

PARK CITY MUNICIPAL CORPORATION
HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD
MINUTES OF AUGUST 7, 2019

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

EX OFFICIO: Bruce Erickson, Hannah Tyler, Caitlyn Barhorst, Tricia Lake

The Board had site visits to 901 Woodside Avenue and 1135 Norfolk Avenue prior to the meeting.

Director Erickson noted that Doug Stephens was at the Old Town Circulation Planning meeting. John Hutchins had a work conflict and was not able to attend this evening.

Director Erickson requested that the Board nominate a Vice-Chair to facilitate the meeting this evening.

MOTION: Board Member Beatlebrox nominated Randy Scott to preside over the meeting this evening. Board Member Hodgkins seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

Vice-Chair Scott assumed the Chair.

ROLL CALL

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

ADOPTION OF MINUTES

July 17, 2019

MOTION: Board Member Hodgkins moved to APPROVE the minutes of July 17, 2019 as written. Board Member Beatlebrox seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS

There were no comments.

STAFF/BOARD COMMUNICATIONS AND DISCLOSURES

Director Erickson announced that the next HPB meeting was scheduled for August 21st. He anticipated only having one meeting in September. Planner Tyler noted that the first Wednesday in September was the week of Labor Day. Director Erickson stated that the Planning Department would send a notice for the meeting on September 4th. If Board members will be out of town that week, the meeting would be rescheduled.

Vice-Chair Scott asked if the HPB had a quorum for the meeting on August 21st. Director Erickson answered yes.

Board Member Hodgkins disclosed that he was a Board Member of Preservation Utah, but he did not believe that association would affect his ability to vote on the LMC item on the agenda this evening.

Board Member Holmgren noted that in the past the agenda had page numbers for each item. She asked if it was possible to add the page numbers again.

CONTINUATIONS - (Public Hearing and Continue to date specified).

Land Management Code (LMC) Amendments - PL-19-04232

Regarding Historic Preservation in 15-11 including amendments to the following sections: 15-11-2(C) Terms and Qualifications of Members; 15-11-8(A) Staff Assistance; and 15-11-12.5 Historic Preservation Board Review for Material Deconstruction. Staff will be updating all references to Utah Heritage Foundation to reflect their new organizational name of Preservation Utah. In addition, staff will be updating the Historic Preservation Board Review process for Material Deconstruction as directed

Vice-Chair Scott opened the public hearing. There were no comments. Vice-Chair Scott closed the public hearing.

MOTION: Board Member Beatlebrox moved to CONTINUE the Land Management Code Amendments to August 21, 2019. Board Member Hodgkins seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

REGULAR AGENDA

1. 1135 Norfolk Avenue - Historic District Design Review - PL-17-03702 Historic Preservation Board Review for Reconstruction of a Significant Historic Site.

The Board visited the site prior to the meeting this evening.

Board Member Holmgren asked if the extension for the plat amendment had been approved. Planner Barhorst stated that it was approved last Thursday.

Garrett Strong, representing the applicant, stated that the goal was to plan a site visit so the Board could see what was behind the siding in order to make educated decisions on how to proceed. Mr. Strong thought it was apparent walking through the house that the northwest and possibly the northeast corner were all original walls. He presented a picture showing the entry from the front door. He indicated the vertical boards that were still in place and he believed they were most likely part of the original structure. The bedroom on the southeast corner and the kitchen behind it were added on, and possibly the bathroom.

Mr. Strong stated that the roof structure was indicative of a roof being added on. It was easy to see difference between the 1x6 of the original structure and the 1x10s in the room that was added. He remarked that when the house was built the slope of the roof would have been equal on both sides. Mr. Strong thought it appeared that the area coming off the back of the house with a shallower pitch was added at a later time. He noted that most of the homes in Old Town were put together in a T-shape. In this particular home they would be looking at the living room and the two bedrooms to the north, which is the structure with the gable-end running east to west; and then a little bit of a wing coming off of it. Looking from the front of the house on the east side of the home, they could see how the old doorway had been cut in and replaced.

Mr. Strong stated that these were the kinds of questions in terms of what is historic and what they were trying accomplish and salvage. He noted that a significant amount of reinforcement needs to be done into the roof structure. The old roof structure is clearly historic and a new portion of the roof is not. As they went into the crawl space they could see concrete, stones stacked in certain places, a floor that was added on. Mr. Strong needed clarification on what the Board would like to see done after visiting the site. The applicant would prefer to panelize the structure, keeping the west, north and east walls and bringing them back. However, because it is a historic home the applicant was looking for guidance.

Board Member Hodgkins clarified that the Board had approved the material deconstruction at the last meeting. He understood that the primary issue this evening was panelization. Planner Barhorst stated that currently the applicant was requesting reconstruction which is the focus of this discussion; however, they were also asking for direction.

After visiting the site and looking at the historic maps, Planner Barhorst observed that the original proportions of the house were a little shorter on the cross-gable

side. She found vertical framing and evidence of nails of the siding that could have been on the exterior side. With the additional of the horizontal structure being added at a later date, she dated that to around 1940 because of the maps and the time period for using asphalt.

Board Member Hodgkins did not believe the map showed the original location of the front door. Planner Barhorst replied that the Sanborn maps are not always accurate. She thought another indication was the floor level change. The exterior siding did not have structure behind. There was a floor level change, which could have been the original porch to the rear. She pointed out that the siding on the addition side to the south did not have the drop siding. It only has asphalt brick and then the structure. The other pieces of the original T-shape have the drop siding.

Board Member Beatlebrox stated that during the site visit, what they saw in the front of the house was a hodge-podge of siding which was termed as lapsiding. Where the siding was removed, they could see the 1x12 wall behind it, which is essentially the interior of the house. Ms. Beatlebrox observed that there was not much lapsiding on the front of the house. She asked if Planner Barhorst had determined the lapsiding to be historic. Planner Barhorst answered yes, because it was the original form before the addition.

Board Member Beatlebrox remarked that in a reconstruction they would want to keep as much of the lapsiding as possible in the front of the house. She also noted from the pictures that there was also lapsiding inside the house. Planner Barhorst replied that she was correct. Ms. Beatlebrox assumed that lapsiding was also considered historic and could be used on the front of the house. Ms. Barhorst stated that it was possibly the original exterior porch. She thought the original interior materials could be reused.

Board Member Beatlebrox understood that the applicant was proposing to put as much of the historic lapsiding as possible on the front of the house. She assumed they were not concerned about the 1x12s because they are on the interior. Ms. Beatlebrox thought the primary decision was whether the HPB would ask the applicant to lift the house and drop it down, and cover the front with the lapsiding; or whether the entire house would be disassembled and rebuilt using the lapsiding. She noted that the engineer had said the house could be lifted, but at the same time the floors are uneven and the house is a hodge-podge. Ms. Beatlebrox questioned how much of the original material could be used.

Vice-Chair Scott agreed with Ms. Beatlebrox; however, he thought they needed to focus on reconstruction of an existing historic building or structure. Per the LMC, a building can be reconstructed if it is deemed hazardous or dangerous by the Chief Building Official.

Board Member Barhorst reviewed the criteria and the Staff analysis. Criteria 1 did not comply. She noted that Dave Thacker, the Chief Building Official, was present to answer questions on his determination.

Mr. Strong clarified that the engineer did not believe the house should be lifted, but Mr. Thacker had said he thought it could be lifted. Mr. Strong was willing to take any of the salvageable original siding off the west and north walls and put it on the front.

Board Member Beatlebrox asked if there was any precedent for not complying with Criteria 1. Dave Thacker, the Chief Building Official, stated that he made the determination on Criteria 1. He noted that the determination letter from the structural engineer recommended panelization as opposed to lifting the house. When he looked at the building itself there were areas that could be panelized and he agreed with that assumption.

Vice-Chair Scott recalled that when the HPB last met, there was limited deconstruction on the inside. Mr. Thacker replied that very little had been pulled apart. He had not been to the site since his initial determination. Vice-Chair Scott thought hodge-podge was an accurate word. It looked like the house could be structurally sound for panelization or being moved.

Cam Schiedel, representing the applicant, thanked the Board for taking the time to visit the site. Ms. Schiedel stated that the applicant originally submitted for approval to deconstruct the historic structure. However, after having the opportunity to do more deconstruction they found historic siding on the inside. There is very little historic siding on the front, but other material on the property is historical. Ms. Schiedel stated that they would be open to revising the plan to disassemble in a panelization fashion and reuse as much historic material as possible.

Vice-Chair Scott asked if the applicant was changing their request to panelization. Planner Barhorst replied that the current proposal was for reconstruction. She had analyzed the proposal against the Code criteria based on reconstruction. If the request is changed to panelization, the application would need to be updated and a new Staff report provided.

Vice-Chair Scott thought the front gable was one of the most distinguishing characteristics. He noted that a portion of the newer siding was taken off and it looked like there was drop siding on the entire area. He believed the windows have been changed at least twice, and it was typical of any old town home where there are patches on the outside. He pointed to the left and right of the two windows and considered that to be historic siding.

Board Member Holmgren stated that there was so much of the original siding in different places on the outside and on the inside. She was pleased that the applicant was willing to put the historic siding on the front.

Mr. Strong stated that if they take off the siding, store it, and reuse it on the front of the house, whether that would be considered panelization. He understood that they would not need to take the entire wall. It would still be considered panelization if they only saved specific pieces. Planner Barhorst explained that the approval needs to be for reconstruction of the form. The applicant would then come back and request panelization. She clarified that currently the request is for reconstruction.

Board Member Hodgkins asked if they would only come back for panelization if the Board did not approve reconstruction. Planner Barhorst replied that he was correct. She noted that the applicant already has approval for material deconstruction to renovate, lift, fix it up, and add the addition on the back.

Planner Hannah Tyler explained that the current request is for reconstruction, which would be to save some material throughout the building and reuse it. Panelization would take each wall and add 2x4s and other structural members to the interior of each wall prior to cutting them out. They would use a crane to pull the panels and they would be stored either on-site or off-site. Planner Tyler pointed out that Garrett Strong has done this work on other homes in the past.

Planner Tyler noted that panelization and reconstruction are very different requests and she wanted to make sure the Board understood that the application before them was reconstruction. The applicant could amend their application, but the Staff would need to change some findings. To prevent this from going to another meeting, she suggested that the Board could move on to the next agenda item to give the Staff time to work on Findings and come back after the discussion on 901 Woodside.

Director Erickson did not favor a hurry-up approach. Depending on the public hearing and the direction the Board takes, he thought the HPB could direct the Staff to prepare Finding for ratification at the August 21st meeting. That would allow adequate time to make sure they know exactly what the applicant was proposing and that the Findings and Conclusions accurately reflect what they want to accomplish.

Planner Barhorst commented on reconstruction versus panelization. She noted that panelization saves the whole wall structure. Reconstruction removes everything and the historic siding is put back piece by piece, but the structure is completely new.

Board Member Hodgkins understood that in panelization, interior siding could be filled onto the panels, but the panels still remain intact and the boards stay in their original location.

Board Member Beatlebrox asked if there was any precedence for not complying with Criteria 1. Director Erickson was not aware of anything.

Vice-Chair Scott opened the public hearing.

Ruth Meintsma, a resident at 305 Woodside, pointed to an area on the front of the structure where the drop siding is missing. On the inside it looked like a patch where there may have been a previous door or window. She thought that area was a small section and not the whole front. Ms. Meintsma stated that the front gable has the interior planks and the drop siding. The front has the drop siding with the exception of the small patch and the planks. The area open on the north side looks like it has drop siding and vertical planks. Ms. Meintsma noted that on the south side only the back end was exposed, so there could still be drop siding over the vertical on the front end. She remarked that if all the material is there, the essential form is saved.

Ms. Meintsma had looked in the General Plan to see if it said anything about historic material. She also went to neighborhoods in Old Town. She noted that the General Plan talks about specific neighborhoods. Ms. Meintsma read from the General Plan for the Old Town neighborhood. "The purpose in Old Town is to maintain historic district designation. The City much prevent significant modification alterations to historic structures and the loss of historic resources. Ms. Meintsma stated that the fabric of the historic structure must be retained, maintained, and protected to prevent the decline and loss of local historic resources. She noted that three of the four supported historic preservation practices are: Preservation, Rehabilitation, and Restoration. The fourth is the least favorable. Preservation is stabilization and retention of material, and it is the first treatment to consider. Preservation emphasizes conservation, repair, and maintenance. Rehabilitation is the second treatment and it allows for replacement of historic material when the condition of the material is too deteriorated to redress. Restoration is the third choice. Restoration takes the historic structure back to an earlier time by retaining materials from the most significant period in the structure's history. Ms. Meintsma stated that the City rarely recommends reconstruction for preservation practice because it produces a new structure identical in size, form, features, and details from a historic structure too dilapidated to be restored. Reconstruction lacks historic materials.

Ms. Meintsma understood this application was asking for a reconstruction, which requires completely removing and rebuilding the structure, and possibly adding back bits and pieces of the historic material. Ms. Meintsma thought the City should only allow reconstruction if the structure cannot be preserved in any other

way. Ms. Meintsma remarked that short of restoration, panelization would retain the historic material in a much better way than completely removing the structure.

Chair Scott closed the public hearing.

Cam Schiedel commented on the area under the front of the porch in the front of the house, and the area on the left side, and noted that they have not been able to confirm that there is much historic siding underneath those two portions. If the applicant chooses to request panelization, she understood they would not be able to take the historic siding from the rear house or the north side of the house and use it in the places where historic siding is missing. Ms. Schiedel stated that the applicant would like to use the historic material on the front of the house and use the interior lapping on the exterior. However, she was concerned that if they do not get approval for deconstruction there would not be enough historical siding to cover the portions of the house most visible from the street.

Board Member Beatebrox asked if that was accurate that gaps could not be filled with other historic siding from other parts of the house. Planner Barhorst answered no. She stated that currently no historic horizontal siding has been found where the original T-shape ends north to the middle of the porch where the addition was added. The full panel of siding found on the interior could definitely be reused on the exterior.

Board Member Hodgkins asked in a panelization if patched areas could be patched if necessary. He considered the gabled area to be historic from front to back, outside of the sheathing on the front. He thought it was important to keep all of it, including the inside. If patchwork is required, he asked if it could be pulled from other areas. Director Erickson stated that panelization does not prohibit repairs. He noted that the applicant already had approval for material deconstruction. Therefore, some of the materials could be removed from other walls that are not necessarily historic.

Director Erickson clarified that the panelization question was in lieu of raising the house. The Staff recommendation was that the structure could not be disassembled and reassembled. Planner Barhorst clarified that currently the application was only analyzed for reconstruction. Director Erickson commented on the importance of understanding exactly what the applicant was requesting so the Staff could write the Findings. The applicant would need to stipulate that the existing house would not be reconstructed; however, panelization in some form is acceptable. The Staff would make an affirmative Finding of Fact that the applicant put on the record that they wanted the request changed to either lifting or panelization.

Board Member Hodgkins asked if the HPB voted on the current request and it was denied, whether the applicant could come back and request panelization.

Director Erickson replied that it would be a different application because at that point they would be applying for something different. They would submit a new application and come back to the HPB.

Tricia Lake, with the Legal Department, thought the aspect of what the Board was reviewing had changed based on testimony from the applicant to the HPB. Ms. Lake thought clarification was needed on exactly what the applicant was requesting, because it affects the ability of the Planning Department to provide accurate Findings and Conclusions to the Board. She asked if the applicant was no longer requesting reconstruction and instead was asking for panelization.

Vice-Chair Scott suggested that each Board member state what they would be the most comfortable with in order to provide some direction to the Staff and the applicant.

Board Member Holmgren thought it would make everyone happy if they could bring the old siding to the front of the house. As an aside, she noticed a beautiful apple tree in the back of the property that she would like saved.

Board Member Beatlebrox noted that the application for reconstruction did not comply with Criteria 1 and they would need to deny the request for that reason. Ms. Beatlebrox thought panelization was a win/win for everyone; especially if they could pull pieces from other walls and portions of the structure to fill the gaps.

Vice-Chair Scott stated that his opinion was similar to Ms. Beatlebrox. He thought it was possible to lift the structure, but in his opinion, they would be lifting a couple of important areas of the house that would not be worth the expense. Vice-Chair Scott thought there was historic value to the front of the house. He was not able to see all of it, but the north side was very interesting, and he was particularly interested in the gabled area. Vice-Chair Scott was leaning towards some level of panelization looking at those areas specifically.

Board Member Hodgkins stated that in being asked to interpret the Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law, he could not see how this would comply with the criteria for reconstruction. He did not believe the HPB could approve this application for reconstruction. Mr. Hodgkins stated that putting a garage underneath the most historic piece of the structure would ruin the streetscape and facade of the historic house. He did not understand why the applicant would want to make a historic single-level home look like a two-story structure. He pointed out that a non-historic garage already sits on the property and there was no reason why that garage could not be rebuilt. Mr. Hodgkins stated that he would need to see the Findings of Facts and Conclusions of Law for panelization before he could commit. He was not opposed if the applicant wanted to propose panelization.

Planner Barhorst asked if there was the potential for a combination of reconstruction and panelization. They could do panelization on the pieces everyone was concerned about, and reconstruct the rest of the historic form.

Mr. Hodgkins thought it was clear after the site visit which sections of the building were original. He asked if the applicant could come back and request additional demolition of the areas where the floor shifts, and only deal with the original portion of the building in terms of panelization.

Planner Tyler commented on other houses in Old Town where for various reasons the front and the side were panelized and other portions were reconstructed. However, those houses were in much worse condition than the structure at 1135 Norfolk. Planner Tyler clarified that the applicant could request a partial reconstruction and partial panelization based on the Chief Building Official's determination. She understood that the Chief Building Official did not find that parts of the building were dangerous or hazardous. Planner Tyler recommended that the applicant reassess and provide a panelization plan between now and the meeting on August 21st, and for the HPB to Continue this item to August 21st with panelization as the next step. At that time the applicant could come forward and propose the different panels they would be structurally stabilizing.

Ms. Schiedel and Mr. Strong were comfortable doing what Planner Tyler had recommended. Director Erickson clarified that the applicant needed to stipulate to the panelization this evening. Otherwise the HPB would probably deny the reconstruction application. Board Member Hodgkins asked if the applicant needed to withdraw the current application and submit a new application. Director Erickson stated that the typical procedure would be to have the applicant stipulate to what they want to do, and the Staff would make it a Finding of Fact and change the Conclusions of Law. Another option would be for the applicant to withdraw the current application and submit a new application; or the HPB could deny the current application and the applicant would submit a new application.

Director Erickson thought Planner Tyler's comments were valid with respect to the rear portions of the site. He was unsure whether the Chief Building Official could make a determination that those wall were hazardous.

Ms. Schiedel preferred to withdraw the application and reapply.

Director Erickson stated that since the applicant had stipulated that the application would be withdrawn, no action was required. Planner Tyler asked how this item would be continued to August 21st. Director Erickson replied that it would need to be re-noticed as a new application. Planner Tyler noted that the

noticing deadline had passed for the August 21st meeting. It would have to be noticed for the September agenda.

2. 901 Woodside Avenue - Historic District Design Review - PL-18-04030
Historic Preservation Board Review for 1) Material Deconstruction and 2)
Disassembly and Reassembly of the Landmark Historic Structure. The
applicant is proposing Disassembly and Reassembly of the Landmark
Historic Site after the Material Deconstruction of non-Historic concrete
exterior stairs; circ. 1890s sandstone foundation; circ. 1889 original roof
forms and later roof form additions; circ. 1930s Bricktex asphalt siding;
non-Historic wood siding; non-Historic window replacements; non-Historic
exterior wood trim; non-Historic doors; circ. 1890s floor structure with
modern upgrades; non-Historic asphalt roof shingles; brick chimney; non-
Historic porch columns and railing; non-Historic rear yard deck.

The Board visited the site prior to the meeting.

Planner Barhorst noted that this item was broken into two proposals requiring two separate actions.

Proposal #1 - Material Deconstruction.

Planner Barhorst reported after further investigation of the structure it was determined that the original form of the house was an L-shape cottage that was lifted at some point prior to 1900. Exhibit B noted the construction method. Planner Barhorst stated that the photos available showed that the asphalt siding was put onto the historic siding prior to 1940. The front porch and roof was built new circa 1982.

Planner Barhorst presented photos showing an open porch and an actual enclosed space with a shed roof from the spring point. She indicated what the structure resembled for the first ten years from the time it was built until it was raised with a first floor and the addition to the rear.

Planner Barhorst requested that the HPB discuss the material deconstruction. The applicant was proposing to remove all non-historic site additions, which included the back deck. The retaining walls and stairs will be reconstructed because they do not meet Code.

Planner Barhorst stated that the applicant was proposing to rebuild the roof using any salvageable materials. They were not proposing to change the historic roof forms. The applicant was proposing to reconstruct the chimney as a non-functional feature.

For the exterior walls, Planner Barhorst stated that the applicant was proposing to reuse any salvageable materials. She noted that the porch was enclosed historically, but there is still siding on the outside that could potentially be reused in the patchwork on the outside.

Planner Barhorst noted that the applicant was proposing to construct a new foundation with the garage.

Planner Barhorst reported that the conditional use permit to construct the basement within the historic footprint; as well as a conditional use permit for a private driveway access through the platted right-of-way was scheduled to go before the Planning Commission the following week.

Planner Barhorst noted that the porch had been altered many times. The applicant was not proposing to construct the original form because the changes are historic in their nature. No mechanical, utility or electrical was being reused.

The applicant was proposing to replicate the front door and replace the other doors. A historic door beneath the siding could be used to replicate. The windows have all been altered, and the applicant was proposing to replace those windows and alter the three rear window openings to match the double-hung windows in the rest of the house.

Planner Barhorst presented the material deconstruction checklist outlined in the Staff report.

Vice-Chair Scott opened the public hearing.

There were no comments.

Vice-Chair Scott closed the public hearing.

Having visited the site, the Board thought the proposal was straightforward.

MOTION: Board Member Hodgkins moved to Approve the Material Deconstruction Proposal based on 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.

Proposal #2 – Disassembly/Reassembly/Panelization

Planner Barhorst reviewed the Criteria as found in the Staff report. She noted that a licensed structural engineer had certified that the structure could not be

reasonably moved intact. Exhibit H was the Structural Engineer's report. Planner Barhorst noted that the application complies with all Criteria or will comply as conditioned.

The Staff recommended approval of the application for disassembly and reassembly.

Vice-Chair Scott opened the public hearing.

Ruth Meintsma, a resident at 305 Woodside, commented on the added conditions of approval outlined on page 54 of the Staff report. She thought the conditions were great because it locks down the details on saving bits and pieces. She thought it would be helpful if similar conditions of approval were added for the structure at 1135 Norfolk if panelization is considered.

Planner Barhorst clarified that Ms. Meintsma was referring to conditions of approval 7-14 under the Exterior Walls Analysis and the Foundation Analysis.

Vice-Chair Scott closed the public hearing.

Board Member Hodgkins referred to the Findings of Fact and he thought Findings 10-15 were confusing as written. Planner Barhorst clarified that it was not referencing the Finding. It was referencing the number on the Condition of Approval.

Board Member Beatlebrox thought this was an elegant project and she could not wait to see it finished. She thought the owners were doing a wonderful service to the community. Board Member Holmgren noted that Jonathan DeGray has several projects that are admirable. Board Member Hodgkins agreed. Walking on the outside of the house there is no evidence that it is compromised. It is nice to see this structure saved with no change in form. He thanked the owners for what they were doing.

MOTION: Board Member Hodgkins moved to APPROVE the disassembly and reassembly of the historic structure located at 901 Woodside Avenue, based on the Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Conditions of Approval found in the Staff report. Board Member Holmgren seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

Proposal #1 – Material Deconstruction

Findings of Fact – 901 Woodside Avenue

1. The property is located at 901 Woodside Avenue in the Historic Residential (HR-1) zoning District.
2. The Site is designated as Landmark on the Historic Sites Inventory.
3. On February 15, 2019, Planning Department received a Historic District Design Review (HDDR) application for the property at 901 Woodside Avenue. It was deemed complete on April 18, 2019 as the applicant was working with the Planning Department to update the Panelization plan.
4. The Conditional Use Permit Application (PL-19-04152) was deemed complete on April 19, 2019. The applicant is requesting 1.) a setback exception for construction of a basement using the footprint of the Historic Structure per LMC § 15-2.2-4 and 2.) construction of a private driveway within Platted, Unbuilt City Streets per LMC § 15-3-5. The application has not been approved at the time of this report as it is pending review by the Planning Commission.
5. Development on this property has spanned across three (3) 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).
6. The house first appears on the 1889 Sanborn Fire Insurance Map as a simple, one-story T/L Crosswing cottage style house with a single-story L-shaped front porch and bay window on the east (front) elevation.
7. The 1900 Sanborn Fire Insurance map shows that the house as a two-story wood frame structure with a one-story L-shaped porch and a large addition in the rear, which means the house was most likely lifted and a new first level was constructed beneath the original form. The L-shaped front porch was recorded as two-story in the 1907 Sanborn map. The house remained unchanged through 1929, with where the front porch used to be recorded as two-story in the 1941 Sanborn Map and a section of the back circ. 1900 L-shaped addition removed.
8. The first photograph of this house appeared as part of the circ.1941 tax assessment. At this time of the 1949, and 1958 tax assessments it was clad in Bricktex asphalt siding and shows the second-floor porch was enclosed with a shed roof sometime after circ. 1900 and pre-circ. 1907. The original pitch of the L-shaped roof can be seen in Figure 2, and was changed before circ. 1982 when windows were added to the second-floor and enclosed the porch as livable space. The first floor porch was also opened up and wood columns were added prior to circ. 1982.
9. The owner of the property received a Historic District Grant in 1987 for \$4,850 and in 1990 for \$1,000. There are no records of any building permits documenting the work done using the Grant money.
10. The applicant is proposing to remove all non-historic site additions and construct new retaining walls, steps, and foundation with a basement level garage addition. The proposed scope of work mitigates any impact that will occur to the Historic significance of the Site.
11. The applicant proposes to Reconstruct the roof using salvageable Historic material. Staff has determined there is existing Historic material in the roof structure. The applicant is not proposing to alter the Historic roof form.

12. The applicant is proposing to reconstruct the chimney as a non-functional feature using the salvageable bricks on the exterior of the roof.
13. Portions of the original horizontal drop-siding remain. The applicant is proposing to install siding that matches the original in profile, detailing, and sizing.
14. The applicant is proposing to construct a new concrete foundation with a basement and basement-level garage. The salvageable Historic stone shall be used to face the new foundation.
15. The Historic porch has been altered within the Historic period. The applicant is not proposing to reconstruct the original form of the house or the structure as the changes made to the Structure have acquired Historic importance in their own right as the major alterations were done prior to circ. 1900.
16. The applicant is proposing to replicate the Historic front door and replace the other non-historic doors.
17. There are a total of twenty-three (23) windows. All windows have been replacement at a time outside the Historic period. The Preservation Plan notes that all windows will be replaced. The three (3) rear window openings will be altered to install double-hung windows to match the rest of the house.
18. The HPB found compliance with the following applicable Design Guidelines:
 - A. Universal Guidelines:
 1. A site should be used as it was historically or be given a new use that requires minimal change to the distinctive materials and features. The applicant is proposing to remove the non-historic site additions and use it as it was historically.
 2. Changes to a site or building that have acquired historic significance in their own right should be retained and preserved. The applicant is proposing to remove all non-historic changes.
 3. The historic exterior features of a building should be retained and preserved. The applicant is not proposing to alter any Historic features.
 4. Distinctive materials, components, finishes, and examples of craftsmanship should be retained and preserved. The applicant is proposing to restore the porch to the Historic form.
 5. Deteriorated or damaged historic features and elements should be repaired rather than replaced. The applicant is proposing to re-use the salvageable Historic materials. Conditions of Approval were added to ensure the protection of the Historic roof form.
 6. Features that do not contribute to the significance of the site or building and exist prior to the adoption of these guidelines may be maintained; however, if it is proposed they be changed, those features must be brought into compliance with these guidelines.
 7. Each site should be recognized as a physical record of its time, place and use. The proposed work does not change the appearance of the site.
 8. Chemical or physical treatments, if appropriate, should be undertaken using recognized preservation methods. No chemical or physical treatments are proposed.

9. New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction should not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the size or building. The proposed work complies.

10. New additions and related new construction should be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment could be restored. The proposed work mitigated any impacts on the historic site.

B. Specific Guidelines:

a. Site Design

A.1.1 Maintain existing front and side yard setbacks of Historic Sites. The applicant is not proposing to alter the existing location.

A.1.2 Preserve the original location of the main entry, if extant. The applicant is not proposing to alter the location of the entry.

A.1.3 Maintain the original path or steps leading to the main entry, if extant. The applicant is proposing to construct new steps as the existing are non-historic and unsafe.

A.5.3 The historic character of the site should not be significantly altered by substantially changing the proportion of built or unpaved space. The proposed scope of work of the driveway will not substantially change these proportions.

b. Primary Structures

B.1.1 Maintain the original roof form, as well as any functional and decorative elements. The applicant is not proposing to alter the Historic roof form.

B.2.1 Primary and secondary façade components should be maintained in their original location on the façade. The applicant is not proposing to alter the façade.

B.3.1 A new foundation should not raise or lower the historic structure generally more than two (2) feet from its original floor elevation. The applicant is not proposing to lift the structure more than two (2) feet from its original floor elevation.

B.3.2 The original placement, orientation, and grade of the historic building should be retained. The applicant is not proposing to change any of these features.

B.4.1 Maintain historic door openings, doors, and door surrounds. The applicant is not proposing to alter these elements.

B.4.2 New doors should be allowed only if the historic door cannot be repaired. Replacement doors should exactly match the historic door in size, material, profile, and style. The applicant is proposing to replace the non-historic door with one that will match what is seen Historically in the District.

B.5.1 Maintain historic window openings, windows, and window surrounds. There are no existing Historic windows. The applicant is not proposing to alter the window openings. Staff has added the Condition of Approval to determine the Historic window openings, sizing, and detailing.

19. The HPB made the following findings with respect to Material Deconstruction Review

Checklist Criterion:

- a. Criterion 1: The proposed work is not Routine Maintenance.
- b. Criterion 2: The proposed Material Deconstruction is required.
- c. Criterion 3: The proposed work does not damage or destroy the exterior architectural features.
- d. Criterion 4: The proposed work mitigates any impacts that will occur to the visual character of the neighborhood; Historical significance of the Structure; architectural integrity of the Structure; and structural stability. All proposed Material Deconstruction complies with applicable Design Guidelines.
- e. Criterion 5: The proposed work will not compromise the historical importance of other structures on the property and on adjacent properties. The applicant is proposing to remove all non-historic features.
- f. Criterion 6: All non-historic additions and site features are proposed to be removed and are non-contributory.

Conclusions of Law – 901 Woodside

1. The proposal complies with the Land Management Code requirements pursuant to 15-2.2 Historic Residential (HR-1) District.
2. The proposal meets the criteria for Material Deconstruction pursuant to LMC 15-11-12.5 Historic Preservation Board Review for Material Deconstruction.

Conditions of Approval – 901 Woodside

1. Final building plans and construction details shall reflect substantial compliance with the HDDR proposal submitted on April 16, 2019. Any changes, modifications, or deviations from the approved design that have not been approved by the Planning and Building Departments may result in a stop work order.
2. The applicant is responsible for notifying the Building Department if changes are made.
3. The applicant shall maintain the original T/L cottage style roof form and Historic roof form additions.
4. The reconstructed roof form shall re-use all salvageable Historic material in their original location, if possible.
5. 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 his/her designee prior to construction.
6. The applicant shall salvage the existing chimney bricks. Any bricks that can be made safe and/or serviceable shall be reused to reconstruct the chimney after review under the Historic District Guidelines. The applicant shall provide construction details documenting the Historic chimney at the time of the building

permit. The reconstructed chimney shall be on the exterior of the Structure and shall not be required to be functional.

7. Written plans detailing the disassembly and reassembly steps and procedures shall be submitted and approved by the Planning and Building Departments as part of the building permit.

8. The applicant shall document through photographic means the disassembly of the building. As each component is disassembled, its physical condition shall be noted, particularly if it differs from the condition stated in the pre-disassembly documentation.

9. The wall panels shall be protected with rigid materials, such as sheets of plywood. The wall panels shall be securely stored on-site until needed for reassembly. The City may hold a portion of the financial guarantee should further damage or destruction occurs to the panels while they are stored on site.

10. When reassembling the structure, its original orientation and siting shall be approximated as close as possible.

11. Should the historic chimney not be able to be removed in one piece, the applicant shall disassemble the chimney in the largest workable pieces possible. All the elements of the chimney shall be systematically separated from the chimney. The markings shall be removable or made on surfaces that will be hidden from view when the chimney is reassembled. The process of the disassembly shall be recorded through photographic means.

12. Where the historic exterior materials cannot be repaired, they will be replaced with materials that match the original in all respects: scale, dimension, texture, profile, material and finish. Prior to replacement, the applicant shall demonstrate to the Planning Director that the materials are no longer safe and/or serviceable and cannot be repaired to a safe and/or serviceable condition. The Planning Director shall approve the removal of the historic materials in writing prior to any removal of the materials. The Historic Preservation Plan shall be updated, as necessary, to reflect the conditions of the original wood siding.

13. The salvageable Historic stone foundation shall be reused to face the new foundation. Where the Historic material cannot be reused, the foundation veneer shall match the original in shape, dimension, profile, and color.

14. The new foundation shall not raise or lower the Historic Structure more than two feet (2') from its original floor elevation.

15. The applicant shall submit for written approval from the Historic Preservation Planner prior to installation of the selected replacement door.

16. The replacement windows on the Historic Structure shall be wood windows.

17. No alterations of the Historic window openings shall be made.

Proposal #2 – Disassembly and Reassembly

Findings of Fact – 901 Woodside

1. The property is located at 901 Woodside Avenue in the Historic Residential (HR-1) zoning District.

2. The Site is designated as Landmark on the Historic Sites Inventory.
3. On February 15, 2019, Planning Department received a Historic District Design Review (HDDR) application for the property at 901 Woodside Avenue. It was deemed complete on April 18, 2019 as the applicant was working with the Planning Department to update the Panelization plan.
4. The Conditional Use Permit Application (PL-19-04152) was deemed complete on April 19, 2019. The applicant is requesting 1.) a setback exception for construction of a basement using the footprint of the Historic Structure per LMC § 15-2.2-4 and 2.) construction of a private driveway within Platted, Unbuilt City Streets per LMC § 15-3-5. The application has not been approved at the time of this report as it is pending review by the Planning Commission.
5. Development on this property has spanned across three (3) 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).
6. The house first appears on the 1889 Sanborn Fire Insurance Map as a simple, one-story T/L Crosswing cottage style house with a single-story L-shaped front porch and bay window on the east (front) elevation.
7. The 1900 Sanborn Fire Insurance map shows that the house as a two-story wood frame structure with a one-story L-shaped porch and a large addition in the rear, which means the house was most likely lifted and a new first level was constructed beneath the original form. The L-shaped front porch was recorded as two-story in the 1907 Sanborn map. The house remained unchanged through 1929, with where the front porch used to be recorded as two-story in the 1941 Sanborn Map and a section of the back circ. 1900 L-shaped addition removed.
8. The first photograph of this house appeared as part of the circ. 1941 tax assessment. At this time of the 1949, and 1958 tax assessments it was clad in Bricktex asphalt siding and shows the second-floor porch was enclosed with a shed roof sometime after circ. 1900 and pre-circ. 1907. The original pitch of the L-shaped roof can be seen in Figure 2, and was changed before circ. 1982 when windows were added to the second-floor and enclosed the porch as livable space. The first floor porch was also opened up and wood columns were added prior to circ. 1982.
9. The owner of the property received a Historic District Grant in 1987 for \$4,850 and in 1990 for \$1,000. There are no records of any building permits documenting the work done using the Grant money.
10. The applicant is proposing the Disassembly and Reassembly of the Landmark Historic Structure.
11. The HPB has made the following findings with respect to LMC § 15-11-14 Disassembly and Reassembly of a Historic Building or Historic Structure:
 - Criteria A:
 - A. Complies. The structural engineer's report (Exhibit H) highlights the issues with the existing condition that cause the Structure to not be reasonably moved intact.
 - B. At least one of the following:

c. The Historic Preservation Board determines, with input from the Planning Director and the Chief Building Official, that unique conditions and the quality of the Historic Preservation Plan warrant the proposed disassembly and reassembly; unique conditions include but are not limited to:

1. Complies. Due to the construction history of the Historic Structure explained previously in this report, Staff has found temporarily lifting or moving the building as a single unit is problematic. The Chief Building Official determined (Exhibit L) Panelization to be the appropriate method of Rehabilitation.
2. Complies. The structural engineer's report (Exhibit G), as well as multiple site visits by the Historic Preservation Planner has determined Panelization is the best approach to preserving the Historic material.
3. Complies. Due to the unique construction of this house highlighted in the sections above, the proposed Panelization allows for the greatest amount of Historic material to be saved.

□ Criteria B:

Complies. On February 15, 2019, Planning Department received a Historic District Design Review (HDDR) application for the property at 901 Woodside Avenue. It was deemed complete on April 18, 2019 as the applicant was working with the Planning Department to update the Panelization plan. The applicant is not proposing to relocate or reorient the Historic Structure.

12. The HPB has made the following findings with respect to LMC § 15-13-4(B) Guidelines for Disassembly and Reassembly:

4. Pending. The Historic Preservation Board Review for Disassembly and Reassembly is pending approval and under review.
5. Complies as Conditioned. The applicant shall complete the Disassembly and Reassembly using recognized preservation methods.
6. Complies. The applicant has updated the plans for Panelization with the input from the Preservation Planner. The updated drawings were received July 17, 2019.
7. Complies. The applicant has documented the interior and exterior of the structure thoroughly throughout the HDDR application process. The updated Panelization plan received July 17, 2019 includes interior photographs of the structure. (Exhibit I)
8. Complies. The applicant shall submit for a building permit through the Building Permit for the disassembly and reassembly of the Structure.
9. Complies. The updated Panelization plan identifies the largest workable sections of the structure to be disassembled.
10. Complies as Conditioned. The applicant shall comply with Condition of Approval #8.
11. Complies as Conditioned. The applicant shall comply with Condition of Approval #9.
12. Complies as Conditioned. The applicant shall comply with Condition

of Approval #10.

13. Complies as Conditioned. The applicant shall comply with Condition of Approval #11.

14. Complies as Conditioned. The applicant shall comply with Condition of Approval #12.

15. Complies as Conditioned. The applicant shall comply with Condition of Approval #13.

Conclusions of Law – 901 Woodside

1. The proposal meets the criteria for Panelization pursuant to LMC § 15-11-14 Disassembly and Reassembly of a Historic Building or Historic Structure.

2. The proposal meets the criteria pursuant to LMC § 15-13-4(B) Guidelines for Disassembly and Reassembly of all or part of a Historic Structure.

Conditions of Approval – 901 Woodside

1. Final building plans and construction details shall reflect substantial compliance with the HDDR proposal submitted on April 16, 2019. Any changes, modifications, or deviations from the approved design that have not been approved by the Planning and Building Departments may result in a stop work order.

2. The applicant is responsible for notifying the Building Department if changes are made.

3. The applicant shall maintain the original T/L cottage style roof form and Historic roof form additions.

4. The reconstructed roof form shall re-use all salvageable Historic material in their original location, if possible.

5. 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 his/her designee prior to construction.

6. The applicant shall complete the Disassembly and Reassembly using recognized preservation methods.

7. The structure shall be disassembled in the largest workable pieces possible in order to minimize loss of Historic fabric.

8. To ensure accurate reassembly, all parts of the building, structure, or element shall be marked as they are systematically separated from the structure.

Contrasting colors of paint or carpenter wax crayons should be used to establish a marking code for each component. The markings shall be removable or shall be made on surfaces that will be hidden from view when the structure is reassembled.

9. Important architectural features of a historic building or structure shall be removed, marked, and stored before the structure or element of the structure is disassembled.

10. The process of disassembly of a historic building or structure shall be recorded through photographic, still or video, means.
11. As each component of a historic building is disassembled, the physical condition shall be noted, particularly if it differs from the condition stated in pre-disassembly documentation. When a component is too deteriorated to remove, it shall be carefully documented— with photographs and written notes on its dimensions, finish, texture, color, etc.---to facilitate accurate reproduction.
12. Wall panels and roof surfaces shall be protected with rigid materials, such as sheets of plywood, when there is risk of damage during the disassembly/storage/reassembly process.
13. Disassembled components— trim, windows, doors, wall panels, roof elements, etc.— shall be securely stored on-site in a storage trailer or off-site in a garage/warehouse/trailer until needed for reassembly.

The Meeting adjourned at 6:00 p.m.

Approved by _____
Douglas Stephens, Chair
Historic Preservation Board