



**PARK CITY MUNICIPAL CORPORATION
HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD
MINUTES OF MAY 4, 2022**

BOARD MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE: Randy Scott-Chair, Puggy Holmgren, Jack Hodgkins, John Hutchings

EX OFFICIO MEMBERS: Gretchen Milliken, Planning Director; Aiden Lillie, Planner; Makena Hawley, Planner; Mark Harrington, Senior City Attorney; Julie Schultz, Executive Office Administrator

1. ROLL CALL

Chair Randy Scott called the meeting to order at 5:00 p.m. and a roll call was conducted.

2. MINUTES APPROVAL

A. Consideration to Approve the Historic Preservation Board Meeting Minutes from March 2, 2022.

MOTION: Board Member Holmgren moved to APPROVE the Minutes of March 2, 2022, as written. Board Member Hutchings seconded the motion.

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

3. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS

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

4. STAFF/BOARD COMMUNICATIONS AND DISCLOSURES

Planning Director, Gretchen Milliken, reported that in May they would be advertising for candidates to fill positions on the Board of Adjustment, Historic Preservation Board ("HPB"), and the Planning Commission. She noted that there were a number of candidates who already applied and some of the current Board Members reapplied. She noted that current Board Members need not reapply. Board Members who either did not reapply or do not want to reapply can withdraw their applications or submit new ones.

A. 2022 Historic Preservation Awards Update.

City Planner, Aiden Lillie, reported that the Artist Selection Committee met and selected Morgan McCue as the artist to be commissioned to paint the winner of this year's award at 1141 Park Avenue. She added that it should be completed by the end of the month.

5. WORK SESSION

A. Historic District Grant Program – The Historic Preservation Board Will Review the 2023 Historic District Grant Program's Scope, Mission, and Requirements.

Planner Lillie announced that this was the third and final Work Session on the Historic District Grant Program. At the last Work Session, they made a lot of changes and wanted to allow all Board Members to review the changes and provide input. She presented a brief outline of the prior Work Sessions, held on February 2, 2022, and explained that they discussed the proposed evaluation criteria; how and when the competitive grant cycle would be run; Staff authority to grant extensions to awardees; the removal of interior work and exterior paint from the Competitive and Repair categories; and predetermined dollar amounts allocated to the Repair category and Competitive category.

At the March 2, 2022, Work Session, she reported that the Board determined that Category A should not be included in the program and that emergency repair requests should and could be brought to the Board for consideration rather than carving out a section in the Program for emergency repairs. She noted that the Board also chose to remove the cap of \$15,000 and requested that the total amount available should be communicated clearly to the applicant. She noted that for this next Fiscal Year, they have \$127,000 in available funds.

Planner Lillie stated that the Board also adjusted and approved the Mission Statement as follows:

"The Park City Historic District Grant Program is designed to financially incentivize the Preservation, Rehabilitation, Restoration and Reconstruction of historic structures and sites in order to create a community that honors its past and encourages Historic Preservation."

The Board suggested that the grant be timed to align with the Park City Museum's History Month and Home Tours. The guided home-walking tour is offered through the Museum from June 28 through September 3. Therefore, the draft Information Guide aligns with those dates.

Planner Lillie noted that the Board requested a separate scoring process from Staff, which would then be compared and discussed for each application. On March 2, 2022, the Board agreed with Director Milliken's suggestion to create a preliminary review committee to weed out ineligible or low-scoring applications. Staff requested input on who should

sit on the preliminary review committee and recommended that the committee include HPB representatives, a representative from the Museum, and a representative from Planning Staff.

Planner Lillie shared the proposed Application and Information Guide with the Board. She reported that they revised the application so that the additional information requested by the Board would be more clearly communicated to the applicant. She noted that removing the capitalization of "historic structures and sites" in the Mission Statement would allow grants for structures or sites that are not on the Historic Sites Inventory but are of historic age that could warrant the use of these grant funds for restoration that could, in turn, lead them to be included on the Historic Sites Inventory.

She highlighted the Grant Program Section and goals, noting that this was a 50% matching grant that requires the applicant to pay 50% of the proposal. Staff hoped this would help applicants have a better understanding of the grant as they had found that many applicants were not aware that it was a 50/50 matching grant. The Grant Program Section also explains that the grant funds come from the General Fund, the Lower Park RDA, and the Main Street RDA. She recalled that the Board requested that the amount of available funds be clearly communicated. As a result, they included that figure in the document. She noted that in the language that there is no cap on funds to be awarded. Staff added language that requested applicants not apply for more funds than are available.

Planner Lillie next addressed the Requirements Section and added that in the past many applicants had difficulty with their Historic District Design Review ("HDDR") approval. She commented that one of the requirements of the application is that the work proposed would be compatible with the Land Management Code ("LMC"). Historically, the HDDR was the prerequisite, and including this should help communicate that requirement. She noted the recommendation that applicants apply by June 1, 2022.

The draft Application also describes the five-year Lien Agreement as well as the façade easement information. She reiterated that these requirements were included early on in the packet and noted that many of the applicants from the last Fiscal Year were developers who would sell the structures within 1-2 years after completing the work. This requirement has dissuaded developers from the funds offered under this program.

Board Member Hodgkins recalled that they also discussed that some of the rating criteria would provide additional points for those who wanted to voluntarily add an easement. Planner Lillie stated that the Board Members who attended the March Work Session did not express an interest in bonus points. Board Member Hodgkins did not view these as bonus points. Rather, it would be part of the criteria designed to help them rate applications.

Planner Lillie referenced the Draft Scorecard and noted that it included six criteria that would be evaluated. In response to her request for clarification, Board Member Hodgkins stated that he was suggesting that they add criteria for the willingness to offer a façade

easement by applicants who receive less than \$25,000. He commented that this would get to the issue of who needs the money. He felt the money should go to those who need it the most to facilitate preservation work that might not otherwise occur without the funding. He also referenced past applicants who proposed complete renovations and stated that there is enough money in Park City for those projects to be completed with the LMC ensuring that those projects get done properly.

Board Member Hodgkins also asked if they could include criteria that preferred in-place rehabs to gut rehabs to try and favor residents. This would speak more toward upkeep versus complete gut renovations that get flipped. Board Member Holmgren echoed Board Member Hodgkins' suggestions and noted that people with money do the work in any event while others find it difficult to apply a coat of paint.

Chair Scott felt that this suggestion could make things interesting, especially if only one applicant agrees to the easement. Board Member Hodgkins agreed, but asked why they would not want to preference that. He added that someone who would voluntarily offer a Façade Easement would likely be one who was not going to sell his or her property. Adding these criteria might also help weed out developers. Board Member Hodgkins noted that if there are a lot of applicants they have to be able to distinguish which ones are slightly stronger than others. As a result, some of these types of questions could help separate proposals that are similar.

Planner Lillie asked the Board if they wanted to see the draft following these additional edits, perhaps as a Staff Communication Report. Board Member Holmgren stated that she would like to see it after these edits are made. It was clarified that the final draft could be circulated outside of a formal Work Session or be published as a Staff Communication in lieu of another Work Session.

Planner Lillie next addressed Eligibility and stated that eligible work may include Preservation, Rehabilitation, or Restoration as defined by the LMC, which would include Historic Architectural features and structural elements. She listed the examples of Eligible Work as set forth in the document, which was taken from the Board's feedback on the goals of the grant. She requested feedback on this section. Board Member Hutchings felt that the list of examples included in the document was appropriate.

Planner Lillie referenced the timeline and highlighted that grant applications could be submitted from August 2, 2022, to September 28, 2022. These dates were based on the Board's feedback requesting that the grant cycle align with the Historic Home Tour. She included dates that were within the latter half of the Home Tour because Staff found that when the grant period is longer, applicants tend to wait until the last minute.

Board Member Holmgren agreed with the proposed time period for the submission of applications. Chair Scott also agreed with the time period and added that it would be preferable to keep it concise. Planner Lillie mentioned that the application would be a fillable .pdf that the applicant could submit via e-mail to the Planning Department.

With regard to the draft Scorecard, Planner Lillie explained that it was updated following the March 2 meeting to include a larger scoring value for each question. The scoring ranges from 2 to 4 and was prepared in accordance with the recommendations from the Duval Study provided to the City in 2018.

Board Member Hutchings returned to the Grant Application Section and asked if the work was required to be completed between July 1, 2022, and June 30, 2024. Planner Lillie explained that the grant does not involve a retroactive award of funds. If an applicant were to apply for work already completed prior to the opening of the Fiscal Year, they would not be eligible for funds. The grant presented to the Board encompassed FY 2023 – 2024.

Board Member Hodgkins felt that a majority of grants during the last round were for projects that had already been completed. Planner Lillie stated that during the last round, the Fiscal Year started June 30, 2021, and applications began in May. Some of them were for emergency repairs. The previous grant was written to align with the Fiscal Year, so work could not begin until June 30, which left applicants having to wait before commencing their work.

Board Member Hutchings was agreeable to the dates in the current grant but wondered if the term “proposed” needed to be changed to “completed.” There was further discussion regarding the language. Board Member Hutchings agreed with the language as drafted.

Chair Scott addressed the first question on the Scorecard and noted a typo on the Scoring Value. He observed that “Non-visible historic elements...” should be “No visible historic elements...” Planner Lillie stated that this Scoring Value referred to the historic elements that are being restored that are not visible because they are interior or hidden in some manner. She agreed that “No visible...” would be better verbiage.

Board Member Hodgkins cited the example of original wall studs removed as part of a project. Planner Lillie emphasized that the criteria was directed at visible character-defining elements that would be restored. Board Member Hodgkins questioned whether changing the wording to “No visible...” would change the meaning of the phrase. Further discussion was held and Planner Lillie offered that the suggested change aligned more with the higher scoring options to this question, which range from “no visible” to “few visible” to “all visible.” Board Member Hodgkins expressed his understanding and noted that similar language was included in the Scoring Value for the next question.

With respect to the Scoring Value that the project “exceeds expectations,” Planner Lillie stated that the Board requested to also be involved in the scoring of the applications; however, she wondered if they should create a selection committee that would weed out low-scoring or ineligible applications so the Board’s review could be more efficient. Staff recommended that the Selection Committee be comprised of Board Members, Staff, and a representative from the Museum. The Board and Staff would then score the applications separately. She recalled that Board Member Lola Beatlebrox requested

those scores be compared and requested input on which scores would govern the selection.

Board Member Hutchings asked if there should be criteria for the initial evaluation of applications. Planner Lillie suggested a minimum score of four or below be implemented this year to identify true low-scoring applications and then next year they could establish the parameters of a low-scoring application.

Board Member Hutchings commented that the Selection Committee would consist of three people weeding out applications, while every other application would be subject to these scoring criteria. Board Member Hodgkins suggested that if Staff did the scoring and then brought the top 75% to the Board, that would weed out the weaker 25% of applications. He noted that the exception would be if there were minimal applications whose requests did not amount to all of the funds available. The Board agreed to have Staff score the applications and provide the Board with the higher scored applications.

Planner Lillie next addressed the Grant Application and noted the Board's request to keep it as simple as possible. She stated that given the criteria for allocation of funds, the application was not as simple as they would like. With respect to Project Information and Applicant Information, she removed information that would not have been previously required.

For the Submittal Requirements, Planner Lillie listed each requirement as set forth in the Application. She correlated each part of the application with each of the Submittal Requirements. She noted that for the Breakdown of Estimated Costs, she removed the section on what the City would match because that is included later in the application.

Board Member Holmgren asked about the Breakdown of Estimated Costs and whether the Estimated Total Cost would be an estimate from a contractor. Planner Lillie stated that applicants are typically asked to get a bid. They could require the bid be attached to the application. The Board thought that would be a good idea.

Board Member Hodgkins asked if they should have a cost floor and also recognized that applicants could attach higher bids, and then use lower bids for the work. Planner Lillie stated that if an applicant is awarded 50% of a \$20,000 bid, yet the project only cost \$10,000, when they submitted an invoice for the 50% match, the City would only reimburse \$5,000 of the actual cost.

Chair Scott noted that Item No. 3, Project Description was spelled incorrectly. It was noted by the Board that the Application was comparatively easy and well done.

Board Member Hutchings asked if drawings were required and noted that some projects might not warrant drawings such as door or window replacements. He suggested that they add language such as "if applicable" and noted that the Code required drawings for certain types of work. Planner Lillie stated that they would amend that language and that they would need elevations for certain window projects but otherwise could require a

window schedule and a photograph of the window being replaced. The Board had no further input or questions.

6. REGULAR AGENDA

A. 945 Norfolk Avenue – Material Deconstruction – The Applicant Proposes Material Deconstruction of the South Façade and Portions of the North and East Facades as needed on the Landmark Historic Structure. PL-22-05155.

Planner Lillie identified 945 Norfolk Avenue as a Landmark Historic Structure on Park City's Historic Sites Inventory. It is also listed on the National Register of Historic Places. The structure is a 1 ½-story pyramid-style home constructed circa 1896. She presented a photograph of the structure from the 1941 Summit County Tax Records. She explained that the applicant submitted a modification of the approval application and proposed a Material Deconstruction of the south façade and portions of the north and east façades. Staff completed a site visit to view the existing conditions, and noted that there was more than 50% of damage to the historic drop siding on the south façade, which included severe splintering and cupping. She reported that the applicant's representative deemed this material unsalvageable.

Planner Lillie presented photographs of the damage to the drop siding. She stated that the deconstruction of the historic material would accommodate new cedar siding to match the existing dimensions and profile of the historic drop siding. Planner Lillie presented images of the proposed elevations to be deconstructed. She noted that the siding on the east façade was to be replaced as needed. She stated that Staff recommended the HPB review the proposal, conduct a public hearing, and approve material deconstruction of the south façade and portions of the north and east façades, subject to the Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Conditions of Approval outlined in the Draft Final Action Letter.

Planner Lillie reported that Staff did not receive any public input. She noted that the applicant's representative, Jonathan DeGray, was attending virtually.

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

Mr. DeGray clarified that the south side was severely damaged and it would be difficult to pull any salvageable material from that façade but they would try. With respect to the other façades, he clarified that they would only remove individual boards, as needed. He reported that the north and east façades were in fairly good shape and only a few boards would need replacing. Chair Scott mentioned that he looked at the site the previous day and confirmed with Mr. DeGray that no repairs would be done on the west façade and that some patches of repair would be done on the north façade. He agreed that the south façade looked poor.

Board Member Hodgkins expressed that it seemed reasonable that the south façade would take the most abuse from weather and felt it was a reasonable request. Board Member Hutchings agreed.

Board Member Holmgren asked for clarification of what was meant by “cupping.” Mr. DeGray explained that it is a condition where the wood has deteriorated to the point that the siding begins to curl and then splits. He noted that wood is a material that has a lifespan and does not last forever.

MOTION: Board Member Hodgkins moved to APPROVE the proposal for 945 Norfolk-Material Deconstruction as outlined in the Packet, subject to the following:

Findings of Fact

Background

1. 945 Norfolk Avenue is a 1 ½ story pyramid house built c.1896.
2. 945 Norfolk Avenue is a Landmark Historic Structure on the Park City Historic Sites Inventory and listed on the National Register of Historic Places.
3. On March 19, 2018, the Planning Department received a complete Historic District Design Review (HDDR) application for 945 Norfolk Avenue.
4. On May 4, 2018, the HPB approved material deconstruction Material Deconstruction of non-historic improvements; reconstruction of the historic c.1896 roof form and c.1990 wood shake roofing materials; reconstruction of two c.1896 chimneys; reconstruct c.1997 basement; reconstruct c.1983 reconstructed front porch; replace c.1900 front door and two non-historic doors; and replace 12 total historic wood windows.
5. On May 14, 2018, the Planning Department held a public hearing and approved the HDDR application.
6. On February 1, 2022, the Planning Department received a complete Modification of Approval application for 945 Norfolk Avenue’s HDDR approval to construct an opening for a door on the rear elevation.
7. On March 2, 2022, the HPB approved the material deconstruction of a portion of the rear façade to accommodate a new door opening.

Material Deconstruction

8. The Applicant proposes Material Deconstruction of the South Façade and portions of the North and West façade as needed.

9. The analysis section of the Staff Report dated April 6, 2022, is incorporated herein.

Conclusions of Law

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

Conditions of Approval

1. The Applicant is responsible for notifying the Building Department prior to any changes to this approval, which is for the plans dated April 6, 2022.
2. The Applicant shall submit in writing any changes from the approved scope of work for Planning Department review.
3. The removed historic siding shall be replaced by siding to match the original in design, dimension, texture, material, and finish.
4. The Applicant shall receive approval of the Historic District Design Review Modification of Approval application prior to issuance of a building permit.

Board Member Holmgren seconded the motion.

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

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

Planner Lillie stated that 1304 Park Avenue is a single-family home that was constructed in 1885. It is a Landmark Historic Site on Park City's Historic Sites Inventory. She presented a 1941 Tax Records photograph of the home. She reported that the applicant proposed the Disassembly and Reassembly of portions of the west, north, and south panels of the structure to construct a new foundation. A licensed Structural Engineer completed a site visit and found that if the Historic Structure were lifted, safety could not be guaranteed when the construction workers would work inside the existing structure. She referenced additional findings with respect to load bearings and joists, as listed in the Staff Report. Planner Lillie noted that photographs of the structure show the absence of a foundation, as well as the condition of the existing materials.

Planner Lillie explained that prior to the official determination by the Chief Building Officer and the Planning Director, she drafted a report recommending approval of lifting. She

previously visited the site with the applicant and applicant's representative, Mr. DeGray. After the Chief Building Official and Planning Director visited the site on April 26, 2022, they determined that the structure was not hazardous or dangerous as defined in the International Building Code, and the physical conditions of existing materials would not prevent temporarily lifting the structure. She was only able to upload the Determination Letter and Draft Final Action Letter. She uploaded the incorrect Staff Report that suggested that Staff recommended approval of material deconstruction; however, they still wanted to proceed with the hearing to allow the applicant to make their case for panelization of the site.

Planner Lillie stated that Staff recommended the HPB review the proposal, conduct a public hearing and deny the disassembly and re-assembly of the Landmark Historic Structure, subject to the Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Conditions of Approval outlined in the Draft Final Action Letter. She indicated that Staff had not received any public input on this application.

Board Member Hodgkins noted that this application dealt with the entire structure because based on the site visit, the façade that is not mentioned is not there. He noted that there was an internal/external wall between the 1941 addition that would remain and the original part of the house. He assumed that this wall would also be panelized.

Mr. DeGray explained that this application involved the exterior walls, because the interior wall, which might become functional during a potential lift of the home, would not be subject to any City regulations. He noted that the floor system would have to be substantially rebuilt in order to lift the house, and they would lose the rear wall since none of that was historic. He added that the roof would also be completely rebuilt. He argued that it did not make sense to go to the expense of re-building the floor to stabilize the structure and re-building the east wall so that it could be lifted, only to remove these elements once the home was lowered. They have proposed removing the wall facing the street, the north wall, and the south wall. He noted the south wall would require more demolition to see what is in there, as there is sheetrock on the interior and new siding on the outside. He assumed that they would save those materials as well.

Mr. DeGray stated that from a pragmatic standpoint, the applicant's proposal gets them where they want to go in terms of saving the most historic material and maintaining the historic character of the building in a way that would not create repetition and waste of time, money and construction material.

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

Board Member Hutchings commented that historically, the determination of the Chief Building Inspector had always been persuasive. He understood that in lifting these homes, each one is unique and required an individual amount of effort, but felt that if the Building Inspector deemed it safe and feasible, he would support that.

Board Member Hodgkins expressed understanding for both sides. During the site visit, he noted the presence of trees in the front and asked whether they would remain regardless of whether the home would be lifted or panelized. Mr. DeGray stated that the idea was to keep those trees, but added that they do not know where the roots run, so there would be no guarantee that they would survive a construction process.

Board Member Holmgren highlighted the determination by the Chief Building Official and Planning Director that recommended lifting. Planner Lillie reminded that the Staff Report in the packet was the incorrect report and that the official determination letter was attached as Exhibit D. Mr. DeGray explained that during the site visit with the Building Official and Planning Director, they saw the same things he saw and was therefore bewildered at how they could conclude that lifting was appropriate. He noted that the Chief Building Official was aware of what construction processes would be required to make this happen if lifting is the chosen method.

Director Milliken explained that after the site visit, she and Chief Building Official, Dave Thacker, compared notes, and their determination was based on the flatness of the site, and the absence of any rot or decomposed materials. They felt that with some shoring, the structure could be lifted. She offered it would not be difficult to shore the back façade that no longer existed. Any need to reconnect the floor could also be accomplished.

Mr. DeGray asked if it would be possible to consider a hybrid solution. He stressed that the gable form that faces Park Avenue makes it big. He inquired whether it would be possible to take that section apart and lift it as a separate unit, noting that the Code allowed for buildings to be broken down in a move. He explained that the south elevation could be one cube, with the other cube being the gable on the west elevation that goes down the north side. He stated that some interior walls could be braced.

Mr. DeGray stated that this approach would leave the shed wall on the south elevation, listed as Panel 2, and asked if that wall could be panelized while lifting the other two sections as modules. Board Member Hodgkins understood that Mr. DeGray was suggesting lifting the historic portion of the house. He felt this could be a good compromise. Mr. DeGray expressed that he would not like to walk away from the meeting with the idea that the Board approved a total lift, and he was trying to make this as reasonable as possible for the applicant.

Chair Scott appreciated Mr. DeGray's effort to look for other alternatives and noted that the HPB had required the lifting of homes that were far more degraded than this one. If they consider precedent, he could not in good faith approve panelizing everything; however, considering safety and cost, he would be open to Mr. DeGray's suggestion. Board Member Hodgkins added that considering the age of the addition if the applicant requested the Board approve the demolition of that addition, they would likely approve that. He mentioned that the Board had in the past approved demolitions of additions constructed in the 1940s and 1950s. He felt that the hybrid approach made sense.

It was clarified that the 1940s addition was the gable on the north and west side of the building, identified as Panel 4, and Panel 5 was north of that piece. Mr. DeGray noted that panelization of Panel 2 on the south elevation could be a stand-alone item. He added that if the Board was amenable to panelizing the 1940's addition, Panels 4 and 5, that would be great as well.

Board Member Hutchings noted that generally he does not support panelization and preferred to avoid it as much as possible. He felt he could be comfortable with the compromise of lifting the structure in two pieces. Mr. DeGray made it clear that his suggestion was to lift the 1907 form as a unit and panelize the two walls of the 1940s addition, Panels 4 and 5. Director Milliken added that in the 1940s addition, there were three façades: the front gable and a small façade next to the porch that had a doorway at one point.

Board Member Hutchings referenced the Code that gives the Board some flexibility in this decision, but added that they would still have to determine why this situation was so unique. Planner Lillie noted the Code requirements for panelization, which include the need for a certified engineer's finding that the structure would not survive lifting. Additionally, the Code states that the HPB could determine, with input from the Planning Director and Chief Building Official, that unique conditions and the quality of the work preservation plan warrant the proposed disassembly and re-assembly. Unique conditions include, but are not limited to if a problematic site or structural conditions preclude temporarily lifting or moving a building as a single unit; or if the physical conditions of the existing materials prevent temporarily lifting or moving a building, and the applicant has demonstrated that panelization will result in the preservation of a greater amount of historic material, or all other alternatives have been shown to result in additional damage or loss of historic materials.

Chair Scott observed that some of those factors, including problematic site or structural conditions, would preclude temporary lifting. He felt that if the Board agreed that the original historic form could be lifted, then they would just be talking about the 1940s addition and whether panelization was an option. He submitted that removal of the rear elevation had created a problematic condition where the building would have to be substantially shored to lift as a unit. He added that panelization of the 1940s form would result in the preservation, of at least an equal and perhaps greater amount of historic materials since the floor and the roof would be re-built in any event.

Board Member Hutchings understood that it would be possible to lift the structure but did not see anything that met the Code requirements. He struggled with the notion raised by Board Member Hodgkins that the Board would likely approve a proposal to remove the 1940's piece and restore it to its original condition. He did not agree with panelization as proposed, but a different proposal might change his mind. He stressed that he was trying to be consistent and noted that the Board had required other applicants to lift homes because they did not meet the criteria.

Chair Scott suggested the Board settle on what they were thinking with respect to this item, given that they have a full panelization proposal in front of them. He added that the Board should give the applicant an idea of what would be acceptable. Board Member Holmgren stated she would support a denial of full panelization. Chair Scott and Board Member Hutchings agreed.

Board Member Hodgkins remarked that the applicant presented a counter-proposal and they were no longer looking at full panelization. Mr. DeGray offered that there were four options before the Board: full panelization, complete lifting of the structure, lifting in two pieces (1907 form and 1940's form), or lifting of the 1907 historic form and panelize the 1940's form. He stated that as far as a complete lifting of the structure, he would accept whatever the Board decided.

Board Member Hodgkins stated that the 1940s piece included two walls and a small portion of a wall. There would be no floor. Mr. DeGray stated that pursuant to the structural report, the roof would have to be re-framed as it is only 15 to 20 percent of capacity. Board Member Hutchings observed that re-framing the roof in these situations was the norm.

Chair Scott observed that when they consider separating the original structure, theoretically it does not have a back wall, and would not have a side wall, so they would be lifting a home with two sides. Board Member Hodgkins noted that there were actually three walls because there was a substantial wall with the original siding and the original house is pretty clearly defined.

Director Milliken recalled that the Engineering Report stated that the roof needed to be reinforced, not demolished. Planner Lillie confirmed that the report recommended the roof be upgraded or replaced with new roof joists. The engineer also suggested re-framing roof ridge and valley beams and installing new 9 ½ " minimum TGI roof joists.

In response to an inquiry, Director Milliken stated that, at a minimum, the roof would need to be reinforced before a lift.

Board Member Holmgren observed that this was getting complicated and felt that the Board agreed to deny complete panelization. She felt that the applicant should come back with a more detailed plan. Board Member Hutchings agreed. Board Member Holmgren continued by stating that the Board needed something to look at to evaluate these options rather than just talking about them.

Board Member Hodgkins asked if the Code addressed lifting in two parts, and noted that the question was whether a lift is a lift, regardless of whether it is done in two parts. Senior City Attorney Harrington felt that the Code provided Staff the ability to coordinate lifting and if the Board were to give Staff direction to consider options with the applicant and the Chief Building Official to lift two sections that would be appropriate. The Board could then finalize its determination at the next meeting.

Board Member Hutchings preferred this course and offered that whatever decision they make should be well founded. He would appreciate further input from the Building Inspector and Staff on the alternatives. He stressed that the information they have now is that the entire structure could be lifted, and he did not see anything unique about the structure. Chair Scott agreed and invited a motion. It was clarified that the Board would vote to deny full panelization, as before them, without precluding the applicant from returning with an alternate proposal. Senior City Attorney Harrington added that the Draft Action Letter was written for a denial.

MOTION: Board Member Hutchings moved to DENY the Disassembly and Re-Assembly of the Landmark Historic Structure at 1304 Park Avenue in accordance with the Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Conditions of Approval as follows:

Findings of Fact

Background

1. 1304 Park Avenue is a one-story T/L cottage with a gabled roof that was constructed in c.1885 and is a Landmark Historic Site on Park City's Historic Sites Inventory.
2. The home was originally constructed as a hall and parlor-type house but received a wing addition in c. 1907.
3. This site was listed on the National Register of Historic Places in 1984 as part of the Park City Mining Boom Era Residences Thematic District. It was built within the historic period, defined as 1872 to 1929 in the district nomination, and retains its historic integrity.
4. On March 29, 2022, the Planning Department received a complete Historic District Design Review (HDDR) application for 1304 Park Avenue. The Applicant is proposing to panelize the structure to complete structural upgrades and a rear addition.
5. This application was reviewed by the Design Review Team on November 17, 2021, December 1, 2021, January 19, 2022, and April 6, 2022.

Panelization

6. On March 30, 2022, a licensed structural engineer visited 1304 Park Avenue and completed a Physical Conditions Report.
7. The report determined the following:
 - i. The main roof existing joists are 2x4 at 24" on center spanning about 8'-0" to 12'-0". The 12'-0" roof joists are 12% capacity of the code.

The 8'-0" roof joists are 16% capacity of the code. They need to be upgraded or replaced with new roof joists. We suggest reframing roof ridge and valley beams and installing new 9 ½" min. TJI roof joists.

- ii. The existing roof deck is 1x wood plank installed perpendicular to the existing joists. It doesn't have any capacity of shear diaphragm value. Suggest installing new 5/8" plywood or OSB with 10d @ 6" on center nailing.
 - iii. The existing crawl space floor joists are 2x4 @ 24" on the center spanning 12'-0. Most of them were totally rotted out and have to be replaced. On the north portion of the house, the crawl space floor joists are kind of new 2x6 @ 16" o.c.
 - iv. All the existing headers need to be upgraded. We will review each one of them when the design is available.
 - v. The exterior and interior walls are actual 2x4 @ 16" o.c. with 1x12 planks horizontally. They have the capacity for gravity loads but no capacity for wind, or seismic. The exterior walls need to be redesigned with new OSB/plywood sheathing and new hold downs for lateral complying with the New Building Code.
 - vi. The whole existing building is supported by loose sandstone or no footing at all. We suggest removing the existing foundation sandstone and frame walls. New reinforced concrete footing and foundation walls need to be poured for supporting the existing building and forming the frost depth of 40" minimum.
 - vii. Considering the existing roof, floor, and wall condition plus the age, rotted condition of the building as well as the bad differential settlement and particularly the house is rested on dirt, we strongly suggest panelizing the existing building so we can re-build the entire house. If not to panelize the existing building, the big concern is that the safety is not guaranteed when the construction crews are working inside of the existing building by jacking or vibrating the building. To panelize the existing building, the construction crews may only need to work from the outside of the building most of the time.
8. On April 26, 2022, the Chief Building Official, Planning Director, and Building and Planning staff visited 1304 Park Avenue.
9. The Chief Building Official and Planning Director determined that the Landmark Historic Structure is not in a state of disrepair that merits demolition.

10. The Historic Preservation Board DENIED panelization of the Landmark Historic Structure.

Conclusions of Law

1. The proposal does not meet the criteria outlined in Land Management Code Disassembly And Reassembly Of A Historic Building Or Historic Structure Land Management Code Chapter 15-11-14.
2. The proposal complies with Chapter 15-11-9, Preservation Policy, and LMC Chapter 15-13-2, Design Guidelines For Historic Residential Sites.

Board Member Holmgren seconded the motion.

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

Planner Lillie noted that someone raised a hand on Zoom.

David Schuelke identified himself as the owner of the property and felt he was stuck in the middle. He understood where Mr. DeGray and the engineer were coming from with regards to removing the roof, but also understood that lifting was common. He asked what would happen in the event that they proceed with the lift and the experts are not able to accomplish it.

Planner Lillie explained that if the lifting was approved and there were additional findings or rotting that would not allow for the structure to be lifted intact, they would then come back to the Building Official and Planning Director with those findings, which would then be presented to the Board.

C. 1129 Park Avenue -- Modification of Approval Historic District Design Review -- The Applicant Proposes to Reintroduce the 1940s Roof Element to the Entry of the Significant Historic Site. -- PL-22-05207.

Planner Lillie stated that this structure was constructed as a one-story hall and parlor circa 1895. It is a Significant Historic Site on Park City's Historic Sites Inventory. She noted that when some demolition was done, the log frame construction was revealed. The applicant submitted a Modification of Approval to the HDDR and has proposed to reintroduce the post-1949 roof element to the entry of the Significant Historic Structure.

Planner Lillie stated that on June 2, 2021, the HPB approved the Material Deconstruction of the rear post-1949 addition, and as part of that approval determined that the front entry element should be removed because the rear was being restored to the pre-1949 structure. Staff recommended that the HPB deny the applicant's proposal to re-introduce the post-1949 roof element at the entry of the Significant Historic Structure based on the Board's prior determination as well as the LMC stating that it was not appropriate to add decorative porch elements not used on similar Historic Structures.

Staff did not receive any public input on this matter. She presented the Historic form of the structure and the Historic entryway. She confirmed that the photograph was taken in 2013. In response to a request, she presented a more recent photograph taken in October 2021, which showed the home before construction. The applicant, Wendy Smith, stated that she could provide a photograph showing an intermediate front porch. Board Member Hodgkins requested a photograph between the oldest photograph and the 1930 photograph.

Planner Lillie directed the Board to the plans, as approved and attached as Exhibit B to the Staff Report. Ms. Smith noted that she e-mailed the referenced photographs to Planner Lillie for presentation to the Board. She estimated that the photographs were taken approximately 80 to 90 years ago. Chair Scott indicated that the porch never showed up on a Sanborn map, and the 1941 photograph did not include the porch element.

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

It was noted by Mr. DeGray that Staff's findings were based on the porch element being decorative. He submitted that it was added to allow a covered entry during the snow season, and therefore more of a necessity than merely decorative. The applicant was proposing to reconstruct the porch element for safety reasons. He noted that he asked Mr. Thacker for input and had not received a formal response. Planner Lillian noted that Mr. Thacker saw the email just prior to the meeting and would provide a response. She reported that he mentioned other snow mitigation opportunities.

Board Member Hodgkins commented that there are other ways of preventing snow and ice from coming off roofs.

Chair Scott referenced the Minutes from the June meeting and noted that the Board tries to be consistent in their decisions and approval of the Material Deconstruction was based on the fact that it would bring the structure back to its pre-1940 look and feel. He stressed that this was a condition of that approval. Board Member Hodgkins recalled that this element was discussed during that meeting and the general comments were that if they were to keep the porch element they should also keep the 1940s additions in the back.

MOTION: Board Member Holmgren moved to DENY the Proposed Re-introduction of the post-1949 Roof Element at the Entry of the Significant Historic Structure located at 1129 Park Avenue, subject to the following:

Findings of Fact

Background

1. 1129 Park Avenue is a Hall and Parlor built c.1895.

2. 1129 Park Avenue is a Significant Historic Structure on the Park City Historic Sites Inventory.
3. On May 21, 2021, the Planning Department approved the Historic District Design Review (HDDR) Application for 1129 Park Avenue.
4. On June 2, 2021, the HPB approved the Material Deconstruction of the front and rear 1940s additions.
5. On March 25, 2022, the Planning Department received a complete Modification of Approval - Historic District Design Review (HDDR) application for 1129 Park Avenue. The Applicant is proposing to reintroduce the 1940s roof element to the entry of the Significant Historic Structure.
6. On June 2, 2022, the Historic Preservation Board reviewed 1129 Park Avenue's request for Material Deconstruction and denied the proposal to retain the post-1949 roof entry addition.
7. The proposal is inconsistent with Historic District guidelines contained in LMC § 15-13-2(b)2(G)(6).
8. No new information or evidence warrants reconsideration of the 6/2/21 decision.

Conclusion of Law

1. The proposal does not comply with Land Management Code § 15-13-2; and *Design Guidelines for Historic Residential Sites*.

Board Member Hutchings seconded the motion.

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

- D. **316 Woodside Avenue – Historic District Design Review – The Historic Preservation Board Will Make a Designation of Contributory Status on the North-Western End of the Bump-Out, Constructed Sometime Between 1907 and 1929 to the 1889 Significant Structure. PL-21-05087.**

City Planner, Makena Hawley stated that currently there is an HDDR and Steep Slopes Conditional Use Permit ("CUP") and this item only involves the determination of contributory status. Pursuant to LMC 15-15-1, the HPB is to determine whether a portion of an existing building is considered contributory if it reflects the historical or architectural character of the site. She stated that 316 Woodside Avenue is a Significant Structure in the Historic Residential ("HR")-1 Zone that was constructed in 1889. It was originally built as a T-shaped cottage and appears in the 1929 Sanborn Maps.

Planner Hawley explained that during the HDDR process, the applicant proposed an addition with a footprint of approximately 500 square feet with a single-car garage access. The applicant originally proposed the structure with a connection through a bump-out. She noted that pursuant to LMC Section 15-13, when an existing non-historic or non-contributory addition is used as a transitional element, the other guidelines for transitional elements are inapplicable. She reported that the original interpretation was that this part of the bump-out was so altered that it no longer retained its historic integrity and was no longer a contributory addition. She added, however, that this determination was to be made by the HPB by analyzing whether the addition meets the specific criteria set forth in LMC Section 15-11-10.

Planner Hawley represented that Staff requested that the HPB determine whether the small bump-out contributes to the historic integrity of the Significant Historic Structure. She noted that the applicant was present online to answer any questions.

Chair Scott requested clarification that regardless of the plans, the HPB was only to determine whether the bump-out was contributory and historic in nature. Planner Hawley answered in the affirmative.

In response to a question by Board Member Hodgkins as to when the bump-out was built, Planner Hawley stated that it appeared in the 1929 Sanborn Maps. Board Member Hodgkins understood that to determine that the bump-out was non-contributory, the HPB must make a determination that it had been altered beyond its original significance. Planner Hawley referenced the Staff Report that detailed materials, setting, and design, and noted that the roof and sides of the bump-out had not been changed and held the same integrity that they did prior. The applicant proposed to remove the doors, which would be the connection to their addition.

Board Member Hodgkins did not understand the consequences of either decision. He noted that the bump-out was located at the back of the building and the Code allows the attachment of a transitional element and the demolition of historic material in order to accomplish that. If the applicant wanted to attach their transitional element to the bump-out, why couldn't they do so if it was determined to be historic.

Planner Hawley explained that if the HPB determined that it was contributory, it would require a longer transitional element. If the HPB determined that it was non-contributory, then the element could be attached as proposed. Board Member Hodgkins clarified and understood that if they determined the bump-out to be non-contributory, it would become the transitional element.

Planner Hawley noted that the proposed plans will not work if the Board deems the bump-out contributory because the transitional element would have to be longer.

Director Milliken added that the bump-out would remain the same. The façade with the French doors would be the attachment piece and the bump-out would be used as the transitional element.

The applicant's representative, Steve Swanson, AIA, stated that he worked on this home 20 years ago when the prior owners stabilized the structure so that the lower floor could be used. There was always talk about how to add a garage to the home because of its unique relationship to the street. He added that there was really only one place for this garage to be able to connect to the house, and it would only work if it could be used as the applicant has proposed. Mr. Swanson stated that they spent the better part of a year on the design process for this application, and felt that it was a reasonable adaptation to allow the house to continue to be functional and create a street entry where it presently has none.

Chair Scott opened the public hearing.

Ruth Meintsma reported that she resides at 305 Woodside. She addressed the Staff Report and the reference to the bump-out as being a non-contributing feature. She stated that the term "bump-out" becomes relevant when they get into the guidelines. She questioned why it was called a "bump-out" as opposed to a bay window because during her walks in the neighborhood with some historic preservationists, it seemed that this element would be called a bay window. Ms. Meintsma looked at the National Park Service, and criteria number 4 was identified as Projections, which includes porches, cornices, and bay windows. She noted that the term Projection did not apply to the City's guidelines, nor do bay windows; however, a small bump-out does not appear in the language at all.

Ms. Meintsma referenced the Physical Conditions Report, page 29, and noted a picture dated 1982 showing the west façade with historic bay windows. She suggested, therefore, that it be referred to as a bay window. She stated that a portion of Section 15-13-2(B)(4), entitled Additions to Primary Structures, provides that minor additions such as bay windows or dormers do not require transitional elements. Ms. Meintsma argued that the bump-out would be best referred to as a minor addition or addition.

To understand the definition of "addition," she used the 1907 Sanborn Maps that showed the original square structure, plus an addition in the back. The Staff Report discussed extensively the west addition that appeared in 1929. Ms. Meintsma observed that the property showed the back addition as a whole, with the bay window.

With regard to the History of the Structure section of the Staff Report, she stated that the statement "retains its historic integrity despite *the additions in the rear..*" was an error as it is not in the Historic Sites Inventory. She offered that this sentence should read: "retains its historic integrity despite the more current patios on the east and west sides.."

She returned to the Sanborn Maps and noted that the 2014 Determination of Significance Report stated that "between 1900 and 1907, it appears that the front porch facing the

south was screened in.” She noted that the person analyzing it identified it as a closed-in porch. The addition is referenced as the one added to the rear wing of the structure between 1907 and 1929.

Ms. Meintsma again referenced the 2014 Determination of Significance Report that stated that “the additions,” which include the west addition plus the bay window, had gained historical significance. Additionally, the Staff Report stated that the addition of French doors to the west “created significant modifications to the historic design and materials.” She proffered that modifications were made, but they were not significant.

With regard to the statements in the Staff Report that “Staff deemed the most appropriate approach was to retain the non-contributing addition,” she felt there was insufficient information to justify the fact that the bay window was not contributing. She argued that the bay window was part of the historically significant addition made in 1907 – 1929, so the statement that this proposal would not change that addition was incorrect.

Ms. Meintsma referenced the language from the 2014 Determination of Significance Report that stated, in part, “Additions made between 1907 and 1929 were constructed within the Mature Mining Era...Further, these additions have gained historical significance in their own right.” She argued that it was established in 2014 that these additions were historically significant, and noted that the French doors were in place in 2014, and there was no recognition that the change in the façade of that bay window was not enough to take away from the historic significance.

Ms. Meintsma presented images to the Board that showed the French doors in the process of being installed. She commented that the installation of the doors was done on a weekend without a permit and the owners were well aware of the historic aspects because they received three different grants from the City. She added that one of the owners was on the Board of the Museum. In 2008, the owners removed the double-hung windows and installed a French window but the form remained. This installation only affected one façade of the bay window/addition. She stated that it could be returned to a representation of what it was before.

In terms of historic character, she presented an image showing that the rear porch was enclosed and pointed out a historic door with access to the porch. She offered that the lack of foundation in this area supports that this was a porch, as the Code states that if there is no foundation, there can be no interior space above it. She remarked that if a historic area is closed off the City has no power to require the owner to re-open it; however, she felt that to be Code compliant, the City could ask the owner to reveal the porch.

Ms. Meintsma suggested that the porch, in combination with the bay window definitely adds a feeling of character that has historic significance as established in the Determination of Significance Report of 2014. She felt the porch gave more importance and relevance to the bay window addition because it added more interest. On the Historic Sites Inventory of 2021, which is identical to the Historic Sites Inventory of 2014, the

narrative description of the property states “this house also had a west facing covered porch into the northern extension which has been removed and replaced with an addition in the northwest corner of the house.” She argued that it had not been removed, as the roofline remained, but with the closure of the porch, the person preparing the analysis did not know what they were looking at.

Ms. Meintsma addressed the condition of the bay window and Staff’s statement that “with the Material Deconstruction on the façade of the west elevation, the historic form has been compromised.” She argued that the form was not compromised and remains. The façade was compromised with the replacement of the double-hung windows with a French door, but the historic form is 100% still present. She also disagreed with Staff’s conclusion that the bay window no longer holds its essential historic form.

With regard to Staff’s conclusion that using the bump out as a transitional element to attach the proposed addition to the west elevation, Ms. Meintsma argued that, by definition, the bay window was in fact an addition before it was a bay window. She referenced the LMC provisions regarding the guidelines for transitional elements, number 9, which was being used to justify using the bay window to avoid using a transitional element. That provision states that “when an existing non-historic or non-contributing addition is used as a transitional element, the preceding guidelines for transitional elements shall not apply.”

She argued that the bay window must be designated as non-historic and non-contributing so that the guidelines that require a transitional element would not be valid. If the bump out was, in fact, contributing and had historic significance, Ms. Meintsma cited the Code that states when the addition of the historic structure is less than 50% and exceeds the height either due to topography or a larger structure, then there must be a transitional element. She commented that the transitional element must be one-third the width of the least wide adjacent elevation. Both the north and south elevations are about 24’ long, therefore the transitional element must be 8’ long.

Ms. Meintsma understood that this property needed parking, and offered that if she owned this property, she would want to make this work with a garage and accessibility to the house and the street. She analyzed this and felt that an 8’ transitional element would move the garage closer to the street. With regards to setbacks, no variance would be required and there would be room for an 8’ transition on the more non-descript side of the house. She stressed that the bay window and the porch have historic character, and because an addition is required to be visually submissive to a historic structure it would be better if it were eight feet away rather than 3 ½ feet away.

In addition, the historic character of the northwest corner would remain and be visible to anyone walking on Woodside Avenue and Third Street. Ms. Meintsma noted that additions to the secondary façade should be done with caution. They should also be visually subordinate when viewed from the primary right-of-way. She offered that this addition would not be visually subordinate, but it could be visually distinct and separated with a clear transitional element. She felt that an addition of three feet from the historic

structure would not have a transitional element from a structure that would be a story higher than the historic structure.

She referenced a survey by Alliance Engineering and reiterated her comments about foundations under porches in support of her claim that the survey was in error. She felt that Code could require the owner to open up that space, which would show off that element if the longer transition were required.

Ms. Meintsma added that the information regarding the west elevation, as stated in the Physical Conditions report, was incorrect because one historic double-hung window was missing and the larger of the double-hung windows was in the wrong location. She disagreed with the conclusion in the Staff Report that the bump-out did not provide a link to an era in Park City history. She referenced the Determination of Significance that stated that the additions represented the need for Parkites to expand their homes. She offered information and calculations she made to help the applicant construct the transitional element of 8 feet.

There was no further public comment. Chair Scott closed the public hearing.

Chair Scott reminded the Board that their focus was on the 1929 addition and whether it is a historic form. He noted that because it is not the primary façade, they often look at the removal of historic materials to create a transition element. He stressed, however, that this is not the question before the Board. The question is whether the form is historic. He felt that the pre-1929 addition, which included the bump-out and the rear addition, was built in the same period and if one part were historic then the other part would be as well. What the transition element would be is irrelevant for the purposes of this meeting.

He noted that the form did not change after the 1929 Sanborn Map, and the 2014 Staff Report concluded that the addition was historic. The conflict is that the bump-out was singled out as potentially being non-historic. He wanted to be consistent with previous Staff Reports. Chair Scott opined that the form had not changed and was therefore historic.

Board Member Holmgren agreed with Chair Scott. Board Member Hodgkins offered that the bump-out or bay window was likely the most significant design element in the addition to the house as shown on the 1929 Sanborn Map. He would have difficulty concluding that it was not significant, and felt it was the most significant piece of that addition. He did not feel that replacing a window with a door changed its use so significantly that it would no longer be viewed as originally intended to be viewed. Board Member Hutchings agreed with the comments of the other Board Members.

MOTION: Board Member Holmgren moved that the Board consider the small bump-out on the west side of the home at 316 Woodside Avenue as a Contributing Feature that is Historic. Board Member Hutchings seconded the motion.

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

7. ADJOURN

The Historic Preservation Board Meeting adjourned at 7:40 p.m.

Approved by _____
Randy Scott, Chair
Historic Preservation Board

APPROVED