



**PARK CITY MUNICIPAL CORPORATION
HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD
MINUTES OF MAY 5, 2021**

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

EX OFFICIO MEMBERS: Gretchen Milliken, Planning Director; Rebecca Ward, Planner; Brendan Conboy, Planner; Aiden Lillie, Planner; Mark Harrington, City Attorney; Jessica Nelson, Planning Analyst

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

Determination of the Health and Safety Risk under the OPMA

Chair Randy Scott read the Determination of Health and Safety Risk under OPMA. Notice of electronic meeting and how to comment virtually.

The meeting will be an electronic meeting without an anchor location as permitted by Utah Code Open and Public Meetings Act Section 52-4-207(4) as amended June 18, 2020, and Park City Resolution 18-2020 adopted March 19, 2020. The written determination of a substantial health and safety risk, required by Utah Code section 52-4-207(4), is attached as Exhibit A.

The Historic Preservation Board Members will connect electronically. Public comments will be accepted virtually as described. To comment virtually, raise your hand on Zoom. Written comments submitted before or during the meeting will be entered into the public record but not read aloud. For more information on participating virtually and to listen live, please go to www.parkcity.org/public-meetings

Exhibit A, Determination of Substantial Health and Safety Risk.

The Board Chair has determined that conducting a meeting with an anchor location presents a substantial risk to the health and safety of those who may be present at the anchor location. Utah Code Section 52-4-207(4) requires this determination and the facts upon which it is based, which include:

- Statewide COVID cases and hospitalizations remain high;
- Based on metrics established by the statewide COVID-19 Transmission Index, Summit County moved to the High-Risk designation on October 22, 2020; and

- Park City is a resort community continually hosting visitors from areas which may be experiencing rapid COVID-19 spread.

This determination is valid for 30 days and is set to expire on May 7, 2021.

Dated April 7, 2021.

1. ROLL CALL

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

2. MINUTES APPROVAL

A. Consideration to Approve the Historic Preservation Board Meeting Minutes from April 7, 2021.

MOTION: Board Member Holmgren moved to APPROVE the Minutes of April 7, 2021, as written. Board Member Beatlebrox seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

3. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS

No e-comments were submitted and no hands were raised on Zoom.

4. STAFF/BOARD COMMUNICATIONS AND DISCLOSURES

There were no staff communications or disclosures.

WORK SESSION

The Board addressed the meeting format going forward. The discussion was facilitated by Planning Director, Gretchen Milliken and City Attorney, Mark Harrington. Ms. Milliken reported that the City Council met recently to discuss the issue. Efforts were being made to hold work meetings with the various boards and commissions to gather input to be shared with the City Council.

Updates were presented regarding the public meeting format. It was reported that changes made to the Open and Public Meetings Act go into effect on May 5, 2021, and the Council extended the authority to meet electronically. The Council also requested ordinance changes that allow flexibility for electronic meetings and recommend consistency among all public bodies for the sake of simplicity. The City Council wants members of the public to have the option of participating remotely going forward. There was discussion about whether the Historic Preservation Board would like to preserve the flexibility of an online meeting format in terms of the Board itself as well as public

participation in those meetings. The Board Members were invited to provide feedback to the City Council.

Chair Scott reported that prior to COVID-19, there were times when he was unable to attend meetings. If he had had the opportunity to attend remotely, he would have done so most of the time. Ultimately, he believed the Board can provide a better product when they are able to be flexible and have more Board Members participate. In terms of public participation, he believed they get a better result when the public does not have to attend meetings in person.

Board Member Stephens commented that they approached the matter a few years ago and recalled that there was an issue of being able to conduct meetings in person but have a Board Member participate electronically. Mr. Harrington indicated that that could still be done. The Council was considering whether to allow each Board discretion in terms of whether to always conduct meetings from an anchor location with a majority and have one or two members and the public participate electronically. There could also be the flexibility to continue to hold meetings fully electronically. He suggested that it be one or the other.

Board Member Stephens agreed that it is beneficial to have consistency and allow members to participate electronically when needed. He felt that it helps with consistency and understanding what is taking place.

Planning Analyst, Jessica Nelson, reported that a recording system was placed in the middle of the room that had to be moved around during meetings. It was used to facilitate hybrid meetings and would pan left to right and pick up when someone was speaking. Since then, the IT Department has replaced the camera system so that there are cameras that are front and back facing to pick up the dais and the rest of the Council Chambers. They also upgraded the audio system. With the new system, she was confident that they can accommodate any type of meeting that is desired by the Board.

Board Member Beatlebrox indicated that the Rotary Club she serves on conducts hybrid meetings as well. One of the concerns is how those participating via Zoom are seen by the Board and the public who are in the room. Most display Zoom on a screen throughout the meeting. She wanted to ensure that they have the technology needed to capture not only those who are in the room but those who are participating via Zoom. Ms. Nelson described how the meetings will be set up and what will be captured. Board Member Beatlebrox expressed her support.

Board Member Holmgren considered what was proposed to be very positive.

Chair Scott stated that ideally meetings will be conducted from an anchor location with the option for flexibility. Ms. Milliken believed that will be the Council's recommendation. They want to hear from the various boards and commissions to ensure that there is a

clear understanding. Ms. Nelson explained that going forward it will not be necessary to read the declaration at the beginning of meetings as long as it has been discussed and confirmed that meetings have been publicly noticed indicating how the public can participate.

5. REGULAR AGENDA

A. 755 Rossie Hill Drive – Materials Deconstruction – The Applicant Proposes Disassembly and the Removal of Historic Materials to Accommodate New Additions and Structure Upgrades to a Landmark Historic Structure. (A) Public Hearing; (B) Historic Preservation Board Approval.

It was noted that the Board visited the site prior to the meeting. City Planner, Aiden Lillie, presented the staff report and stated that the current structure was constructed in 1895 and is a one-story cottage with a gable roof. 755 Rossie Hill Drive was formerly known as 622 Rossie Hill Drive and was listed on the National Register of Historic Places on July 12, 1984, as part of the Park City mining boom era residences in that district. The site is designated as a Landmark Historic Site on Park City's Historic Sites Inventory. A tax photograph of the structure was displayed from around the year 1940. In recent years the property has been vacant and fallen into poor condition. The overall form and materiality of the building remains intact and the building holds its historic value. The physical evidence from the period that defines it as a typical Park City mining era house includes simple methods of construction, use of wood siding, a simple roof form, informal landscaping, restrained ornamentation, and a plain finish. The elements of the property's historic character convey a sense of life in a western mining town in the late 19th and early 20th centuries. Photos of the building over the years were displayed.

Planner Lillie reported that the applicant has proposed the material deconstruction of a portion of the rear façade to accommodate an addition as well as panelization of the historic structure. Staff reviewed the proposal for compliance with the Design Guidelines for historic residential sites and found that the proposal is in compliance. Staff recommended that the Board approve the material deconstruction of a portion of a rear façade to accommodate an addition. Architectural drawings were presented. The Engineer's Report concluded that the floor joists are rotted and require replacement. Additionally, the exterior and interior walls have no capacity for wind, seismic, or gravity loads, and most of the 1' x 12' plank walls are rotted. The Landmark Historic Structure stands on sandstone and wood piles, 90% of which are rotted, and requires a foundation. It was noted that the structure has settled six inches due to age and rotted condition.

Approval of the Material Deconstruction will allow the property owner to rehabilitate the structure with the addition of living space and a garage, which will be accessed from the rear of the property. Additional photographs were presented. Currently, 755 Rossie Hill

is undergoing Historic District Design Review (“HDDR”) and will be required to comply with Land Management Code (“LMC”) Chapter 15-13 and 15-11-9 before the City issues a Building Permit. Approval was recommended subject to the conditions set forth in the staff report. Staff also recommended that the Board approve panelization. Additional elevation drawings were provided by the Architect depicting what portions of the structure will be panelized.

Planner Lillie reported that on April 25, 2021, the Chief Building Official, Planning Director, and staff visited the site and determined that based on the criteria noted in the International Building Code, that structures that involve illegal or improper occupancy or inadequate maintenance shall be deemed to be in an unsafe condition and taken down and removed and made safe. If the Board determines that panelization is necessary as outlined, LMC 15.13.4B requires the standards be met as set forth in the draft Action Letter. Planner Lillie indicated that to date staff has received no public comment.

Chair Scott clarified that two decisions need to be made. The first involves the proposed material deconstruction of a portion of a rear façade with an addition. Various photos of the site were reviewed and discussed. In response to a question raised, the applicant described the portion to be removed and the portion that will be restored.

In response to a question raised by Board Member Stephens, it was estimated that the current owners have owned the property for six months. The owner’s representative, Keith Leonard, reported that his partner built the homes next door. An agreement with the owners allowed them to work with the City. They closed on the option in November 2020 but have been working on the project for the last 3 ½ years.

Board Member Beatlebrox appreciated the opportunity to visit the site, which made the request very clear.

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

The Board Members had no concerns with the proposal.

MOTION: Board Member Holmgren moved to APPROVE the proposed Material Deconstruction of a portion of the rear façade to accommodate an addition subject to the following:

Findings of Fact

Background

1. 755 Rossie Hill Drive (formerly 622 Rossie Hill Drive) is a one-story cross-wing cottage with a gable roof built circa 1895 during the Mature Mining Era (1894- 1930).

2. In 1984, 755 Rossie Hill Drive was listed on the National Register of Historic Places as part of the Park City Mining Boom Era Residences Thematic District.
3. 755 Rossie Hill Drive is a Landmark Historic Structure on the Park City Historic Sites Inventory.
4. On February 16, 2017, the City Council adopted Ordinance No. 2017-05 to rezone the Residential – Medium Property to Historic Residential Low – Density to decrease Density in the area from 24 to eight units to protect the three Rossie Hill Drive Landmark Historic Structures.
5. On January 9, 2020, the City Council adopted Ordinance No. 2020-02, approving the Lilac Hill East Subdivision. 755 Rossie Hill Drive is Lot 3 of the Subdivision. 62This plat amendment assigned new addresses to the Rossie Hill Drive Landmark Historic Structures. The Applicant has not yet recorded the plat with Summit County.
6. On February 25, 2021, the City Council adopted Ordinance No. 2021-09, extending the Lilac Hill East Subdivision approval for one year.
7. On February 17, 2021, the Applicant submitted a Historic District Design Review (HDDR) Application.

Material Deconstruction

1. The Applicant proposes the Material Deconstruction of a portion of the rear façade to accommodate an addition to the rear of the Landmark Historic Structure to expand the living area and to add a garage that will be accessed from the rear of the property.
2. Additions to Historic Structures shall be considered only on non-character defining facades, usually tertiary facades.
3. The Historic Preservation Board approved the Material Deconstruction to accommodate an addition and garage, accessed from the rear of the property, subject to the Conditions of Approval below.

Panelization

1. On January 25, 2021, Shen Engineers, Inc. investigated 755 Rossie Hill Drive and completed a Physical Conditions Report.
2. The report determined the following:

- a) The existing roof joists need to be upgraded or replaced with code-compliant roof joists and the roof ridge and valley beams need to be reframed.
 - b) The existing roof deck is deficient and has no capacity of shear diaphragm value.
 - c) The main and crawl space floor joints are rotted and must be replaced.
 - d) Headers must be upgraded.
 - e) The existing walls are in poor condition and have no capacity for wind, seismic, or gravity loads.
 - f) The building has no foundation, but rather sits on sandstone and wood piles. 90% of the footings are rotted out. It is suggested to tear off existing foundation walls and add new concrete footing and foundation walls.
 - g) Due to the age, rotted condition of the building, and a differential settlement of 6 inches, the building cannot be moved intact.
 - h) It is suggested that the existing building should be panelized and re-built.
3. On April 5, 2021, the Chief Building Official, Planning Director, and Building and Planning staff visited 755 Rossie Hill Drive.
 4. The Chief Building Official and Planning Director determined that due to the considerably poor condition of the buildings along with the substantial differential settlements, moving the structures and straightening them would cause them to fail and collapse and the Landmark Historic Structure should be panelized and rebuilt to be preserved and made safe for occupancy.

Conclusions of Law

1. The proposal complies with Land Management Code § 15-11-12.5, Historic Preservation Board Review For Material Deconstruction; § 15-11-9, Preservation Policy; § 15-13-2, Design Guidelines For Historic Residential Sites; and § 15-11-14, Disassembly And Reassembly Of A Historic Building Or Historic Structure.

Conditions of Approval

1. The applicant is responsible for notifying the Building Department prior to proposing any changes to this approval.
2. The Applicant shall submit in writing any changes, modifications, or deviations from the approved scope of work for Planning Director review and approval/denial in accordance with the applicable standards prior to construction.
3. Where the Historic exterior materials cannot be repaired, they shall be replaced with materials that match the original in all respects: scale, dimension, texture, profile, material, and finish. Prior to removing and replacing Historic materials, the applicant shall demonstrate to the Planning Director and Historic Preservation Planner that the materials are no longer safe and/or serviceable and cannot be repaired to a safe and/or serviceable condition. No Historic materials may be disposed of prior to advance approval by the Planning Director and Historic Preservation Planner.
4. An encroachment agreement may be required prior to issuance of a building permit for projects utilizing soil nails that encroach onto neighboring properties.
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 Historic Structure shall be returned to its 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.
7. The Applicant shall complete a Historic Preservation Plan, subject to Chief Building Official and Planning Director approval prior to issuance of a building permit.
8. The Applicant shall provide the City with a financial Guarantee to ensure compliance with the conditions and terms of the Historic Preservation Plan prior to issuance of a building permit.

9. The addition shall be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future the essential form and integrity of the Landmark Historic Structure could be restored.
10. The addition shall be visually subordinate to Historic Structures when viewed from the Right-of-Way.
11. The Applicant shall complete Historic District Design Review and approval prior to issuance of a building permit.
12. Where the addition abuts the Historic Structure, a clear transitional element between the old and new should be designed and constructed.
13. In-line additions shall be avoided.
14. Panelization shall be done using recognized preservation methods.
15. The Applicant shall complete measured drawings of the structure or element to be disassembled/reassembled.
16. The Applicant shall submit a thorough photographic survey of the interior and exterior elevations as well as architectural details of the structure, including site and location views from all compass points, exterior elevations, and interior elevations of each room.
17. Written plans detailing the disassembly and reassembly steps and procedures shall be completed and approved by the Planning and Building Departments.
18. Structures shall be disassembled in the largest workable pieces possible.
19. To ensure accurate reassembly, all parts of the Building, Structure, or element shall be marked as they are systematically separated from the Structure. Contrasting colors of paint or carpenter wax crayons shall be used to establish a marking code for each component. The markings shall be removable and shall be made on surfaces that will be hidden from view when the Structure is reassembled.
20. Important architectural features of a Historic Building or Structure shall be removed, marked, and stored before the Structure or element of the Structure is disassembled.
21. The process of disassembly of a Historic Structure shall be recorded through photographic, still, or video.

22. Wall panels and roof surfaces shall be protected with rigid materials, such as sheets of plywood when there is a risk of damage during the disassembly/storage/reassembly process.
23. Disassembled components—trim, windows, doors, wall panels, roof elements, etc.— shall be securely stored on-site in a storage trailer or off-site in a garage/warehouse/trailer until needed for reassembly.
24. The original orientation and siting shall be replicated as closely as possible.
25. New foundations and additions shall follow the Design Guidelines.
26. The Landmark Historic Structure must be reassembled in the original form, location, placement, and orientation.

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

Board Member Beatlebrox asked if there will be a storage area on the site during construction. The applicant reported that Lots 4 and 5 will be vacant for some time. He assumed that materials will be stored there. As in the past, equipment will be stood up, braced, and covered with plastic.

Board Member Stephens commented that there seemed to be two different approaches and that the entire project was being treated with the same level of scrutiny. In the past, he recalled that they were able to successfully deal with the original structure of the home differently than the additions. He asked if it was possible to break it up with the additions to the sheds being panelized and maintain the integrity of the structure in one piece. His experience was that panelization should be the last resort rather than the first. The applicant described what was done with nearby projects. He explained that the system that will hold the home together in a lift scenario is in very questionable condition and it was not believed that the house would sustain a lift. For that reason, they were proposing to panelize it. Possible options were discussed.

The comment was made that perhaps the applicant was pursuing panelization where historically, as a Board, panelization was the last resort. The applicant stated that it was unknown to what extent the house would have to be rebuilt and made structurally sound in order to lift it when they could just as easily remove the panels, build a new house, and put the panels up. To go to the work of stabilizing the interior structurally so that it would sustain a lift seemed like a waste of time and money to achieve the same outcome. The point was made that the nature of mining homes in town were never structurally sound but for the last several decades they have made it work. There was concern that they are directly pursuing panelization although the additions are clearly

problematic. It was noted that in terms of the panelization, the Chief Building Official and the Planning Director evaluated the situation and supported panelization.

Chair Scott commented that when the Board has had panelization options come before them in the past, it has been all or nothing. He looked at the house as a whole and was distracted most by the sheds. The floor and kitchen were of concern as well. When considering panelization, he recalled a request on Norfolk Avenue that came before the Board on three occasions. The Board determined that there were other options. Ultimately, the owners found a way to raise the home. Three landmark structures on Deer Valley Drive were also referenced that are set back from the road. There was some question as to whether a landmark structure can be panelized and remain a landmark structure.

Board Member Beatlebrox remarked that the two buildings have essentially been outdoors for years and are disintegrating. Because they have been neglected for a long time, it seemed to her that the panelization process would do a better job of preserving the structures. For that reason, she wanted to ensure that there is good coverage.

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

Board Member Holmgren commented that they should be showcase homes. She wanted to do what is safest and preserve the structures in the best way possible. She commented that the front of the home is attractive but the back side is in very poor condition.

Ms. Nelson displayed the criteria for removal and the landmark site criteria. It was noted that in order for a Landmark Historic Site on the Park City Historic Sites Inventory any building, accessory building, or structure may be designed as a Landmark Site if the City Council, with a recommendation from the Historic Preservation Board, considers all of the following criteria:

- It is at least 50 years old or the site is of exceptional importance to the community;
- It retains its historic integrity in terms of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association as defined by the National Park Service or the National Registrar of Historic Places;
- Is significant in local, regional, and national history, architecture, engineering, or culture associated with at least one of the following:
 - An era that has made a significant contribution to the broad patterns in our history; or
 - The lives of persons significant in history of the community, state, region, or nation; or
 - It is a distinctive character of type, period, or method of construction or the work of a notable architect or master craftsman.

Ms. Nelson explained that after panelization the home must be placed back in its original location and setting.

Mr. Leonard reported that there was a historic cabin on Rossie Hill Drive that was originally proposed to be panelized but it ultimately was not possible. It was deconstructed and reconstructed and has maintained its historical status. The finished product was beautiful. They would aim for something similar in this case. It was clarified that there are four structures on the street currently and one was a historic cabin that was reconstructed.

Chair Scott recognized what the applicants were trying to accomplish. He did not disagree that the home should be panelized. He wanted both homes to be reviewed individually. Specific problematic areas of the home were identified. Board Member Stephens was interested in knowing about the ownership of the home and stated that if it had had the same owner for the last several years, he would have considered it to be demolition by neglect. He, however, wanted to consider all available options.

Board Member Holmgren expressed support for panelization. Board Member Stephens was concerned about how the panels will be preserved when they are removed. He would want assurance that the panels are protected and preserved. Board Member Beatlebrox asked if they could somehow be covered by a roof or temporary structure to protect it from the elements. She was sensitive to this due to a recent storage problem. Board Member Stephens referred to bullet point number four that specifies that the panels shall be securely stored on-site, in a storage trailer, or off-site in a garage, warehouse, or trailer unit until needed for reassembly. The applicant stated that on this particular lot they have storage areas on the undeveloped lots.

MOTION: Board Member Beatlebrox moved to APPROVE the Panelization of the Landmark Historic Structure at 755 Rossie Hill Drive subject to the following:

Findings of Fact

Background

1. 755 Rossie Hill Drive (formerly 622 Rossie Hill Drive) is a one-story cross-wing cottage with a gable roof built circa 1895 during the Mature Mining Era (1894-1930).
2. In 1984, 755 Rossie Hill Drive was listed on the National Register of Historic Places as part of the Park City Mining Boom Era Residences Thematic District.
3. 755 Rossie Hill Drive is a Landmark Historic Structure on the Park City Historic Sites Inventory.

4. On February 16, 2017, the City Council adopted Ordinance No. 2017-05 to rezone the Residential – Medium Property to Historic Residential Low – Density to decrease Density in the area from 24 to eight units to protect the three Rossie Hill Drive Landmark Historic Structures.
5. On January 9, 2020, the City Council adopted Ordinance No. 2020-02, approving the Lilac Hill East Subdivision. 755 Rossie Hill Drive is Lot 3 of the Subdivision. This plat amendment assigned new addresses to the Rossie Hill Drive Landmark Historic Structures. The Applicant has not yet recorded the plat with Summit County.
6. On February 25, 2021, the City Council adopted Ordinance No. 2021-09, extending the Lilac Hill East Subdivision approval for one year.
7. On February 17, 2021, the Applicant submitted a Historic District Design Review (HDDR) Application.

Material Deconstruction

1. The Applicant proposes the Material Deconstruction of a portion of the rear façade to accommodate an addition to the rear of the Landmark Historic Structure to expand the living area and to add a garage that will be accessed from the rear of the property.
2. Additions to Historic Structures shall be considered only on non-character defining facades, usually tertiary facades.
3. The Historic Preservation Board approved the Material Deconstruction to accommodate an addition and garage, accessed from the rear of the property, subject to the Conditions of Approval below.

Panelization

1. On January 25, 2021, Shen Engineers, Inc. investigated 755 Rossie Hill Drive and completed a Physical Conditions Report.
2. The report determined the following:
 - a) The existing roof joists need to be upgraded or replaced with code-compliant roof joists and the roof ridge and valley beams need to be reframed.
 - b) The existing roof deck is deficient and has no capacity of shear diaphragm value.

- c) The main and crawl space floor joints are rotted and must be replaced.
 - d) Headers must be upgraded.
 - e) The existing walls are in poor condition and have no capacity for wind, seismic, or gravity loads.
 - f) The building has no foundation, but rather sits on sandstone and wood piles. 90% of the footings are rotted out. It is suggested to tear off existing foundation walls and add new concrete footing and foundation walls.
 - g) Due to the age, rotted condition of the building, and a differential settlement of 6 inches, the building cannot be moved intact.
 - h) It is suggested that the existing building should be panelized and re-built.
- 3. On April 5, 2021, the Chief Building Official, Planning Director, and Building and Planning staff visited 755 Rossie Hill Drive.
 - 4. The Chief Building Official and Planning Director determined that due to the considerably poor condition of the buildings along with the substantial differential settlements, moving the structures and straightening them would cause them to fail and collapse and the Landmark Historic Structure should be panelized and rebuilt to be preserved and made safe for occupancy.

Conclusions of Law

- 1. The proposal complies with Land Management Code §15-11-12.5, Historic Preservation Board Review For Material Deconstruction; §15-11-9, Preservation Policy; § 15-13-2, Design Guidelines For Historic Residential Sites; and § 15-11-14, Disassembly And Reassembly Of A Historic Building Or Historic Structure.

Conditions of Approval

- 1. The applicant is responsible for notifying the Building Department prior to proposing any changes to this approval.
- 2. The Applicant shall submit in writing any changes, modifications, or deviations from the approved scope of work for Planning Director review

and approval/denial in accordance with the applicable standards prior to construction.

3. Where the Historic exterior materials cannot be repaired, they shall be replaced with materials that match the original in all respects: scale, dimension, texture, profile, material, and finish. Prior to removing and replacing Historic materials, the applicant shall demonstrate to the Planning Director and Historic Preservation Planner that the materials are no longer safe and/or serviceable and cannot be repaired to a safe and/or serviceable condition. No Historic materials may be disposed of prior to advance approval by the Planning Director and Historic Preservation Planner.
4. An encroachment agreement may be required prior to issuance of a building permit for projects utilizing soil nails that encroach onto neighboring properties.
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 Historic Structure shall be returned to its 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.
7. The Applicant shall complete a Historic Preservation Plan, subject to Chief Building Official and Planning Director approval prior to issuance of a building permit.
8. The Applicant shall provide the City with a financial Guarantee to ensure compliance with the conditions and terms of the Historic Preservation Plan prior to issuance of a building permit.
9. The addition shall be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future the essential form and integrity of the Landmark Historic Structure could be restored.
10. The addition shall be visually subordinate to Historic Structures when viewed from the Right-of-Way.

11. The Applicant shall complete Historic District Design Review and approval prior to issuance of a building permit.
12. Where the addition abuts the Historic Structure, a clear transitional element between the old and new should be designed and constructed.
13. In-line additions shall be avoided.
14. Panelization shall be done using recognized preservation methods.
15. The Applicant shall complete measured drawings of the structure or element to be disassembled/reassembled.
16. The Applicant shall submit a thorough photographic survey of the interior and exterior elevations as well as architectural details of the structure, including site and location views from all compass points, exterior elevations, and interior elevations of each room.
17. Written plans detailing the disassembly and reassembly steps and procedures shall be completed and approved by the Planning and Building Departments.
18. Structures shall be disassembled in the largest workable pieces possible.
19. To ensure accurate reassembly, all parts of the Building, Structure, or element shall be marked as they are systematically separated from the Structure. Contrasting colors of paint or carpenter wax crayons shall be used to establish a marking code for each component. The markings shall be removable and shall be made on surfaces that will be hidden from view when the Structure is reassembled.
20. Important architectural features of a Historic Building or Structure shall be removed, marked, and stored before the Structure or element of the Structure is disassembled.
21. The process of disassembly of a Historic Structure shall be recorded through photographic, still, or video.
22. Wall panels and roof surfaces shall be protected with rigid materials, such as sheets of plywood when there is a risk of damage during the disassembly/storage/reassembly process.
23. Disassembled components—trim, windows, doors, wall panels, roof elements, etc.— shall be securely stored on-site in a storage trailer or off-

site in a garage/warehouse/trailer until needed for reassembly. The storage method shall be approved by staff.

24. The original orientation and siting shall be replicated as closely as possible.
25. New foundations and additions shall follow the Design Guidelines.
26. The Landmark Historic Structure must be reassembled in the original form, location, placement, and orientation.

Board Member Stephens seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

B. 741 Rossie Hill Drive – Historic District Design Review – The Applicant Proposes the Removal of Historic Materials to Accommodate a New Addition to a Landmark Historic Structure in the Historic Residential Low-Density Zoning District. PL-21-04800. (A) Public Hearing; (B) Action.

City Planner, Rebecca Ward, presented the staff report and stated that 741 Rossie Hill Drive involves a one-story framed parlor house constructed around 1895. It is the center of the three Rossi Hills homes. In 1984, it was also listed on the National Register of Historic Places as part of the Park City mining boom era residences. The home is a Landmark Historic Structure on the Park City Historic Sites Inventory. In 2017, the area was downzoned from 24 to eight units per acre to protect the Landmark Historic structures. The reason for the readdressing was due to a subdivision plat that was approved in 2020 that created five single-family dwelling lots. The applicant is working with staff through the Historic District Design Review process for approval of their request. They have also gone before the Design Review team once and will return pending the decision of the Historic Preservation Board.

Planner Ward identified the subject property on a map displayed. The applicant is proposing to stabilize the landmark historic structure, lift it, and place it on cribbing to accommodate a new foundation and salvage as much of the existing material as possible. The applicant is also requesting to remove 8½ feet of the rear façade to accommodate an addition by expanding a living area and add a garage. The applicant's engineer evaluated the structure and determined that the existing foundation is sandstone and wood piles. It was determined that reinforced concrete footings and foundation are needed to stabilize and support the historic structure. If the Historic Preservation Board approves the request, some of the required conditions of approval will come through the Land Management Code. The conditions of approval set forth in the staff report were reviewed. Planner Ward indicated that the Building Department will need to monitor and inspect the Historic Structure throughout the process.

Planner Ward reported that the applicant's second request is to remove 8½ feet of the rear façade to allow for the rear addition and garage. It was noted that the home had a tenant up until recently and is in fair condition. If panelization is requested, the applicant would need to return to the Historic Preservation Board for consideration. The applicant's representative Jonathan DeGray reported that the area proposed to be removed is minimal. The intent was to maintain as much of the original form as possible.

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

The Board Members had no concerns with the request. Board Member Stephens stated that lifting the structure was a good option and had no issues. Chair Scott agreed.

MOTION: Board Member moved to approve the lifting of a Landmark Historic Structure for a new foundation and for the material deconstruction of a portion of the rear façade to accommodate an addition and a garage subject to the following:

Findings of Fact

Background

1. 741 Rossie Hill Drive (formerly 660 Rossie Hill Drive) is a one-story frame hall-parlor Single-Family Dwelling built around 1895 during the Mature Mining Era (1894-1930).
2. In 1984, 741 Rossie Hill Drive was listed on the National Register of Historic Places as part of the Park City Mining Boom Era Residences Thematic District.
3. 741 Rossie Hill Drive is a Landmark Historic Structure on the Park City Historic Sites Inventory.
4. On February 16, 2017, the City Council adopted Ordinance No. 2017-05 to rezone the Residential – Medium Property to Historic Residential Low – Density to decrease Density in the area from 24 to eight units to protect the three Rossie Hill Drive Landmark Historic Structures.
5. On January 9, 2020, the City Council adopted Ordinance No. 2020-02, approving the Lilac Hill East Subdivision. 741 Rossie Hill Drive is Lot 1 of the Subdivision. This plat amendment assigned new addresses to the Rossie Hill Drive Landmark Historic Structures. The Applicant has not yet recorded the plat with Summit County.

6. On February 25, 2021, the City Council adopted Ordinance No. 2021-09, extending the Lilac Hill East Subdivision approval for one year.
7. On March 8, 2021, the Applicant submitted a Historic District Design Review (HDDR) Application.

Material Deconstruction

1. The Applicant proposes stabilizing the Landmark Historic Structure, lifting it, and placing it on cribbing to accommodate a new foundation. The Landmark Historic Structure will then be lowered onto the new foundation, re-frame it to meet code, and salvaging and using as much historic material as possible.
2. The Applicant also proposes the Material Deconstruction of 8 ½' of the rear façade to accommodate an addition to the rear of the Landmark Historic Structure to expand the living area and to add a garage that will be accessed from the rear of the property.
3. Additions to Historic Structures shall be considered only on non-character defining facades, usually tertiary facades.
4. The Historic Preservation Board approved the Material Deconstruction to lift the Landmark Historic Structure to accommodate a new foundation, and the removal of 8 ½' of the rear façade to accommodate an addition and garage, accessed from the rear of the property, subject to the Conditions of Approval below.

Conclusions of Law

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

Conditions of Approval

1. The applicant is responsible for notifying the Building Department prior to proposing any changes to this approval.
2. The Applicant shall submit in writing any changes, modifications, or deviations from the approved scope of work for Planning Director review and approval/denial in accordance with the applicable standards prior to construction.

3. Where the Historic exterior materials cannot be repaired, they shall be replaced with materials that match the original in all respects: scale, dimension, texture, profile, material, and finish. Prior to removing and replacing Historic materials, the applicant shall demonstrate to the Planning Director and Historic Preservation Planner that the materials are no longer safe and/or serviceable and cannot be repaired to a safe and/or serviceable condition. No Historic materials may be disposed of prior to advance approval by the Planning Director and Historic Preservation Planner.
4. An encroachment agreement may be required prior to issuance of a building permit for projects utilizing soil nails that encroach onto neighboring properties.
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 new foundation shall not raise or lower the Landmark Historic Structure more than two feet from its original floor elevation.
7. The Historic Site shall be returned to its original grade following the construction of a foundation. When the original grade cannot be achieved, generally no more than six inches of the new foundation shall be visible above Final Grade on the primary and secondary facades.
8. Re-grade the Site so that all water drains away from the Structure and does not enter the foundation.
9. 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.
10. The form, material, and detailing of a new foundation shall be similar to foundations of nearby historic structures.
11. Historic foundations shall not be concealed with masonry, block, plywood panels, corrugated metal, or wood shingles.
12. 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.

13. 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.
14. 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.
15. 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.
16. The Applicant shall complete a Historic Preservation Plan—subject to Chief Building Official and Planning Director approval—prior to issuance of a building permit.
17. The Applicant shall provide the City with a financial Guarantee to ensure compliance with the conditions and terms of the Historic Preservation Plan prior to issuance of a building permit.
18. The addition shall be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future the essential form and integrity of the Landmark Historic Structure could be restored.
19. The addition shall be visually subordinate to Historic Structures when viewed from the Right-of-Way.
20. The Applicant shall complete Historic District Design Review and approval prior to issuance of a building permit.
21. Where the addition abuts the Historic Structure, a clear transitional element between the old and new should be designed and constructed.

22. In-line additions shall be avoided.
23. If the Landmark Historic Structure requires panelization, the Applicant shall return to the Historic Preservation Board for an amendment to this approval.

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

C. 729 Rossie Hill Drive – Historic District Design Review – The Applicant Proposes Disassembly and Reassembly and the Removal of Historic Materials to Accommodate New Additions and Structural Upgrades to a Landmark Historic Structure in the Historic Residential Low-Density Zoning District. (A) Public Hearing; (B) Action.

Planner Ward presented the staff report and identified 729 Rosie Hill Drive as the middle structure shown on the map displayed. The structure is a cross-wing cottage with a gable roof built around 1895. It is listed on the National Register of Historic Places and is a Landmark Historic Structure on the City's Historic Sites Inventory. The applicant is requesting the following:

1. To determine whether the rear shed contributes to the Landmark Historic Structure.
2. Approve material deconstruction of a portion of the rear façade to accommodate an addition and garage.
3. Approve panelization of the historic structure.

Planner Ward reported that in the Land Management Code, a contributing building structure, site area, or object is a portion of the existing building or an accessory building structure object. It is considered contributory to the historic significance of a building or a site if it reflects the historical architectural character of the site or district as designated by the Historic Preservation Board. The Historic Sites Information Form that was completed in 1984, addresses the small, half-story shed extension that is attached to the rear of the home and complements it in scale and materials. It may be original, however, in-period rear additions and extensions are part of Park City's architectural vocabulary. While an alteration may represent a major alteration of the original home, it usually contributes to the significance of a house because it documents the most common and acceptable method of expansion of the small Park City house. The building is unaltered and in good condition and, therefore, maintains its original integrity.

Planner Ward stated that the applicant conducted additional research and found that the first available Sanborn map shows the property in 1907. The shed was shown jutting to the south of the structure. The existing shed is flush with the rear wall of the home. The photos provided show that the inside of the shed at the common walls to the home have siding indicating that the walls were exterior at one time. Photos were provided showing that the exterior walls are framed with nominal lumber and craft paper and are clad with fiberboard. The items date the addition to the 1940s at the oldest.

Planner Ward reported that the Land Management Code defines historic integrity as the ability of a site to retain its identity and convey the significance in the history of Park City. The City recognizes seven aspects or qualities defined by the National Park Service. The factors relevant to the rear shed include design, materials, and feeling. Staff requested input from the Historic Preservation Board regarding whether a rear shed contributes to the Landmark Historic Structure.

Board Member Stephens commented that in the past they have allowed the applicant to choose a time period that they wish to restore the property back to. The lumber on the back of the addition was dimensional from the 1940s and very different from the early 1900s when the rest of the home was built. He did not oppose the owner and design professionals choosing a period to restore the house to and staying true to that period.

Chair Scott agreed and found it interesting that the first Sanborn map that is available is from 1907 and shows a shed but no side wall. Mr. DeGray stated that the desire is to take the home back to a period prior to the shed being built. The exterior walls are evident inside the shed and at some point were added on. They dated them to no older than the 1940s in terms of age. They would like to take it back to a period prior to that if deemed acceptable by the Board.

Board Member Holmgren felt that the shed was of a different era from the home and appeared to be an add-on.

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

Procedural issues were discussed. It was recommended that the issues be incorporated into one motion.

The consensus of the Board was to support the removal of the rear shed.

The Board next addressed the Material Deconstruction of a portion of the rear façade to accommodate the addition. Planner Ward reported that the next request was to remove an 8' 2" x 10' portion of the rear façade to accommodate an addition to the rear of the structure to expand the living area and add the garage that will be accessed from the rear of the property. The applicant will be required to complete the Historic Preservation

Plan to complete the financial guarantee. Under the Historic District Design Guidelines, the addition will be required to meet certain standards.

Board Member Stephens asked for clarification from Mr. DeGray regarding the shed addition to be removed. He asked if the proposed addition will replace the shed area. Mr. DeGray explained that the transition element will be attached to the portion to be removed. The historic portion of the home will be exposed. Board Member Stephens did not want the addition to overpower the house. It was noted that there will be a transitional element to the new addition.

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

The consensus of the Board was to support the 8' 2" section of material being removed.

Planner Ward explained that the last request is to approve panelization of the Landmark Historic Structure. It is based on the January 22, 2021 Engineer's Report. It was determined that the existing frame needs to be replaced, the roof structure is deficient, and the walls have no capacity for wind, seismic, or gravity loads. The building sits on sandstone and wood piles so a new foundation is proposed. Lifting under the building will cause the structure to fail and collapse. The engineer suggested panelization of the structure. The Land Management Code requires that the Chief Building Official and Planning Director sign off on the site.

Chair Scott recalled the first home that was reviewed and acknowledged that it is a completely different situation. He felt that while it is rundown, there are buildings that have been successfully raised. He questioned the need to go directly to panelization. Board Member Stephens agreed. His opinion was that engineering reports almost always lean toward panelization. It would have been problematic to try to lift the rear addition. The siding and framing all look straight. He commented that there have been buildings in the City in worse condition that have been successfully raised. His preference was to see the home raised rather than panelized. Board Member Holmgren considered it to be a stout house. Board Member Beatlebrox agreed. It was suggested that they revisit the issue once the interior demolition is complete. If the Chief Building Official, the Engineer, and Planning Director concur they can decide whether to pursue panelization. Board Member Stephens wanted the matter to come back to the Board. He considered the Historic Preservation Board to be a watchdog between the Planning Department and the rest of the community.

It was suggested that the first two requests be approved and the third continued. Mr. DeGray asked that he be granted with at least approval to do the lift, which will enable him to obtain a Demolition Permit. The applicant would have to come back to the Board if they decide to do something different than the lift. Once the demolition work is complete they will better understand the structure of the home. Mr. Leonard agreed with that tact.

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

Procedural issues were discussed. Planner Ward stated that the Board could specify that the panelization was denied but allow for the lifting a Historic Structure subject to the conditions of approval set forth in the staff report. Doing so would prevent the applicant from having to come back for approval to lift the structure.

MOTION: Board Member Beatlebrox moved to approve (I) removal of the rear shed as it does not contribute to the Landmark Historic Structure; and (II) the Material Deconstruction of a portion of the rear façade to accommodate an addition and garage based on the following that apply to the removal of the shed and a portion of the rear wall:

Findings of Fact

Background

1. 729 Rossie Hill Drive (formerly 652 Rossie Hill Drive) is a one-story cross-wing cottage with a gable roof built around 1895 during the Mature Mining Era (1894- 1930).
2. In 1984, 729 Rossie Hill Drive was listed on the National Register of Historic Places as part of the Park City Mining Boom Era Residences Thematic District.
3. 729 Rossie Hill Drive is a Landmark Historic Structure on the Park City Historic Sites Inventory.
4. On February 16, 2017, the City Council adopted Ordinance No. 2017-05 to rezone the Residential – Medium Property to Historic Residential Low – Density to decrease Density in the area from 24 to eight units to protect the three Rossie 196Hill Drive Landmark Historic Structures.
5. On January 9, 2020, the City Council adopted Ordinance No. 2020-02, approving the Lilac Hill East Subdivision. 729 Rossie Hill Drive is Lot 2 of the Subdivision. This plat amendment assigned new addresses to the Rossie Hill Drive Landmark Historic Structures. The Applicant has not yet recorded the plat with Summit County.
6. On February 25, 2021, the City Council adopted Ordinance No. 2021-09, extending the Lilac Hill East Subdivision approval for one year.

7. On March 8, 2021, the Applicant submitted a Historic District Design Review (HDDR) Application.

Rear Shed Status

1. The Applicant proposes removing the rear shed of the Landmark Historic Structure.
2. According to the Utah State Historical Society Historic Preservation Research Office Structure/Site Information Form completed in 1984, “[a] small, half story shed extension is attached to the rear of the house which complements it in scale and materials. It may be original, but whether original or not, in-period rear additions and extensions are part of Park City’s architectural vocabulary. Although in many cases an addition represents a major alteration of the original house, it usually contributes to the significance of a house because it documents the most common and acceptable method of expansion of the small Park City house. The building is unaltered, is in good condition, and therefore maintains its original integrity.”
3. However, the Applicant conducted additional research and found that:
 - a. The first available Sanborn map showing the property is 1907. The map shows a building mass that extends southward. However, the rear shed is flush with the rear wall, indicating it is a different, later addition.
 - b. The inside of the shed at the common walls to the home have siding, indicating the walls were exterior at one time.
 - c. The exterior walls are framed with nominal lumber, utilizing craft paper, and are clad with fiberboard. These items date the addition to the 1940s at the oldest.
4. The Historic Preservation Board determined the rear shed [DOES OR DOES NOT] contribute to the Landmark Historic Structure.

Material Deconstruction

1. The Applicant proposes the Material Deconstruction of a portion of the rear façade to accommodate an addition to the rear of the Landmark Historic Structure to expand the living area and to add a garage that will be accessed from the rear of the property.

2. Additions to Historic Structures shall be considered only on non-character defining facades, usually tertiary facades.
3. The Historic Preservation Board approved the Material Deconstruction to accommodate an addition and garage, accessed from the rear of the property, subject to the Conditions of Approval below.

Panelization

1. On January 22, 2021, Shen Engineers, Inc. investigated 729 Rossie Hill Drive and completed a Physical Conditions Report.
2. The report determined the following:
 - a. The existing frame needs to be replaced with a code-compliant frame.
 - b. The roof structure is deficient.
 - c. The existing walls are in poor condition and have no capacity for wind, seismic, or gravity loads.
 - d. The building has no foundation, but rather sits on sandstone and wood piles.
 - e. The porch is failing and not code compliant f. Lifting or moving the building will cause the Structure to fail and collapse.
3. The Engineer's Report suggests panelizing the walls of the existing Historic Landmark Structure, storing the walls on-site, and then re-installing the walls over a new code-compliant structural frame.
4. On April 5, 2021, the Chief Building Official, Planning Director, and Building and Planning staff visited 729 Rossie Hill Drive.
5. The Chief Building Official and Planning Director determined that due to the considerably poor condition of the buildings along with the substantial differential settlements, moving the structures and straightening them would cause them to fail and collapse and the Landmark Historic Structure should be panelized and rebuilt to be preserved and made safe for occupancy.

Conclusions of Law

1. The proposal complies with Land Management Code § 15-11-12.5, Historic Preservation Board Review For Material Deconstruction; § 15-11-9, Preservation Policy; § 15-13-2, Design Guidelines For Historic Residential Sites; and § 15-11-14, Disassembly And Reassembly Of A Historic Building Or Historic Structure.

Conditions of Approval

1. The applicant is responsible for notifying the Building Department prior to proposing any changes to this approval.
2. The Applicant shall submit in writing any changes, modifications, or deviations from the approved scope of work for Planning Director review and approval/denial in accordance with the applicable standards prior to construction.
3. Where the Historic exterior materials cannot be repaired, they shall be replaced with materials that match the original in all respects: scale, dimension, texture, profile, material, and finish. Prior to removing and replacing Historic materials, the applicant shall demonstrate to the Planning Director and Historic Preservation Planner that the materials are no longer safe and/or serviceable and cannot be repaired to a safe and/or serviceable condition. No Historic materials may be disposed of prior to advance approval by the Planning Director and Historic Preservation Planner.
4. An encroachment agreement may be required prior to issuance of a building permit for projects utilizing soil nails that encroach onto neighboring properties.
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 Historic Structure shall be returned to its 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.

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

20. Important architectural features of a Historic Building or Structure shall be removed, marked, and stored before the Structure or element of the Structure is disassembled.
21. The process of disassembly of a Historic Structure shall be recorded through photographic, still, or video.
22. Wall panels and roof surfaces shall be protected with rigid materials, such as sheets of plywood when there is a risk of damage during the disassembly/storage/reassembly process.
23. Disassembled components—trim, windows, doors, wall panels, roof elements, etc.— shall be securely stored on-site in a storage trailer or off-site in a garage/warehouse/trailer until needed for reassembly.
24. The original orientation and siting shall be replicated as closely as possible.
25. New foundations and additions shall follow the Design Guidelines.
26. The Landmark Historic Structure must be reassembled in the original form, location, placement, and orientation.

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

MOTION: Board Member moved to deny the request for panelization but approve the lifting of a 729 Rossie Hill Drive for a new foundation in a form approved by the City Attorney and subject to the following:

Findings of Fact

Background

1. 729 Rossie Hill Drive (formerly 652 Rossie Hill Drive) is a one-story cross-wing cottage with a gable roof built around 1895 during the Mature Mining Era (1894- 1930).
2. In 1984, 729 Rossie Hill Drive was listed on the National Register of Historic Places as part of the Park City Mining Boom Era Residences Thematic District.
3. 729 Rossie Hill Drive is a Landmark Historic Structure on the Park City Historic Sites Inventory.

4. On February 16, 2017, the City Council adopted Ordinance No. 2017-05 to rezone the Residential – Medium Property to Historic Residential Low – Density to decrease Density in the area from 24 to eight units to protect the three Rossie 196Hill Drive Landmark Historic Structures.
5. On January 9, 2020, the City Council adopted Ordinance No. 2020-02, approving the Lilac Hill East Subdivision. 729 Rossie Hill Drive is Lot 2 of the Subdivision. This plat amendment assigned new addresses to the Rossie Hill Drive Landmark Historic Structures. The Applicant has not yet recorded the plat with Summit County.
6. On February 25, 2021, the City Council adopted Ordinance No. 2021-09, extending the Lilac Hill East Subdivision approval for one year.
7. On March 8, 2021, the Applicant submitted a Historic District Design Review (HDDR) Application.

Rear Shed Status

1. The Applicant proposes removing the rear shed of the Landmark Historic Structure.
2. According to the Utah State Historical Society Historic Preservation Research Office Structure/Site Information Form completed in 1984, “[a] small, half story shed extension is attached to the rear of the house which complements it in scale and materials. It may be original, but whether original or not, in-period rear additions and extensions are part of Park City’s architectural vocabulary. Although in many cases an addition represents a major alteration of the original house, it usually contributes to the significance of a house because it documents the most common and acceptable method of expansion of the small Park City house. The building is unaltered, is in good condition, and therefore maintains its original integrity.”
3. However, the Applicant conducted additional research and found that:
 - d. The first available Sanborn map showing the property is 1907. The map shows a building mass that extends southward. However, the rear shed is flush with the rear wall, indicating it is a different, later addition.
 - e. The inside of the shed at the common walls to the home has siding, indicating the walls were exterior at one time.

- f. The exterior walls are framed with nominal lumber, utilizing craft paper, and are clad with fiberboard. These items date the addition to the 1940s at the oldest.
4. The Historic Preservation Board determined the rear shed [DOES OR DOES NOT] contribute to the Landmark Historic Structure.

Material Deconstruction

1. The Applicant proposes the Material Deconstruction of a portion of the rear façade to accommodate an addition to the rear of the Landmark Historic Structure to expand the living area and to add a garage that will be accessed from the rear of the property.
2. Additions to Historic Structures shall be considered only on non-character defining facades, usually tertiary facades.
3. The Historic Preservation Board approved the Material Deconstruction to accommodate an addition and garage, accessed from the rear of the property, subject to the Conditions of Approval below.

Panelization

1. On January 22, 2021, Shen Engineers, Inc. investigated 729 Rossie Hill Drive and completed a Physical Conditions Report.
2. The report determined the following:
 - a. The existing frame needs to be replaced with a code-compliant frame.
 - b. The roof structure is deficient.
 - c. The existing walls are in poor condition and have no capacity for wind, seismic, or gravity loads.
 - d. The building has no foundation, but rather sits on sandstone and wood piles.
 - e. The porch is failing and not code compliant f. Lifting or moving the building will cause the Structure to fail and collapse.
3. The Engineer's Report suggests panelizing the walls of the existing Historic Landmark Structure, storing the walls on-site, and then re-installing the walls over a new code-compliant structural frame.

4. On April 5, 2021, the Chief Building Official, Planning Director, and Building and Planning staff visited 729 Rossie Hill Drive.
5. The Chief Building Official and Planning Director determined that due to the considerably poor condition of the buildings along with the substantial differential settlements, moving the structures and straightening them would cause them to fail and collapse and the Landmark Historic Structure should be panelized and rebuilt to be preserved and made safe for occupancy.

Conclusions of Law

1. The proposal complies with Land Management Code § 15-11-12.5, Historic Preservation Board Review For Material Deconstruction; § 15-11-9, Preservation Policy; § 15-13-2, Design Guidelines For Historic Residential Sites; and § 15-11-14, Disassembly And Reassembly Of A Historic Building Or Historic Structure.

Conditions of Approval

1. The applicant is responsible for notifying the Building Department prior to proposing any changes to this approval.
2. The Applicant shall submit in writing any changes, modifications, or deviations from the approved scope of work for Planning Director review and approval/denial in accordance with the applicable standards prior to construction.
3. Where the Historic exterior materials cannot be repaired, they shall be replaced with materials that match the original in all respects: scale, dimension, texture, profile, material, and finish. Prior to removing and replacing Historic materials, the applicant shall demonstrate to the Planning Director and Historic Preservation Planner that the materials are no longer safe and/or serviceable and cannot be repaired to a safe and/or serviceable condition. No Historic materials may be disposed of prior to advance approval by the Planning Director and Historic Preservation Planner.
4. An encroachment agreement may be required prior to issuance of a building permit for projects utilizing soil nails that encroach onto neighboring properties.

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

17. Written plans detailing the disassembly and reassembly steps and procedures shall be completed and approved by the Planning and Building Departments.
18. Structures shall be disassembled in the largest workable pieces possible.
19. To ensure accurate reassembly, all parts of the Building, Structure, or element shall be marked as they are systematically separated from the Structure. Contrasting colors of paint or carpenter wax crayons shall be used to establish a marking code for each component. The markings shall be removable and shall be made on surfaces that will be hidden from view when the Structure is reassembled.
20. Important architectural features of a Historic Building or Structure shall be removed, marked, and stored before the Structure or element of the Structure is disassembled.
21. The process of disassembly of a Historic Structure shall be recorded through photographic, still, or video.
22. Wall panels and roof surfaces shall be protected with rigid materials, such as sheets of plywood when there is a risk of damage during the disassembly/storage/reassembly process.
23. Disassembled components—trim, windows, doors, wall panels, roof elements, etc.— shall be securely stored on-site in a storage trailer or off-site in a garage/warehouse/trailer until needed for reassembly.
24. The original orientation and siting shall be replicated as closely as possible.
25. New foundations and additions shall follow the Design Guidelines.
26. The Landmark Historic Structure must be reassembled in the original form, location, placement, and orientation.

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

6. ADJOURN

MOTION: Board Member Holmgren moved to adjourn. Board Member Beatlebrox seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Board.

Historic Preservation Board Meeting
May 5, 2021

The Historic Preservation Board Meeting adjourned at 7:30 p.m.

Approved by _____
Randy Scott, Chair
Historic Preservation Board

APPROVED JUNE 2, 2021