



**PARK CITY MUNICIPAL CORPORATION
HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD MEETING
SUMMIT COUNTY, UTAH
MINUTES OF JULY 5, 2023**

BOARD MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE: Lola Beatlebrox-Chair, Puggy Holmgren, John Hutchings, Jack Hodgkins

EX OFFICIO MEMBERS: Caitlyn Tubbs, Senior Historic Preservation Planner; Mark Harrington, City Attorney; Rebecca Ward, Interim Planning Director

1. ROLL CALL

MOTION: In the absence of Chair Randy Scott, Puggy Holmgren moved to nominate Lola Beatlebrox to serve as Chair. Jack Hodgkins seconded the motion.

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

Board Member Beatlebrox assumed the Chair and called the meeting to order at 5:03 p.m. A roll call was conducted.

2. MINUTES APPROVAL

A. Consideration to Approve Historic Preservation Board Meeting Minutes from June 7, 2023.

MOTION: Board Member Holmgren moved to APPROVE the Minutes of June 7, 2023, as written. Board Member Beatlebrox seconded the motion.

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

3. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS

There were no public communications.

4. STAFF AND BOARD COMMUNICATIONS AND DISCLOSURES

There were no Staff or Board communications or disclosures.

5. CONTINUATIONS

A. Historic District Design Guideline Illustrations - Work Session.

MOTION: Board Member Holmgren moved to CONTINUE the Work Session to a date uncertain. Board Member Hutchings seconded the motion.

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

6. REGULAR AGENDA

A. 316 Woodside Avenue – Material Deconstruction – Applicant Seeks Approval for Material Deconstruction of a Portion of the Side Façade and Interior Roof Framing of a Significant Historic Structure to Facilitate the Construction of an Addition. PL-21-05087.

Senior Historic Preservation Planner, Caitlyn Tubbs, presented the Staff Report and stated that the request is for a material deconstruction at 316 Woodside Avenue, which is listed as a significant historic structure on Park City's Historic Sites Inventory. The property is in the HR-1 zoning district, which is governed by the Historic District Design Guidelines. It is a corner lot with frontage along Woodside Avenue and the Third Street Stairs public right-of-way. The front of the home faces the Third Street Stairs and the side of the property faces Woodside Avenue, which is more readily visible for vehicular traffic. A historic photo of the home was displayed as well as from Woodside Avenue. In 2022, the Board heard a request to connect a proposed addition to the bay window projection. The Board denied the request and the applicant has returned with an updated design and is requesting material deconstruction of 64 square feet of non-historic siding as well as replacement of the internal roof framing of the historic structure.

Ms. Tubbs reported that earlier in March the Planning Commission heard a Conditional Use Permit ("CUP") and a steep slope CUP for the property. That review is required by the Planning Commission. The location of the home on the lot encroaches into some of the setbacks and since adequate parking needs to be provided for the proposed addition, the applicant requested a setback waiver. The Land Management Code allows the Planning Commission to permit some encroachment into the setback for additions to historic structures. The Planning Commission approved an encroachment of 4 ½ to 5 ½ feet into the front setback for the proposed addition. Instead of connecting the proposed addition to the bump out, which was found by the Board to be historically significant to the house, the applicant has proposed to relocate the transitional element to the rear corner of the side façade. It will connect to a porch that was recently enclosed. The enclosure materials will be removed and are non-historic since the enclosure was added within the last 10 to 20 years.

The proposed elevations were presented. The north elevation serves as the transitional element between the existing historic structure and the proposed addition. Where the

transitional element connects to the historic porch, the applicant has proposed the utilization of porch railings, a column, and some glazing. As a result, that portion of the structure will read as a porch even though it will remain enclosed and provide a connection between the historic structure and the new construction. The 64 square feet of non-historic materials that are proposed to be removed will be in the doorway and on the side of the home.

Ms. Tubbs reported that the other request is to redo the framing of the roof, which will be fully interior. There will be no change to the roof form, shape, or pitch. The applicant wants to vault the interior of the structure to see the architectural lines of the roof and stabilize the roof so that it is structurally stronger. After reviewing the material deconstruction request, staff reviewed the proposal and its potential effects on the historic integrity of the sites. Staff found that there are no detrimental effects to the historic integrity of the site that will not be addressed as part of the Historic District Design Review process or as part of the Historic Preservation Plan when construction takes place. Staff recommended the Historic Preservation Board review the material deconstruction request, conduct a public hearing, and consider approving the request subject to the Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Conditions of Approval set forth in the draft Final Action Letter.

It was clarified that the Board was considering the material deconstruction, which has nothing to do with the transitional element. Ms. Tubbs confirmed that the Board is considering the removal of the historic materials. The overall design review will take place at a future public hearing with the Planning Director designee at an administrative public hearing.

Board Member Hodgkins commented that the transitional element is part of the Land Management Code and is due to the Historic Preservation Board's requirements to set the historic building apart. Ms. Tubbs stated that the scope of the Board's review is simply related to the historic materials and the removal thereof. Per the Land Management Code, the Planning Director or the Director's designee are the ultimate land use authority for the overall Historic District Design Review. As a result, the request will not return to the Board for the Design Review component.

Chair Beatiebrox referenced the upper floor plan and a request was made for additional orientation to the site. It was noted that the garage will open onto Woodside Avenue. The proposed addition will be visible from Woodside Avenue. The proposed addition will sit between the Woodside Avenue right-of-way and the historic structure. It was clarified that the window that was on the porch is not historic. The overall porch form is there, however, the original balusters and railings have been removed.

The applicant, Matt Safchik, commented that the French doors that are on the deck were installed about 20 years ago. They were proposed to be restored back to the Bay window, which was the ruling last time. The bump out is important to the home so they will restore the French doors back to the Bay window and then reopen the doorway on the far left

that served as a storage closet. That historic exit from the home will be used. The doorway from the home to the porch exists but they plan to reopen the historic doorway and use it as the transition. There is an exterior door on the right. The exterior doorway will be reopened and the transition will connect to the former doorway. About half of the deck on the side closest to the stairs will remain and the addition will take the left-hand side closest to the neighbor and furthest from the public stairs.

It was noted that the porch was originally recessed. Someone removed the porch materials and there is an existing historic door that will become interior. That was actually a closet and is what they are proposing to remove. Mr. Safchik commented that the door is on the right side of the porch. The front façade is not being touched and the new construction is as far as possible from the front of the home. He stated that they are being as respectful as possible of the historic home and blocking only the furthest corner from the front. It was noted that there is no construction under the deck.

A question was raised as to whether historic material is being removed. Mr. Safchik indicated that he would like to vault the ceiling. In the process of putting in fire sprinklers as required by the Building Department, he decided to open it up and get some height in the house. In addition, when he purchased the home in 2020, the Structural Engineer pointed out a few concerns with the framing, which they plan to address at the same time. The home is 135 years old and was built in the early mining years. The primary concerns were exterior materials such as eaves and eave details. The applicant will work with the City to ensure that everything is replaced to be as it is currently. The only change in historic materials will be to the reframing from the inside. The most extreme change will involve the removal of some of the existing framing and boards. It was noted that there is structural deterioration inside the attic. They intend to fix that, which may require removing some of the skip sheathing, existing rafters, and cross ties. This will not be visible from the outside. They will maintain the thickness of the fascia boards, details, and view from underneath.

It was clarified that any material removed from the building will be encapsulated within the attic, the eave structure, or under the roof. They are having difficulty dealing with the actual physical structure of the roof. He noted that some of the volume is revealed inside.

A question was raised with regard to what is being removed and what is historic and what is not. Ms. Tubbs' understanding was that the overall framing of the roof is starting to suffer. Without reinforcing or treating it, there could be concern about damage to the overall historic structure. If the roof framing materials are replaced, the overall pitch, form, and height of the historic roof would be required to remain as-is. A question was raised as to whether it will be clear what was replaced. It was suggested that measured drawings be used and a 3D scan. Mr. Safchik stated that they will document every dimension of the roof to ensure that it is replaced exactly as it is now.

It was mentioned that one of the engineers commented that the framing is undersized for the size of the roof. It was determined to be important to fix the structural components

and respect the visual aesthetic of the roof. Some of the details, however, will have to change in terms of the size of the beams.

It was mentioned that a condition of approval could be added that the roof pitch remains unchanged. Board Member Hutchings did not think anyone was concerned about the interior framing. The concern was that that material will not be historic and because the roof is not historic they can change it. If they include a condition of approval that allows for the upgrade to the framing, the condition is that the roof pitch won't change now or in the future.

Condition number 12 was referenced. Mr. Safchik stated that their only intention is to fix the structural issues and open up the drywall so that it is a vaulted ceiling. Ms. Tubbs stated that it is listed as a finding under material deconstruction. She suggested it be duplicated and listed as a condition of approval.

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

Board Member Hutchings expressed support subject to the added condition. Board Member Hodgkins agreed. He asked about the Landscaping Plan and stated that the addition goes in front of the building. As seen from the road it would be desirable to make sure that the historic building can be seen.

Mr. Safchik stated that they have not gotten into detail with regard to the landscaping. There are two large trees on the site. Both will remain in place. They plan to clean up the landscaping and will present the plan once there is some detail. He noted that they do not plan to block the view of the home.

MOTION: Board Member Hutchings moved to APPROVE the material deconstruction at 316 Woodside Avenue subject to the following:

Findings of Fact

1. The Site is located at 316 Woodside Avenue, also known as Lot A of the Thibault Plat Amendment.
2. 316 Woodside Avenue is a Significant Historic Structure on Park City's Historic Sites Inventory.
3. The home was originally constructed c. 1889 and is an L-cottage type house.
4. In 1984, 316 Woodside Avenue was listed on the National Register of Historic Places as part of the Park City Mining Boom Era Residences Thematic District.

5. On March 4, 2015, the Historic Preservation Board reviewed a Determination of Significance application (PL-14-02555) and found 316 Woodside Avenue complied with the requirements for a Significant Historic Site.
6. On September 14, 2021, a Historic District Design Review Pre-Application (PL-21-04992) was submitted regarding a proposed addition to the rear of the Historic Site.
7. On November 29, 2021, a Steep Slope Conditional Use Permit (SSCUP) application (PL-21-05086) and Historic District Design Review (HDDR) application (PL-21-05087) were submitted.
8. On May 4, 2022, the Historic Preservation Board determined the small “bump out” on the rear of the Structure was historically significant to the Site (PL-22-05238).
9. On December 16, 2022, a Conditional Use Permit application (PL-22-05483) was submitted to allow the encroachment of the proposed addition into the front setback along Woodside Avenue.
10. On March 8, 2023, the Planning Commission reviewed the SSCUP (PL-21-05086) and CUP (PL-22-05483), conducted a public hearing, and approved the Steep Slope Conditional Use Permit and Conditional Use Permit.

Material Deconstruction

11. The Applicant proposes the Material Deconstruction of approximately 64 square feet of the side and rear façade to facilitate the construction of an addition and attached garage.
12. The Applicant proposes Material Deconstruction of interior roof framing supporting approximately 600 square feet of roofing materials. The form, pitch, shape, and height of the roof will not be altered.
13. Additions to Historic Structures shall be considered only on non-character-defining facades, usually tertiary facades.
14. The construction of the proposed addition will not diminish the Historic Integrity of the Structure as defined in LMC §15-13-2(A) and as demonstrated in the analysis included in the July 5th Staff Report.

15. The Historic Preservation Board approved the Material Deconstruction to accommodate an addition and garage, accessed from the front of the property, subject to the Conditions of Approval below.
16. The Findings for "Complies" from the Analysis of Proposal sections of the Staff Report dated July 5, 2023, are incorporated herein by reference.

Conclusions of Law

1. The proposed addition is located on the secondary façade of the Historic Structure and adjacent to the Woodside Avenue public right-of-way. (LMC §15-13-2(B)(4)(a)(2)).
2. The proposal to construct an addition complies with the requirements set forth in the Historic Residential (HR-1) District (LMC Chapter 15-2.2).
3. The proposal to construct an addition complies with the Design Guidelines for Historic Residential Sites (LMC §15-13-2(B)(4)).

Conditions of Approval

4. The Applicant is responsible for notifying the Planning Department and Building Department prior to proposing any changes to this approval.
5. The Applicant shall submit in writing any changes, modifications, or deviations from the approved scope of work for Planning review and approval/denial in accordance with the applicable standards prior to construction.
6. The Applicant must obtain Historic District Design Review approval prior to the submittal of a building permit.
7. An encroachment or access agreement is required for work conducted five feet or less from a lot line or having the potential to encroach on another property.
8. A Soils Report completed by a geotechnical engineer as well as a temporary shoring plan, if applicable, will be required at the time of building permit application.
9. The Site shall be re-graded so that all water drains away from the Structure and does not enter the foundation.

10. The Applicant shall complete a Historic Preservation Plan, subject to approval by the Chief Building Official and the Planning Director, or their respective designee(s), prior to the submittal of a building permit.
11. The Applicant shall provide the City with a Financial Guarantee to ensure compliance with the conditions and terms of the Historic Preservation Plan and the relevant documents shall be recorded with Summit County prior to the submittal of a building permit.
12. The addition shall be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future the essential form and integrity of the Significant Historic Structure could be restored.
13. The Applicant shall abide by an approved Historic Preservation Plan ensuring all historic materials not approved for material Deconstruction are protected during all stages of construction. Additionally, the Applicant shall protect neighboring and adjacent Historic Structures during all stages of construction. Any damage or loss of historic materials outside the scope of this Material Deconstruction approval (on the subject property or neighboring historic structures) shall be reported to the Planning Department immediately.

The motion was seconded by Holmgren.

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

B. 317 Ontario Avenue – Material Deconstruction – Applicant Seeks Approval for Material Deconstruction of a Portion of the Rear Façade of a Significant Historic Structure to Facilitate the Construction of an Addition. PL-22-05451.

Ms. Tubbs presented the Staff Report and stated that the subject property is located at 317 Ontario Avenue and is listed as a significant historic structure on Park City's Historic Sites Inventory List. It is located in the HR-1 zoning district and sits above Marsac Avenue well below the street level of Ontario Avenue. The historic home is seated toward the bottom of the lot. Photos of the site were presented. It was noted that there was a significant alteration made to the historic roof form. There is a large dormer projection that currently serves as access to Ontario Avenue via the deck. The applicant is proposing to utilize the non-historic alteration as a transitional element to connect to a proposed addition. The applicant is looking to create an addition to provide additional living space and off-street parking for the homeowner. The transitional element connects directly to the non-historic projection and bridges the gap between the two masses of structure.

Elevations were presented. The overall slope of the site is fairly steep and the applicant has applied for a Steep Slope Conditional Use Permit, which is pending. From the western elevation, a portion of the historic structure is still obscured from view from the Marsac Avenue public right-of-way, however, the addition will sit above the home and will be visible. It will not block view of the historic structure.

The applicant is requesting material deconstruction of about 62 square feet of siding from the rear of the historic structure. The portion of the siding was shown outlined in red. The materials to be removed will facilitate the proposed connection. As part of the draft Final Action Letter, staff recommended a condition of approval that the salvageable siding be kept and utilized in the event there are other portions of siding on the property that need to be patched. Staff reviewed the impacts on historic integrity on the site and found that they are minimal and will be easily mitigated by reusing any salvageable siding materials. Staff recommended that the Board review the application, conduct a public hearing, and consider approving the material deconstruction request. The applicants were not present.

In response to a question raised, Ms. Tubbs stated that the connection will take place in the footprint of the dormer addition but extend to the full height of the home. It will go down to the first floor and extend up to the ridgeline modification. She explained that the proposed addition is greater than 50% of the historic home's square footage. If it is taller, the transitional element is required. If it is considered a large addition, some additional transitional element depth is required. To her knowledge, there is no prohibition on transitional element space.

A question was raised regarding the roof pitch on the transition. Ms. Tubbs stated that it is an artifact of the existing modification to the roof. The roof modification sits at the ridgeline of the historic roof. To allow for drainage, it was tipped slightly higher toward the back of the dormer. As a result, there is a very slight incline and it appears that the roof pitch is taller. That is, however, an artifact of the existing condition. As it sits, rain washes down the front of the building the way.

Board Member Hodgkins liked the renderings looking from a distance to the hillside. The renderings show the buildings being of a similar color. He thought it would be nice for the historic building to be a different color to appear unique and separated. Perhaps the addition could be another building behind it. He suggested that they read as different structures. He suggested a Condition of Approval be added to change the color. He would want the historic structure to look like it is its own small building independent of the one going in behind it. Ms. Tubbs' understanding was that the applicants have selected their materials but she was not sure if they have come to a conclusion on the overall color scheme of the structure. She offered to follow up on that.

Board Member Holmgren commented that they may be going too far by making color suggestions. Board Member Hodgkins stated that they do not need to make it seem like it is all one building if the intent is to add an addition. He thought it was within their right to have the historic structure stand out as its own building. That would not have to be

done with color and could be in building materials. There was some question as to whether that is in the Board's purview.

Board Member Hutchings recalled that when he built his home he was required to have different siding. Board Member Holmgren considered that to be outside the Board's purview and the job of the Design Review Board. Ms. Tubbs stated that the Historic Preservation Board will not review the request again as it will follow the same design review process through an Administrative Hearing with the Planning Director designee.

City Attorney, Mark Harrington stated that one option was to include a condition that states that during design review, the Planning Director shall give direct attention to universal guideline number 9. New construction should be differentiated from the historic structure while also maintaining compatibility. He agreed that it is the Planning Director's ultimate decision in terms of the design guideline review.

Chair Beatlebrox commented that the architect is Jonathan Degray, who has done many of these marvelous additions. He understands how important the view is. It was suggested that staff direction be given to the applicant rather than imposing a condition of approval.

The applicant, Mary Loudon participated remotely. She thanked the Board Members for their comments and consideration. She heard the comments regarding color, siding, and offsetting the historic structure. They are working with Mr. Degray to maintain the integrity of the historic home.

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

MOTION: Board Member Hodgkins moved to APPROVE the material deconstruction of 317 Ontario Avenue subject to the following:

Findings of Fact

1. 317 Ontario Avenue is a Significant Historic Structure on Park City's Historic Sites Inventory.
2. The home was originally constructed c. 1885 and is a 1.5-story Hall-Parlor style house.
3. In 1984, 317 Ontario Avenue was listed on the National Register of Historic Places as part of the Park City Mining Boom Era Residences Thematic District.
4. On November 11, 2022, the Applicant submitted a Historic District Design Review Pre-Application to discuss a potential addition to the Structure.

5. On March 29, 2023, the Applicant submitted a full Historic District Design Review application for a proposed addition.

Material Deconstruction

6. The Applicant proposes the Material Deconstruction of 62 square feet of the existing siding on the rear exterior walls to accommodate an addition to expand the living area of the home and provide an attached garage.
7. Additions to Historic Structures shall be considered only on non-character-defining facades, usually tertiary facades.
8. The Historic Preservation Board approved the Material Deconstruction to accommodate an addition and garage, accessed from the front of the property, subject to the Conditions of Approval below.
9. The Findings for "Complies" from the Analysis of Proposal sections of the Staff Report dated July 5, 2023, are incorporated herein by reference.

Conclusions of Law

1. The proposed addition is located on the tertiary façade of the Historic Structure and adjacent to the Ontario Avenue public right-of-way. (LMC §15-13-2(B)(4)(a)(2)).
2. The proposal to construct an addition complies with the requirements set forth in the Historic Residential (HR-1) District (LMC Chapter 15-2.2).
3. The proposal to construct an addition complies with the Design Guidelines for Historic Residential Sites (LMC §15-13-2(B)(4)).

Conditions of Approval

1. The Applicant is responsible for notifying the Planning Department and Building Department prior to proposing any changes to this approval.
2. The Applicant shall submit in writing any changes, modifications, or deviations from the approved scope of work for Planning review and approval/denial in accordance with the applicable standards prior to construction.
3. The Applicant must obtain Historic District Design Review and Steep Slope Conditional Use Permit approval prior to the issuance of a building permit.

4. An encroachment or access agreement is required for work conducted five feet or less from a lot line or having the potential to encroach on another property.
5. A Soils Report completed by a geotechnical engineer as well as a temporary shoring plan, if applicable, will be required at the time of building permit application.
6. The site shall be re-graded so that all water drains away from the Structure and does not enter the foundation.
7. The Applicant shall complete a Historic Preservation Plan, subject to approval by the Chief Building Official and the Planning Director prior to the issuance of a building permit.
8. The Applicant shall provide the City with a Financial Guarantee to ensure compliance with the conditions and terms of the Historic Preservation Plan prior to the issuance of a building permit.
9. The addition shall be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future the essential form and integrity of the Significant Historic Structure could be restored.
10. In-line additions shall be avoided.
11. The Applicant shall re-use any salvageable removed original siding material to replace areas of damaged siding on the remainder of the Historic Structure.
12. The Applicant shall reduce the eave overhangs in the side yards to comply with the requirements of LMC §15-2.2-3(J).
13. The height of the proposed addition shall be reduced to comply with the requirements of the Land Management Code prior to the approval of the HDDR.
14. A Steep Slope Conditional Use Permit ("SSCUP") shall be approved prior to the issuance of a Building Permit.

Board Member Holmgren seconded the motion.

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

7. **ADJOURN**

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

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

The Historic Preservation Board Meeting adjourned at 5:54 p.m.

Approved by _____
Randy Scott, Chair
Historic Preservation Board

Approved 09.06.2023