



**PARK CITY MUNICIPAL CORPORATION
HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD
MINUTES OF JULY 6, 2022**

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

EX OFFICIO MEMBERS: Gretchen Milliken, Planning Director; Rebecca Ward, Assistant Planning Director; John Robertson, City Engineer; Aiden Lillie, Planner; Spencer Cawley, Planner; Chief Building Official Dave Thacker

1. ROLL CALL

Chair Randy Scott called the meeting to order at 5:00 p.m. A roll call was held, and Chair Scott noted that a quorum was present.

2. MEETING MINUTES

A. Consideration to Approve the Historic Preservation Board Meeting Minutes from May 4, 2022.

Board Members Lola Beatlebrox and Douglas Stephens each stated that they were not present at the May 4 meeting and would abstain from the vote.

MOTION: Board Member Puggy Holmgren moved to APPROVE the Minutes of May 4, 2022, as written. Board Member John Hutchings seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously with two abstentions.

3. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS

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

4. STAFF AND BOARD COMMUNICATIONS AND DISCLOSURES

Chair Scott mentioned that the Daly West Headframe was raised and was amazing. He believed it would give some momentum for other items on the list to get higher priority. He added that there would be a full video created that would be circulated.

5. **WORK SESSION**

A. **Small Wireless Facility Design Standards - The Historic Preservation Board Will Conduct a Work Session on Small Wireless Facility Design Standards for Small Wireless Installations in the Historic Districts and near Historic Sites.**

Assistant Planning Director, Rebecca Ward, reported that there had been developments on this issue since it was last presented to the Board in April 2021. She introduced City Engineer, John Robertson, who was available on Zoom to answer any questions. In addition, Toro Blanco was the design firm that had been drafting the plans to show what a Small Wireless Facilities ("SWF") might look like in the Historic District. Zack Hodgins was present on behalf of Toro Blanco and available to answer questions.

Assistant Director Ward thanked the wireless facility providers for their openness to meeting with Staff and the City Engineer. She reported that they conducted a tour on Main Street and representatives visited the Historic Districts to brainstorm how the SWF could be installed with minimal impacts. She added that the State Historic Preservation Office also weighed in and Staff reached out to the University of Utah, which has design guidelines to protect the Historic President Circle and Fort Douglas area. They also reached out to other communities that are also working through these issues, and Staff found that things were still developing and progressing. She stated that while they have not yet found the magic solution, they were headed in a good direction.

Assistant Director Ward reported that one of the outcomes of the April 2021 Work Session was the recommendation from the Historic Preservation Board ("HPB") that there be proportionate Main Street replacement lights provided for when the Design Standards are scheduled to go before City Council for review. She stated that those were completed and based on those renderings, the City Council was not in favor of replacing the Main Street lights with the taller lights. The Council directed Staff to go back to the drawing board specifically to the Historic District.

Assistant Director Ward reported that on December 16, 2021, the City Council adopted the Design Standards Citywide, with the exception of the Historic Districts. She added that the wireless providers have continued to show good faith in working with the City to try and find creative solutions. Staff had been working with the City Engineer, who in turn was working with a third-party consultant that specializes in these designs. They found that some communities are implementing a Distributed Antenna System ("DAS") that would be owned and operated by a third party; the City would allow wireless providers to install conduit along Main Street to connect to the DAS.

Assistant Director Ward explained that because this conduit would be underground, it would reduce the amount of equipment required for each SWF. She added that the system will have an antenna as an addition to the Main Street light, but it would not require the replacement of the Main Street light. Instead, a box would be added to the

top of the existing light pole. She noted that because the conduit would be underground, it would eliminate the need for the equipment boxes in the base. There would be a minor increase to the base dimensions but nothing like what they previously presented.

Assistant Director Ward referenced renderings prepared by Toro Blanco and noted that they were still working out the dimensions of the antennas. She presented renderings of an existing light and compared it to one that showed the proposed antenna. She remarked that the antenna would match the light pole in materials and color, and in the worst-case scenario, the antenna would be 15 inches high and 6 inches wide. She noted there might be an opportunity to reduce those dimensions.

She explained that the proposed Design Standards would require DAS for the Main Street Small Wireless Facilities. For SWF proposed in or near Historic Sites, they proposed a separate section for adoption as part of the Design Standards. This would require the small wireless provider demonstrate that adequate coverage could not be maintained, existing services or capacities could not be improved, or new services could not be added to the existing facilities unless they were allowed to install these facilities in the Historic District or near a Historic Site.

The second requirement would be to require a comprehensive plan for complete coverage of the Historic District to identify co-location opportunities and to reduce the number of facilities to be installed. Assistant Director Ward explained that the proposed Design Standards will establish an optional pre-submittal meeting and establish public notice for Section 106 review with the State Historic Preservation Office that would allow for the City and any interested member of the public to participate as consulting parties. She explained the prioritization for SWFs in Historic Districts and installed away from Main Street. The first would be On-Strand Attachments, where the SWF would hang below a power line. The second priority would be to attach an SWF to an existing utility pole.

With respect to the third priority, she noted that while there are no traffic signals in the Historic District, there are some historic sites that are near traffic signals to which SWFs could be attached fairly easily. The fourth preference would be streetlights, excluding those on Main Street, where replacements would be allowed of existing streetlights for a particular streetscape. The last preference would be unobtrusive co-location or the installation of a standalone pole.

Assistant Director Ward explained that the proposed Design Standards would prohibit the installation of Small Wireless Facilities on Historic Structures or Sites. They would also be prohibited along the primary façade or lot frontage and discouraged from canopies, awnings, overhangs, balconies, and rooftops. If an SWF were allowed to be installed near a Historic Site, historic material would require protection during installation. She added that the proposed Design Standards would require screening, concealment, camouflage, or other stealth techniques to blend it into the environment.

In addition, the Design Standards require that undergrounding of utility boxes should be accomplished whenever possible.

She asked the HPB for input and explained that this was scheduled to go before the City Council in September. She noted that the Design Standards were already adopted; this would add a chapter specific to the Historic Districts and near Historic Sites.

Board Member Stephens asked if conduit already existed along Main Street. Assistant Director Ward expressed her belief that conduit already exists. Mr. Robertson explained that the City installed conduit when the sidewalks were replaced along Main Street five to six years ago. He added that there would have to be some sort of agreement with providers to use that conduit since it was installed and is maintained by the City.

Board Member Stephens recalled discussions from last year where they felt that they would not need too many of these SWFs along Main Street. Mr. Robertson explained that current Utah State Law allows multiple providers to place their facilities in City rights-of-way. If they do not have DAS, it could be that providers could place facilities up and down Main Street. Mr. Robertson emphasized that the advantage of DAS is that there might be antennas placed on multiple poles, but they would be much less intrusive and multiple providers could use one antenna. He added that the City could, therefore, force placement in certain locations. He clarified that State law does not allow the City to force providers onto a DAS, although it would be an advantage for the providers. Providers could still propose other locations within the Historic District if they did not want to use the DAS; however, the City could promote and encourage the use of the DAS to the provider.

Board Member Stephens commented that even with the DAS, the antenna would be noticeable. He wondered if the antennas could be concentrated in locations at the top of Main Street and at the bottom of Main Street, as well as in some parks and public areas. He suggested design alternatives for those types of areas that might present a better option.

In response to an inquiry from Chair Scott, Mr. Robertson stated that these antennas could be installed on every pole along Main Street but would not necessarily have to depend on provider coverage. He suggested that they might be able to install three to four antennas along Main Street that could provide a significant amount of coverage for the different providers; however, they would need input from the providers regarding their coverage needs.

Chair Scott noted that in some areas a monopole could potentially be hidden, which could present an interesting solution. Board Member Holmgren questioned whether that would detract from the historic image if the poles were located on Main Street. Chair Scott expressed that it would be better to not alter the existing poles along Main Street but suggested that a monopole could be made to look similar to a historic pole

that would fit in with the aesthetic. He added that if they could install such a pole near the bottom of lower Main Street, or near the Brew Pub lot, they could potentially be more hidden. He also mentioned a location back into Miner's Park.

Assistant Director Ward added that following the last Work Session, Staff created a map of the different rights-of-way and park areas running through Main Street that was reviewed with the wireless providers. She reported that the wireless providers expressed concern that if the wireless facilities are placed behind or to the side of a structure, additional issues would arise. She stated that the DAS would have a 10' x 10' operating system that could be hidden on rooftops or in the rights-of-ways off of Main Street; however, to actually place the SWF in those areas would not be possible without additional height.

Board Member Beatlebrox expressed support for the new design and felt that the Board's concerns about the light poles were heard. She felt that a small protrusion at the top of the antenna would not detract from the light pole. She added her belief that people would likely not notice the addition and would be happy with the cell service.

Board Member Beatlebrox was particularly pleased that the new design had a smaller base. From a design standpoint, she reiterated that was happy with the proposed changes.

There was support from the Board for the new design and keeping the base similar to the existing size.

Board Member Hutchings asked if they require provisions regarding removal in the event that facilities are abandoned. Assistant Director Ward explained that when the City Council adopted the Design Standards, they also adopted a section of the Code that outlined the required agreements to operate these in the right-of-way, which addresses this issue.

Planning Director, Gretchen Milliken, mentioned that a message was received via the chat in Zoom. The comments of Mr. Hodgins of Toro Blanco were read as follows:

'Monopoles could be part of the DAS system. The real advantage of the DAS is to ensure multi-tenant collection of the carriers, instead of the carriers each having their own individual poles, which would lead to 3 – 4 times as many installations over time. The size installation and DAS calls for a total of 10 nodes along Main Street that will enable complete coverage for every carrier along that street.'

6. REGULAR AGENDA

A. Consideration of a Resolution Authorizing Electronic Meetings and Hybrid Meetings with an Anchor Location.

City Planner, Aiden Lillie, explained that the Board is required to adopt the Resolution in order to conduct hybrid meetings. This Resolution would allow participation both in-person and online.

Director Milliken read the Resolution into the record as follows:

“A RESOLUTION GOVERNING THE USE OF ELECTRONIC MEETINGS BY THE HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD.

WHEREAS Park City values transparency and conducting the public's business in public meetings where actions are taken, and deliberations are conducted openly;

WHEREAS, while the preference is for Park City public bodies to convene in person, it is understood that there may be circumstances where electronic meetings are necessary;

WHEREAS the Open and Public Meetings Act was amended during the 2021 General Session to grant additional flexibility in how public bodies conduct electronic meetings;

WHEREAS the COVID-19 virus continues to raise health or safety concerns for in-person public meetings and electronic meetings help facilitate social distancing;

BE IT ORDAINED BY THE HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD OF PARK CITY, UTAH, THAT:

The Historic Preservation Board may hold electronic meetings in accordance with section 52-4-207 of the Utah Code, as amended.

MOTION: Board Member Holmgren moved to APPROVE the Resolution Authorizing Electronic Meetings and Hybrid Meetings with an Anchor Location. Board Member Beattlebrox seconded the motion.

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

B. 1304 Park Avenue -- Disassembly and Reassembly -- The Applicant Proposes Partial Disassembly and Reassembly to Construct Structural Upgrades to the Landmark Historic Site. PL-21-05028.

Planner Lillie acknowledged Board Member Holmgren's comment that this home came before the Board in the prior meeting where the applicant requested full panelization of the Historic Structure. She explained that the application was a revised proposal to only panelize four walls from the pre-1941 addition and lift the original structure. She reported that the original structure was constructed circa 1885 and is a Landmark Historic Structure on Park City's Historic Sites Inventory. She presented a 1941 photograph of the home.

The application before the Board proposed the disassembly and reassembly of four walls of the 1941 addition and to lift the original form of the Historic Structure. She referenced the drawings from the project architect, Jonathan DeGray, AIA that show the Panelization Plan. She stated that following the Board's prior review and denial of the proposal for full panelization, the applicant provided a letter included as Exhibit B to the Staff Report that states that lifting the structure would be difficult due to its size and the lack of a continuous floor or roof framing system that would allow for bracing.

Planner Lillie reported that the proposed disassembly and reassembly of the 1941 form would allow the applicant to construct a new foundation and perform other structural upgrades. She added that on April 26, 2022, Chief Building Official, Dave Thacker, and Director Milliken visited the site and determined that the conditions did not require panelization. As of this time, the Chief Building Official and Planning Director had not received any new information or observed any change in conditions that would alter their findings and determination.

Planner Lillie stated that Staff recommended the Board review the proposal, conduct a public hearing and deny the disassembly and reassembly of the Landmark Historic Structure, subject to the Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Conditions of Approval set forth in the staff report. Staff had not received any public input on this proposal.

Board Member Hutchings requested clarification of what panels were proposed to be panelized. Planner Lillie presented the panelization plan and identified the 1941 addition proposed to be panelized, and the original structure proposed to be lifted. One panel to be disassembled was located on the front façade and contains the gable. There would be two additional panels from the south elevation that would also be disassembled.

Planner Lillie explained that the north side of the home would also be panelized. She explained that the rear was non-contributing as it was a more recent addition and would be removed for the proposed addition.

Board Member Beatlebrox expressed confusion over the discussion about a 1907 addition and asked for clarification about the number of additions. Planner Lillie explained that there was one addition as depicted on the 1941 Sanborn Map.

Mr. DeGray explained that there have also been more recent additions. The original form was constructed circa 1885 and would be lifted and put back onto a new foundation. There was a 1941 addition, and all that remains of that addition are the three panels. They included the south side shed and roof form panel in the Panelization Plan because it has no rear wall. He offered that everything to the east was part of an addition done in the 1980s. He stressed that there is no back to the building that is contributory. This proposal would take the parts of the structure that are salvageable and put them aside to be reassembled. He added that this plan followed along with the discussions during the last meeting. Mr. DeGray stated that based on precedent, they could tear down the 1941 addition, but expressed that this addition was contributory because it created a gable form in the front, and saving those panels would have value. It also represented the building that the applicant would like to save.

Board Member Stephens asked how they knew the gable façade was constructed in 1941. Planner Lillie clarified that the 1907 date in the Staff Report was the earliest date that this structure appeared on the Sanborn Map. She referenced the north and east elevations of the home that appear on the 1941 Sanborn Map. She explained these are the portions of the home proposed to be panelized. It was clarified that the additions were done sometime between 1929 and 1941.

Board Member Stephens referenced the siding on the south side of the original building and questioned whether it was original. Mr. DeGray confirmed that none of this siding appeared to be original. He added that the home had been renovated over the years, particularly in the 1980s when the 1941 addition was extended even further back into the rear yard. He added that most recently, a prior owner had started to reframe portions of the building without a permit.

Board Member Beatlebrox understood that the rectangular form of the original structure could be lifted. She stated that during a recent visit, she noted the absence of a wall between the two forms on the north side. Mr. DeGray stated that the other three walls were in decent shape and the form was small enough to be braced and lifted as a unit.

In response to an inquiry regarding panelization of Panel D, Mr. DeGray confirmed that it was included in the Panelization Plan because it is the only other intact wall. He added that the siding was not original, and the interior is covered with sheetrock, so until they do a full demolition he could not state for sure whether it was intact.

Board Member Hutchings asked what would need to be done to lift the entire structure. Mr. DeGray explained that they would have to do extensive rebuilding on the interior. He added that this would be counter-intuitive because they want the structure as light as possible before lifting and adding framing that would in the end be thrown away would

not make sense. He noted that the roof and floor would be reframed after installation of the foundation.

Board Member Stephens noted that Mr. DeGray's comments would apply to every house in Old Town. Board Member Stephens observed that there was original siding on the front of the house, and he felt that the façade on the gable end facing Park Avenue was closer to 1929 than 1941. On the north side of the building, he felt there was the same siding. He was not sure how contributing Panel D was to this structure and would rather see the historic form from 1885 and the next historic form built prior to 1941 lifted intact. He would also like to see the shed addition on the back removed. Board Member Beatlebrox concurred with Board Member Stephens' suggestions.

Mr. DeGray confirmed that they included the rear wall because it was part of the non-contributory addition and was the only panel that represented the historic form that might be worth saving.

Board Member Stephens asked if any framing would be discarded if they lifted the original structure and 1941 addition. Mr. DeGray responded in the negative and noted that there was neither a back wall to the 1941 gable addition nor an interior wall. Board Member Stephens observed that the applicant would have to construct some type of structure to support the new gable roof and questioned why they don't just build a newly engineered structure, as it would be intended when it is finished.

Mr. DeGray stated he would hope to avoid that scenario because the increased weight would complicate the lift. He referenced the house that fell in the hole on Park Avenue a few years back. He added that because that house was fully reframed it survived the fall, but it created quite a mess to clean up. Based on his experience, he recommended making this as light as possible to accommodate the lift, and then they could reapply the 1941 addition to a proper structure. There was brief discussion regarding the windows that were part of the historic form.

Board Member Stephens stated that he would have difficulty agreeing to the panelization of the addition on the north side that took place between 1929 and 1941 and would rather see that lifted intact. Board Member Holmgren noted that historically, they have tried to avoid panelization and wondered if they could avoid it in this instance.

Board Member Beatlebrox understood that the applicant would have to build a wall or structure on the left-hand side of the original structure in order to lift it. She did not understand why a ghost wall could not be installed on the right-hand side of the gable.

Mr. DeGray responded that the issue was that there was no continuous floor on that side of the building, so they would have to frame a floor to stabilize it and connect it. It was noted that the joists that were part of the non-permitted framing were in good shape, but it was not connected to the 1885 form.

Board Member Beatlebrox noted that it seemed like a house of cards and asked how confident the applicant was that if the applicant panelized the three sides of the gable form that it could be reassembled exactly as it exists today. Mr. DeGray expressed confidence and added that there was plenty of evidence of that being done all over town. He added that the panels seemed to be in pretty good shape. Mr. DeGray stated that the owner would like to move forward with the Building Permit as soon as possible. Board Member Beatlebrox expressed her support for the proposal.

Chair Scott noted that this was tricky and commented that they have allowed applicants to go back to a prior period. He noted that here, the applicant wants to keep the gable, which is a non-historic form, and during the last meeting they explored ways to save that structure and meet somewhere in the middle. He stated that he was and continues to be agreeable with the concept discussed during the last meeting as long as they worked to preserve the 1941 piece and preserve the original Historic Structure. He added that the owner could go back to the 1929 Sanborn Map and recreate the structure as is, which would be a loss to the community.

Board Member Hutchings echoed these struggles and stated that if they were being 100% consistent, they would deny this application based on the Chief Building Official's determination. However, he felt that this might encourage the removal of historic material, which they do not want to do. He added that if the owner removed that historic material, they would have to live with it as well. Board Member Hutchings commented that the owner wanted to preserve that area of the home.

Board Member Stephens observed that the Board has often allowed the property owner to decide which historic period they want to go back to, but the property owner must live with that decision and must meet the current Code. Often, it is in the property owners' best interest to keep the later edition. He stressed that the Board historically opposed panelization and preferred lifting. There are instances where panelization would be better, as noted by Board Member Beatlebrox. He referenced a home on Ninth Street that could not be lifted. He stressed that the information they have now is that the entire structure could be lifted.

Chair Scott opened the public hearing. There was no public input, however, Chief Building Official Thacker offered to provide his input.

Director Milliken added that she viewed the property with Mr. Thacker and acknowledged that this was a difficult situation. This is a heavier structure that would require the recreation of some of the missing façades in order to lift it as a whole. She stated that the site, which is flat and contains space for staging, also played into the determination that the structure should not be panelized.

Mr. Thacker echoed Director Milliken's comments and stated that the site is flat and contains a substantial amount of room. He added that although the structure is a 'hodge-podge,' it seemed that it could be put together and secured to accommodate

lifting. He added that compared to some of the other structures that have been lifted, this one seemed easier in some respects.

Board Member Beatlebrox asked Mr. Thacker about the impact of the floor not being connected to the rest of the house. Mr. Thacker stated that even though the floor was not perfectly connected, there would be ways to secure it to allow the structure to be lifted and then secured to a foundation. He stated it would take some additional preparation prior to the lift, but it was still a reasonable and possible activity.

Chair Scott closed the public hearing.

Board Member Stephens noted that denial of this application would further delay the applicant, and asked Mr. DeGray if the applicant could live with lifting as discussed during this meeting. He suggested that as part of a motion, they could allow for the removal of Panel D and the non-historic material from the historic form.

Director Milliken stated that this could be added as part of the motion, and it would become part of the public record.

Board Member Stephens added that if the non-historic material was removed from the historic form, then some sheeting could be added to assist with the lift. Mr. DeGray indicated he would work with Staff to update the plan. It was suggested that the Board could move to deny panelization and add the modifications as discussed that would allow the entire structure to be lifted.

MOTION: Board Member Beatlebrox moved to DENY the Partial Disassembly and Reassembly of 1304 Park Avenue, and ALLOW the removal of Panel D and the non-historic siding material from the south façade in order to facilitate the lifting of the entire Historic Form at 1304 Park Avenue, including the 1885 Form and the 1929/1941 Form according to the Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law and Conditions of Approval as follows:

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 but received a wing addition in c. 1907.
3. This site was listed on the National Register of Historic Places in 1984 as part of the Park City Mining Boom Era Residences Thematic District. It

was built within the historic period, defined as 1872 to 1929 in the district nomination, and retains its historic integrity.

4. On March 29, 2022, the Planning Department received a complete Historic District Design Review (HDDR) application for 1304 Park Avenue. The Applicant is proposing to panelize the structure to complete structural upgrades and a rear addition.
5. This application was reviewed by the Design Review Team on November 17, 2022, December 1, 2022, January 19, 2022, and April 6, 2022.
6. On May 4, 2022, the HPB reviewed the project, conducted a public hearing, and requested the Applicant modify their proposal.

Panelization

7. On March 30, 2022, a licensed structural engineer visited 1304 Park Avenue and completed a Physical Conditions Report.
8. The report determined the following:
 - i. The main roof existing joists are 2x4 at 24" on center spanning about 8'-0" to 12'-0". The 12'-0" roof joists are 12% capacity of the code. The 8'-0" roof joists are 16% capacity of the code. They need to be upgraded or replaced with new roof joists. We suggest reframing roof ridge and valley beams and installing new 9 1/2" min. TJI roof joists.
 - ii. The existing roof deck is 1x wood plank installed perpendicular to the existing joists. It doesn't have any capacity of shear diaphragm value. Suggest installing new 5/8" plywood or OSB with 10d @ 6" on center nailing.
 - iii. The existing crawl space floor joists are 2x4 @ 24" on center spanning 12'-0". Most of them were totally rotted out. They have to be replaced. On the north portion of the house, the crawl space floor joists are kind new 2x6 @ 16" o.c.
 - iv. All the existing headers need to be upgraded. We will review each one of them when the design is available.
 - v. The exterior and interior walls are actual 2x4 @ 16" o.c. with 1x12 planks horizontally. They have the capacity for gravity loads but no capacity for wind, or seismic. The exterior walls need to be

redesigned with new OSB/plywood sheathing and new hold-downs for lateral compliance with the new Building Code.

- vi. The whole existing building is supported by loose sandstone or no footing at all. We suggest removing the existing foundation sandstone and frame walls. New reinforced concrete footing and foundation walls need to be poured for supporting the existing building and forming the frost depth of 40" minimum.
 - vii. Considering the existing roof, floor, and wall condition plus the age, rotted condition of the building as well as the bad differential settlement and particularly the house is rested on dirt, we strongly suggest panelizing the existing building so we can re-build the entire house. If not to panelize the existing building, the big concern is that the safety is not guaranteed when the construction crews are working inside of the existing building with jacking or vibrating to the building. To panelize the existing building, the construction crews may only need to work from the outside of the building most of time.
9. On April 26, 2022, the Chief Building Official, Planning Director, and Building and Planning staff visited 1304 Park Avenue.
- a. The Chief Building Official and Planning Director determined that the Landmark Historic Structure is not in a state of disrepair that merits demolition.
 - b. The Chief Building Official and Planning Director visited the site and determined that the Landmark Historic Structure is not hazardous or dangerous pursuant to International Building Code Section 116.1.
 - c. The Chief Building Official and Planning Director visited the site and determined that the Landmark Historic Site and structural conditions will not preclude lifting or moving the Structure; the physical conditions of existing materials will not prevent temporarily lifting the Structure.

Conclusion of Law

- 1. The proposal does not meet the criteria outlined in Land Management Code Disassembly And Reassembly Of A Historic Building Or Historic Structure Land Management Code Section 15-11-14.

Board Member Stephens seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

C. 517 Park Avenue -- Material Deconstruction -- The Applicant Proposes Material Deconstruction of a Portion of the Rear Façade of the Landmark Historic Structure to Accommodate a Rear Porch Addition. PL-21-05118.

Planner Lillie reported that 517 Park Avenue was constructed circa 1888 and was listed as a Landmark Site on Park City's Historic Sites Inventory. She presented a photograph of the structure taken in the 1970s. She explained that the applicant proposed to remove 32 square feet of historic material in order to accommodate a rear second-level deck addition. She referenced the diagram that depicted the sections of material to be removed.

Staff completed a site visit to determine existing historic material, and she reported that much of the historic siding was removed during an extensive 1993 addition. She explained that in 1993, the Episcopal Diocese of Utah wanted to demolish the structure, and with the help of the Historic District Commission, the City was able to persuade them to sell the property to a local contractor who renovated the structure and removed a significant portion of historic material.

Planner Lillie presented a graphic of the proposed rear addition. She noted that during the site visit, the contractor removed a portion of the interior wall, and they confirmed the absence of any historic material underneath the new siding that was installed in 1993. With input from the City's historic preservation consultant, they determined that the only material that would be destroyed by this proposal was the second-story deck addition. She stated that prior to issuance of a Building Permit for any material deconstruction work, the Planning Department would review the proposal for compliance with the Design Guidelines for Historic Residential Sites. The Design Review Team reviewed this proposal and found the deck to be consistent with the Design Guidelines.

Staff recommended approval of the material deconstruction of a portion of the rear façade of the Landmark Historic Structure located at 517 Park Avenue. Staff had not received any public input on this application.

General Contractor, Kyle Hedman, stated that the square footage of material removed would be used to repair other locations on the house. The applicant's representative, Caitlyn Barhorst, from AIA, confirmed this and added that the deck would be offset from the north elevation by approximately 2 feet to comply with the additional guidelines. She added that the owner was using the Utah Rehabilitation Tax Credits for this project.

The applicant, Jeff Love, stated the primary reason for the deck was to screen the condominium behind the house. The home is primarily two stories, with the living area and master bedroom on the primary level. The deck would help screen any rear

windows from the condominiums. Ms. Barhorst added that they are returning the structure from four separate apartments to a single-family home.

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

Board Member Stephens referenced page 131 of the Packet that mentioned Senior City Attorney Mark Harrington.

MOTION: Board Member Hutchings moved to APPROVE the Partial Material Deconstruction of the Landmark Historic Structure at 517 Park Avenue, subject to the Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Conditions of Approval as follows:

Findings of Fact

1. 517 Park Avenue is a one-story T/L cottage was constructed in c.1888 and is a Landmark Historic Site on Park City's Historic Sites Inventory.
2. This site was listed on the National Register of Historic Places in 1994 as part of the Park City Mining Boom Era Residences Thematic District.
3. The structure underwent major rehabilitation work from 1993 to 1994.
4. On December 28, 2021, a Historic District Design Review Pre-Application was submitted to the Planning Department.
5. On March 24, 2022, the Planning Department received a complete Historic District Design Review (HDDR) application for 517 Park Avenue. The Applicant is proposing Material Deconstruction to the structure to construct a rear deck.
6. The HDDR Application was reviewed by the Design Review Team on April 13, 2022.
7. Per the Land Management Code Section 15-11-12.5, the HPB reviews the removal of Historic Material to Accommodate New additions, New Construction, or Structural Upgrades.
8. The Applicant proposes to remove 88 square feet of historic material to accommodate a rear second-level deck addition.
9. The staff report 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; and § 15-13-2, Design Guidelines For Historic Residential Sites.

Conditions of Approval

1. 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.
2. In order to prevent damage to a historic structure, the deck shall be constructed to be self-supporting. If the deck cannot be constructed to be self-supporting, the deck shall be attached to a historic structure with care, so loss of historic fabric is minimized.
3. 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 can be restored.
4. The deck shall be constructed in an inconspicuous area where visually minimized from the primary right-of-way. The deck shall be located such that the deck does not damage or conceal significant historic features or details of the historic structure.
5. The visual impact of the deck shall be minimized by limiting its size and scale. Significant site features, such as mature trees, shall be protected from damage during the construction of the deck by minimizing ground disturbance and by limiting the use of heavy construction equipment.

Board Member Holmgren seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

7. ADJOURN

The Historic Preservation Board Meeting adjourned at 6:35 p.m.

Approved by _____
Randy Scott, Chair
Historic Preservation Board