



**PARK CITY MUNICIPAL CORPORATION  
HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD  
MINUTES OF AUGUST 4, 2021**

**THE AUDIO EQUIPMENT IN COUNCIL CHAMBERS MALFUNCTIONED AND DID NOT CAPTURE THE ENTIRETY OF THE MEETING. AREAS HIGHLIGHTED BELOW WERE NOT AUDIBLE.**

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

**EX OFFICIO MEMBERS:** Rebecca Ward, Assistant Planning Director; Spencer Cawley, Planner; Aiden Lillie, Planner; Tricia Lake, Attorney

**1. ROLL CALL**

Chair Randy Scott called the meeting to order at 5:00 p.m. and noted that all Board Members were present.

**2. MINUTES APPROVAL**

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

**MOTION:** Board Member [REDACTED] moved to APPROVE the Minutes of June 2, 2021, as written. Board Member [REDACTED] seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

**3. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS**

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

**4. STAFF/BOARD COMMUNICATIONS AND DISCLOSURES**

Board Member Puggy Holmgren requested staff provide an update on landscaping requirements for historic sites.

Chair Randy Scott inquired about the barn associated with 1125 Park Avenue and staff responded the barn had not been designated a historic site. Staff is working to prepare a work session on accessory structures to

**5. REGULAR AGENDA**

**A. 1060 Park Avenue – Historic District Design Review – The Applicant Proposes Removal of Historic Material to Accommodate a New Addition to the Rear of a Significant Historic Structure in the Historic Residential medium (HRM) Zoning District. PL-21-04866.**

Planner Cawley reported 1060 Park Avenue is a one-story WWII Era cottage built circa 1946 and is designated a significant historic site in Park City's Historic Sites Inventory. The applicant requests Board approval for the material deconstruction of a portion of the rear façade to accommodate an addition.

The applicant proposes stabilizing the structure by reinforcing the concrete masonry units and replacing the roof to meet code. The applicant's Engineer's Report concludes the exterior walls and interior bearing walls are built with concrete masonry units and are not reinforced and recommends removing the existing roof to expose the hollow sections of the concrete masonry units to reinforce the walls, install rebars, and grout the masonry cells.

The applicant also plans to install straps to connect the corners of the concrete masonry unit walls to concrete foundation walls to strengthen the lateral capacity.

The roof is to be reframed to match existing conditions and designed at 100% capacity to meet code.

Condition of Approval 3 requires the applicant to provide the City with a financial guarantee to ensure compliance with the conditions and terms of the Historic Preservation Plan. Condition of Approval 5 requires the applicant to complete a Historic Preservation Plan, subject to Chief Building Official and Planning Director approval, prior to issuance of a building permit.

Planner Cawley further outlined Conditions of Approval required for the addition to conform with the Historic District Design Guidelines.

Chair Scott opened the public hearing. There were no public comments. The public hearing was closed.

**MOTION:** Board Member X moved to APPROVE the material deconstruction of 1060 Park Avenue, PL-21-04866, based on the following:

**Findings of Fact**

**Background**

1. 1060 Park Avenue is a one-story World War II era cottage built around 1946

- during the Mining Decline & Emergence of Recreation Industry Era (1931-1962).
2. 1060 Park Avenue is a designated Significant Historic Structure on the Park City Historic Sites Inventory.
  3. On August 1, 2000, an application for the Determination of Historical Significance was submitted for 1060 Park Avenue. The application was withdrawn on September 8, 2000.
  4. On April 16, 2019, the Applicant submitted a Determination of Historical Significance Application to remove 1060 Park Avenue as a Significant Site from the Park City Historic Sites Inventory. The City Council Denied the application on June 27, 2019.
  5. On May 13, 2021, the City Council adopted [Ordinance No. 2021-22](#), approving the Gasparac Plat Amendment. 1060 Park Avenue is Lot A of the Subdivision. This plat amendment assigned a new address to Park Avenue Lot B. The Applicant indicates Lot B is set aside for the purpose of constructing a future Single-Family Dwelling. The Applicant has not yet recorded the plat with Summit County.
  6. On June 25, 2021, the Applicant submitted a Historic District Design Review (HDDR) Application. The Applicant proposes to stabilize the Significant Historic Structure by reinforcing the concrete masonry units and then replacing the roof. The Historic Structure will meet code, salvaging and using as much historic material as possible. The Applicant also proposes the Material Deconstruction of 47.5 square feet of the rear façade to accommodate a rear addition.
  7. The deconstruction is on a non-character-defining façade.
  8. The Analysis section of the Staff Report dated August 4, 2021, is incorporated herein.

#### Conclusions of Law

1. The proposal complies with Land Management Code § 15-11.12.5, *Historic Preservation Board Review for Material Deconstruction*; § 15-11-9, *Preservation Policy*; and § 15-13-2, *Design Guidelines for Historic Residential Sites*.

#### Conditions of Approval

1. The Applicant is responsible for notifying the Building Department prior to proposing any changes to this approval.
2. The Applicant shall submit in writing any changes, modifications, or deviations from the approved scope of work for Planning Director review and approval/denial in accordance with the applicable standards prior to construction.
3. The Applicant shall provide the City with a Financial Guarantee to ensure compliance with the conditions and terms of the Historic Preservation Plan prior to issuance of a building permit.
4. The Applicant shall complete Historic District Design Review and approval prior to issuance of a building permit.
5. The Applicant shall complete a Historic Preservation Plan—subject to Chief Building Official and Planning Director approval—prior to issuance of a building permit.

6. Where the Historic exterior materials cannot be repaired, they shall be replaced with materials that match the original in all respects: scale, dimension, texture, profile, material, and finish. The replacement of existing historic material is allowed only when it can be shown that all historic material is no longer safe and/or serviceable and cannot be repaired to safe and/or serviceable condition.
7. The Applicant shall submit a cribbing and excavation stabilization shoring plan reviewed and stamped by a State of Utah licensed and registered structural engineer prior to issuance of a building permit. Cribbing or shoring must be of engineer specified materials.
8. The Applicant shall also request an inspection through the Building Department following the modification to the cribbing and/or shoring. Failure to request the inspection will be a violation of the Preservation Plan and enforcement action through the Historic Preservation Final Guarantee or ACE could take place.
9. An encroachment agreement may be required prior to issuance of a building permit for projects utilizing soils that encroach onto neighboring properties.
10. 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.
11. Re-grade the Site so that all water drains away from the Structure and does not enter the foundation.
12. Any re-grading of the site shall blend with the grade of adjacent sites and shall not create the need for incompatible retaining walls.
13. Historic foundations shall not be concealed with masonry block, plywood panels, corrugated metal, or wood shingles. Masonry foundations shall be cleaned, repaired, or re-pointed according to masonry guidelines.
14. The addition shall be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future the essential form and integrity of the Significant Historic Structure could be restored.
15. The addition shall be visually subordinate to the Historic Structure when viewed from the Right-of-Way.
16. Where the addition abuts the Historic Structure, a clear transitional element between the old and new should be designated and constructed.
17. In-line additions shall be avoided.
18. If the Significant Historic Structure requires penalization, the Applicant shall return to the Historic Preservation Board for an amendment to this approval.

Board Member X seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Board.

**B. 909 Woodside Avenue – Disassembly and Reassembly – The Applicant Proposes Disassembly and Reassembly to Accommodate new Additions and Structural Upgrades to a Significant Historic Structure. PL-21-04753.**

Planner Lillie reported that the property at 909 Woodside Avenue is a significant historic site in Park City's Historic Sites Inventory. This application previously received Board approval for material deconstruction and lifting of the structure; however, as the applicant began construction, it was determined that the structure would not survive lifting. As a result, the applicant is now proposing that the structure be disassembled and reassembled to accommodate a basement garage and new foundation.

Planner Lillie stated that staff recommends approval of panelization for this project, and showed images of the proposed panels to the Board. Planner Lillie commented that staff has not received any public input on the proposal.

In response to an inquiry, Planner Lillie clarified that there are two panels, identified as Panels A and B. It was confirmed that the front and south side of the structure were deemed historic. The non-historic portions of the structure were deemed non-historic based on the construction methods.

Planner Lillie also confirmed that this structure first appeared in the 1889 Sanborn Map. A Board Member commented that the Sanborn Maps do not specify when the second story was added but acknowledged that this does not matter since the footprint was not altered.

It was noted that there are only 18 inches between the south wall and the neighboring property. A question was raised regarding current easements. Pursuant to the guidelines, the structure must be put back to where it was with a fire-rated assembly for a wall-less than three feet from the property line. Board Member Holmgren noted that because the wall is directly on the concrete, it must be panelized since there is no way the structure can be raised.

Chair Scott opened the public hearing. There were no public comments. The public hearing was closed.

Board Member Stephens commented that they have been seeing more panelization in general and stated that they should not be using panelization and historic restoration in the same terms. He agreed that the best way to preserve the home is to remove the walls in panels due to the unusual construction methods used. These comments were echoed and it was noted that if the Board is being asked to approve panelization for three sides, that would present a different issue. They have seen creative ways to keep a structure sound but it was agreed that the construction methods compromise the integrity of the structure and panelization is the only solution.

It was noted by Board Member Holmgren that she has seen the terms "disassembly and reassembly" more than the term panelization. Planner Lillie commented that the Land Management Code uses the terms "disassembly and reassembly."

**MOTION:** Board Member Beatlebrox moved to APPROVE the Disassembly and Reassembly of the Significant Historic Structure at 909 Woodside Avenue, PL-21-04753, based on the following:

### **Findings of Fact**

#### **Background**

1. 909 Woodside Avenue is a 1 ½ story frame side passage type house built circa 1889.
2. 909 Woodside Avenue is a Significant Historic Structure on the Park City Historic Sites Inventory.
3. On March 3, 2021, the Historic Preservation Board approved Material Deconstruction of a rear portion of the façade to accommodate an addition and lifting the structure to accommodate a basement addition.
4. As the Applicant began construction, they discovered the walls were detached from the floor joists, the Structure was in poorer condition than initially determined, and lifting or moving the Structure would result in failure of the Structure.
5. As a result, on June 10, 2021, the Applicant submitted a Historic District Design Review (HDDR) Application for panelization of the Significant Historic Structure.

#### **Panelization**

6. On July 27, 2021, Shen Engineers, Inc. submitted an updated report outlining the condition of the Historic Structure upon further investigation.
7. The report determined that the home was remodeled at some point, probably when the concrete foundation was poured. At that time, the walls were cut above the floor at different elevations, and then concrete walls were poured under the wall. The result is that the exterior walls are disconnected from the floor system. Also, the main floor is overbuilt with a second floor, probably to adjust the floor height or to level the floor.
8. On June 28, 2021, the Chief Building Official, Planning Director, and Building and Planning staff visited 909 Woodside Avenue and determined that due to the detachment of the walls from the floor joists and the considerably poor condition of the building, to lift or move the Structure would cause it to fail and collapse.

9. The Chief Building Official and Planning Director determined the panelization of the Historic Structure can only be made safe and/or serviceable through panelization of the existing historic structure and rebuilding the house.
10. The Analysis section of the Staff Report dated August 4, 2021, is incorporated herein.

### **Conclusions of Law**

1. The proposal complies with Land Management Code Disassembly And Reassembly Of A Historic Building Or Historic Structure; § 15-11-9, Preservation Policy; § 15-13- 2; and Design Guidelines For Historic Residential Sites; and § 15-11-14.

### **Conditions of Approval**

1. The applicant is responsible for notifying the Building Department prior to proposing any changes to this approval.
2. The Applicant shall submit in writing any changes, modifications, or deviations from the approved scope of work for Planning Director review and approval/denial in accordance with the applicable standards prior to construction.
3. Where the Historic exterior materials cannot be repaired, they shall be replaced with materials that match the original in all respects: scale, dimension, texture, profile, material, and finish. Prior to removing and replacing Historic materials, the applicant shall demonstrate to the Planning Director and Historic Preservation Planner that the materials are no longer safe and/or serviceable and cannot be repaired to a safe and/or serviceable condition. No Historic materials may be disposed of prior to advance approval by the Planning Director and Historic Preservation Planner.
4. 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.
5. The Historic Structure shall be returned to the original grade following the construction of a foundation. When the original grade cannot be achieved, generally no more than six inches (6") of the new foundation shall be visible above final grade on the primary and secondary facades. The site shall be re-graded so that all water drains away from the Structure and does not enter the foundation. A plinth, or trim board at the base of the

Historic Structure, shall be added to visually anchor the Historic Structure to the new foundation.

6. The Applicant shall complete a Historic Preservation Plan, subject to Chief Building Official and Planning Director approval prior to issuance of a building permit.
7. The Applicant shall provide the City with a financial Guarantee to ensure compliance with the conditions and terms of the Historic Preservation Plan prior to issuance of a building permit.
8. The addition shall be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future the essential form and integrity of the Landmark Historic Structure could be restored.
9. The addition shall be visually subordinate to Historic Structures when viewed from the Right-of-Way.
10. The Applicant shall complete Historic District Design Review and approval prior to issuance of a building permit.
11. Where the addition abuts the Historic Structure, a clear transitional element between the old and new should be designed and constructed.
12. In-line additions shall be avoided.
13. Panelization shall be done using recognized preservation methods.
14. The Applicant shall complete measured drawings of the structure or element to be disassembled/reassembled.
15. The Applicant shall submit a thorough photographic survey of the interior and exterior elevations as well as architectural details of the structure, including site and location views from all compass points, exterior elevations, and interior elevations of each room.
16. Written plans detailing the disassembly and reassembly steps and procedures shall be completed and approved by the Planning and Building Departments.
17. Structures shall be disassembled in the largest workable pieces possible.
18. 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 shall be

used to establish a marking code for each component. The markings shall be removable and shall be made on surfaces that will be hidden from view when the Structure is reassembled.

19. 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.
20. The process of disassembly of a Historic Structure shall be recorded through photographic, still, or video.
21. Wall panels and roof surfaces shall be protected with rigid materials, such as sheets of plywood when there is a risk of damage during the disassembly/storage/reassembly process.
22. 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.
23. The original orientation and siting shall be replicated as closely as possible.
24. New foundations and additions shall follow the Design Guidelines.
25. The Landmark Historic Structure must be reassembled in the original form, location, placement, and orientation.

Board Member Hutchings seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Board.

C. **1002.5 Norfolk Avenue – Disassembly and Reassembly – The Applicant Proposes Disassembly and Reassembly and Material Deconstruction to Accommodate New Additions to a Landmark Historic Structure. PL-21-04761.**

Planner Lillie reported that the proposal for the above application would allow for the accommodation of structural upgrades in the rear addition of this structure. She presented a photograph of the property and noted that it was constructed circa 1893. The most recent image of the subject property was shown and Planner Lillie explained that staff's first recommendation is that the Board approves material deconstruction of a portion of the rear façade to accommodate an addition that would extend the living area.

Planner Lillie explained that approval by the Board would include several conditions, including the completion of a Historic Preservation Plan by the applicant, as well as a financial guarantee that the addition shall be undertaken in such a manner that if

removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the structure could be restored. Another condition of approval was that the addition be officially subordinate to the historic structure. The applicant must also complete the Historic District Design Review and approval prior to issuance of a Building Permit.

Planner Lillie explained that a clear transitional element must be included as part of the design and inline additions shall be avoided.

Staff's second recommendation was to approve lifting and potentially a temporary shifting of the structure. She reported that staff recommended denying the application for disassembly and reassembly of the structure. Planner Lillie presented an image illustrating the tight lot lines, which formed the basis for the request for disassembly and reassembly. She reported that the Chief Building Official, the Planning Director, and staff visited the property in February 2021 and determined that panelization would be unnecessary since the structure is neither hazardous nor dangerous pursuant to the International Building Code. They also determined that site and structural conditions would not preclude lifting or moving the structure.

Planner Lillie reported that the lot size constraints were discussed during the site visit and it was determined that the structure would need to be lifted higher and for a longer period to allow for construction of the addition. As such, staff recommended that the Board consider either approving lifting the structure higher for a longer period, temporarily shifting the structure to one side of the lot or panelization. She presented drawings prepared by the applicant that demonstrate the panelization plan.

Planner Lillie reported that staff had not received public input on the application.

In response to an inquiry from Board Member Toly regarding restrictions behind the structure, it was noted that the lot is surrounded by homes. Planner Lillie presented a diagram of the lot.

Board Member Hutchings asked about power lines in front of the home and requested information regarding the type of equipment being proposed for the excavation work. Jonathan DeGray, on behalf of the applicant, reported that they will use a track hoe. He stated that a full-size track hoe would be preferable. He further stated that they have tried to come up with a plan where the builder does not have to work in tight quarters. He estimated that the building will have to be lifted 15 to 18 feet so that a track hoe can maneuver beneath it. It was noted that by Board Member Holmgren that 18 feet would likely be the minimum to accommodate the track hoe.

Mr. DeGray stated that the primary access issue is width and the current configuration of the structure on the lot creates logistics concerns for the safety of the structure. A question was raised regarding other equipment options so that they would not have to be so aggressive with lifting the structure. Mr. DeGray offered that with a reasonable lift and current side yard dimensions, they would probably be limited to a mini-hoe, which

would slow the project down considerably. He stated that the elevation of the addition would be equal to the area seen during the site walk-through. With the half-level below that, he opined that the excavation would be approximately 6 to 8 feet from the foundation.

In response to a question regarding the plan to move the structure, Mr. DeGray stated that the building will likely have to move to the left, which would increase the width of the side yard on the right from approximately six feet to nine feet. He commented that the structure will still be elevated and be three feet closer to the adjacent structure. It was noted that engineering will be required to stabilize the house.

Board Member Stephens suggested removing the front porch only, which would allow them to minimally raise the structure and move it to the west. This could allow a mini track-hoe to access the back by the east side of the property. Mr. DeGray stated that if the Board was amenable to allowing the removal of the roof on the west side, that would give them an additional four feet. Board Member Hutchings acknowledged that this might be an easier option since this section is back and away from the front of the home and would be easier to reconstruct.

The Board discussed other options, including removing the porch and panelizing the section on the west side, then moving the structure four feet towards the west. It was noted by Terrence Scheckter, the homeowner, that due to the steepness of the street, the builder would like to be able to pull their trucks onto the property to offload onto a level grade. Chair Scott noted that the Board's purview is to find the best way to preserve this historic structure. He stated that panelization is not the best way to accomplish that.

It was noted that in balancing construction logistics with preservation, the option of removing the porch and panelizing a section would serve the purpose of providing additional access to the builder while avoiding the lifting of the home for an extended period of time.

Mr. DeGray agreed with this approach and noted that the panels are already identified in the plans. It was requested that the Board approve a motion allowing the house to be lifted with the additional condition that the applicant could panelize the portion on the west side as discussed. It was suggested that approval include the removal of the rear porch from its 1907 position and reconstructing it to the 1900 footprint.

In response to an inquiry from Board Member Toly regarding moving the location of the house, it was confirmed that the home will ultimately be returned to its current location. It was noted that the applicant would like to include the ability to move the house temporarily to the west during construction, with the idea that the house would then be replaced in its original location.

Board Member Toly raised the issue of the impact of construction on 10<sup>th</sup> Street. Mr. DeGray stated that those issues will be addressed in their Construction Mitigation Plan, however, he expected that some type of full closure of the street would be required if they could not get a truck off the street. The primary goal would be to have trucks backed into the lot.

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

Board Member Toly stated that she would not agree to panelization. There was discussion regarding whether the applicant would be required to submit a new proposal in line with the prior discussions. Attorney Lake suggested that it might be best to have the Planning Department provide an updated recommendation based on the discussions presented at this meeting. The Board could vote on the existing recommendations for approving the material deconstruction and deny disassembly and reassembly. The Planning Department could then come back with the updated recommendation for consideration.

Planner Lillie stated that in the past they have had the Board approve conditions that were not recommended, such as lifting a structure as opposed to panelization. She expressed confidence that the Board could approve this item with updated Conditions of Approval.

Chair Scott recognized a member of the public, *David Weinberg*, who stated that he and his wife, Christine Lane are the owners of 1002 Norfolk, which is the home to the left of the house in question. He stated that they will be impacted by the reconstruction but recognized that reconstruction is inevitable to improve the appearance of the home, which they strongly favor. Mr. Weinberg asked about the impact of the construction process on their property and their lives. He expressed the feeling that there is not three feet between the existing home at 1002.5 and the property line and opined that it is more likely not more than 1.5 feet. He stressed that they are not trying to stand in the way of this project, but want to ensure that their property is not damaged and any impact on their quality of life is minimized.

Chair Scott thanked Mr. Weinberg for his comments and stated that the Board was focused on the preservation and restoration of the historical structure. Construction issues and lot lines would be best addressed to the Building Department.

Board Member Stephens commented that if there is confusion regarding the location of the property line, the proposed solution might not be appropriate. It was clarified that the home would not be any closer to the adjacent home because the width of the panel would determine how far the home would be moved.

It was noted by Planner Lillie that the Board should entertain two different motions. The first would be to approve the material deconstruction and deny the proposed

disassembly and reassembly. The second motion would be to approve temporary relocation and panelization of a portion of the structure at 1002.5 Norfolk subject to the Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law set forth in the staff report.

**MOTION:** Board Member John Hutchings moved to APPROVE the Material Deconstruction of the Landmark Historic Structure at 1002.5 Norfolk Avenue, PL-21-04761, in accordance subject to the following:

### **Findings of Fact**

#### **Background**

1. 1002.5 Norfolk Avenue is a one-story cross-wing house built around 1893.
2. 1002.5 Norfolk Avenue is a Landmark Historic Structure on the Park City Historic Sites Inventory.
3. On May 12, 2021, the Applicant submitted a Historic District Design Review (HDDR) Application.

#### **Material Deconstruction**

4. The Applicant proposes the Material Deconstruction of a portion of the rear façade to accommodate an addition to the rear of the Landmark Historic Structure to expand the living area.
5. Additions to Historic Structures shall be considered only on non-character-defining facades, usually tertiary facades. The proposed Material Deconstruction is for the rear façade.
6. Where the Historic exterior materials cannot be repaired, they shall be replaced with materials that match the original in all respects: scale, dimension, texture, profile, material, and finish. Prior to removing and replacing Historic materials, the applicant shall demonstrate to the Planning Director and Historic Preservation Planner that the materials are no longer safe and/or serviceable and cannot be repaired to a safe and/or serviceable condition. No Historic materials may be disposed of prior to advance approval by the Planning Director and Historic Preservation Planner.
7. The Historic Preservation Board approved the Material Deconstruction to accommodate an addition, subject to the Conditions of Approval below.

### **Conclusions of Law**

1. The proposal complies with Land Management Code § 15-11-12.5, Historic Preservation Board Review For Material Deconstruction; and § 15-11-9, Preservation Policy; § 15-13-2; and Design Guidelines For Historic Residential Sites.

**Conditions of Approval**

1. The applicant is responsible for notifying the Building Department prior to proposing any changes to this approval.
2. The Applicant shall submit in writing any changes, modifications, or deviations from the approved scope of work for Planning Director review and approval/denial in accordance with the applicable standards prior to construction.
3. Where the Historic exterior materials cannot be repaired, they shall be replaced with materials that match the original in all respects: scale, dimension, texture, profile, material, and finish. Prior to removing and replacing Historic materials, the applicant shall demonstrate to the Planning Director and Historic Preservation Planner that the materials are no longer safe and/or serviceable and cannot be repaired to a safe and/or serviceable condition. No Historic materials may be disposed of prior to advance approval by the Planning Director and Historic Preservation Planner.
4. 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.
5. The Historic Structure shall be returned to original grade following construction of a foundation. When the original grade cannot be achieved, generally no more than six inches (6") of the new foundation shall be visible above final grade on the primary and secondary facades. The site shall be re-graded so that all water drains away from the Structure and does not enter the foundation. A plinth, or trim board at the base of the Historic Structure, shall be added to visually anchor the Historic Structure to the new foundation.
6. The Applicant shall complete a Historic Preservation Plan, subject to Chief Building Official and Planning Director approval prior to issuance of a building permit.
7. The Applicant shall provide the City with a financial Guarantee to ensure compliance with the conditions and terms of the Historic Preservation Plan prior to submission of a building permit.

8. The addition shall be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future the essential form and integrity of the Landmark Historic Structure could be restored.
9. The addition shall be visually subordinate to Historic Structures when viewed from the Right-of-Way.
10. The Applicant shall complete Historic District Design Review and approval prior to issuance of a building permit.
11. Where the addition abuts the Historic Structure, a clear transitional element between the old and new should be designed and constructed.
12. In-line additions shall be avoided.

Board Member Beattlebrox seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Board.

There was further discussion regarding whether the Board could vote to approve panelization and temporary relocation of the structure or if the Planning Department should submit a new recommendation. It was noted that the Land Management Code requires a Structural Engineering Report that specifies that temporary relocation can be accomplished. It was agreed that the Board's further action on this matter would be addressed at the September 1, 2021 meeting.

**MOTION:** Board Member Holmgren moved to CONTINUE consideration of staff's recommendations regarding lifting and temporary relocation, PL-21-04761, to September 1, 2021. Board Member Hodgkins seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Board.

## 6. ADJOURN

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

Approved by \_\_\_\_\_  
Randy Scott, Chair  
Historic Preservation Board