-historic. She felt it would just be a question of whether the siding where the addition comes out is Historic.

Assistant Director Ward suggested discussing that on January 3rd as well so that Staff could ensure that the full scope of the proposal was addressed.

City Attorney Harrington opined that the balance of the application was continued so no further motion regarding the windows was required.

E. 2024 Preservation Awards - The Historic Preservation Board will Review Proposed Nominations for the 2024 Preservation Awards and Select Award Recipients.

Planner Tubbs reminded the Board Members that the proposed nominations came before the Board on October 4, 2023. At this meeting, the Board would select one Grand Prize winner and up to three recipients of a plaque. Staff also requested the Board to choose the members of the Artists Selection Committee. She reported that the goal was to issue a Request for Proposal ("RFP") for the artists at the end of next week, and they would begin holding interviews and select an artist between the end of December to the end of January. The goal was to have the art piece completed and ready for presentation to the City Council in May 2024 in honor of National Preservation Month.

Up to three members of the Board could sit on the Artist Selection Committee. The Committee would also include one member nominated from the Public Arts Advisory Board and a member of Planning Staff. The time commitment would be 3 – 5 hours.

Planner Tubbs listed the nominees for the 2024 Preservation Award as follows:

1. Alliance Caretaker's Cabin, which has received new footings to keep it from sinking into the hillside;
2. 909 Woodside Avenue;
3. Daly West Headframe; and
4. 901 Woodside Avenue

She noted the Daly West Headframe was nominated last year and was awarded a plaque, so Staff did not recommend awarding another plaque unless the Board felt very strongly otherwise.

Board Member Hutchings asked why Daly West Headframe was nominated again. Planner Tubbs explained that the Preservation Award nominee pool came from preservation projects completed within the last two years. She noted that last year's Grand Prize winner was the King Con Ore Bin.

Board Member Beatlebrox suggested selecting one of the homes this year to make sure that people know they value those structures. Chair Scott agreed.

Board Member Holmgren liked 909 Woodside. There was consensus, with Board Member Hodgkins noting that his favorite was the Caretaker's Cabin. Board Member Hutchings stated that if they were not going to choose a home, he would agree with the Caretaker's Cabin, however, if the Board preferred choosing a home, he liked 909 Woodside. It was noted that they could pick a winner, and also select additional nominees to receive a plaque. There was consensus to award a plaque to the Caretaker's Cabin.

Chair Scott liked 901 Woodside but did not know it was completed. Board Member Hodgkins concurred and stated it could be nominated next year. Board Member Hutchings commented that it was huge and he felt it was out of place. Board Member Holmgren stated there was consensus that 909 Woodside would be the Awardee, and the Caretaker's Cabin would receive a plaque.

Board Members Beatlebrox and Holmgren expressed interest in serving on the Artist Selection Committee. Board Member Holmgren noted some time constraints and stated she was available Tuesdays and Wednesdays. Board Member Beatlebrox felt that Board Member Long would also like to serve on the Committee. The remaining Board Members and Chair Scott passed on serving on this year's Committee.

Following a brief recess, Chair Scott announced that a quorum was present and the meeting continued.

6. WORK SESSION

A. Historic District Design Guideline Illustrations - The Historic Preservation Board will Review Draft Amendments to the Standards Adopted in Chapter 15-13: Design Guidelines for Historic Districts and Historic Sites of the Land Management Code.

Planner Tubbs recalled a number of Work Sessions in which they reviewed an assortment of Design Guidelines for Historic Districts. This Work Session provided an update on the amendments to the Guidelines. Staff was working on incorporating a recommendation to illustrate the Design Guidelines. They were also working on a recommendation to clarify the Driveway Regulations, as well as to limit Opacity Requirements in Historic Districts to Historic Structures only. Finally, Staff was working on a recommendation for minor grammatical corrections within the Land Management Code.

Following the October Joint Session with the Planning Commission, Staff was also working on Design Guidelines for Temporary Structures, including Temporary Balcony Enclosures, Tents, and Yurts. Those would move through a separate process given that they wanted to expedite those for the coming winter.

Planner Tubbs reported that the City contracted with Io LandArch to create illustrations and graphics that would be adopted within the Land Management Code. It was commonly seen as a Best Practice to offer some sort of visual component with these regulations. Local cities as well as cities across the nation have incorporated illustrations, photographs, or other graphics into their Design Guidelines for their Historic Districts. She mentioned that the 1983 Guidelines were 52 pages long and included illustrations. The current Guidelines are around 27,000 words over 81 pages, and there were no current illustrations. Illustrations were something they want to incorporate into the current standards as quickly as possible.

She next advised that following feedback received from the community and the Board, Staff was looking to clarify Driveway Regulations within the Historic Districts. There was a recommendation in the Code to visually minimize the amount of off-street parking so as not to detract from Historic Structures and alter the Historic character.

Planner Tubbs reported that currently driveways were recommended to have a width of 10 feet, with a maximum width of 12 feet. For the amount of area within the Front Setback, a driveway cannot exceed the 12-foot width. She presented images of driveway configurations showing an extensive amount of pavement that visually presented as a large mass.

Staff recommended limiting driveway width to 10 feet and requiring a minimum of 18 inches between driveways for landscaping to visually break up the appearance of paving in front of structures in the Historic District.

Board Member Hutchings asked if the presented example involved neighboring homes or two driveways in front of one house. Planner Tubbs explained the example was taken

from one 25-foot-wide property. Some infill structures have proposed side-by-side garage configurations, which were currently permitted by the Land Management Code. She explained that the recommendations would seek to break up the visual mass in front of one structure.

Planner Tubbs noted that in June 2023, the Board held a Work Session to address Opacity requirements in the Historic District. Currently, all buildings are required to have a fully opaque treatment on materials that were traditionally painted. For example, any proposed wood siding is required to be fully opaque, meaning the texture of the grain is visible but a color difference is not visible. She presented images depicting various opacities. She reminded the Board Members that they were previously comfortable with allowing a variety of opacities on new construction or non-historic materials; however, Historic Materials and Historic Structures should still have the full opacity treatment. The proposed modifications would make the changes suggested by the Board.

Board Member Holmgren asked if this meant no paint. Planner Tubbs explained that in some instances under the new requirements, a varnish or sealant could be proposed on any material that was non-historic or on a Historic Structure. Board Member Holmgren noted her home was purple. Chair Scott stated the requirements were for fully opaque paint and stain treatments on Historic Structures.

Planner Tubbs stated Staff also recommended minor corrections within the Land Management Code. She noted some conflicting statements and pointed out some requirements that listed a standard, and within the sentence, the word "should/shall" appeared next to each other. She explained that "should" was a recommendation and "shall" was a requirement. Staff would go through the provisions and remove the conflicting words.

Staff was also looking to replace the word "Guidelines" with "Regulations." She commented that these were enacted ordinances and requirements, and not recommendations, whereas the word "Guidelines" connoted a recommendation. They also recommend removing the asterisk within the Historic Sites Inventory, which denotes which properties were under appeal for a determination of significance. Currently, there are no properties on the Historic Site Inventory under appeal. Staff also recommended removing gender-specific terms with more neutral terms. Some minor grammatical and spelling errors would also be corrected.

Planner Tubbs noted they were also focusing on the regulations for Temporary Structures, and were working to get these Code amendments through the process as expeditiously as possible.

Board Member Holmgren wanted to see the word "Guidelines" used for exterior color instead of "Regulation." She noted that as soon as they use "Regulation" it becomes black or white and there is no room for error. She mentioned Rick Martinez' hot pink house, and she did not want to take away the personality.

Chair Scott felt that “Regulation” had to do with the type of product to be used, not color. Planner Tubbs agreed and stated the Design Guidelines did not regulate color. Chair Scott liked the word “Regulation” as it related to a lot of these issues.

Planner Tubbs stated they would return with more detail and a proposed Ordinance, as well as lo LandArch’s graphics for the Board’s review.

7. ADJOURN

MOTION: Board Member Beatlebrox moved to ADJOURN. Board Member Hutchings seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Board.

The Historic Preservation Board Meeting adjourned at approximately 7:15 p.m.

Approved by _____
Randy Scott, Chair
Historic Preservation Board



Stacked
rock
wall

Disturbance

33



— 5 feet to new
2 story addition

stacked rock wall

built per
recommendations
Applied Geotechnical
Engineering Consultants
Gary Bosh Construction
PMMC Building
Permit 2004

