



**PARK CITY MUNICIPAL CORPORATION
HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD MEETING
SUMMIT COUNTY, UTAH
MINUTES OF AUGUST 2, 2023**

BOARD MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE: Randy Scott-Chair, Puggy Holmgren, Lola Beatlebrox, Douglas Stephens, Jack Hodgkins, John Hutchings, Alan Long

EX OFFICIO MEMBERS: Caitlyn Tubbs, Senior Historic Preservation Planner; Spencer Cawley, Planner II; Rebecca Ward, Assistant Planning Director

1. ROLL CALL

Chair Randy Scott called the Park City Historic Preservation Board Meeting to order at 5:00 p.m. A roll call was conducted and all members were present, with the exception of Board Member Alan Long, who was expected to arrive later on during the meeting.

2. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS

There were no public communications.

3. STAFF AND BOARD COMMUNICATIONS AND DISCLOSURES

Senior Historic Preservation Planner, Caitlyn Tubbs, reported that on June 14, 2023, the Planning Department issued an Emergency Work Waiver Letter for asbestos TSI insulation mitigation and structural stabilization at the Thaynes and Silver King mining complexes. She wanted to share an update on those projects. There had been feedback that the Silver King building was stabilized and the TSI insulation had been removed from that structure. The work at the Thaynes Building was currently underway. Additionally, on July 25, 2023, an Emergency Work Waiver Letter was issued for stabilization of the Alliance Watchman's Cabin. That work was underway.

Planner Tubbs reported that the Historic District Grant Program would reopen for the 2024 fiscal year in the next few weeks. Final touches needed to be made to the application form before it went live. The grant cycle would run through the end of the year. During the Historic Preservation Board Meeting in December, the awardees would be chosen.

Staff was conducting the annual inspections of the Silver King Tramway Towers at the end of the week. There would be photographs taken and the status of the towers would be cataloged. The Historic Preservation Board would receive an update in the future.

Chair Scott noted that the Meeting Materials Packet did not include Meeting Minutes from the last Historic Preservation Board Meeting. Planner Tubbs reported that those Meeting Minutes were still being worked on and would be available at the September meeting.

4. CONTINUATIONS

- A. **161 Park Avenue - Material Deconstruction - The Applicant Seeks Material Deconstruction Approval to Lift a Landmark Historic Structure, Construct a Basement and New Foundation, Construct a Rear Addition, and Construct a Detached Accessory Building in the Rear Yard. PL-22-05333**

MOTION: Board Member Holmgren moved to CONTINUE 161 Park Avenue, Material Deconstruction, to September 6, 2023. Board Member Hodgkins seconded the motion.

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

5. REGULAR AGENDA

- A. **517 Park Avenue - Modification of Approval - The Applicant Proposes Modification to the Historic Preservation Board's July 6, 2022, Approval of Material Deconstruction (PL-21-05118) and Requests Disassembly and Reassembly of the Historic Stone Retaining Wall Along the Right-of-Way at 517 Park Avenue, a Landmark Historic Site, Using Historic Material. PL-23-05748.**

Planner II, Spencer Cawley, presented the Staff Report and stated that the request was for a Modification of Approval at 517 Park Avenue. He reported that the property owner, Jeff Love, and the applicant's representative, Caitlyn Barhorst, were both present. The application pertained to with the Material Deconstruction, Disassembly, and Reassembly of the historic rock retaining wall that was at 509 Park Avenue and 517 Park Avenue. In September 2022, the City Council approved a Plat Amendment that created two lots out of the original 517 Park Avenue location. 517 Park Avenue contained a Landmark Historic Structure and 509 Park Avenue was currently a vacant lot. The historic stone wall extended across both properties. Based on the Historic Site Inventory form, stated:

- "At the front edge of the property, there is a historic, but perhaps not original, three-and-one-half-foot tall retaining wall built of native stone laid in random ashlar coursing. New retaining walls with random rubble course stone veneer flank the driveway to the garage beneath the cross-wing."

The historic stone wall was failing due to snowfall that occurred during the last winter as well as construction activity at the property. Reconstruction was required. The applicant proposed to disassemble the retaining wall and reassemble it along 517 Park Avenue. To achieve that, the applicant proposed to pour a concrete wall where the existing wall

sat. The concrete would then be faced with re-used historic stone. The curved stones and the stone from the steps at 509 Park Avenue would also be re-used to construct the entry at 517 Park Avenue. The future 509 Park Avenue driveway location would not allow for the reconstruction of the wall. A map of the area was shown to Board Members. Planner Cawley explained that the area pictured in red was the area that would be reassembled. The area that was shown in blue was the area that would be deconstructed.

Photographs of the subject property were shared. In 2018, there was an emergency repair done to repair a section of the wall. It was a 10-foot long and 4-foot tall section of the wall and the property owner at the time was required to document the disassembly of the wall and the reconstruction. The property owner was also required to store all historic material on site. There was work done with a planner to accomplish those requirements.

Planner Cawley explained that the Historic Preservation Board would now consider approving the Disassembly and Reassembly of the stone retaining wall to improve the functionality and safety along the right-of-way. The Disassembly of a Historic Structure shall be considered only after the Historic Preservation Board determined that Disassembly and Reassembly was necessary. He noted that the wall could not be reasonably be moved intact, so the proposed Disassembly and Reassembly would abate demolition of the wall. There were several Conditions of Approval outlined in the Staff Report. Conditions 2 through 7 addressed the manner in which the applicant shall repair the wall. Since the proposal was very similar to what was approved in 2018, some of the Conditions of Approval were taken from the previous 2018 approval. Planner Cawley asked that the Historic Preservation Board also consider approving the Material Deconstruction of the historic stone wall, as found in Land Management Code § 15-11.

There were two locations along the wall that the applicant proposed to deconstruct. Planner Cawley reported that there was a 42-square-foot area that was at 509 Park Avenue. It would also include the stairway. At 517 Park Avenue, there was an entryway that was approximately 14 square feet. As for the historic integrity, there was a list that included several items. It showed that the applicant complied with the requirements of the Land Management Code. There were two associated Conditions of Approval. One was related to the setting. The applicant was required to maintain as much of the wall at 509 Park Avenue as feasibly possible and as required by the December 2022 Historic District Design Review. In terms of the material, he explained that the applicant was required to reuse the original stone material when reconstructing the wall at 517 Park Avenue.

In the Historic District Design Review approval for 509 Park Avenue, there were two Conditions of Approval that Planner Cawley felt were important to highlight. The first was: "The Applicant shall integrate the existing retaining wall into the final design to mitigate the changes to topography north of the proposed driveway," and the second was: "The existing historic retaining wall shall be surveyed by a Historic Preservation Professional prior to disturbing the site." Staff also recommended that the applicant obtain a Modification to the Historic District Design Review approval for both 509 Park Avenue

and 517 Park Avenue prior to the issuance of Building Permits. Planner Cawley explained that the Historic Preservation Board could approve, deny, or continue the application.

Board Member Hodgkins wondered if the stairs originally aligned with the front of the historic building. This was confirmed. Board Member Hodgkins asked where that information was obtained. Ms. Barhorst noted that there was an old photograph that was included in a previous Meeting Materials Packet. Mr. Love explained that there was a house on 509 Park Avenue in the 1880s, but was no longer there by the 1940s. As for the stairs that were there, he believed those were to 509 Park Avenue. There was a photograph that was believed to be from the early 1900s and it was possible to see where there was a shadow in front of 517 Park Avenue that appeared to be a separate entrance.

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

Board Member Hodgkins asked for additional clarification about the Conditions of Approval. For instance, the one that referenced reusing existing stone. Ms. Barhorst explained that the staircase at 509 Park Avenue had the original stone steps and the curved stones. Those would be removed and used at 517 Park Avenue. Board Member Hodgkins noted that there was a building uphill that also had a stone wall. He wondered whether there were continuous walls along the street. Ms. Barhorst clarified that the section from the right side of the driveway would not be impacted. Additional discussions were had about the surrounding properties and the walls in place. Ms. Barhorst noted that it would be possible to reuse the stone for the retaining walls leading to the driveway. This would ensure that additional materials were used in the project.

Board Member Beatlebrox asked to view a rendering of 509 Park Avenue. It was noted that it was a conceptual rendering, so it would not be perfectly to scale. The setback on the garage was defined by the code. Mr. Love stated that it would be similar to 517 Park Avenue. He reported that the garage was added to 517 Park Avenue in 1992. There was a similar setback for the garage proposed as there was for 505 Park Avenue and 517 Park Avenue. Part of the reason the steps at 509 Park Avenue had been proposed to be moved to 517 Park Avenue was because the existing steps did not work. Mr. Love hoped the stones could be reused as they were more fitting at 517 Park Avenue.

MOTION: Board Member Beatlebrox moved to APPROVE the Disassembly and Reassembly and Material Deconstruction at 509 and 517 Park Avenue, subject to:

Findings of Fact

1. The property is located at 517 Park Avenue.
2. The site is in the Historic Residential (HR-1) Zoning District.
3. The property is listed with Summit County as Parcel number PC-73.

4. The property contains a T/L cottage constructed circa 1888 and is on the Park City Historic Sites Inventory as a Landmark Historic Structure.
5. A historic stone retaining wall sits at the front property line of 509 and 517 Park Avenue.
6. The Applicant is the property owner of 509 and 517 Park Avenue.
7. A Financial Guarantee is in place for the remodel of 517 Park Avenue. Further Guarantee requirements will be determined during the Planning Department review of the Modification of Historic District Design Review Approval for 509 and 517 Park Avenue.
8. The stone retaining wall is failing due to significant snowfall this past winter and the construction activity associated with 517 Park Avenue. Heavy machinery accessed the site through 509 Park Avenue with ramps over the wall. The wall requires deconstruction to abate further deterioration.
9. The Applicant proposes to disassemble a portion of the retaining wall, pour a new concrete retaining wall in the same location, and face the concrete wall with stone re-used from the existing wall. The Applicant also proposes to re-use the curved stones and stone steps from the neighboring property (509 Park Avenue) to create the assumed historic entry to 517 Park Avenue from the sidewalk.
10. 509 Park Avenue received Historic District Design Review (HDDR) Approval on December 8, 2023, to construct a new Single-Family Dwelling (PL-22-05313).
11. In May 2018, the Planning Department issued an HDDR waiver letter for the emergency repair of a 10-foot-wide by four-foot-tall section of the retaining wall at 517 Park Avenue.
12. The repairs in 2018 required the property owner to construct a new concrete wall behind the existing historic wall location, planning for footings and drainage, and attach the historic stones to the concrete wall so it is not visible from Park Avenue.
13. The Applicant provided photos with their application that show the capstones present today are not original.
14. Vertical break lines in the wall identify where the stairs originally accessed the site.

15. Because of the unique circumstances of the Historic stone wall, it is not possible to reasonably move the wall intact. Furthermore, due to the failure of the wall, the proposed disassembly and reassembly will abate demolition of the Historic Structure. The Applicant proposes to repair the wall in the same manner as approved in 2018 by the Planning Department.
16. The Historic Preservation Board shall consider approving the Disassembly and Reassembly of the historic stone retaining wall to improve the functionality and safety of the wall along the public Right-of-Way.
17. The historic stone retaining wall is considered a Structure as defined by the Land Management Code.
18. Disassembly of a Historic Structure shall be considered only after it has been determined by the HPB that disassembly and reassembly is necessary as outlined in LMC § 15-11-14.
19. Because of the unique circumstances of the historic stone wall, it is not possible to reasonably move the wall intact. The proposed disassembly and reassembly will abate demolition of the Historic Structure.
20. The Applicant proposes to repair the wall in the same manner as approved in 2018 by the Planning Department.
21. The Historic Preservation board shall consider approving the Material Deconstruction of the historic stone wall pursuant to LMC § 15-11-12.5.
22. The Applicant proposes deconstruction of approximately 42 square feet (3.5 feet tall by 12 feet wide) at 509 Park Avenue to accommodate the approved driveway for the yet-to-be-constructed Single-Family Dwelling.
23. The new stairway opening at 517 Park Avenue is approximately 14 square feet (3.5 feet tall by four feet wide). The Applicant proposes deconstruction of this portion of the stone wall to reconstruct the stone stairs and entryway by utilizing the curved stones from the existing entry at 509 Park Avenue.
24. Reconstruction of Historic Structures and features must be constructed in such a way that the Historic Integrity of the Structure is not diminished.
 - a. Location: Complies – The proposal is to deconstruct the stone wall at the future driveway entrance of 509 Park Avenue and the future stairway entry at 517 Park Avenue. The Applicant will then reconstruct the entry to 517 Park Avenue with the material taken from 509 Park Avenue. The remainder of the wall at 517 Park Avenue will be disassembled, a concrete wall poured in the same location, and

- then reassemble the stone on the façade of the concrete retaining wall. The stone wall will remain in the same location as it sits today.
- b. Design: Complies – The proposed work on the stone wall will not detract from the Historic Character of the Site. The reassembled portion of the stone wall will appear identical to what exists today. The reconstructed stairway entry at 517 Park Avenue is the assumed location of the original entry to the Site.
 - c. Setting: Condition of Approval 8 - The existing grade at 517 Park Avenue is maintained and does not require additional retaining. The updated entryway to the Landmark Historic Structure adds to the historic context of the Site.
 - d. Materials: Condition of Approval 2.
 - e. Workmanship: Complies – The proposed method of construction will help to preserve the visual techniques used in the mining era to construct stacked stone retaining walls.
 - f. Feeling: Complies – The Material Deconstruction and Reconstruction will not alter the Site's expression of feeling as a result of the proposed work. The presence of the repaired wall will maintain the Property's Historic character.
 - g. Association: Complies – The Historic stone wall will remain in the same location as it sits today, with the exception of the location of the new entryway to 517 Park Avenue and the location of the approved driveway at 509 Park Avenue. The form and location of the wall will remain intact.
25. Condition of Approval 13 of the 509 Park Avenue HDDR Approval requires the Applicant to integrate the existing historic stone retaining wall into the final design to mitigate the changes to topography north of the proposed driveway.
26. Because of the existing uphill grade of 509 Park Avenue, the existing topography will be altered to accommodate the garage and stairway entrance. The Applicant is required to maintain the natural grade under the proposed entryway stairs. Retaining walls are proposed to help maintain the site's natural topography north (left) of the driveway.
27. Staff published notice on the City's website, the Utah Public Notice website, and posted notice to the property on July 19, 2023.

28. Staff mailed courtesy notices to property owners within 300 feet on July 19, 2023.
29. The Park Record published notice on July 19, 2023.

Conclusions of Law

1. The proposal complies with the Land Management Code requirements pursuant to Chapter 15-2.2 Historic Residential (HR-1) District, LMC § 15-11-14 Disassembly and Reassembly of A Historic Building or Historic Structure, and LMC § 15-13-2 Design Guidelines for Historic Residential Sites.
2. The proposed Use, as conditioned, is compatible with the surrounding structures, in Use, scale, mass, and circulation.
3. The effects of any difference in use or scale have been mitigated through careful planning.

Conditions of Approval

1. Final building plans and construction details shall reflect substantial compliance with the Historic Preservations determination dated August 2, 2023. Any changes, modifications, or deviations may result in a stop work order.
2. The Applicant shall repair the retaining wall using the original materials that are found to be safe and/or in serviceable condition. The retaining wall shall be reassembled in its original location, placement, and orientation.
3. The Applicant shall provide the Planning Department with a certified structural engineer's report showing that reassembly will result in a stable retaining wall. This report shall be provided prior to building permit issuance.
4. If any material is deemed unusable, then the Applicant shall work with the Project Planner on-site to determine if non-historic stone is appropriate for use.
5. The Applicant shall provide drainage plans for review and approval by the Engineering Department.
6. The Applicant shall prioritize repairing and preserving historic stone and mortar over the use of new materials.

7. The Applicant shall maintain the stone in its natural finish. It is not appropriate to paint, stain, or plaster over stone or concrete.
8. The Applicant shall maintain as much of the Historic stone wall in its existing location at 509 Park Avenue as feasibly possible as required by the December 8, 2022, HDDR Conditions of Approval.
9. The Applicant shall obtain a Modification to the HDDR approval for 509 and 517 Park Avenue prior to the issuance of a Building Permit. The Planning Director or their designee is the Review Authority for the Modification approval.
10. All Conditions of Approval from the July 6, 2022, Historic Preservation Board hearing still apply.
11. All Conditions of Approval from the July 28, 2022, Historic District Design Review hearing for 517 Park Avenue still apply.
12. All Conditions of Approval from the December 7, 2022, Historic Preservation Board hearing for 517 Park Avenue still apply.
13. All Conditions of Approval from the December 8, 2022, Historic District Design Review hearing for 509 Park Avenue still apply.

The motion was seconded by Board Member Holmgren.

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

B. 1304 Park Avenue – Modification to Material Deconstruction and Partial Panelization – The Applicant Proposes Modification to the Historic Preservation Board’s November 2, 2023 Approval (PL-21-05028) and Requests Panelization of a Landmark Historic Structure Due to Structural Collapse this Winter. PL-23- 05744

Assistant Planning Director, Rebecca Ward, presented the Staff Report and explained that the application was for a Modification to Material Deconstruction and Partial Panelization. She reported that the item had been before the Historic Preservation Board several times, which meant 1304 Park Avenue was a site that was familiar to Board Members. The applicant representative, Jonathan DeGray, was present at the meeting.

Assistant Director Ward explained that the structure was a T/L cottage with a gabled roof that was constructed around 1885. It was designated a Landmark Historic Site on the Historic Sites Inventory and there was a wing addition in 1907. The applicant originally proposed full panelization and that proposal was brought before the Board on May 4, 2022. That request was denied. The Board recommended that the applicant reevaluate

the site and the proposal. The applicant came back with a partial panelization plan, which the Board also denied. However, the Board approved the removal of Panel D and the non-historic siding material from the south façade to facilitate the lifting of the entire historic form. That included the 1885 form as well as the 1929/1941 form.

On April 3, 2023, due to heavy snowfall, the roof of the Landmark Historic Structure collapsed, causing significant structural damage. The Park City Fire District and Building Department worked with the applicant to stabilize the structure. The applicant had updated their application and was now requesting a Modification proposing full panelization of the Historic Landmark Structure. When the Board considered full panelization, there was certain criteria, which was outlined in Section 15-11-14 of the Land Management Code. It stated that a licensed Structural Engineer needed to certify that the building could not be moved intact. An exhibit in the Staff Report was the July 2, 2023, Shen Engineers. report. It found that the integrity of the house had been lost. Another requirement was that the structure be hazardous or dangerous, pursuant to the International Building Code. Assistant Director Ward explained that the Chief Building Official issued a determination that the structure was hazardous or dangerous pursuant to International Building Code Section 116.1. The site and structural conditions precluded lifting or moving the structure. The physical conditions of the existing materials were found to prevent temporarily lifting the structure, which was seen in Exhibit D.

The applicant proposed the panelization of five panels. There were several recommended Conditions of Approval, one of which was that the applicant record a Financial Guarantee with Summit County. Another proposed condition was that written plans detailing the Disassembly and Reassembly steps and procedures be completed prior to submitting a Building Permit application. Additionally, it was recommended that the Disassembly be recorded through photographs or video and that the original orientation and siting be replicated as closely as possible. Staff recommended that the Board review the proposal, conduct a public hearing, and consider approval.

Board Member Stephens asked about storing the panels until it was time for them to be reinstalled. He assumed that the reinstallation would not occur until after the next winter season. This was confirmed. Mr. DeGray reported that the intention was to store the materials on-site, but he would need to speak to the contractor to determine whether there were off-site facilities that the contractor might have. Board Member Stephens wondered whether the storage of the materials would be part of the approval. Mr. DeGray confirmed that the Planning Department would have to sign off on the location. If those pieces remained on site, the storage method would need to be approved.

Board Member Beatlebrox noted that the Historic Preservation Board had previously determined that panelization was not preferred, but it had been a difficult winter. She understood that the application now needed to move forward, but she was disappointed that the snow had not been cleared from the roof. Board Member Beatlebrox asked for additional information about material storage. Mr. DeGray understood the frustration expressed by Board Member Beatlebrox but pointed out that it was an extreme winter,

and the building was in some level of use during that time. The impacts of the snow load had not been fully taken into account. That being said, the Planning Department would carefully watch and approve the panelization process. The previous approval for lifting the structure would have been scrutinized just as much as the panelization process. Everything possible would be done to save the panels and to cooperate with Staff. Mr. DeGray would also ensure that there was proper documentation throughout the process.

Board Member Stephens had a question about how all of this happened. He wondered what was meant by the statement that the building was partially occupied. Mr. DeGray reported that there were some area heaters there when the space was in use. It was used as a photo studio periodically, but there was no one living there full-time. Board Member Stephens wanted to know how to prevent similar situations from occurring in the future. There could be something done during the planning approval process. Assistant Director Ward believed the suggestion was to establish a timeline for when the Financial Guarantee was required to be recorded. It was something that could be discussed during a future Work Session of the Historic Preservation Board if desired by Board Members. There could be discussions about proactive measures to encourage stabilization.

Board Member Beatlebrox pointed out that there was a long period of time when nothing happened on the property. If the panelization was granted during the current meeting, she wondered when that work would actually occur. Demolition by neglect was one of the worst things that could happen to a historic building, so she had a lot of concerns. Assistant Director Ward explained that in addition to the applications that had been before the Historic Preservation Board, there had also been a Plat Amendment process, where there were some Conditions of Approval that were still being worked through. For example, there were conditions related to fencing. The City Council recently approved an extension of that Plat Amendment to allow the applicant to work through those issues. The Plat Amendment extension would apply for one year. If the Historic Preservation Board took action at the current meeting, it meant there would be a one-year timeline to move forward with that work as well. Mr. DeGray informed the Board that the property owner had expressed a desire to move forward with a Building Permit this year.

Board Member Stephens believed additional work may need to be done if the building was not panelized before winter arrived. He could envision the materials twisting under the forces of the collapse. That would make it very difficult to reinstall those materials. Assistant Director Ward reported that there had been work with the Building Department to stabilize the structure. At this point, there was no estimated timeline for panelization. Mr. DeGray noted that if the concern was the preservation of the panels and the protection of the panels, there could be a Condition of Approval to state that there needed to be panelization before the end of the year or that the materials must be protected in a way that Planning Staff approved. He believed it would be possible to make something work.

Assistant Director Ward shared suggested Condition of Approval language: The applicant shall panelize or further protect the structure with materials as approved by the Historic Preservation Planner and Chief Building Official by October 31, 2023. Board Member

Stephens pointed out that even if it snowed before that date, it was unlikely that the panels would be damaged in that time. It was important to provide an adequate amount of time.

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

It was noted that Board Member Long joined the meeting at approximately 5:50 p.m. Board Member Long liked the additional condition that had been suggested. It would ensure that what was left would be preserved in the best way possible. Board Member Stephens stated that panelization was not preferred unless something serious had happened, which it had in the case of this particular application.

MOTION: Board Member Hodgkins moved to APPROVE the Panelization of the Landmark Historic Structure at 1304 Park Avenue, subject to the following:

Findings of Fact

Background

1. 1304 Park Avenue is a one-story T/L cottage with a gabled roof that was constructed in c.1885 and is a Landmark Historic Site on Park City's Historic Sites Inventory.
2. The home was originally constructed as a hall and parlor-type house. A wing addition was constructed in c. 1907.
3. 1304 Park Avenue was listed on the National Register of Historic Places in 1984 as part of the Park City Mining Boom Era Residences Thematic District. The Historic Site was built within the historic period, defined as 1872 to 1929 in the district nomination, and retains its historic integrity.
4. On October 14, 2021, the Applicant submitted a Historic District Design Review Pre-Application for a basement and rear addition and foundation upgrade.
5. The Design Review Team provided input on the Pre-Application on November 17, 2021, December 1, 2021, and January 19, 2022.
6. On March 29, 2022, the Applicant submitted a complete Historic District Design Review Application for 1304 Park Avenue to panelize the structure to accommodate a basement and rear addition and foundation upgrade.
7. The Design Review Team provided input on the Historic District Design Review Application on April 6, 2022.

8. As part of the Historic District Design Review application, the Applicant proposed full panelization of the Landmark Historic Structure.
9. On May 4, 2022, the Historic Preservation Board (HPB) denied panelization of the Landmark Historic Structure and directed the Applicant to return to the HPB with a modified proposal.
10. On July 6, 2022, the Applicant modified their proposal to partially panelize the Landmark Historic Structure. The HPB denied the partial panelization, but approved removal of Panel D and the non-historic siding material from the south façade to facilitate the lifting of the entire Historic Form at 1304 Park Avenue, including the 1885 form and the 1929/1941 form.
11. On November 2, 2022, the HPB approved the final action letter for their July 6, 2022 decision.
12. The property owner did not manage heavy snow accumulation on the Landmark Historic Structure during the winter of 2022-2023.
13. On April 3, 2023, due to heavy snowfall, the roof of the Landmark Historic Structure collapsed.
14. The Park City Fire District and Building Department worked with the property owner to stabilize the structure.
15. On July 6, 2023, the Applicant submitted a modification application proposing full panelization of the Landmark Historic Structure.

Panelization

16. On July 2, 2023, Shen Engineers, Inc. submitted a letter recommending full panelization due to the collapsed roof and current compromised condition finding "[t]he integrity of the house is totally lost."
17. Due to the collapsed roof, the structural integrity of the Landmark Historic Structure is compromised. Panelization will allow for preservation of as much remaining historic material as possible.
18. On July 28, 2023, the Chief Building Official issued a determination finding the Landmark Historic Structure is hazardous or dangerous pursuant to International Building Code Section 116.1, the site and structural conditions preclude lifting or moving the structure, and the physical conditions of existing materials will prevent temporarily lifting the Structure.
19. The Applicant proposes panelization of five panels.

Conclusion of Law

1. The proposal meets the criteria outlined in Land Management Code Section 15-11-14 Disassembly And Reassembly Of A Historic Building Or Historic Structure.

Conditions of Approval

1. The applicant is responsible for notifying the Building and Planning Departments 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 the 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.
4. Prior to removing and replacing Historic materials, the applicant shall demonstrate to the 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 advanced approval by the Historic Preservation Planner.
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 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.
6. 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.
7. The Applicant shall complete a Historic Preservation Plan, subject to Chief Building Official and Planning Director approval prior to issuance of a building permit.
8. Prior to submitting a building permit application, the Applicant shall record with Summit County Financial Guarantee documents in a form approved by the City Attorney's Office to ensure compliance with the conditions and

terms of the Historic Preservation Plan and Historic District Design Review approvals.

9. 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.
10. Panelization shall be done using recognized preservation methods.
11. The Applicant shall submit measured drawings of the Landmark Historic Structure to be disassembled/reassembled to the Historic Preservation Planner prior to submitting a building permit application.
12. 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.
13. Written plans detailing the disassembly and reassembly steps and procedures shall be completed and approved by the Planning and Building Departments prior to submittal of a building permit application.
14. Structures shall be disassembled in the largest workable pieces possible.
15. 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.
16. Important architectural features of a Historic Structure shall be removed, marked, and stored before the Structure or element of the Structure is disassembled.
17. The process of disassembly of a Historic Structure shall be recorded through photographic, still, or video.
18. Wall panels shall be protected with rigid materials, such as sheets of plywood, when there is risk of damage during the disassembly/storage/reassembly process.
19. 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.

20. New foundations and additions shall follow the Design Guidelines.
21. The original orientation and siting shall be replicated as closely as possible. The Landmark Historic Structure must be reassembled in the original form, location, placement, and orientation.
22. The applicant shall panelize or further protect the structure with materials as approved by the Historic Preservation Planner and Chief Building Official by October 31, 2023.

The motion was seconded by Board Member Hutchings.

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

C. 1002.5 Norfolk Avenue – Modification to Material Deconstruction and Partial Panelization – The Applicant Proposes Modification to the Historic Preservation Board’s October 6, 2021 Approval (PL-21-04761) and Requests Panelization of a Landmark Historic Structure Due to Site Constraints. PL-23- 05715

Assistant Director Ward presented the Staff Report and explained that the application was for a Modification to Material Deconstruction and Partial Panelization. This was a property that the Historic Preservation Board was familiar with and it was 1002.5 Norfolk Avenue. The applicant was requesting a modification for panelization. This was a Landmark Historic Structure on the Historic Sites Inventory and was built around 1893. It was a cross-wing house with a rear addition. The property was located between 1002 and 1003 Norfolk Avenue. It was on the 10th Avenue portion that had a steep slope. Example images of the area were shared with the Board as a reminder of the conditions.

On August 4, 2021, the Historic Preservation Board reviewed a request for panelization and recommended the applicant consider partial panelization. The applicant revised their proposal and on October 6, 2021, the Historic Preservation Board approved temporary relocation to help accommodate the construction of an addition at the rear of the site as well as partial panelization of the Landmark Historic Structure. The applicant came back a year later requesting that the Board consider modifying the approval for full Deconstruction and Reconstruction or full panelization. The Board attended a site visit and denied the request. The applicant was back again requesting full panelization. Geoff Sloan and Josh Kaze were both present at the meeting with a presentation. Assistant Director Ward reiterated that the applicant request was for full panelization.

The Historic Preservation Board reviewed panelization requests pursuant to Section 15-11-14 of the Land Management Code. The first criterion was that a licensed Structural Engineer certified that the building could not be moved. On July 2, 2023, the applicant submitted a report from Shen Engineers, Inc. It stated that “the existing roof was totally

removed and the exterior walls were only built with 1x12 vertical planks and they may fall down when it's windy or a little vibrating. The integrity of the house is totally lost."

One of the criteria was that the building needed to be found hazardous or dangerous pursuant to the International Building Code. On July 28, 2021, and September 28, 2021, the former Planning Director and Chief Building Official issued notices of official determination. They were supportive of the previous approval from the Board for the temporary relocation and partial panelization, but found that the physical conditions of existing materials would not prevent temporarily moving the structure. The applicant had alternatives to lift, preserve, and rehabilitate the Landmark Historic Structure when building the proposed addition. On July 28, 2023, the Chief Building Official confirmed that there were no changes to the previous determinations that had been issued.

There was an additional provision in the panelization section that the Board may determine, with input from the Planning Director and Chief Building Official, that unique conditions and the quality of the Historic Preservation Plan warrant panelization. Unique conditions could include a problematic site that precluded temporary lifting or moving a building as a single unit. Other unique conditions included situations where the physical conditions of the existing materials prevented temporarily lifting or moving the building or if the applicant was able to demonstrate that panelization would result in preservation of a greater amount of historic material. This was also applicable if all other alternatives had been shown to result in additional damage or loss of historic materials. The applicants had prepared a PowerPoint presentation for the Historic Preservation Board to consider.

Mr. Kaze reported that the second review took place in the fall of last year. At that time, it was thought that lifting the structure would be best. When deconstruction started, the first goal was to focus on remediation of contamination. The way that the original construction of the building took place was vertical pine board that was nailed to horizontal pine board. On the inside of that, there was a paper mache type of glue that was used as a weather sealant. From there, there was insulation, which was part of the contamination. When they came in to do the asbestos remediation, it was discovered that there was no structural framing. It was essentially siding nailed in two directions. There were also some major failures in the roof system. He shared example images of the roof area and explained that there were leaks as well as structural issues. With none of those items being historic, removal was done with the hope that there would not be snowfall on the roof that would lead to a collapse of the remaining structure. Mr. Kaze reported that there were signs of dry rot and wood damage on the interior panels.

Some reinforcement had been added in an attempt to keep everything together through the winter. That was successful. Once the snow melted, there was an attempt to pull away more of the non-historic material around the footings and foundations in order to expose a potential place to run steel beams through to lift the house. Mr. Kaze explained that one of the first problems was that there was a nine-inch difference in elevation from one corner of the house to the other. The idea then was to lift sections of the house to try to make it somewhat level, then come in to do interior structural walls, adhere the

outside to those structural walls, and lift it all together as one. That lift started and the historic siding material started to be pulled apart. Over the years, those materials had sagged and the old connections were failing. Additional photographs were shared.

The reason that the application was back before the Board for the third time was because there were concerns about the preservation of the historic material. The pieces that did fail in the back were not deemed historical. However, the connection point to the gable had been deemed historical, so he was concerned that the historic material that had been identified on the site would be destroyed. Mr. Kaze shared additional information about the plan and explained that the idea was to leave panels on the site. Alternatively, those could be stored in a covered location where the materials would be safe from the weather. The paint remediation could be done in a secure location and the historical wood could be treated to address the rotted sections. Everything could be brought back in and mounted without any loss of historical material. He shared more site photos.

Mr. Kaze had confidence that it would be possible to preserve all of the historical wood but also the historic corners. With the corner sections, the connections between the walls could be broken from the inside and the piece of wood that made up the corners could be preserved and reutilized. There was a desire to retain the historic nature of the house. He thanked the Board for considering the application as he had concerns about a weather event that could cause more failure to the structure before a solution was reached. The bracing that was currently on the house was not an engineered solution and was temporary. There were concerns about the house next door as well since there was less than 15 feet to the house on the west. He wanted to make sure there was no damage.

Board Member Beatlebrox believed there was a porch that had been removed so the house could be moved to the left. She wondered where the porch material was. Mr. Kayes reported that there were materials preserved as the porch was pulled off, but his understanding was that it was found not to be historical. Certain panels had been identified to be historic on the structure. Mr. Sloan explained that anything that had been taken off that was deemed historical had been preserved and stored on location. The materials were under cover and protected with plastic. If there was the option to panelize the structure, it would be possible to store the materials and remediate them indoors.

Board Member Beatlebrox wondered why the Chief Building Inspector believed the structure could be lifted. Assistant Director Ward explained that he was unable to attend the Historic Preservation Board Meeting and she did not want to speak on his behalf. As she understood things, with the bracing and the stabilization, it was believed that it could still be possible to lift the structure. That being said, some new information had been heard during the applicant presentation that was not submitted with the modification application. If there was a desire to continue the item to the September 6, 2023, Historic Preservation Board Meeting, it would be possible to have another site visit. The Chief Building Inspector could be on site with the Board Members if that was desired.

Mr. Kaze reported that there was a unique situation with the structure as it did not have any structural components to the exterior walls. Essentially, a siding material had been used. He noted that there had been extensive work with the engineer. To try to lift evenly would be a challenge with how out of square the house was. The front corner was leaning in one direction, the back corner was leaning back, and the other front corner was leaning toward the street. A lot had been done to try to accommodate the lift.

Board Member Stephens asked Mr. Kaze about the roof that was removed. He wanted to understand what the roof was attached to and whether there was framing inside. Mr. Kaze shared example images with the Board to illustrate what had happened. He pointed out sections that had rotted and areas where degradation had occurred. Additional discussions were had about the roof and materials. Chair Scott reported that he had driven past the site earlier in the day. The current conditions looked dangerous to him. If there was a wind storm, he was concerned that the back panel would be shifted.

Board Member Puggy Holmgren noted that when the site visit previously took place, there were concerns at that time. Board Member Hodgkins was surprised that the structure had withstood the winter months. Additional images of the structure were shared. Mr. Kaze explained that the siding panels were vertical on the inside and horizontal on the outside. Those were nailed together, which created a lot of issues. The house had been finished with a piece of trim that went up the corner and up the eaves. With panelization from the inside, he believed those pieces could be preserved, the paint remediation could be done, and the exact same finish could be reapplied on the corners.

Board Member Beatlebrox believed the proposal was to remove the house in large panels so that each façade was complete. Those would be stored undercover. Then the addition would be built and everything would be repainted and reassembled on the site. This was confirmed. Mr. Kaze shared an image of the front of the house. The intention was not to cut any of the historical wood. Wherever that wood had a joint when it was built would be where the panel was taken. The panel would come off in one piece and it would be sandwiched between new framing so nails would not need to be placed in the panel itself, but into the new wood framing. This would also be done at the back of the site. Originally, the house was going to be moved to the back of the site, so it was possible to leave the panels on site if that was something that was desired by the Board. Alternatively, it would be possible to move the panels into a warehouse facility where the paint remediation could be done before those panels were brought back to the site.

Mr. Sloan asked that the floor plan elevation be shared. He reported that there were clear labels shown there. For example, there was Panel A, Panel B, Panel C, and so on. It was possible to leave the panels on site, but he preferred to handle the panels off-site because it would be possible to do the paint remediation there and protect the materials.

Board Member Stephens believed that what aggravated the situation was taking the roof off. Even under the best conditions, it would have been difficult to move the house. He thought more damage had taken place with the removal of the roof because it had added

some level of structural stability. He reported that the construction method described was not uncommon with old homes. Anything built before the 1900s often had board and batten vertical siding. Somewhere in the 1890s, the batten piece was removed and horizontal siding was added. This was not an uncommon problem with historic homes. He knew that similar types of homes had been lifted and moved in the past. Board Member Stephens did not like going down the path of panelization, especially in this case, when the roof had been removed. He understood there was a desire to move forward with the application, but he was not inclined to approve the request at the current meeting. He felt it was important for there to be another site visit with the Chief Building Official.

Mr. Kaze understood the desire to return to the site. He would be willing to visit the site with the Chief Building Official to hear his opinion. Board Member Stephens noted that there had been a lot of references to saving the historic material. He pointed out that it was not just about saving the historic material, but it was also about saving the historic structure. He had confidence that Mr. Kaze would be able to take those panels, preserve them, work on them, and bring them back to the site, but that was not the preferred method. Board Member Beatlebrox asked about the number of historic homes he had worked on in Park City over the last five years. Mr. Kaze explained that he was the Operations Manager for Big-D Signature and had not worked on any other homes in Park City. However, he noted that Big-D Signature had, so the company had a lot of experience. Mr. Kaze reported that the original Superintendent that oversaw the project was chosen due to his experience with historical buildings and renovating in the Salt Lake area.

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

Mr. Kaze understood that there was a desire to do a site visit. He asked to meet with the Chief Building Official soon to review what had been done already. There could be a site visit with the Board Members and the Chief Building Official at a later date if that was desired. Assistant Director Ward noted that additional information had been presented at the Historic Preservation Board Meeting. There could be work with the applicant to make sure that all of the additional information would be included in the next Staff Report. It was suggested that the site visit take with the Board take place before the next meeting.

Board Member Beatlebrox believed time was of the essence and expressed concerns about weather conditions. Mr. Kaze noted that there were some sections that he was nervous about. He did not want to see any of the historic material destroyed or harmed. Board Member Beatlebrox asked whether the Board needed to wait until the September 2023 Historic Preservation Board Meeting or if a special meeting could be held. Assistant Director Ward explained that if there was availability and a quorum, it would be possible to hold a special meeting. The special meeting would need to be publicly noticed. She noted that this could be done by continuing the item to August 16 or 22, 2023. That being said, she wanted to make sure that the Chief Building Official was available to be there. Discussions were had about the best dates for a site visit and the future Board meeting.

MOTION: Board Member Stephens moved to CONTINUE the Modification to Material Deconstruction and Partial Panelization for 1002.5 Norfolk Avenue to the September 6, 2023, meeting. The motion was seconded by Board Member Hutchings.

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

6. ADJOURN

MOTION: Board Member Holmgren moved to ADJOURN the Historic Preservation Board Meeting. Board Member Hodgkins seconded the motion.

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

The Historic Preservation Board Meeting adjourned at approximately 6:43 p.m.

Approved by _____
Randy Scott, Chair
Historic Preservation Board