

PARK CITY MUNICIPAL CORPORATION
HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD
MINUTES OF MARCH 3, 2021

BOARD MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE: Chair Randy Scott, Lola Beatlebrox, Puggy Holmgren, John Hutchings, Douglas Stephens, Tana Toly

EX OFFICIO: Gretchen Milliken, Planning Director; Laura Kuhrmeyer, Mark Harrington, Jessica Nelson

The Historic Preservation Board meeting was conducted virtually via Zoom. The public was able to submit eComments 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 April 5, 2021.

Dated March 3, 2021.

ROLL CALL

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

ADOPTION OF MINUTES

Board Member Beatlebrox referred to page 3 of the Minutes and changed devasted to correctly read **devastated**.

Board Member Beatlebrox noted that she was referred to as Mr. Beatlebrox in several places throughout the Minutes and asked that they be changed to correctly read **Ms. Beatlebrox**.

Board Member Beatlebrox referred to page 19 and noted that she had made additional comments that were not reflected in the record and she wanted them added. She added - **Ms. Beatlebrox pointed out that the tax records for the house across the street from 1128 Park Avenue were more complete and contained more information that the records for 1128 Park Avenue. She made the observation that perhaps the record showing the exact date the A-line frame part of the building was erected and standing alone without a shed on it was missing.**

MOTION: Board Member Holmgren moved to APPROVE the Minutes of February 3, 2021 as corrected. Board Member Beatlebrox seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS

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

STAFF/BOARD COMMUNICATIONS AND DISCLOSURES

Chair Scott referred to HB98 and asked if there were additional progress updates beyond what Director Milliken sent to the Board members on February 24th.

City Attorney Mark Harrington reported that progress was made in the past week in getting additional amendments to the bill. However, the bill was still pending. Mr. Harrington reported that they were successful in getting a third line added to qualify a local historic designation in addition to the National and State designation, which helps Park City preserve its design review, the Historic HSI, and Districts. He noted that they have been trying to retain additional design review in the City in general, and two sections aided in the ability to accomplish

that. One is a residential carve out for pre-existing subdivisions substantially built before a date certain that have existing design review criteria codified. It also applies to a third carve out for historic districts, and those must be in existence as of January 2021. Mr. Harrington believed these changes provide additional area to retain their current authority, however, they will likely lose some design review authority in some portions of the City primarily outside of the Historic Districts.

City Attorney Harrington reported that another party was able to include mountain planning language as a further exemption. It appears to be tied to more Mountain Accord type planning districts, but Park City may have some ability to utilize that language. A carve out for resort cities that qualify for the Resort City Sales Tax was co-lobbied by Park City, Moab, and Brian Head, but it did not make it onto the list as a blanket exemption.

City Attorney Harrington emphasized that what was accomplished is good news for the historic districts; however, Chapter 9 in the Land Management Code will need to be substantially modified.

Board Member Beatlebrox asked when HB98 would be voted on. City Attorney Harrington replied that a vote would probably take place today or tomorrow. Ms. Beatlebrox noted that she had called her legislator and reiterated her concerns. She asked if she could do anything else. Mr. Harrington thought it was good that she had contacted her legislator. At this time there was nothing else to do. He believed they had made all the progress they could on the historic end and benefitted from several allies in the lobbying effort. He would continue to monitor the House Bill until the end.

REGULAR AGENDA

- 5.A. 909 Woodside Avenue – Historic District Review
Historic Preservation Board Review for Material Deconstruction of
Significant Historic Site – The Applicant is proposing Material
Deconstruction for the Significant Historic Site consisting of removal of a
portion of the rear wall to accommodate a new addition.

Planner Laura Kuhrmeyer reviewed the application for a material deconstruction for 909 Woodside Avenue, which is a Significant historic site.

The Staff recommended that the Historic Preservation Board review the proposal, conduct a public hearing, and approve the proposed material deconstruction based on the findings of fact, conclusions of law, and conditions of approval as found in the Exhibit A draft final action letter.

Planner Kuhrmeyer reported that the applicant was proposing material deconstruction that consists of removing the historic foundation for the

construction of a new foundation with basement garage addition, and removal of the historic rear wall for the construction of an addition. She presented a slide showing the section of the rear wall that would be removed, which is approximately 16' wide. The applicant was also removing a non-historic addition that was approved by Staff.

Planner Kuhrmeyer showed the proposed remodel and addition at the back of the house. She also presented photos from the 1890s and from 1968 and the Sanborn maps. Planner Kuhrmeyer noted that from the photos it looks like the front part juts out; however, it is actually the roof overhang that creates an optical illusion. She clarified that the front does not project out.

Board Member Beatlebrox stated that she was very confused when she saw the photos and Planner Kuhrmeyer was very helpful in helping her understand that the front did not jut out and that it was an optical illusion.

Board Member Holmgren thought the Staff report was well-done. However, she thought the color choice was marginal. Planner Kuhrmeyer thought the color would probably change in the design.

Chair Scott asked if there was historic material under the aluminum siding in the front. Planner Kuhrmeyer stated that she needed to look at her Design Review Team meeting notes. The VPN was not currently working, and she could not access those notes. However, she recalled that the aluminum siding would be removed and replaced with wood siding.

Chair Scott indicated the roof between the existing and the new portion. He pointed out that on the new portion the roof is flat; however, historically it always had a pitch. He thought they should try to keep the look of the historic roofline. Planner Kuhrmeyer recalled talking about it in Design Review, but she could not recall what was concluded. She assumed the existing porch is not historic which is why the applicant is able to remove it, but she needed to access her notes to be certain. Planner Kuhrmeyer offered to point it out to the applicant. Chair Scott remarked that even the latest Sanborn map in 1941 shows the roof all the way across.

Board Member Beatlebrox noted that it is a shed that was attached to a shotgun house. She understood that the porch that sticks out is not historic and the applicant can do whatever he wants.

John DeGray, the project architect, stated that the rendering is incorrect, and it was being fixed with the revisions he was making to the addition. Mr. DeGray noted that the east elevation shows the correct appearance. He stated that the intent is to keep the porch intact. The columns would be changed to something

more historically accurate because the existing columns are decorative wrought iron.

Chair Scott opened the public hearing.

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

Chair Scott closed the public hearing.

Board Member Hutchings thought this project was a good example of how these projects should be done. It shows the historic house well and also accommodates the addition well. He thought it was well-done.

Board Member Beatlebrox noted that it is down the street from 901 Woodside, and she had toured it today. The elevated foundation with the garage underneath is quite prevalent on that street. Ms. Beatlebrox remarked that 901 Woodside is more elegant than the house at 909 Woodside, but she assumed having a garage would be fine.

Chair Scott commented on the slim space between 905 and 909 Woodside. He asked if setbacks become an issue when the house is raised or whether it will be raised in its own space. Planner Kuhrmeyer replied that it will be raised in the same location. The applicant would need a relocation request to move it. Planner Kuhrmeyer explained that the applicant will need a conditional use permit because it is within the setbacks. That application has not yet been submitted because the applicant wanted to make sure they could do the material deconstruction before submitting plans.

Chair Scott agreed that this was a good project. The applicant was keeping the structure and preserving the structure, and the addition compliments the historic house.

MOTION: Board Member Holmgren moved to APPROVE the proposed material deconstruction for 909 Woodside based on the Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Conditions of Approval as found in the draft action letter. Board Member Hutchings seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

Planner Kuhrmeyer wanted the HPB to be aware that the stairs will be moved from going straight down into the street and instead they will turn and be buried behind the wall to be more consistent with what was there historically. Chair Scott was pleased with the change. The Board members concurred.

Findings of Fact – 909 Woodside Avenue

1. The property is located at 909 Woodside Avenue in the Historic Residential (HR-1) zoning District.
2. The Site is designated as Significant on the Historic Sites Inventory.
3. The legal description of the property is Lots 3 & 4 Block 10 Snyder's Addition to Park City. SA-100-101.
4. On January 26, 2021, the Planning Department received a complete Historic District Design Review (HDDR) application for the property at 909 Woodside Avenue.
5. Development on this property began in the Mature Mining Era (1894-1930).
6. Built prior to 1889, the Structure located at 909 Woodside Avenue is a one and a half story frame side passage type house.
7. The original structure located at 909 Woodside was likely a shotgun house, built circ. 1883 when David C. McLaughlin purchased the lot, with the shed roof addition and rear additions/ modifications having taken place prior to the first 1889 Sanborn map.
8. As seen in the 1889 Sanborn Fire Insurance Map and circ. 1890s photograph, the front porch was centered beneath the gable with a low-pitched roof and four (4) columns.
9. The 1900 Sanborn map shows the porch was extended to full width at that time and remained as such until the latest 1941 Sanborn map.
10. The porch has since been shortened to the low-pitched hipped roof, as seen in the 1968 tax photo which still exists today.
11. Additionally, there are window modifications including the window in the attic/ gable modified to the current size, the addition of a large picture window beneath the primary gable, and windows added along the secondary (side) and tertiary (rear) facades.
12. The rear pitched-roof addition that currently contains a bathroom and mechanical room have been modified outside of what can be confirmed with the Sanborn map which notates a circ. 1900 brick cellar in that rear area of the home and do not retain historic integrity.
13. The proposed Material Deconstruction of the Significant Historic Structure has been reviewed for compliance with LMC § 15-13-2 Design Guidelines for Historic Residential Sites, including the following applicable Design Guidelines:

A. Universal Guidelines:

1. A site should be used as it was Historically or be given a new use that requires minimal change to the distinctive materials and features.
 - Complies; the site will continue to be used as a single-family dwelling and the distinctive features are not proposed to be altered.
2. Changes to a site or building that have acquired Historic significance in their own right should be retained and preserved.
 - Complies; there are no known Historic additions proposed to be removed.
3. The Historic exterior features of a building should be retained and preserved.

- Complies; the Historic exterior features are proposed to be rehabilitated.
4. Distinctive materials, components, finishes, and examples of craftsmanship should be retained and preserved.
- Complies; the applicant is not proposing removal of any distinctive materials, components, finishes or examples of craftsmanship.
5. Deteriorated or damaged Historic features and elements should be repaired rather than replaced.
- Complies; per the submitted Historic Preservation Plan, the applicant proposes to repair rather than replace all deteriorated or damaged Historic features and elements.
6. Features that do not contribute to the significance of the site or building and exist prior to the adoption of these guidelines, such as incompatible windows, aluminum soffits, or iron porch supports or railings, may be maintained; however, if it is proposed they be changed, those features must be brought into compliance with these guidelines.
- Complies; the proposed rehabilitation includes restoring incompatible windows to those that would have been seen Historically.
7. Each site should be recognized as a physical record of its time, place and use. Owners are discouraged from introducing architectural elements or details that visually modify or alter the original building design when no evidence of such elements or details exists.
- Complies; the applicant has not proposed to introduce architectural elements or details.
8. Chemical or physical treatments, if appropriate, should be undertaken using recognized preservation methods. Treatments that cause damage to Historic materials should not be used. Treatments that sustain and protect, but do not alter appearance, are encouraged.
- Complies; the applicant is not proposing to use any treatments that cause known damage to Historic materials.
9. New construction such as new additions, exterior alterations, repairs, upgrades, etc., should not destroy Historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the Historic site or Historic building. New construction should be differentiated from the Historic structure while also maintaining compatibility with the Historic structure in materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the Historic structure, the Historic site, and its environment.
- Complies; the proposed exterior alterations will not damage the Historic Structure.
10. New additions and related new construction should be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the Historic property and its environment could be restored.
- Complies; the essential form and integrity of the Historic property and its environment could be restored if the proposed new construction were to be removed in the future.

B. Specific Guidelines:

2. Primary Structures

a. Exterior Walls

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

- Complies; the applicant proposes to preserve, maintain, and repair the Historic exterior materials.

4. Additions to Primary Structures – The Administrative Staff Review of the Historic District Design Review will confirm compliance with this Design Guideline.

a. Protection for Historic Structures and Sites

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

- Complies; the addition is proposed to be located on the tertiary façade.

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

- Complies; the proposed material deconstruction is for the rehabilitation of the Historic structure and the construction of a new addition.

b. Transitional Elements

The Administrative Staff Review of the Historic District Design Review will confirm compliance with this section of the Design Guidelines.

Conclusions of Law – 909 Woodside Avenue

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

Conditions of Approval – 909 Woodside Avenue

1. Final building plans and construction details shall reflect substantial compliance with the plans approved by the Historic Preservation Board March 3, 2021 for the Material Deconstruction of a portion of the rear wall for the construction of a new addition. Any changes, modifications, or deviations from the approved design that have not been approved in advance by the Planning and Building Departments may result in a stop work order.

2. The applicant is responsible for notifying the Building Department prior to making any changes to the approved plans.
3. Any changes, modifications, or deviations from the approved scope of work shall be submitted in writing for review and approval/denial in accordance with the applicable standards by the Planning Director or his/her designee prior to construction.
4. Where the Historic exterior materials cannot be repaired, they shall be replaced with materials that match the original in all respects: scale, dimension, texture, profile, material and finish. Prior to removing and replacing Historic materials, the applicant shall demonstrate to the Planning Director and Historic Preservation Planner that the materials are no longer safe and/or serviceable and cannot be repaired to a safe and/or serviceable condition. No Historic materials may be disposed of prior to advance approval by the Planning Director and Historic Preservation Planner.
5. The applicant shall submit a cribbing and excavation stabilization shoring plan reviewed and stamped by a State of Utah licensed and registered structural engineer prior to issuance of a building permit. Cribbing or shoring must be of engineer specified materials. Screw-type jacks for raising and lowering the building are not allowed as primary supports once the building is lifted.
6. An encroachment agreement may be required prior to issuance of a building permit for projects utilizing soils nails that encroach onto neighboring properties.
7. A Soils Report completed by a geotechnical engineer as well as a temporary shoring plan, if applicable, will be required at the time of building permit application.
8. Within five (5) days of installation of the cribbing and shoring, the structural engineer will inspect and approve the cribbing and shoring as constructed.
9. Historic Structures which are lifted off the foundation must be returned to the completed foundation within 45 days of the date the building permit was issued.
10. The Planning Director may make a written determination to extend this period up to 30 additional days if, after consultation with the Historic Preservation Planner, Chief Building Official, and City Engineer, he/she determines that it is necessary. This would be based upon the need to immediately stabilize an existing Historic property, or specific site conditions such as access, or lack thereof, exist, or in an effort to reduce impacts on adjacent properties. The applicant is responsible for notifying the Building Department if changes are made. If the cribbing and/or shoring plan(s) are to be altered at any time during the construction of the foundation by the contractor, the structural engineer shall submit a new cribbing and/or shoring plan for review. The structural engineer shall be required to re-inspect and approve the cribbing and/or shoring alterations within five (5) days of any relocation or alteration to the cribbing and/or shoring.
11. The applicant shall also request an inspection through the Building Department following the modification to the cribbing and/or shoring. Failure to request the inspection will be a violation of the Preservation Plan and

enforcement action through the Historic Preservation Financial Guarantee or ACE could take place.

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

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

14. The applicant shall provide physical evidence to support the size and location of the proposed window restoration(s) on the primary façade.

15. Per LMC 15-11-9 Preservation Policy, the Planning Department is authorized to require that the Applicant provide the City with a Financial Guarantee to ensure compliance with the conditions and terms of the Historic Preservation Plan.

5.B. Land Management Code (LMC) Amendment – Proposal to amend the LMC to address Shared Driveways and Common Parking Structures within the Historic Residential Medium Density Zoning District, amending LMC Chapter 15-2.4, LMC Section 15-13-2, LMC Section 15-13-8, and LMC Chapter 15-15. APPLICATION WITHDRAWN

Planner Kuhrmeyer reported that this application was withdrawn and would not be moving forward. The Planning Department was exploring other options for the application that was driving this amendment. The Staff will come back at some point to amend that section of the Code, but it is on hold at this time.

Board Member Stephens noted that the last meeting went longer than expected and the last item on the agenda regarding the Grant Program was continued to this meeting; however, it was not on the agenda this evening.

Planner Kuhrmeyer stated that this would be leaving the City on March 12th and Brendan Conboy would be taking over the historic district matters for the Planning Department. She had not yet reviewed the Grant Program with Planner Conboy; however, applications for the program should be opening within the next week or two. The time period will be approximately 30 days from the opening date. Planner Kuhrmeyer recalled that before leaving the Planning Department, Caitlyn Barhorst had recommended requiring a grant proposal outlining why the grant money is being requested and how it will be used.

The Board Members wished Planner Kuhrmeyer well in her new job.

Historic Preservation Board Meeting
March 3, 2021

The Historic Preservation Board Meeting adjourned at 5:35 p.m.

Approved by _____
Randy Scott, Chair
Historic Preservation Board

APPROVED 04.07.2021