



**PARK CITY MUNICIPAL CORPORATION
HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD
MINUTES OF MARCH 2, 2022**

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

EX OFFICIO MEMBERS: Gretchen Milliken, Planning Director; Aiden Lillie, Planner; Mark Harrington, City Attorney

1. ROLL CALL

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

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

Determination of the Health and Safety Risk under the OPMA

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

Public notice is hereby given that the Historic Preservation Board of Park City, Utah will hold its Regular Meeting electronically on Zoom, through www.parkcity.org/public-meetings for the purposes and at the times as described below on March 2, 2022.

2. MINUTES APPROVAL

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

MOTION: Board Member Holmgren moved to APPROVE the Minutes of February 2, 2022, as written. Board Member Beatlebrox 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

City Planner, Aiden Lillie, reported that there was an open call for artists as part of the 2022 Annual Cindy Matsumoto Historic Preservation Awards. The request for proposals opened on February 14, 2022, and would close on March 14, 2022. Planner Lillie noted that she reached out to many organizations and schools in the region, including the University of Utah, Brigham Young University, Utah Valley University, Salt Lake Community College, the Utah Arts Alliance, Preservation Utah, as well as other organizations within Summit County and the State. The Communications Department also shared posts on social media and flyers were posted in locations such as community coffee shops and libraries. The Board Members were impressed by the broad level of outreach. Board Member Beatlebrox informed Planner Lillie that she would be out of town on March 20, 2022, and asked that the interviews take place the week of March 14-18, 2022. Planner Lillie made note of the request.

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 reported that the Work Session would be dedicated to the Historic District Grant Program. The purpose of the Work Session was to reevaluate the scope of the program, determine criteria and evaluation methods, and explore additional opportunities for the program. During the previous cycle in Fiscal Year 2022, the Historic Preservation Board and Planning Staff identified opportunities to improve the Historic District Grant Program. The matter was discussed during the February 2, 2022, Historic Preservation Board Meeting. However, the Board decided to table the conversation at that time because several members were not present.

At the February 2, 2022, Historic Preservation Board Meeting, the Board discussed the following items related to the Historic District Grant Program:

- The proposed evaluation criteria:
 - Adding more points to the analysis evaluation criteria per question. There would be 0-4 points available to the applicant for each question.
- Running the Competitive Grant Cycle annually as opposed to biannually;
- Allowing Staff to grant awardees extensions on a per-application basis;
- The removal of interior work, exterior paint, or any other type of work that would fall under routine maintenance from the Competitive and Repair categories; and
- Predetermining the total dollar amounts allocated to the Repair category and the Competitive category.

The Staff Report included several different sections of analysis. In the first analysis, Staff recommended that the Historic Preservation Board determine the scope of work for the

Fiscal Year 2023 Competitive Grant Cycle and Emergency Grant Cycle. Several questions were posed to the Historic Preservation Board:

- Should routine maintenance qualify for Competitive Historic District Grant Program funds?
- Should studies qualify for the Historic District Grant Program funds?
- Should projects in progress qualify for Historic District Grant Program funds?
- Should Historic District Grant Program awards have a cap?

In the second analysis, Staff recommended that the Historic Preservation Board determine the Historic District Grant Program mission. Some suggestions included:

- Adopt a Historic District Grant Program mission statement that reflects contemporary conditions, values, and opportunities for impact; and
- Create Historic District Grant Program guidelines:
 - Create a clear and transparent scoring system;
 - Upgrade grant eligibility.

In the third analysis, Staff recommended that the Historic Preservation Board determine the Historic District Grant Program requirements:

- Façade easements and lien;
- Application materials; and
- Timing.

Planner Lillie explained that in the previous cycle for Fiscal Year 2022, an applicant who received the award was required to enter into a lien. If the property owner sells the property within a year of receiving funds, those funds need to be repaid. If the property owner sells the property within five years of receiving funds, there was a formula to determine how much needed to be paid back. After five years, the funds do not need to be repaid. Planner Lillie discussed façade easements and stated that property owners entered into an Easement Agreement to ensure that the facades of the structure were not destroyed. She asked the Board to consider which requirements made the most sense for the Historic District Grant Program.

In the fourth analysis, Staff recommended that the Historic Preservation Board provide input on community outreach:

- Build a database of grant-supported projects for management and reporting purposes; and
- Establish a communications strategy to raise awareness, and build community knowledge and engagement.

Chair Scott suggested that the Board discuss each of the Staff recommendations in order. Board Members discussed the first question posed by Planner Lillie:

- Should routine maintenance qualify for Competitive Historic District Grant Program funds?

Board Member Beatlebrox thanked Planner Lillie for summarizing what was discussed at the last Historic Preservation Board Meeting. Board Member Stephens explained that when the grant program was first started, there were a lot of buildings in a state of disrepair. Repair funds were intended to help save those buildings. He felt that when a historic home is purchased in Old Town, there is an expectation that maintenance costs will be associated with that purchase. He did not believe that repairs and maintenance to the outside of the home should be included in the Historic District Grant Program. It would be worthwhile to save the money for preservation as much as possible. There was a discussion regarding emergency repairs. It might be best to bring emergency repair requests to the Historic Preservation Board for consideration rather than have emergency repairs formally built into the grant program. Planner Lillie pointed out that emergency repair requests are rare occurrences. It made sense to bring those requests directly to the Historic Preservation Board for consideration.

The Historic Preservation Board discussed the second question posed by Planner Lillie:

- Should studies qualify for the Historic District Grant Program funds?

Chair Scott stated that he would rather reserve the funds for the preservation of property than a study. Council Member Beatlebrox noted that at the last Board Meeting, there were concerns that a study would be conducted and then nothing would happen afterward. Board Member Stephens asked if any studies had been requested for residential historic homes. Planner Lillie explained that the question about whether to include studies was the result of a grant application from Friends of Ski Mountain Mining History. The application was not rejected because the information guide was vague and did not say that studies were ineligible. In terms of residential historic homes, no one had ever requested funds for a residential site study. However, there may be homeowners who wanted to explore lifting their homes to construct a foundation. This would require an engineer to come out and study the structure.

Board Member Stephens suggested keeping the language vague. If there was an application for a study, it could be analyzed and discussed in conjunction with the other grant applications. If it is approved would depend on the other grant applications received that year. Chair Scott agreed with the suggestion. He noted that a study application would be a rare occurrence. Board Member Stephens felt that the more high-quality applications were received, the better because it would make the program more visible. He hoped that would lead to additional funding. Planning Director, Gretchen Milliken believed it was a good approach to keep the language open. Applications for studies were not received often and the vague language would allow those types of applications to be considered and discussed.

The Historic Preservation Board discussed the third question posed by Planner Lillie:

- Should projects in progress qualify for Historic District Grant Program funds?

Board Member Stephens believed that the program was intended to help improve restoration. Just because someone did not apply for the grant before they started a project did not believe the property owner should be penalized. The grant application process only took place once a year and it would not be fair to ask people to hold off on work until after the grant application process started. Board Member Beatlebrox agreed. Chair Scott pointed out that the grant may also allow a property owner to improve the quality of restoration already in progress.

The Historic Preservation Board discussed the fourth question posed by Planner Lillie:

- Should Historic District Grant Program awards have a cap?

Chair Scott did not know what the proposed cap would be but last year there was a \$15,000 cap to share the grant funds as much as possible. Board Member Beatlebrox did not believe a cap was helpful because it was important to substantially help restoration projects. Chair Scott suggested that the Historic Preservation Board could have a general cap in place but the Board could reserve the right to make modifications based on the size and scope of the application. Board Member Stephens did not believe there should be a cap. If there was a cap set for \$15,000, applicants may be disappointed that their project did not receive the full amount. The ultimate cap would be the amount of money that there was to allocate to projects.

Director Milliken explained that during the last grant process, even though there was a \$15,000 cap, many applications were for \$75,000 or \$100,000. It could be difficult to analyze that type of application when there was such a large scope. Board Member Stephens noted that there would always be applications for more than there was to give. In the next cycle, he suggested that the decisions be more targeted. For instance, if it was a \$100,000 application, then \$10,000 could be granted for work specific to windows. It was possible to help with a specific portion of a larger project.

Board Member Beatlebrox felt it was important to communicate the total amount the Historic District Grant Program had to allocate to projects. Chair Scott agreed and noted that clear communication with applicants is essential. Board Member Holmgren explained that in the past grant applications included the cost of each item. For instance, the cost of the doors or windows. If applicants listed out the costs, it would make it easier to determine which portion of the project to fund. Board Member Stephens noted that the application process could continue to be streamlined in the future.

There was discussion regarding the mission statement. Chair Scott read the amended language proposed by Staff, which was 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 to support a community that honors its past and encourages historic preservation.

Chair Scott was supportive of the amendments. Board Member Beatlebrox suggested that it be altered slightly to state, "... to support our community." The Historic Preservation Board liked the suggestion. Planner Lillie asked the Board to discuss the possible creation of Historic District Grant Program guidelines, which would:

- Create a clear and transparent scoring system; and
- Upgrade grant eligibility.

The previous evaluation forms were included as Exhibits in the Staff Report. Planner Lillie pointed out that the forms were a way to communicate with the public. They made it clear how applicants would be evaluated and how applicants could receive a better score. Board Member Stephens believed that after the applications were received, Planning Staff would review the applications, use the evaluation forms, and share recommendations. The Board would then consider those recommendations. He felt it was important for the Board to weigh in on the scoring process as well. Board Member Beatlebrox wanted the Board to go through a separate scoring process. The two sets of scores could then be compared and discussed.

The Historic District Grant Program scorecard was shared. Planner Lillie explained that it was a draft version. Previously, there were sections with 0-1 points, but based on the feedback received, there was a desire to have a broader range. Some sections included scores from 0-4 and some were 0-3. However, that could be adjusted to have consistency from section to section, if desired by the Board. Chair Scott thought the scorecard looked good and did not mind some sections having different ranges.

Director Milliken noted that there were a lot of applications during the last cycle. That was not always the case, but she suggested that it may make sense to have a preliminary review committee, made up of a few Board Members and Staff Members, to weed out ineligible or low-scoring applications. The Board felt that made sense.

Planner Lillie asked the Board to discuss the possibility of bonus points on the scorecard. For instance, some community contributions could be considered. Bonus points had not been included in the draft scorecard, because she wanted to receive feedback from the Board first. Board Member Stephens felt that community contributions were admirable but would be difficult to monitor within the grant process.

Planner Lillie asked the Board to discuss the third analysis, which asked that the Historic Preservation Board determine the Historic District Grant Program requirements:

- Façade easements and lien;

- Application materials; and
- Timing.

The Duval Study listed the following requirements as part of the Competitive Historic District Grant Program Funds Score Card:

- All projects \$10,000 or less will require entering into a five-year lien with the City. Should the property be sold within that five-year period, the applicant is responsible for repaying the City a prorated amount of the total grant disbursement; and
- For projects \$10,000.01 or more, the applicant will be required to donate a façade easement to the City that will be recorded on the property.

Planner Lillie asked the Board to discuss the language related to the façade easements and lien requirements. Board Member Stephens wondered if there would be a lien on the property if a project was awarded more than \$10,000. Planner Lillie explained that all projects would have a lien on the property but there would also be a façade easement on projects that received a larger amount of funding. Based on previous discussions, it seemed that \$25,000 and above was suitable for the façade easement requirement. Board Member Stephens pointed out that people may not want to apply for the program, because a façade easement would further restrict their property. He felt that the Historic District Guidelines and Land Management Code requirements were strict enough. It was important not to scare applicants away from the program.

City Attorney, Mark Harrington explained that when the program first started, façade easements were required with almost all of the awards, but went away for a while because they were administratively burdensome and burdensome to the property owners. If there was a major investment made in a project, it may make sense to consider the façade easement. The Board determined that if \$25,000 or more was awarded through the program, there should be a façade easement.

Planner Lillie asked for feedback related to the application materials. She reported that last year, there was a section that allowed the applicant to provide a brief project description or narrative. Chair Scott felt it was important for the Board to hear some of the applicant's story as part of the application. Board Member Beatlebrox wondered whether the application form would be a fillable PDF form that applicants could type directly onto. Planner Lillie confirmed this and noted that the City was moving towards applications being done entirely online. Board Member Beatlebrox felt it was important for the applicant to be able to fill out the application online, otherwise, it would be far more difficult to put everything together for submission.

Board Member Stephens suggested that Planning Staff create a sample application for applicant review. If someone was filling out the Historic District Grant Program application for the first time, the process could be overwhelming. However, having a sample application that is filled out to let applicants know what is expected of them. He felt this

would improve the quality of the applications and save the Board time during the evaluation process. Director Milliken stated that Staff could create a sample application.

Planner Lillie asked if the Board felt an application needed to include a project description. Board Member Stephens felt that a project description should not necessarily state the reason someone was applying for a grant. Instead, it should explain how the grant would benefit the project. He believed the Board needed to be specific about what they were asking applicants. Board Member Beatlebrox suggested that there be a desired word count listed to make sure the expectations were clear for applicants. Planner Lillie noted that a word count could be listed and the wording could be clarified to match the comments shared by Board Member Stephens.

There was discussion regarding communication and information. Planner Lillie noted that the website could be used to let homeowners know about other available grants. There was also an opportunity to let homeowners know about proper preservation methods. For instance, the application packet could include resources about recommended materials or restoration that would heighten the preservation of a historic structure. Some outside resources, such as the National Park Service standards and guidelines, could also be included for reference. Chair Scott felt that type of information would be beneficial for applicants to have. Staff would explore how to best share relevant information with program applicants.

Board Member Stephens reported that when the grant program was initially started, the grant was timed with the Park City Museum history month and home tours. He wondered if it would be possible to coordinate again with Park City Museum. Chair Scott believed it would be fairly easy to coordinate with them. Planner Lillie explained that previously, pamphlets were created and tours were led. That was something that Staff could reintroduce now that there was a full team of planners in the department. Planning Staff could work to provide materials and focus on coordination.

Planner Lillie reminded the Board Members that in the fourth analysis, Staff recommended that the Historic Preservation Board provide input on community outreach. She shared recommendations from the Duval study with the Board:

- Build a database of grant-supported projects for management and reporting purposes:
 - Create a database of projects to track them from the time a grant is awarded to the time the grant is paid out;
 - Apply metrics defined in recommendation 1.3 into a program database, so that the performance and contribution of projects supported by the grant program can be measured;
 - Use the database to mitigate the management challenges inherent in the current disconnect between the fixed level of non-rollover funding sources (operations, not capital dollars) and the multi-year activities that the grant dollars fund, by incorporating projections over time; and

- Include data about the funding source for each project.
- Establish a communications strategy to raise awareness, build community knowledge and engagement, and tell Park City's story:
 - Establish a website with program information and resources;
 - Create opportunities for news coverage; and
 - Recognize projects and people who have made significant contributions through the use of the grant.

The Board Members were in support of the recommendations. Planner Lillie wanted to confirm that the Board only wanted a competitive grant program moving forward and that there would not be a repair fund. However, repair funds could be carved out for special exceptions. Board Members confirmed this. Director Milliken felt that good progress had been made during the Work Session discussions.

6. REGULAR AGENDA

A. 341 Ontario Avenue – Disassembly and Reassembly and Material Deconstruction – The Applicant Proposes Material Deconstruction and Disassembly and Reassembly to Accommodate Structural Upgrades and New Additions to a Significant Historic Structure. PL-15-02687.

Planner Lillie presented the Staff Report and explained that the proposal was for disassembly, reassembly, and material deconstruction at 341 Ontario Avenue. The applicant proposed material deconstruction of the Significant Structure's roof, along with the east and south panels, as well as disassembly and reassembly of the west and north panels. The site included a one-story hall and parlor-style home that was constructed sometime after 1900. It was listed as a Significant Historic Site on Park City's Historic Sites Inventory. The structure sat on a steep slope on Ontario Avenue, which was only accessible by City stairs that led to a set of private stairs. The building was constructed into the steep hillside and was historically accessed by foot from below the structure, not directly from Ontario Avenue. The historic orientation made it difficult for the proposed restoration work and new construction efforts to take place.

Example images of the site were shared with the Board. The first analysis section of the Staff Report was related to the material deconstruction proposed for portions of the south and east elevations and the roof. Planner Lillie explained that the proposal was to construct structural upgrades. The material had deteriorated due to moisture and exposure as well as the weight of the soil on the hillside. There were several failures along the wall and the panels had splintered on the east and south elevations. The roof itself was not quite intact and the applicant representative deemed it as not salvageable. Additional images were shared to illustrate the current conditions of the materials.

The second analysis section of the Staff Report was related to the disassembly and reassembly of the west and north elevations of the structure. Planner Lillie explained that

the applicant previously hoped to be able to lift the structure. However, after the interior demo, the applicant did not believe the structure would survive a lift due to issues with the panels as well as splitting on the floor and the walls. Due to the constraints on the site and the poor condition of the materials, panelization was proposed. Shen Engineers Inc. certified that the structure could not be reasonably moved intact. The specific findings from the engineer were included in the Staff Report.

Planner Lillie reported that the Chief Building Official and Planning Director visited 341 Ontario Avenue and determine that the building could only be made safe or serviceable through panelization. The structure would not survive the temporary lifting of moving the building as a single unit. Board Members did not feel they needed to see additional photos, as many had been able to attend a site visit before the Historic Preservation Board Meeting. Chair Scott noted that he had not seen anything in that condition before and was glad there was an opportunity to preserve what was left. The condition of the wood made it too difficult to raise the structure. Board Member Stephens noted that once soil is up against the wood, it impacted the overall condition of the wood. Board Member Beatlebrox commented that access to the area was difficult.

There were no comments from the public.

MOTION: Board Member Holmgren moved to APPROVE the Material Deconstruction and Disassembly and Reassembly to Accommodate Structural Upgrades and New Additions to a Significant Historic Structure, Located at 341 Ontario Avenue, subject to the following:

Findings of Fact

Background

1. 341 Ontario Avenue is a one-story frame hall-parlor built c.1900.
2. 341 Ontario Avenue is a Significant Historic Structure on the Park City Historic Sites Inventory.
3. On May 12, 2014, the Planning Department received a Plat Amendment application to remove an internal lot line that ran under the Historic Structure. On July 31, 2014, the City Council approved it.
4. On September 22, 2015, the property owner submitted a Steep Slope Conditional Use Permit (SSCUP) application. On August 8, 2018, the Planning Commission approved the SSCUP. On April 10, 2019, the property owner applied to extend the SSCUP approval. On April 8, 2021, Planning Staff approved an extension to the SSCUP.

5. On November 4, 2016, the Applicant submitted a Historic District Design Review (HDDR) Application. On June 13, 2019, the Planning Department approved the 98 HDDR Application. On June 30, 2020, the property owner applied to extend the previous HDDR approval. On February 10, 2021, the Planning Director approved a one-year extension.
6. On May 9, 2017, the property owner applied for a variance to reduce the front Setbacks and Height. On April 17, 2018, the Board of Adjustment approved three variances: (1) Reducing the front Setback from 10 feet to four feet, six inches; (2) Allowing Building Height above Existing Grade up to 35 feet; and (3) Allowing a maximum interior height of 35 feet to 39 feet six inches.
7. On December 10, 2018, the property owner applied for an Administrative Conditional Use Permit to construct retaining walls in the Right-of-Way. On June 10, 2019, Planning Department staff approved an Administrative Conditional Use Permit for walls.

Material Deconstruction

8. The Applicant proposes Material Deconstruction of the roof and east and south elevations and roof of the Significant Historic Structure.
9. The proposal complies with the Land Management Code Chapter 15-13-2, Design Guidelines For Historic Residential Sites:
 - a. LMC Chapter 15-13-2(2)(A)
 - i. 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.
 - ii. When disassembly of a historic element - window, molding, bracket, etc. - is necessary for its restoration, recognized preservation procedures and methods for removal, documentation, repair, and reassembly shall be used.
 - iii. When historic exterior materials cannot be repaired, they shall be replaced with materials that match the historic in all respects: scale, dimension, profile, material, texture, and finish. The replacement of existing historic material is allowed

only when it can be shown that the historic material is no longer safe and/or serviceable and cannot be repaired to a safe and/or serviceable condition.

10. The Historic Preservation Board approved the Material Deconstruction of the Significant Historic Site, subject to the Conditions of Approval below.

Panelization

11. On February 21, 2022, a licensed structural engineer visited 341 Ontario Avenue and completed a Physical Conditions Report.
12. 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 1/2" 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 main and crawl space floor joists are 2x4 @ 24" on center spanning 12'-0. Most of them were rotted out. They have to be replaced.
 - iv. All the existing headers need to be upgraded. We will review each one of them when the design is available.
 - v. The whole exterior and interior walls are 1x12 installed vertically. Small portions of the exterior walls are upgraded with 2x4 @ 16" o.c. They have no capacity for wind, seismic, or gravity loads. The building walls will need to be entirely re-framed from the inside with new stud wall framing that is code compliant, 2x4 or 2x6 at 16" o.c.
 - 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, 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 was that safety is not guaranteed when the construction crews are working inside of the existing building with jacking or vibrating to the building. To panelize the existing building, the construction crews may only work from the outside of the building most of the time.
- 13. On February 14, 2022, the Chief Building Official, Planning Director, and Building and Planning Staff visited 341 Ontario Avenue.
- 14. The Chief Building Official and Planning Director determined that the building can only be made safe and/or serviceable through panelization.
- 15. The Historic Preservation Board approved panelization of the Significant Historic Structure.

Conclusions of Law

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

Conditions of Approval

- 1. The Applicant is responsible for notifying the Building Department prior to proposing any changes to this approval.
- 2. The Applicant shall submit in writing any changes to the approved scope of work for Planning Department review.
- 3. Prior to removing and replacing Historic materials, the applicant shall demonstrate to the Planning Department that the materials are not safe or serviceable and cannot be repaired to a safe or serviceable condition. No Historic materials may be disposed of prior to advance approval by the Planning Department.

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.
5. The Historic Structure shall be returned to the original grade following construction of a foundation.
6. Disassembly and Reassembly shall be done using recognized preservation methods.
7. The Applicant shall complete measured drawings of the structure or element to be disassembled and reassembled.
8. The Applicant shall submit a thorough photographic survey of the interior and exterior elevations as well as architectural details of the structure, including site and location views from all compass points, exterior elevations, and interior elevations of each room.
9. Written plans detailing the disassembly and reassembly steps and procedures shall be completed and approved by the Planning and Building Departments.
10. Structures shall be disassembled in the largest workable pieces possible.
11. To ensure accurate reassembly, all parts of the Building, Structure, or element shall be marked as they are systematically separated from the Structure. Contrasting colors of paint or carpenter wax crayons shall be used to establish a marking code for each component. The markings shall be removable and shall be made on surfaces that will be hidden from view when the Structure is reassembled.
12. Important architectural features of a Historic Building or Structure shall be removed, marked, and stored before the Structure or element of the Structure is disassembled.
13. The process of disassembly of a Historic Structure shall be recorded through photographic, still, or video.
14. Wall panels and roof surfaces shall be protected with rigid materials, such as sheets of plywood when there is a risk of damage during the disassembly/storage/reassembly process.
15. Disassembled components - trim, windows, doors, wall panels, roof elements, etc. shall be securely stored on-site in a storage trailer or off-site in a garage/warehouse/trailer until needed for reassembly.

16. New foundations and additions shall follow the Design Guidelines.
17. The Significant Historic Structure must be reassembled in the original form, location, placement, and orientation.

Board Member Stephens seconded the motion.

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

A. 945 Norfolk Avenue – Material Deconstruction – The Applicant Proposes Material Deconstruction of a Portion of the Rear Façade to Accommodate a New Door Opening on the Landmark Historic Structure. PL-22-05155.

Planner Lillie presented the Staff Report and stated that the proposal was for 945 Norfolk Avenue. The applicant proposed material deconstruction of a portion of the rear façade to accommodate a new door opening on the Landmark Historic Structure. 945 Norfolk Avenue was listed as a Landmark Historic Site on Park City's Historic Sites Inventory and was also listed on the National Register of Historic Places on July 12, 1984. The 1 1/2 story pyramid house was constructed in 1896 by Nathaniel J. Williams. The proposal was for the material deconstruction of a 3'6" by 8'8" panel on the rear façade. The deconstruction of the historic material would be done to accommodate a new door opening with a two-foot transom window above it.

Planner Lillie reported that the specific guidelines the proposal applied to stated that new door openings were allowed on secondary and third facades, but they must be similar in size to the existing doors. The existing historic door opening on the front of the Landmark Structure was 3'1" by 6'10". The proposed door would be 3'6" by 6". The proposal was compliant with the Design Guidelines for Historic Residential Sites. Planner Lillie shared a drawing of the rear façade with the proposed door. It would be situated between two windows and would be an entrance to a small patio area. The proposal would require Modification of Approval to Historic District Design Review approval, which was contingent on Board approval for material deconstruction.

The architect on the project, Jonathan DeGray was present to answer questions. Board Member Beatlebrox asked about the timeline for work on the home. Mr. DeGray believed all work would be completed before the end of the year. The foundation work was done and the framing was done through the main level and upper floor. He believed by September or October all work would be complete. Board Member Beatlebrox noted that the rear façade was a second egress. Mr. DeGray explained that the intention was to develop some outdoor areas on the small lot. The only outdoor area was to the rear, so the rear façade would afford direct access from the house.

There were no comments from the public.

MOTION: Board Member Holmgren moved to APPROVE the Material Deconstruction of a Portion of the Rear Façade to Accommodate a New Door Opening on the Landmark Historic Structure, Located at 945 Norfolk Avenue, 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; reconstruct the historic c.1896 roof form and c.1990 wood shake roofing materials; reconstruct 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.

Material Deconstruction

7. The Applicant proposes Material Deconstruction of a 4-foot by 8-foot section of the rear facade of the Landmark Historic Structure to enable a new door similar in size to the front façade door.
8. The new door is located on a secondary façade.
9. The analysis section of the Staff Report dated March 2, 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 March 2, 2022.
2. The Applicant shall submit in writing any changes from the approved scope of work for Planning Department review.
3. The construction of the door and window opening shall be undertaken in such a way that if removed in the future the essential form and integrity of the Landmark Historic Structure could be restored.
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 Stephens seconded the motion.

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

7. ADJOURN

The Board discussed in-person meetings. Planner Lillie noted that she had looked through the previous Meeting Minutes with Attorney Harrington, and a Resolution had not been adopted to meet in person. If the Board wanted to meet in person, a Resolution would need to be adopted. Attorney Harrington clarified that a hybrid meeting, where some members connected electronically, would require a Resolution to be passed. A Resolution was not needed to go back to regular, in-person meetings. He suggested scheduling the next meeting in person. An Electronic Meeting Resolution that offered some level of flexibility could be adopted at that time.

Attorney Harrington noted that the different meeting options could be discussed further at the next meeting. Chair Scott wondered if it was the intent of the Board to hold hybrid meetings. Attorney Harrington noted that other organizations were already holding hybrid meetings. However, it was up to the Board to decide what made the most sense. He recommended adopting a Resolution that was as broad as possible, so the Board had some level of flexibility. That would allow adjustments to be made as necessary. Chair Scott reported that the next Historic Preservation Board Meeting would be in-person and the Resolution would be discussed at that time.

Board Member Stephens wondered if there was a Liaison from the City Council for the Historic Preservation Board. Director Milliken reported that there is not a specific City Council Liaison and that role would be filled as needed. Board Member Beatlebrox pointed out that there is a vacancy on the Board and asked if that vacancy will be filled. Director Milliken confirmed that it would and explained that Staff was working with the Mayor to fill that vacancy. That issue would be addressed shortly.

MOTION: Board Member Stephens moved to ADJOURN the Historic Preservation Board Meeting. Board Member Beatlebrox seconded the motion.

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

The Historic Preservation Board Meeting adjourned at 6:55 p.m.

Approved by _____
Randy Scott, Chair
Historic Preservation Board