

PARK CITY MUNICIPAL CORPORATION
HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD
MINUTES OF MARCH 4, 2020

BOARD MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE: Douglas Stephens, Lola Beatlebrox, Puggy Holmgren, Jack Hodgkins, Tana Toly

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

ROLL CALL

Chair Stephens called the meeting to order at 5:00 p.m. and noted that all Board Members were present except Jack Hodgkins, who was excused.

ADOPTION OF MINUTES

February 5, 2020

MOTION: Board Member Holmgren moved to APPROVE the minutes of February 5, 2020 as written. Board Member Hodgkins seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS

There were no comments.

STAFF/BOARD COMMUNICATIONS AND DISCLOSURES

Director Erickson reported that last week the City Council approved the HPB recommendation to change material deconstruction to an Administrative position.

Director Erickson stated that the Grant Program would be coming forward this week. The City Council was providing more funding than what was previously authorized.

Director Erickson noted that the IT Department had completed setting up new technology. He explained that changes and noted that the HPB meeting was screening live. The mics on the dais were hot mics. He reminded the Board Members to always speak directly into their microphones.

REGULAR AGENDA

- 5.A. 440 Main Street – Historic Preservation Board Review of Material Deconstruction of a Landmark Historic Site – The Applicant is proposing to rehabilitate the Landmark Historic Structure following the Material

Deconstruction of the Historic Main Street Façade and non-historic rear façade.
(Application PL-18-04052)

Planner Laura Kuhrmeyer reviewed the application for material deconstruction at 440 Main Street. She noted that the front façade facing Main Street is the historic façade that is proposed to be modified. The applicant was only proposing to push back the non-historic front door. Changes were being proposed for the rear façade, but the rear façade is non-historic.

Planner Kuhrmeyer stated that there was little photographic evidence of the original historic entrance. She presented a 1930s photos showing that the entrance was recessed at some point. Another photo from the 1940s was shadowed and it was difficult to determine how it actually looked at that time.

Planner Kuhrmeyer showed slides of the existing facade and the existing floor plan; as well as the new plan being proposed. She indicated the door that would be pushed back and noted that the change was minor.

The Staff supported pushing the door back so it would not open onto Main Street. It is also consistent with other designs seen in similar buildings on Main Street. Planner Kuhrmeyer reiterated that the rear side would be also be changed, but the rear has non-historic material from a 1980s addition. None of the doors and windows are historic and no changes were being proposed. The storefront facade would remain essentially the same; however, orange panels over the front door on the Main Street façade will be removed to return to the original design.

The Staff recommended that the HPB conduct a public hearing and approve the requested material deconstruction.

Chair Stephens assumed the purpose was to accommodate a new retail tenant in the lower level consistent with the intent of Swede Alley becoming more of a commercial use. Jonathan DeGray, the project architect, stated that the proposed Swede Alley elevation is to accommodate an entrance to a sub-leased space. The current owner has renovated the building. The bottom floor is still unfinished and does not yet have a tenant. The idea of modifying the entrance on Main Street was to get rid of the non-historic door on the front façade. The proposal would retain the opening but allow people to walk in from the sidewalk and have the opportunity to go to either the upstairs leased space or the downstairs leased space from the foyer instead of dealing with an airlock door, which is unnecessary in that location. Mr. DeGray stated that opening would not be modified by removing the door. It would also create a safer condition because there is an existing step in front of the historic door that does not meet Code. It would remove an improper landing in front of the current door.

Chair Stephens did not believe there was much of a change on the Swede Alley side. He noted that there was a lot of mechanical on the back.

Chair Stephens opened the public hearing.

There were no comments.

Chair Stephens closed the public hearing.

MOTION: Board Member Hodgkins moved to APPROVE the material deconstruction for 440 Main Street as outlined and in accordance with the Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Conditions of Approval as found in the Staff report. Board Member Beatlebrox seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

Findings of Fact – 440 Main Street

1. The property is located at 440 Main Street. The Legal Description is Lot A 440 Main Street Plat Amendment.
2. On July 11, 2019, the Park City Council approved Ordinance 2019-39, approving the 440 Main Street Plat Amendment; it was recorded on October 2, 2019. The Conditions of Approval of this plat amendment continue to apply.
3. On August 29, 2019, the Planning Department received a complete Historic District Design Review (HDDR) for the remodel of an existing Historic Commercial Structure at 440 Main Street.
4. A public hearing was held for the HDDR application on September 12, 2019.
5. The property is located in the Historic Commercial Business (HCB) zoning district and is subject to all requirements of the Park City Land Management Code (LMC) and all the guidelines of the Historic District Design Guidelines.
6. This site is listed as Landmark on the Historic Sites Inventory (HSI).
7. The current building was constructed circa 1900. However, a previous building first appears on the Sanborn Fire Insurance Map in 1889.
8. In 1882, the lot was purchased by Edward and Joseph Theriot, who built a one-story building with a basement (see 1889 Sanborn Map), which housed two businesses and had a canopy over its Main Street façade.
9. In 1891, the building was torn down by First National Bank to construct a new Park City branch. The new bank building was completed in 1891.
10. The building was a casualty of the Great Fire of June 21, 1898. Reconstruction was not completed until 1902.
11. In 1905, the building was bought by the City Attorney and turned into a law office.
12. The building was turned into a restaurant in 1910 by Joe Julian. The building has housed various businesses and restaurants since.

13. In 1988, an addition was constructed on the rear (Swede Alley) side of the building, adding approximately 1,241 square feet to the footprint.

14. Based on our records, the building was reroofed in 1999 and 2001.

15. In 2011, Shane Barber applied for and received a Historic District Grant in the amount of \$7,660. The scope of work included removing the siding and trim below the windowsill on the Main Street side and replace with like material and repainting the building front. Based on our records, it appears the work was not completed and the grant expired.

16. In 2015, Jennifer Barber applied for a Historic District Grant, but the application was withdrawn on March 26, 2015. A Historic District Design Review was approved in March 2015 and the scope of work included: reframing the front wall where needed, installing new insulated glass windows, and replacing wood paneled kick-plate in kind. The scope also included removing the bump-out at the base of the storefront, beneath the glass windows and returning the flat appearance of the façade. The primary façade components (window/door configurations, wall planes, recesses, steps, and entryways) were retained in the original location.

17. The Historic Structure has received various alterations during and outside of the Historic period. The building has also undergone many interior remodels, but overall, the building has retained its historical appearance.

18. The applicant is proposing to: modify the storefront (west – Main Street) Historic façade to include a recessed entryway; remove paneling that covers the historic window openings above the storefront door; and modify the rear (east – Swede Alley) non-historic façade to allow for a more commercial entrance.

19. The proposed scope of work mitigates any impact that will occur to the Historic significance of the Site.

20. The Historic Main Street elevation is to remain with the exception of a modified front door area and approximately 41.65 square feet will be impacted. While there is little photographic evidence of the original Historic storefront, the photograph below (Figure 5) shows a recessed entryway was present in the 1930s. The 1940s tax photograph shows the front façade, but the shadows make it difficult to determine what the front entryway looked like at that time.

21. Staff finds the proposed front door alteration is consistent with the Design Guidelines. Per LMC §15-13-3(B)(2)(d)(5), if historic recessed entry has been lost during a previous renovation, reconstruction should be considered. Further, per LMC §15-13-3(B)(2)(d)(8), if no evidence of the historic door appearance is available, new doors should be similar in materials and configuration to historic doors on commercial buildings of similar period. Additionally, the proposed design would move the front door back so that it does not open onto the Main Street public sidewalk.

22. The Swede Alley, rear façade is non-historic and will be completely remodeled. The proposed commercial entry would be consistent with the Park City General Plan (Goal 16, City Implementation Strategies 16.11) by improving Swede Alley as a secondary retail location.

23. Staff finds the proposed exterior changes will not damage or destroy the exterior architectural features of the subject property which are compatible with the character of the Historic Structure

24. There are no existing Historic doors or windows. All doors and windows have been replacement at a time outside the Historic period. The Physical Conditions Report notes there are no Historic doors remaining. A new door, consistent with the style and dimensions, will be installed on the storefront façade, to be approved by the Historic Preservation Planner prior to installation. As the Physical Conditions report notes, there are proposed changes to the windows on the storefront façade. The only window changes are on the rear, non-historic façade.

25. The HPB found compliance, as conditioned, with the LMC §15-13-3. Specifically,

A. The proposal complies with LMC §15-13-3(A) Universal Design Guidelines:

- 1) The site shall be used as it was historically.
- 2) The changes to the site or building that have acquired historic significance in their own right shall be retained and preserved.
- 3) The historic exterior features of the building shall be retained and preserved.
- 4) Distinctive materials, components, finishes, construction techniques, and examples of craftsmanship shall be retained and preserved.
- 5) Universal Design Guideline #5 is not applicable as no historic materials are being affected.
- 6) Non-historic alterations that have been made to elements of a property, such as window replacements, eave enclosures, or porch element substitutions that are in place prior to the adoption of these Design Guidelines may be maintained. However, if additional alterations to these elements are proposed, the elements must be brought into compliance with these Design Guidelines.
- 7) The Applicant is not proposing to introduce architectural elements or details that visually modify or alter the original building design without evidence of such elements existing historically. No photographic evidence is present of the circa 1940s modifications; however, staff finds the proposed front façade modification of the entrance door location is consistent with what would have been seen historically.
- 8) Chemical or physical treatments, if appropriate, shall be undertaken using recognized preservation methods. Treatments that cause damage to historic material shall not be used. Treatments that sustain and protect the historic building and its occupants, but do not alter appearance, are encouraged.

9) New construction, such as additions, exterior alterations, repairs, upgrades, etc. shall not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the historic site or historic building.

10) Universal Design Guideline #10 is not applicable as no new construction is proposed.

11) The proposed project must not cause the building, site, or Historic District to be removed from the National Register of Historic Places.

B. The proposal complies with Specific Design Guidelines for Historic Commercial Sites LMC §15-13-3(B)(1) Site Design:

- a. Building Setback and Orientation. The Applicant has not proposed any changes to the existing setbacks of the building. While the original main entry may have been altered in the past, the Applicant proposes to re-introduce a recessed entryway, which is more consistent with what was seen historically.
- b. Topography and Grading. The Applicant has not proposed any changes to topography or grading.
- c. Landscaping and Vegetation. The Applicant has not proposed any changes to landscaping or vegetation.
- d. Sidewalks, Plazas, and Other Street Improvements. The Applicant has not proposed any changes to sidewalks, plazas, or other street improvements.
- e. Parking and Driveways. The Applicant has not proposed any changes to parking or driveways.

C. The proposal complies with Specific Design Guidelines for Historic Commercial Sites LMC §15-13-3(B)(2) Primary Structures:

- a. Foundation. The Applicant has not proposed any changes to foundation.
- b. Exterior Walls. The Applicant proposes to modify the Main Street façade to include a recessed front entryway. This is consistent with what was seen historically and a portion of a recessed entry can be seen in the circ. 1930s photograph. The Applicant also proposes to create a commercial entrance on the rear non-historic façade.
- c. Roofs. The Applicant has not proposed any changes to roofs.
- d. Storefronts. While little documentary evidence shows the historic recessed entry on the storefront, the Applicant is proposing an entryway that is similar to ones seen on other commercial buildings from a similar period. The Applicant is not proposing any changes to the window configuration on the storefront.
- e. Doors (Not Included in Storefronts). There are no historic doors on the rear façade, as it is a non-historic addition. The proposed doors, as conditioned, will be similar to those found historically in Park City and will be similar in size, location, and type to those on the Historic structure.

- f. Windows (Not Included in Storefronts). There are no historic windows on the rear façade. The proposed windows, as conditioned will be similar in location, size, scale, type, and glazing pattern to those seen on the Historic structure.
- g. Gutters. The Applicant has not proposed any changes to gutters.
- h. Historic Balconies/Porticos. There are no historic balconies or porticos.
- i. Decks, Fire Escapes, and Exterior Staircases. There are no historic decks, fire escapes, or exterior staircases.
- j. Chimneys and Stovepipes. There are no historic chimneys or stovepipes.
- k. Architectural Features. There are no proposed changes to the architectural features (eaves, brackets, cornices, moldings, trim work, decorative shingles) on the Main Street façade. The Applicant proposes to add corbel detailing on the rear façade.

D. Specific Design Guidelines for Historic Commercial Sites LMC §15-13-3(B)(3) Mechanical Equipment, Communications, and Service Areas is not applicable as there are no proposed changes to these items.

E. Specific Design Guidelines for Historic Commercial Sites LMC §15-13-3(B)(4) Additions to Primary Structures is not applicable as there are no proposed additions at this time.

26. The HPB made the following findings with respect to Material Deconstruction Review Checklist Criterion:

- A. Criterion 1: The proposed work is not Routine Maintenance.
- B. Criterion 2: The proposed Material Deconstruction is required for renovation of the building.
- C. Criterion 3: The proposed work does not damage or destroy the exterior architectural features.
- D. Criterion 4: The proposed work mitigates any impacts that will occur to the visual character of the neighborhood; Historical significance of the Structure; architectural integrity of the Structure; and structural stability. All proposed Material Deconstruction complies with applicable Design Guidelines.
- E. Criterion 5: The proposed work will not compromise the historical importance of other structures on the property and on adjacent properties.
- F. Criterion 6: All additions to the Structure have been found to be noncontributory to the historic integrity or historical significance of the structure or site.

Conclusions of Law – 440 Main Street

1. The proposal complies with the Land Management Code (LMC) requirements pursuant to 15-2.6 Historic Commercial Business (HCB) District.
2. The proposal complies with the Land Management Code (LMC) requirements pursuant to 15-13-3 Design Guidelines for Historic Commercial Sites.

3. The proposal meets the criteria for Material Deconstruction pursuant to LMC §15-11-12.5 Historic Preservation Board Review for Material Deconstruction.

Conditions of Approval – 440 Main Street

1. Final building plans and construction details shall reflect substantial compliance with the HDDR proposal submitted on January 22, 2020. Any changes, modifications, or deviations from the approved design that have not been approved by the Planning and Building Departments may result in a stop work order.
2. The applicant is responsible for notifying the Planning and Building Departments if changes are made.
3. Any changes, modifications, or deviations from the approved scope of work shall be submitted in writing for review and approval/denial in accordance with the applicable standards by the Planning Director or his/her designee prior to construction.
4. Should any Historic material be discovered while deconstructing the storefront, the Physical Conditions Report and Preservation Plan shall be amended to document the condition of the storefront materials and provide an updated scope of work to the satisfaction of the Historic Preservation Planner.
5. All windows and doors shall be compliant with Design Guidelines for Historic Commercial Sites.
6. All windows on the non-historic addition will be aluminum-clad wood or wood material. No vinyl or aluminum windows are permitted.

5.B. Land Management Code) LMC) Amendment – Amending the LMC to Remove the Requirement that Solar Energy Systems Shall be at Least One Foot (1') from the Eave of a Roof by Amending LMC 15-5-5(G)(3)(b).
(Application PL-20-04463)

Planner Liz Jackson presented proposed Land Management Code Amendments for Pitched Roof Solar Energy Systems within the Historic Districts. Within LMC Section 15-5-5(G)(3)(b), the Staff was proposing to remove the requirement that pitched roof solar energy systems be at least one foot from the eave of a roof. Some from the design community, solar professionals, and City Staff believe there is no reason to have that requirement from design a standpoint or a safety standpoint. The second proposal was to modify the images and provide examples to show that the solar systems can now go to the roof eave.

Planner Jackson provided an example showing how the solar system can go to the edge of the roof eave.

Board Member Hodgkins asked if the Staff made it clear that the solar system could only go to the edge and not hang over; or whether they were only removing

the 1' buffer. Planner Jackson replied that for now it could only go to the edge of the eave. Director Erickson stated that Planner Jackson had worked closely with the Building Department, particularly on on roof drainage to make sure it would not create an ice damn at the end of the solar. He was comfortable with the proposal to remove the 1' buffer requirement. Director Erickson clarified that they heard conflicting interpretations from the Fire Marshall and the Fire District about the difficulty of climbing over solar panels on a roof to fight a roof fire. However, that was not the case and the Building Official and the Fire Marshall had signed off on Planner Jackson's recommendation.

The Staff recommended that the Historic Preservation Board review the proposed Land Management Code Amendments to address pitched roof-mounted Solar Energy Systems in the Historic Districts by amending LMC 15-5-5 - Architectural Design Guidelines, open a public hearing, and consider forwarding a positive recommendation to Planning Commission and City Council on the proposed Amendments.

Planner Tyler pointed out that the language in the Code only allows solar panels on gable roofs that do not face the right-of-way. A flat porch roof would need to comply with the flat roof ordinance, which requires a 4' distance from the end of the eave, which would only provide a smaller array.

Chair Stephens opened the public hearing.

There were no comments.

Chair Stephens closed the public hearing.

MOTION: Board Member Beatlebrox moved to forward a POSITIVE recommendation to the Planning Commission and the City Council on the proposed amendments to LMC 15-5-5(G)(3)(b) to remove the requirement that Solar Energy Systems shall be at least one-foot from the eave of a roof as outlined in the draft ordinance. Board Member Hodgkins seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

The Historic Preservation Board Meeting adjourned at 6:18 p.m.

Approved by _____
Douglas Stephens, Chair
Historic Preservation Board