

PARK CITY MUNICIPAL CORPORATION
HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD
MINUTES OF JUNE 3, 2020

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

EX OFFICIO: Bruce Erickson, Hannah Tyler, Caitlyn Barhorst, Laura Kuhrmeyer, Mark Harrington

The Historic Preservation Board meeting was conducted virtually via Zoom. The public was able to submit eComments during the meeting.

ROLL CALL

Chair Pro Tem Randy Scott called the meeting to order at 5:00 p.m. and noted that all Board Members were present except Doug Stephens and Tana Toly, who were excused.

ADOPTION OF MINUTES

March 4, 2020

MOTION: Board Member Hodgkins moved to APPROVE the minutes of March 4, 2020 as written. Board Member Holmgren seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS

There were no comments.

STAFF/BOARD COMMUNICATIONS AND DISCLOSURES

Director Erickson reported that Planner Caitlyn Barhorst had arranged for one or two employees from other City Departments that were furloughed to help the Planning Department update the Historic Sites Inventory Mapping. Planner Barhorst has a new camera and she will train those employees on how to do the photography. The result will be a new set of current photographs.

Director Erickson stated that Planner Barhorst was working to continue the Historic District Grant Program. It is difficult with the current situation affecting City finances; however, the plan is to continue with the emergency grants and wait to move forward with the competitive grants in the future.

Planner Barhorst noted that the Board would probably see an update on the progress of the Grant Program at the next meeting in July. Applications are open during the month of June for the next fiscal year.

Director Erickson pointed out that the City recently gave \$30,000 to the Museum and the Friends of Ski Mountain Mining History.

CONTINUATIONS – (Conduct public hearing and continue to date certain.)

- 5.A. Land Management Code (LMC) Amendment – Proposal to amend the LMC to address inconsistencies and amend prohibited siding and roofing materials. The proposed LMC amendments would affect LMC 15-2.1, 15-2.2, 15-2.3, 15-2.4, 15-2.5, 15-2.6, 15-4, 15-5-5, and 15-15.

Planner Laura Kuhrmeyer stated that the Staff was making minor changes to the Amendments. In addition, approximately 2,000 addresses need to be noticed and they were not able to send out the notices in time for this meeting. For these reasons, the Staff was requesting a continuance to the July meeting.

Director Erickson noted that Planner Barhorst had produced a postcard noticing system, so they no longer need to send letters. The noticing can now be done with pre-paid postcards.

Planner Kuhrmeyer stated that the recommendation in the Staff report was incorrect. The Staff was actually recommending a continuance to the July 1st HPB meeting to forward a recommendation for the Planning Commission meeting on July 22nd and the City Council meeting on August 4th.

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

MOTION: Board Member Beatlebrox moved to CONTINUE the LMC Amendments to July 1, 2020. John Hutchings seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

REGULAR AGENDA

- 6.A. 1162 Woodside Avenue – Historic District Design Review
Historic Preservation Board Review for Material Deconstruction of
Landmark of Historic Site – The Applicant is proposing Material
Deconstruction for the Landmark Historic Site consisting of removal of the
Historic Foundation for the construction of a basement and removal of four
feet (4'-0") of the Historic rear wall to accommodate a New Addition.

Planner Barhorst reviewed the material deconstruction review for 1162 Woodside Avenue. She noted that this was the first project being reviewed

under the new material deconstruction code that was amended in February. As opposed to the long reports where they went through every door and window, the change allows for reviewing a portion of the historic wall that the applicant was proposing to remove permanently for the addition.

Planner Barhorst stated that the Staff would be approving removal of the non-historic shed roof at the back of the house, as well as window replacements, and other non-historic items. A report with the final action on those items will be available.

Planner Barhorst remarked that the HPB would be reviewing the removal of a portion of the historic rear wall to accommodate the new addition.

Board Member Hodgkins understood that this was a Landmark Historic Site. Planner Barhorst replied that he was correct. Mr. Hodgkins asked if it was in a location of current fenestration. Planner Barhorst stated that it is close to where there is a door currently. However, a shed addition on the back of the house will be removed and the original exterior wall will be exposed. The door opening will be slightly widened.

Mr. Hodgkins clarified that there is a non-historic structure connected to the back that will be removed to accommodate a new addition. He was unable to tell from the drawings whether the historic siding that remains will be exposed, or if it will be sandwiched into the addition on the back. Planner Barhorst replied that it would be an exterior wall again. The only portion of the addition that touches the historic house is 7' wide, and most of that exterior wall will be repaired or restored with the historic siding on the rear wall.

Director Erickson noted that the x's shown on the drawing were decks. It was not construction.

Mr. Hodgkins asked if the original siding was still there and remaining. Planner Barhorst assumed so. She noted that people live in the house and no interior demolition had been done. Since the addition was attached on the back, she thought it was most likely covered in drywall and that will come off. Planner Barhorst stated that if there is any historic siding beneath it, it will be reviewed by the Staff and they will make sure it is restored using as much of the historic material as possible, and the rest will be replaced with rest with the exact profile of the historic siding.

Mr. Hodgkins commented on the new proposed addition, and the portion with the window and the stairwell that will be visible from the street. He wanted to know how far back that portion will be from the street. Planner Barhorst stated that the front setback road to the house is approximately 11 feet. She estimated the addition would be 20 to 30 feet from Woodside. Mr. Hodgkins thought the new

LMC required the addition to be sympathetic to the historic style of the house. Planner Barhorst replied that they were still working through the design of the addition under the HDDR application. The addition was not part of the discussion this evening. Mr. Hodgkins understood; however, they were working with the new LMC and he was trying to understand the new requirements. Planner Barhorst replied that the requirement was the same. It needs to be compatible with historic elements. Mr. Hodgkins asked if there is a limit under the new Code for how much can touch the house. Planner Barhorst replied that only 6 actual feet touches the house. There is a limit under the Code, but she could not recall what it was. She thought it might be a third of the elevation.

Director Erickson stated that it was the transitional element required in the design guidelines and this proposal was far less than the transitional element. He recalled that the applicant would be allowed to come up to 3' on either side of the historic house. Director Erickson stated that this proposal as minimal compared to what the Code allows.

Board Member Hodgkins understood that the home would be materially deconstructed, a foundation will be poured, and the home will be reconstructed on the new foundation. Planner Barhorst noted that they were not proposing to change the elevation. It could change a few inches either way logistically, but that is allowed.

Board Member Holmgren did not think the Exhibit pages were clearly marked and asked if they would be redone in the future. They were not marked as to north, south, east or west, and she had a difficult getting her bearings for the addition. Ms. Holmgren asked if this was the design for the addition or whether the applicant was proposing something different. Planner Barhorst replied that they were still in the pre-application stage and the addition has not been approved.

Board Member Holmgren stated that she is very familiar with this house. In looking at the drawings, she thought the addition would overwhelm the look of the historic building.

Board Member Beatlebrox understood that they were not discussing the addition this evening, but she had the same impression. She thought it was very modern compared to the small pyramid house.

Board Member Hodgkins agreed. He did not think it met the intent of the new Code.

Chair Pro Tem Scott thought it was good guidance and he was glad the other Board members had mentioned it. He always thought the Board could only

comment on the historic part of the structure and not give personal comment to design. He agreed with the comments of the other Board members.

Chair Pro Tem Scott opened the public hearing.

There were no comments.

Chair Pro Tem Scott closed the public hearing.

Board Member Hutchings clarified that they were only talking about a 4-foot section. Board Member Hodgkins clarified that it is was a 4' demolition, 6' adherence. Planner Barhorst stated that it also included foundation since the house would be lifted to pour the foundation. Mr. Hodgkins was pleased that the foundation would be at the same elevation as the house currently. Board Member Holmgren concurred.

Board Member Beatlebrox liked the visual separation of the house from the new addition. She thought the transitional element was nice. Board Member Hutchings agreed.

Board Member Hodgkins thought the Code was working well, with the exception of the mass of the addition because it is not obscured behind the historic house, which he thought was part of the intent.

Chair Pro Tem Scott assumed this proposal would not jeopardize the Landmark site status because the home would be at the same elevation and the historic part of the home was not changing in dimensions. Planner Barhorst stated that since the material deconstruction code was changed, they were still working with the same exact rehabilitation/restoration plan. The plan is to restore all the original windows openings, as well as the front facade. The door will remain as is currently, but the windows will reflect something more historically accurate to the 1940s tax photo. Planner Barhorst emphasized that the plans have not been finalized and the Staff was working towards a more complete restoration approach on the historic house.

Board Member Hodgkins asked if the doors and windows were not presented because they are not historic. Planner Barhorst answered yes. She stated that there were several modifications and the location of the door changed sometime between 1940 and 1980. The applicant was not proposing to change the door back to the original location, but they were proposing to put the more historic original windows back on the front facade and the other facades. Mr. Hodgkins asked if it was the same with the roof. Planner Barhorst replied that a metal roof was added in 1997 under the grant program. Mr. Hodgkins asked if the metal roof was allowed because the structure originally had a metal roof. Planner

Barhorst replied that metal roof material is compatible; and the Historic Guidelines allow metal roofs on historic structures.

Chair Pro Tem outlined the three alternatives outlined in the Staff report. The HPB could approve the proposed material deconstruction, deny the material deconstruction, or request additional information and continue this item to a future meeting.

Board Member Beatlebrox had no issues with the proposal as presented. It was only four feet, and the addition would not be visible from the front of the house. Board Members Hutchings and Holmgren concurred.

Board Member Hodgkins thought it lets the volume of the historic house breathe. Board Member Beatlebrox asked if the Board had the ability to weigh in on any concerns they might have with the design elements of the addition. Board Member Hodgkins thought they could make it contingent on approval for removing 4-feet of wall.

City Attorney Harrington stated that the Board could propose a mitigation element that addresses the specific design guidelines under which this approval is being reviewed as a part of the design; and make it contingent on the site plan the applicant put forward. However, the Board could not add additional review to this approval.

Board Member Beatlebrox did not think the approval needed to be contingent because she recalled design guidelines that address the proportion of the addition to the original home. She asked how the HDDR process would address that issue.

Planner Barhorst replied that the review had not yet been finalized. She asked City Attorney Harrington if he would be appropriate to take their comments into consideration with respect to the HDDR design guidelines. Planner Barhorst noted that the public hearing for the HDDR process on the design of the addition would take place on June 18th. City Attorney Harrington stated that if the Board members had concerns about what they were seeing in the Staff report, those comments could be taken into consideration. He noted that due to changes to State law, the HPB is no longer the appeal authority. Therefore, individual Board member could attend the HDDR public hearing and make their comments as citizens, not as Board members.

Board Member Scott asked about the process for the public hearing. Planner Barhorst stated that it would be a Zoom meeting and the plans will be available for eComment by members of the public.

Board Member Beatlebrox asked who would be meeting on June 18th. Planner Barhorst replied that the applicant would be meeting with the Planning Department Staff. Board Member Beatlebrox remarked that the Planning Staff knows the Historic District Guidelines better than anyone, and there are guidelines regarding proportion, size, streetscape, etc. She thought streetscape was especially important because it is next to the Library and the old garage. It is a prominent corner and everyone who goes to the Library passes the historic house.

Board Member Hodgkins recalled that the Board extensively reviewed the proposed language to update the Land Management Code to avoid such situations. They looked at examples of nomenclature and various other elements and provided feedback on what they thought was or was not appropriate. He did not believe this fit that discussion, and since it was the first application coming through under the new Guidelines, he had concerns. Mr. Hodgkins asked if it was possible to revisit the Guidelines to see if there are loopholes that allow something like this to be proposed.

Chair Scott agreed. He recalled spending a lot of time on windows and he would like to know if this proposal actually matches the guidelines.

Board Member Beatlebrox pointed out that during that process the Board identified negative examples and positive examples. She thought it was important for this proposal to match those guideline discussions.

Board Member Holmgren was not comfortable having this type of project come into Old Town. She understood it was on the fringes of Old Town, but it goes to gentrification. The homes next door and in front are all small houses.

Planner Barhorst appreciated their comments and offered to take their comments into consideration for the HDDR review.

Planner Hannah Tyler stated that the Staff would be reviewing the design against specific Design Guidelines, and she thought this was a good exercise to take aim at their high-level concerns. As they move forward with the public hearing, they will also meet with the Design Review Team. Planner Tyler remarked that this was a good opportunity for Planner Barhorst to take their input and move it forward in the process. Planner Tyler emphasized that the design has not been approved. She understood that the process might seem backwards to the Board, but the architect needs to know how much of the house can be removed before designing the addition. Planner Tyler noted that the Staff was still moving through and trying to understand the new Code, and they will consider the Board's comments as they move through the process.

Director Erickson stated that the HPB could make a motion to approve the material deconstruction with recommendations to the Staff to review the size and volume of the addition during the HDDR and Design Review Process.

Board Member Hodgkins asked for the age of the addition that would be removed. Planner Barhorst replied that the rear addition was added prior to 1956. Board Member Hodgkins wanted to know why the addition could be removed without an approval if it is over 50 years old. Planner Barhorst replied that the addition was outside of the historic period.

Planner Tyler explained that the way the Historic Sites Inventory is structured, the period of historic significance is determined and when things are outside of that period those elements are deemed non-historic for that purpose. Board Member Hodgkins understood that they were considering the period of the original house. However, if the property was built in 1956, it would still be under this jurisdiction for demolition. Planner Barhorst stated that it would be a different period of significance at that point. The period of significance for this structure was identified as the Settlement and Mining Boom Era and Mature Mining.

MOTION: Board Member Holmgren moved to APPROVE the Material Deconstruction of the Landmark Historic Site at 1162 Woodside Avenue based on the Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Conditions of Approval found in the Staff report, and with a recommendation that the Staff consider height, volume, and size of the new addition, as well as the windows, during the HDDR and Design Review process. Board Member Hodgkins seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

Findings of Fact – 1162 Woodside Avenue

1. The property is located at 1162 Woodside Avenue.
2. The legal description of the property is all Lot 17 and North ½ Lot 18 of Block 5 of Snyder's Addition to Park City, SA-55.
3. The property is located in the Historic Residential (HR-1) Zoning District.
4. The property at 1162 Woodside Avenue is designated as Landmark on the Park City Historic Sites Inventory.
5. On May 8, 2020 the Planning Department received a complete Historic District Design Review application.
6. The applicant has submitted a Plat Amendment application (PL-20-04522) and a Conditional Use Permit application (PL-04523) that are currently under review.
7. The Historic Single-Family Dwelling was constructed circ. 1904.
8. Staff published notice on the City's website and the Utah Public Notice website and posted notice to the property on May 20, 2020. Staff mailed courtesy notice to property owners within 100 feet on May 20, 2020. The Park Record published notice on May 20, 2020.

9. The maximum Building Footprint for this Lot is 1,200 square feet, and the proposed Footprint is 1,106 square feet.
10. The applicant has submitted a Conditional Use Permit application per LMC 15-2.2-4 Existing Historic Structures. The request is to construct a basement addition beneath the existing historic structure's footprint that currently does not meet setbacks. This application has not been approved at the time of writing this report.
11. The proposed addition complies with the required Front and Rear Setbacks. The minimum Front and Rear Setbacks are ten feet (10') each; the Applicant is proposing a ten foot (10') Rear Setback for the addition.
12. The proposal complies with the Side Setbacks. The south Side Setback is three feet (3') and the north Setback along 12th Street is five feet (5').
13. The proposal complies with LMC 15-2.2-5, with a maximum height of twenty-seven feet (27') from Existing Grade. The maximum height of the proposed structure is 27 feet (27').
14. The proposal complies with LMC 15-2.2-5(A), maximum interior height is thirty-five feet (35') as the proposed interior height is twenty-eight feet (28').
15. The proposal complies with LMC 15-2.2-5(B), ten foot (10') minimum horizontal step in the downhill façade.
16. The proposal complies with LMC 15-2.2-5(C) in that the Contributing Roof Form of the existing Historic Structure is between 7:12 and 12:12.
17. The Applicant is proposing Material Deconstruction for the Landmark Historic Site consisting of removal of the Historic foundation for the construction of a basement and removal of four feet (4'-0") of the Historic rear wall to accommodate a new Addition.
18. Per LMC § 15-11-12.5(A)(2) Historic Preservation Board Review for Material Deconstruction. The Historic Preservation Board shall review the Removal of Historic Material to Accommodate New additions, New Construction, or Structural Upgrades. Prior to issuance of a Building Permit for any Material Deconstruction work, the Review Authority shall review the proposed plans for compliance with the Land Management Code 15-13 Design Guidelines For Historic Districts and Historic Sites.
19. The applicant is not proposing to alter the existing USGS floor elevation of 6922'-0" after lifting the house to construct the new basement foundation; the floor elevation will remain the same once construction of the new foundation is complete.
20. The applicant is proposing the removal of four feet (4'-0") the Historic rear wall to accommodate a new addition.
21. The proposed Material Deconstruction has been reviewed for compliance with LMC § 15-13-2 Design Guidelines for Historic Residential Sites based on the following applicable Design Guidelines:
 1. Historic foundation:
 - B: Specific Guidelines:
 2. Primary Structures

b. Foundation

(1) The historic placement, orientation, and grade of a historic building shall be retained, as shall the original grade of the property where feasible.

Complies, the building orientation will remain the same as the historic placement; original grade will be returned at the perimeter of the site.

(2) A new foundation shall not raise or lower a historic structure generally more than two (2) feet from its original floor elevation.

Complies, the floor elevation will remain the same upon completion of the new basement foundation.

(3) A historic site shall be returned to original grade following construction of a foundation. When the original grade cannot be achieved, generally no more than six inches (6") of the new foundation shall be visible above final grade on the primary and secondary Facades.

Complies, see Condition of Approval #13.

(4) Re-grade the site so that all water drains away from the structure and does not enter the foundation.

Complies, see Condition of Approval #13.

(5) 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.

Complies, see Condition of Approval #13.

(6) Any re-grading of the site shall blend with grade of adjacent sites and shall not create the need for incompatible retaining walls.

Complies, grade will be returned following construction. No incompatible retaining walls are proposed.

(7) The form, material, and detailing of a new foundation shall be similar to the historic foundation (when extant) or similar to foundations of nearby historic structures.

Complies, the new foundation will be made of board formed concrete.

2. Historic rear wall:

B. Specific Guidelines:

2. Primary Structures

a. Exterior Walls

(2) Preserve and maintain historic exterior materials including wood siding (drop siding, clapboard, board and batten), frieze boards, cornices, moldings, shingles, etc., as well as stone and masonry. Repair deteriorated or damaged historic exterior materials using recognized preservation methods appropriate to the specific material.

Complies, the applicant is proposing to restore the exterior wall once the shed addition is removed. See Condition of Approval #4.

4. Additions to Primary Structures

a. Protection for Historic Structures and Sites

- (1) Additions to historic buildings should be considered only when it is demonstrated that the new use of the building cannot be accommodated by solely altering interior spaces.

Complies, the applicant desires to construct an addition to achieve additional square footage. The proposed rear wall removal is minor and located on a tertiary façade. The applicant has provided the City with several design concepts and the proposal before the Historic Preservation Board has been reviewed by the Design Review Team. For compliance with the Design Guidelines for Historic Districts and Historic Sites – all other alternatives to an addition were considered.

- (2) Additions to historic structures shall be considered with caution and shall be considered only on non-character defining facades, usually tertiary and occasionally secondary facades. Additions shall not compromise the architectural character of historic structures. Additions to the primary façades of historic structures are inappropriate.

Complies, the addition is proposed on the tertiary façade.

- (3) Additions should be visually subordinate to historic buildings when viewed from the primary public right-of-way.

The Administrative Review of the Historic District Design Review will confirm compliance with this Design Guideline.

- (4) Additions to historic structures shall not be placed so as to obscure, detract from or modify historic roof forms.

Complies, the proposed addition does not obscure, detract from, or modify the historic roof form.

- (5) Additions to historic structures shall not contribute significantly to the removal or loss of historic material.

Complies, the applicant is proposing to remove only four feet (4') of the Historic rear wall.

- (6) Where the new addition abuts the historic building, a clear transitional element between the old and the new should be designed and constructed. Minor additions, such as bay windows or dormers do not require a transitional element.

Complies, the four feet (4') proposed to be removed is for the construction of the transitional element.

- (7) Maintain and preserve additions to structures that are significant to the era/period of restoration.

Complies, there are no Historic additions on this Structure.

- (8) In-line additions shall be avoided.

Complies, the proposed addition is not in line with the Historic Structure.

2) The Design Review Committee, Development Review Committee, and Planning and Legal Departments reviewed this application.

3) Staff did not receive any public input at the time this report was published.

Conclusions of Law – 1162 Woodside

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

Conditions of Approval – 1162 Woodside

1. Final building plans and construction details shall reflect substantial compliance with the attached plans approved June 3, 2020 for the Material Deconstruction of the 4' of the rear wall and removal of the foundation for the construction of the basement. Any changes, modifications, or deviations from the approved design that have not been approved in advance by the Planning and Building Departments may result in a stop work order.
2. The applicant is responsible for notifying the Building Department prior to making any changes to the approved plans.
3. Any changes, modifications, or deviations from the approved scope of work shall be submitted in writing for review and approval/denial in accordance with the applicable standards by the Planning Director or his/her designee prior to construction.
4. Where the Historic exterior materials cannot be repaired, they shall be replaced with materials that match the original in all respects: scale, dimension, texture, profile, material and finish. Prior to removing and replacing Historic materials, the applicant shall demonstrate to the Planning Director and Historic Preservation Planner that the materials are no longer safe and/or serviceable and cannot be repaired to a safe and/or serviceable condition. No Historic materials may be disposed of prior to advance approval by the Planning Director and Historic Preservation Planner.
5. The applicant shall submit a cribbing and excavation stabilization shoring plan reviewed and stamped by a State of Utah licensed and registered structural engineer prior to issuance of a building permit. Cribbing or shoring must be of engineer specified materials. Screw-type jacks for raising and lowering the building are not allowed as primary supports once the building is lifted.
6. An encroachment agreement may be required prior to issuance of a building permit for projects utilizing soils nails that encroach onto neighboring properties.
7. 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.
8. Within five (5) days of installation of the cribbing and shoring, the structural engineer will inspect and approve the cribbing and shoring as constructed.
9. Historic Structures which are lifted off the foundation must be returned to the completed foundation within 45 days of the date the building permit was issued.

10. The Planning Director may make a written determination to extend this period up to 30 additional days if, after consultation with the Historic Preservation Planner, Chief Building Official, and City Engineer, he determines that it is necessary. This would be based upon the need to immediately stabilize an existing Historic property, or specific site conditions such as access, or lack thereof, exist, or in an effort to reduce impacts on adjacent properties. The applicant is responsible for notifying the Building Department if changes are made. If the cribbing and/or shoring plan(s) are to be altered at any time during the construction of the foundation by the contractor, the structural engineer shall submit a new cribbing and/or shoring plan for review. The structural engineer shall be required to re-inspect and approve the cribbing and/or shoring alterations within five (5) days of any relocation or alteration to the cribbing and/or shoring.

11. The applicant shall also request an inspection through the Building Department following the modification to the cribbing and/or shoring. Failure to request the inspection will be a violation of the Preservation Plan and enforcement action through the Historic Preservation Financial Guarantee or ACE could take place.

12. Prior to removal of any Historic material which is required to be reused, the applicant shall document their location and condition.

13. The historic site shall be returned to original grade following construction of a foundation. When the original grade cannot be achieved, generally no more than six inches (6") of the new foundation shall be visible above final grade on the primary and secondary facades. The site shall be re-graded so that all water drains away from the structure and does not enter the foundation. A plinth, or trim board at the base of the historic structure, shall be added to visually anchor the historic structure to the new foundation.

The Historic Preservation Board Meeting adjourned at 5:50 p.m.

Approved by _____
Douglas Stephens, Chair
Historic Preservation Board