

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

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

EX OFFICIO: Gretchen Milliken, Planning Director; Caitlyn Barhorst, 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

Chair Jackson read from Exhibit A, Determination of Substantial Health and Safety Risk. On January 6, 2021, the Board Chair 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 March 3, 2021.

Dated February 3, 2021.

ROLL CALL

Chair Jackson called the meeting to order at 5:08 p.m. and noted that all Board Members were present.

Mayor Andy Beerman remarked that everyone in Park City is still very sad over the passing of Bruce Erickson. He recognized that many of the Board members were close to Bruce through the HPB, and others had known him for a long time. Mayor Beerman stated that the sadness stretches throughout the City. Bruce was involved in the community over four decades and in that time, he made a lot of friends and earned a lot of respect. His passing is a huge loss, and some were not prepared for the loss. Mayor Beerman stated that Bruce was stubborn, and he was adamant that his declining health remain private between him and his family. He asked those who did know to keep it quiet and allow him to deal with it internally. Mayor Beerman understood that many people are disappointed that they did not have the opportunity to say goodbye, but he believes Bruce knew that he was loved and appreciated by many in the community, and he did not need it to be reinforced. He passed in his own way, which is very typical for Bruce. He will be missed. Mayor Beerman did not want anyone to feel bad about not having the opportunity to catch up with him, because it was not what he wanted.

Mayor Beerman stated that the City has been in touch with Bruce's sons and expressed condolences for everyone. He noted that after Covid the City will do something special to commemorate Bruce when people are able to gather again. Mayor Beerman noted that the family was taking contributions to either the Glenwood Cemetery or the Candi Erickson Fund.

Mayor Beerman reported that Bruce Erickson was in the middle of retiring when he got ill, and the City was fortunate to find someone very talented to replace him. He introduced Gretchen Milliken, the new Planning Director, who will be taking over Bruce Erickson's responsibilities. Ms. Milliken knows she has big shoes to fill, but she will also be contributing fresh new ideas. He welcomed Ms. Milliken and was pleased to have her on board with the City.

Director Milliken thanked Mayor Beerman for his nice comments. She did realize she has big shoes to fill and she expressed her disappointment in not having the opportunity to meet Bruce. When someone has historic knowledge of a town it is the most valuable input coming into a new job. Ms. Milliken assumed the HPB also has historic knowledge of the town and she was looking forward to working with the Board on historic preservation; especially since Caitlyn Barhorst will be leaving soon.

The Board welcomed Ms. Milliken.

Board Member Beatlebrox stated that she was devastated when she heard about Bruce. She knew Bruce and Candi and loved both of them for very different reasons. They were an amazing couple, and she was very grateful to have had them as part of the community because they both made such a difference. Ms. Beatlebrox thanked Mayor Beerman for his words because she was worried that no one would speak about this remarkable person. Ms. Beatlebrox stated that she was at a loss when she heard the news and immediately reached out to was Anya Grahn, a former planner in Park City for many years, who she had kept in touch with.

Ms. Beatlebrox read a message that Anya had sent back to her because it made her laugh and cry, and it helped her deal with what had happened. Chair Scott thanked Ms. Beatlebrox for sharing the message.

Board Member Stephens stated that for those who have lived in the community for a long time it goes back to Candi Erickson and the years she spent on City Council during a transitional time for the City; as well as what Bruce brought to the Planning Commission and eventually the order that he brought to the Planning Department. Mr. Stephens stated that because of thought, Ms. Milliken was getting a stable foundation to start. He could not think of another couple who added so much to this community. Like everyone else, he was devastated and saddened when he heard the news. He also expressed sympathy for Bruce's sons. Board Member Stephens thanked Mayor Beerman for his words this evening and for giving the Board the opportunity to make their comments.

Chair Scott appreciated the Mayor joining them this evening because it helped to give them all closure. Chair Scott stated that when he joined the Board Bruce was instrumental in helping him understand his role and responsibilities. He also needed a lot of education and every time he reached out Bruce made himself available. Chair Scott stated that he owes a lot of the passion he has regarding historic preservation to Bruce. He will be dearly missed. Chair Scott welcomed Ms. Milliken, and even though she has big shoes to fill, she has the support of the HPB.

Mayor Beerman thanked the HPB for their service. He recognized their job is difficult because they deal with some of the most controversial and challenging projects in town, and he appreciates all the heart and effort the Board puts into everything they do.

ADOPTION OF MINUTES

MOTION: Board Member Holmgren moved to APPROVE the Minutes of January 6, 2021 as written. Board Member Stephens 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

Jessica Nelson stated that if any of the Board members had not completed their training for Michelle Kellogg, they need to get it in as quickly as possible. Reminder emails were sent earlier that day.

REGULAR AGENDA

- 5.A. 1003 Norfolk Avenue – Historic District Design Review Historic Preservation Board Review for Material Deconstruction of a Significant Historic Site – The Applicant is proposing Material Deconstruction Consisting of Removal of Historic Material for the Proposed Restoration of the circ. 1900 Footprint and Construction of a New Addition.
(Application PL-20-04495)

Planner Caitlyn Barhorst noted that this item has been continued several times at prior meetings to allow time for the Staff to research more historic photographs and site investigation. She noted that the applicant, Gary Bush, and the project architect, Jon DeGray were open and flexible throughout the continuations.

Planner Barhorst reported that the proposal was for restoration of the site to the circa 1900 footprint based on the Sanborn map documentation. The existing accessory structure at the front of the property will be restored and turned into a single-car detached garage in the same location.

Planner Barhorst stated that the house was built sometime prior to 1900, but it was outside of the 1889 Sanborn map. At that time the house was a cross-gable form footprint with a L wrap-around porch. The applicant was proposing to restore the house back to that historic form, as well as remove rear additions that took place after the 1900 date.

Planner Barhorst presented a diagram showing the additions. The farthest rear additional are non-historic and were approved to be removed by Staff. She pointed to a hatched area in the middle, which was what the HPB was being asked to review and approve for removal. Planner Barhorst reviewed the elevation drawings for further clarification. She noted that photographs in the Staff report point to the physical evidence, as well as the Sanborn map evidence of where the siding joints occur along the wall face. In addition to the many photos in the physical condition report, and she was in the roof herself and saw a

conglomeration of additions. She also showed the area on the south elevation that was being removed.

Planner Barhorst presented a 3D rendering of the proposal. She had not included the proposed plans because of the concerns raised in previous meetings regarding whether the HPB should be reviewing the proposed addition. The HPB was reviewing a simple restoration proposal to restore the footprint from the 1900 Sanborn map.

The Staff recommended approval of the proposal without further concerns.

Jonathan DeGray, the project architect thought Planner Barhorst had covered everything in her presentation. He pointed out that part of going back to this particular version of the house is to restore the front porch as a wrap-around porch. Having gone through the house several times, the interior kitchen wall, which is the back line of the area being removed, has exterior siding inside the house which is more evidence of the accuracy of the Sanborn map that it was a later addition.

Board Member Hodgkins stated that from looking at the proposal, as the porch wraps around it appears the roofline is getting pushed back. He asked if it was determined that the roofline was extended when they infilled the wraparound porch. Planner Barhorst presented slide #9, noting that this part of the restoration proposal was under the Staff review of removing non-historic features under the material deconstruction. She stated that the HPB was only reviewing the back footprint piece this evening. Mr. Hodgkins clarified that he was talking about the front gable on the left side. He understood that if it becomes a wraparound porch, it will eliminate the current roof line and it abuts against the addition, which goes straight up. Planner Barhorst replied that the detail in the wraparound porch comes from wraparound porches on houses in Park City with the same shed roof detail and how it connects.

Mr. DeGray remarked that based on what they were seeing in the field and the wraparound porch shown on the Sanborn map, they believe it looked like what was shown in the rendering. Whenever the living space was expanded under the porch roof, the roof was pulled off and the gable was extended as well. The lines in the siding also allude to that being the case. Mr. DeGray stated that the structure inside the house alludes to that being the case as well.

Board Member Hutchings asked if the addition in the back that the applicant was proposing to remove was added after the 1941 Sanborn map. Planner Barhorst replied that it was an addition between 1900 and 1907. The 1907 Sanborn Map shows where the porch was infilled to be a wraparound facing the 10th Street right-of-way.

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 was struggling to understand why the addition was not historic. Planner Barhorst replied that the addition is historic because it was constructed between 1900 and 1907. She explained that the proposal to restore it back to the 1900s footprint includes the wraparound porch restoration and the footprint to match the 1900s addition.

Board Member Toly stated that she was also trying to understand why they were removing the 1907 portion.

Chair Scott remarked that he had the same struggle until Board Member Hodgkins mentioned a former application on the east side of Park Avenue. Chair Scott pointed out that there are many additions that are technically historic, but the mission by the applicant is to restore the home to a specific time on the Sanborn maps, and they were opting to restore it to the 1900 historic version. He noted that they could also opt to bring it back to the 1940 historic version. Chair Scott emphasized that the applicant was staying true to the historic form at a certain historic period.

Board Member Toly did not believe there was a big historic difference between 1900 and 1907. She noted that the wraparound porch could have happened in 1907 or 1900 and she was unclear as to why that addition would be removed.

Board Member Beatlebrox understood that a Landmark building is Landmark at 1900, 1907, and at 1941. It does not change the designation of Landmark, and an owner can take it back to the footprint of whatever year in that era that is important to this particular Landmark property. Ms. Beatlebrox thought this was an appropriate use of the ability to restore sites to what they used to be. It guides this particular property, and it guided many other properties the HPB has reviewed in the past.

Planner Barhorst replied that Board Member Beatlebrox was correct. She noted that there was limited photographic evidence for this property, but there was significant physical evidence to support the proposed restoration. Planner Barhorst stated that the existing condition of the extreme roof overbuild and the condition it creates in the back actually detracts from the historic character of the T-Cottage style. Restoring it back to that clean cut 1900s period removes all the non-historic additions that detracts from the character.

Board Member Toly asked Planner Barhorst to pull up a picture of the back of the house. Planner Barhorst pointed to an additional valley and the gambrel roof that builds off the back that would be removed. She stated that the element where the wraparound porch terminates and there is a shed addition existed in the 1900 footprint and would remain. The shed roof would be extended completely across. Planner Barhorst stated that the photograph on the bottom is what the roof condition would be constructed back to. Mr. DeGray remarked that the photograph was showing the main gable of the north roof form.

Mr. DeGray referred to the photo of the rear of the building and noted that it has been overbuilt at least twice to create a gambrel condition that covers up the actual roof. The old roof is still there but it has been covered up. Removing those portions and taking it back to the 1900s is a cleaner and more appropriate looking roof form for the period. Mr. DeGray stated that they will bring back and the porch and get remove the fireplace that is hanging off the south side of the building. The result will be a truer old town cottage.

Board Member Stephens understood that the applicant was taking it back to the consistent roof line that was there when the house was originally built. Mr. DeGray stated that if the 1900 version of the Sanborn is the original, which is as far back as they have evidence, they would be bringing it back to the original form.

Board Member Hutchings was not opposed to the idea, but if the duty of the HPB is to preserve historic material and the addition is still historic, he did not understand why the recommendation is to remove the historic material. He understood that the criteria is whether a structure is over 50 years, if it is contributory, etc.

Chair Scott explained that as long as the applicant is taking it back to a documented historic form, even though the additions can be historic, they are still being true to the historic form, which in this case is the 1900s form. He pointed out that the applicant could take it back to the 1907 form, which is closer to where it is now. Chair Scott noted that the HPB can have that discussion.

Board Member Hutchings asked if there was any way the HPB could deny this application. All the evidence suggests that this is the original form. If the process is to allow the applicant to take it back to the original form, then the criteria is met.

City Attorney Mark Harrington thought Board Member Hutchings raised a good point. He explained that this was the basis by which the HPB took back this actual of review. In more difficult applications where there was a decision of which historic period form to prioritize a restoration to was where there was community concern when this was purely a Staff approval that some things were

not aligning with the guidelines and the HPB expectations. For that reason, the HPB called back this type of review for this reason. Mr. Harrington stated that there needs to be an additional round of importance to the additions, which create a level of significance above and beyond just their affiliation with the Landmark structure by way of period of time. Mr. Harrington remarked that there is a basis by which the HPB could deny one of these, but it is typically not one where the architect, the preservationist, the Staff, and outside consultants argue that even though the additions were within a historic period, they were not of a historic significance in terms of form and contributing to the actual type of structure. They are a hodgepodge and repeatedly gone over time and time again. It was not enough to disqualify the structure as a whole from a listing, but they are not seen as imperative to the original period listing. Mr. Harrington noted that some projects are restored in a way where there is enough compatibility and the HPB has the ability to ask the applicant to restore it to another date because that form was particularly important, and the addition was consistent with that and contributes to significance of the overall structure. Mr. Harrington stated that where these additions are just a pile-on that detract from a specific form that has known historic significance, then there is a contradiction. He believed this is why Board Member Beatlebrox was passionate about enabling this higher priority restoration.

City Attorney Harrington cautioned the Board about continuing to use owner's choice, because the HPB has the ability to weigh which way is better, but in this circumstance, the cleaner solution with the most authenticity related to the original form is what the Board was being asked to confirm or question. Mr. Harrington clarified that nothing is a rubber stamp, but they should approach the second component of whether the deconstruction meets the guidelines and which part of the building needs to be retained. The Board needs to be as objective as possible, as opposed to thinking that any change in the historic period needs to be preserved.

Planner Barhorst stated that because there are so many phases of additions and what exists now had additions removed that were constructed during the historic era further removes the additions from contributing to any significance of the site. The clean restoration of the footprint is based on maps, documentation, and physical evidence.

Board Member Hodgkins agreed with Mark Harrington and Lola Beatlebrox. He also agreed that the additions detract from the architectural significance of this particular building. It is not as though the additions were built in a later time but continued to be historic design periods, such as the 1930s and 1940s. It is only an add-on to the original house, and the original house has the architectural significance. Mr. Hodgkins believed the only exception to that rule would be if a historic event took place or a historic person lived at the site possibly in 1930, that would need to be taken into consideration. In reality, this is an addition that

got slapped on to the back of the structure without a lot of architectural significant or thought.

Board Member Toly clarified that she was not opposed to this application. She spent her entire childhood looking at this house because she lived across the street. Her confusion was with removing and destroying material from the early 1900s, and she was not aware that this has occurred in the past. Board Member Hutchings agreed.

Board Member Hodgkins thought the role of the HPB was to preserve historic architecture more than to preserve historic material. Board Member Toly stated that she always thought it was also to preserve historic material, but she learned otherwise this evening. City Attorney Harrington stated that on occasion there are conditions of approval that require saving salvageable material to a reasonable degree. The Staff evaluates the deconstruction to save the material so it can be used wherever possible. Planner Barhorst agreed. She explained that where the wraparound porch will be reconstructed the applicant will reuse the historic siding on the current wall where possible. She clarified that salvaging and reusing material in the construction is prioritized. Board Member Stephens pointed out that salvage and reuse of materials was part of the HDDR review.

Board Member Stephens stated that this appearing to seem like a rubber stamp was a testament to where they are now versus ten years ago. The HPB was reviewing these projects as a check and balance against decisions being made between an owner or developer and the Planning Department. The community was looking at a third set of eyes and that is the role of the HPB. Mr. Stephens agreed with Mr. Harrington that the Staff, the preservationists, the consultants, and architect are all in step because they are not just trying to save a facade in the front and put a whole new house on the back. He stated that the City spent years changing the LMC to make sure the additions to the rear of these homes were more architecturally cohesive with the historic homes, and this was a good example of that goal. Mr. Stephens could support this project as proposed.

Chair Scott noted that conditions of approval #4 addresses the reuse of historic materials.

Board Member Holmgren thought this was a good project. Chair Scott concurred.

MOTION: Board Member Holmgren moved to APPROVE the proposed Material Deconstruction based at 1003 Norfolk Avenue, based on the Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Conditions of Approval as found in Exhibit A: Draft Action Letter. Board Member Hodgkins seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

Findings of Fact – 1003 Norfolk Avenue

1. The property is located at 1003 Norfolk Avenue in the Historic Residential (HR-1) zoning District.
2. The Site is designated as Landmark on the Historic Sites Inventory.
3. The legal description of the property is Lots 1 & 2 Block 16 Snyder's Addition to Park City. SA-164.
4. On November 1, 2020, the Planning Department received a complete Historic District Design Review (HDDR) application for the property at 1003 Norfolk Avenue.
5. Development on this property has spanned across three (3) of Park City's designated Historic eras, including the Settlement and Mining Boom Era (1868-1893), the Mature Mining Era (1894-1930), and the Mining Decline and Emergence of Recreation Industry Era (1931-1962).
6. The house first appears on the 1900 Sanborn Fire Insurance Map as a simple, one-story T/L Cross-wing cottage style house with a single-story L-shaped front porch and footprint to the south-west corner of the T cottage.
7. The 1907 Sanborn map shows an addition to the west which brought the footprint closer to the accessory structure on site and enclosed the southern-side of the Lshaped porch.
8. A series of non-historic additions took place after the 1941 Sanborn map, including a gabrel-roof overbuild that can be seen protruding from the historic ridgeline.
9. The circ.1941 tax assessment photograph of this property is unavailable. There are no known historic photographs of this property at the time of writing this report.
10. The proposed Material Deconstruction for the restoration of the circ. 1900 footprint has been reviewed for compliance with LMC § 15-13-2 Design Guidelines for:

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 proposed to be restored.
2. Changes to a site or building that have acquired historic significance in their own right should be retained and preserved.
 - Complies; the additions to the building are proposed to be removed for the restoration of the original circ. 1900 historic footprint.
3. The historic exterior features of a building should be retained and preserved.
 - Complies; the historic exterior features are proposed to be restored to the circ. 1900 historic footprint.
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 restoration includes restoring incompatible windows to those that would have been seen in the proposed 1900 restoration period.
 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 to 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

a. Protection for Historic Structures and Sites

(1) Additions to historic buildings should be considered only when it is demonstrated that the new use of the building cannot be accommodated by solely altering interior spaces.

- Complies; the applicant desires to construct an addition to achieve additional square footage that cannot be accommodated by solely altering interior spaces.

(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.

(3) Additions should be visually subordinate to historic buildings when viewed from the primary public right-of-way.

- The Administrative Staff Review of the Historic District Design Review will confirm compliance with this Design Guideline.

(4) Additions to historic structures shall not be placed so as to obscure, detract from, or modify historic roof forms.

- The Administrative Staff Review of the Historic District Design Review will confirm compliance with this Design Guideline.

(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 restoration of the circ. 1900 historic footprint.

(6) Where the new addition abuts the historic building, a clear transitional element between the old and the new should be designed and constructed. Minor additions, such as bay windows or dormers do not require a transitional element.

- The Administrative Staff Review of the Historic District Design Review will confirm compliance with this Design Guideline.

(7) Maintain and preserve additions to structures that are significant to the era/period of restoration.

- Complies; the proposed restoration removes additions to the structure that are not significant to the circ. 1900 footprint.

(8) In-line additions shall be avoided.

- Complies; the proposed addition is not in-line with the Historic Structure.

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 – 1003 Norfolk 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 – 1003 Norfolk Avenue

1. Final building plans and construction details shall reflect substantial compliance with the plans approved by the Historic Preservation Board February 3, 2021 for the Material Deconstruction of the Historic foundation for the construction of the basement 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 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. 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. 1128 Park Avenue - Stipulated Remand for Historic District Design Review from Board of Adjustment Appeal- Historic Preservation Board Review for

Material Deconstruction – The Applicant is Proposing the Material Deconstruction of the Landmark Historic Site Consisting of Removal of Historic Material for the Proposed Restoration of the circa 1909 Historic Cross-T Footprint. (Application PL-20-04484)

Planner Barhorst noted that the Planning Commission had previously reviewed this item. The first HPB review was September 12, 2020, followed by site visits. Another HPB meeting was held on October 7, 2020 and the Board had another site visit. The final site visit was prior to the HPB meeting on November 4, 2020, where Proposal 1 was denied with a 4-3 vote on a motion to deny. The final action letter was signed November 18, 2020.

Planner Barhorst stated that the Planning Department received an appeal of the determination. After the appeal was submitted on December 18, 2020, she found additional historic documentation that shifted the narrative of this project into a conversation similar to the previous project.

Planner Barhorst outlined the new findings and new information for the HPB to consider and discuss. The Staff was recommending approval of the proposed material deconstruction. Planner Barhorst stated that the updated proposal consists of restoring the footprint to the circa 1909 date, which is based on mortgage records where the owner at that time took out a mortgage for the property, which would presumably had been used to add on to the building. She explained that the cross gable came from the 1909 date.

Planner Barhorst stated that additional elements were brought forward in the proposal, including restoring the original entry door located on the south elevation of the original shotgun house; preserving the porch but removing the architectural ornamentation because it did not exist within the historic period; and the removal of the additions at the rear. Planner Barhorst stated that new photographs added an additional construction chronology onto the site, documenting an even further phase of additions that was not contemplated in November and prior.

Planner Barhorst presented the Sanborn maps. She noted that the original house was a shotgun structure built between 1900 and 1907. In the 20 years following, there was a series of two addition. One is the Cross-T gable dating back to circa 1900, and the shed addition that is under review this evening for removal to accommodate the restoration proposal.

Planner Barhorst stated that the photograph of the site perfectly depicts the rear of the property. It is dated circa 1950s based on photographs and some of the existing buildings around the site. Planner Barhorst remarked that as seen during the site visits, the cellar staircase leans at the rear of where the original shotgun wall ended. There is a foundation wall in the cellar crawl space that

matches the condition. Based on the photograph, an additional series of additions took place.

Planner Barhorst reiterated that the original footprint was the shotgun structure. The actual construction date of the root cellar is not known; however, it could have existed with the original shotgun house based on the foundation excavation. Planner Barhorst stated that following the circa 1909, the cross-gable addition was constructed, again potentially having the stellar stairs at that time. As reflected in the 1929 Sanborn map, the shed addition with the offset wall plane on the south facade, and proportionally based on the dimensions of a Sanborn Map, she put together a potential footprint that would have existing at that time. Planner Barhorst stated that following the 1941 Sanborn map, and based on the late 1940s, early 1950s photograph, is when the shed addition was expanded to the existing condition of being flush with the south elevation.

Planner Barhorst remarked that following the 1950s photograph, presumably in the late 1950s or early 1960s, another series of additions took place, which changed what the HPB had reviewed in the Fall. She explained that after the 1950 photograph. The end gable of the shotgun structure was extended to encompass, cover, and enclose the cellar staircase. The other additions took place following the 1950s photograph.

Planner Barhorst stated that the series of additions following the historic era are not contributing to the actual architectural significance of this site. She pointed out that in order to have a clean-cut restoration date, the 1909 date was selected based on the mortgage records.

Planner Barhorst clarified that removal of the shed addition is the only item back for review this evening since it does not contribute to the architectural significance of the 1909 era footprint. In addition to the research Planner Barhorst had conducted, SWCA, the preservation consulting team, prepared a memorandum and analyzed the findings in the new photograph and came to a similar conclusion. She read the memorandum into the record, "Based on the chronology of the additions to the rear of the property is not entirely certain. In particular, there is not sufficient evidence to support with certainty that the shed addition to the stem wing is a post-1941 replacement of the historic rear addition illustrated in the 1929 and 1941 updates to the 1907 Sanborn map. However, there is evidence that the addition has been expanded and altered after the period of significance for the property. As a result of those alterations, the shed addition does not retain historic integrity and does not contribute to the historic significance of 1128 Park Avenue".

Planner Barhorst stated that as documented in the 1929 Sanborn map there was not a porch. She assumed the porch was likely added around 1940. It does not show up in the 1941 Sanborn map, but it does show in the circa 1940 tax photo.

The proposal was sort of a merging of the restoration approach of the footprint; however, the applicant was preserving the porch and restoring it back to the 1940 era condition by removing the architectural ornamentation that exists today on the porch and the gable and restoring the entry door to the shotgun house.

Kevin Horn, representing the applicant, referred to the 1950s photograph and noted that the single pitch shed form roof ended flush with the east gable where the stair went down to the cellar. He pointed out that the current "shed addition" extends past that by approximately 4', indicating that more than one shed was built on the back of this structure.

Planner Barhorst remarked that the actual length of the shotgun house on the north elevation was extended based on the findings and where the gable end was extended. The dimensions had not yet been confirmed, but the proposal would be to bring that exterior wall approximately 4'. Since that addition of enclosing the cellar staircase occurred outside of the historic period, removing that piece was currently under Staff review. Planner Barhorst clarified that she did not want that piece to be confused with what the HPB was being asked to review this evening. It only shows evidence of further additions that they did not know existed when this application was reviewed in the Fall.

Chair Scott understood that the east side of the original shotgun house is what they were seeing in the 1950s photograph. Mr. Horn clarified that the photo actually shows a different route covering the stairs down to the cellar. The shed shown in the photograph aligns with the original shotgun east wall. Planner Barhorst pointed out that it does not match the existing roof pitch. Mr. Horn agreed, which leads him to believe that the shed in the photo is not the same as the existing shed because it currently extends the full 4 feet past the stairs.

Board Member Toly recalled that when the HPB previously reviewed this application there were three options and the Board decided to vote on one of those options. She asked if they were being asked to vote on one option. Planner Barhorst explained that the three options was back in 2020. The Board was reviewing the proposal presented this evening. This was only coming back to the HPB because additional records changed the findings. Ms. Tolly asked whether the architectural design could be completely different based on the new findings in terms of what more can be removed. Planner Barhorst answered no. The proposal that was denied in the Fall was the proposal removing that shed piece shown in red. The design of the addition as separate from the removal being discussed this evening. The design was still under review.

Chair Scott clarified that the HPB was being asked to determine the material deconstruction on the red shed addition, and the proposal regarding the front porch. Board Member Stephens pointed out that the porch will be preserved. The HPB was only looking at the shed addition, as well as the shed addition circa

1941 to 1950. Planner Barhorst replied that he was correct. The issue for the HPB is the layering of shed additions. The porch element would be reviewed and approved at the Staff level. The proposal this evening was updated and revised with the additional findings.

Board Member Beatlebrox thought the Board was only approving the 1909 footprint. Planner Barhorst replied that she was correct. They were reviewing the proposal to remove that addition and restore it back to the circa 1909 footprint.

Board Member Hodgkins asked how they know the porch was part of the 1909 footprint. Planner Barhorst stated that the proposal is to preserve the porch as it exists, even though it likely did not exist in the 1909 time period because the 1929 map does not have the porch drawn in. Most of the time for Sanborn map reasons, if a porch existed it was drawn. The porch is a later addition dating back to the late 1930s or early 1940s.

Board Member Toly understood that technically the porch is not original. The applicant is keeping different parts of the house from different times, but it is not the exact original shotgun house.

Board Member Beatlebrox explained that it is the Cross-T. The shotgun is the part shown in green, which has nothing to do with the porch. She thought it was evident that the T-addition was added in 1909 and the roof can be clearly seen in the rafter. That roof was eventually covered up by several sheds and coverings. Ms. Beatlebrox clarified that the applicant was trying to take it back to the cross-T which was probably there in 1909.

Board Member Hodgkins did not believe there was evidence to accurately suggest that the porch and some type of addition behind the cross-T were not there in 1909. Board Member Beatlebrox pointed out that there is no evidence to prove that it was not there. Mr. Hodgkins agreed that there is no evidence to prove that something was or was not on either side of the cross-T room that was added on. He noted that the photographs show that the addition towards the back was aligned with the outer edge. Mr. Hodgkins did not think the Sanborn map was accurate. In creating new Sanborn maps they start with the old one and the mistakes continue. In his opinion, they should not rely so much on the Sanborn maps for evidence, other than the fact that the side addition shows up at a certain date. They presume it was 1909 because it corresponds with a mortgage, but they do not know the shape or what was exactly built.

Board Member Toly pointed out that just because someone takes out a mortgage does not mean they are adding on to their house. She also suggested that they go back to see what was happening historically in Park City in 1909 or research

information on the residents in this house at the time. She believed there were many reasons why the owners might have taken out a mortgage.

Board Member Beatlebrox stated that what convinced her about this particular house is whether the A-frame on the south facade, which corresponds with the roof inside, which corresponds with the haphazard shed roof over the top. She questioned why someone would put in a roof with a beautiful A-line if they intended to cover it up with a shed. She believed there was a period of time when this particular house had a beautiful A-line T-addition and for whatever reason it was later changed. 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 than 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. Ms. Beatlebrox stated that the question is whether they leave it as is, or return it to the cross-T. She has always been in favor of returning to the cross-T.

Board Member Hodgkins stated that he never thought the roofline was original, and he believed the new photograph they found proves that originally there was a different flatter roof. He noted that flat roofs in Park City cause leaks and other things and that might be why it was changed to a steeper roof and the roofline was changed.

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 stated that last time he voted against removing the shed because he felt it was contributory in relation to what was occurring historically at that time. However, based on their discussion from the last project, he thought the evidence shows that this shed was just an addition and not unique. If the applicant wants to take it back to the 1909 footprint, he will support it.

Board Member Hodgkins pointed out that there is no proof of the actual 1909 footprint. They had this same discussion on the previous project, and he was unsure whether it changed his position on this project. Mr. Hodgkins remarked that they could not prove or disprove that something was there and it's the same with the porch.

Board Member Beatlebrox thought Board Member Hodgkins was in favor of going back to the original shotgun footprint. Mr. Hodgkins replied that it was his

preference because there are not many shotgun forms left. This house is extremely historic and very few houses were built as early as 1895.

Board Member Beatlebrox stated that whether it returns to the 1900 or 1909 footprint, the Landmark structure was definitely a standalone A-frame cross-T addition. Even though they do not know the exact year, the evidence is in the roof. Ms. Beatlebrox was comfortable with either of those dates. Park Avenue is a premier road in town and the houses along the road should look authentic. She believed the appeals board asked the HPB to relook at this project for a reason and she supported the applicant's request.

Board Member Hutchings thought the porch was an interesting question because they are taking it back to its original form, but it is not its original form. Mr. Hutchings stated that if they take it back to the T-construction, in order to make that T-construction stand out it will be important to look at what the transitions are like and what the addition looks like. Board Member Beatlebrox agreed that the transition element was very important.

MOTION: Board Member Beatlebrox moved to approve the proposed material deconstruction of 1128 Park Avenue, based on the Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Conditions of Approval as found in the draft action letter, Exhibit A. Board Member Stephens seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed 6-1. Board Member Hodgkins voted against the motion.

Findings of Fact – 1128 Park Avenue

1. The property is located at 1128 Park Avenue.
2. The Legal Description is All Lot 8 & S 1/2 Lot 9 BLK 56 Snyder's Addition to Park City. Parcel Number SA-365. This Lot is part of the Double H Plat Amendment approved by Ordinance 2019-28. Upon recordation of the plat, the legal description and parcel number with Summit County will be updated to reflect the change.
3. The property is located in the Historic Residential- Medium Density (HRM) Zoning District.
4. The property at 1128 Park Avenue is designated as Landmark on the Park City Historic Sites Inventory.
5. On July 27, 2020 the Planning Department received a complete Historic District Design Review application.
6. Staff published notice on the City's website and the Utah Public Notice website and posted notice on the property on January 20, 2021. Staff mailed courtesy notice to property owners within 100 feet on January 20, 2021. The Park Record published notice on January 20, 2021.

7. The Historic Single-Family Dwelling was constructed circ. 1907 as a shotgun house.
8. Between circ. 1907 and 1929, a series of two additions occurred as documented in the Sanborn fire insurance maps. The South-facing cross T gable addition was constructed circ. 1909 based on the mortgage records that show the owner at that time Charles Rolfe mortgaged the property for \$150.
9. A circ. 1950s photograph documents the condition of the cellar staircase having been enclosed by an exterior angled roof enclosure. This building element is not extant today.
10. A series of further non-historic rear additions took place sometime following the circ. 1950 photograph.
11. Staff is currently reviewing the proposed addition for compliance with LMC 15-13 Design Guidelines for Historic Districts and Historic Sites.
12. The Minimum Lot Area for a Single-Family Dwelling is 1,875 square feet. This Lot contains 2,812.50 square feet.
13. The applicant has submitted a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) application (PL-20-04607) that is currently under review per LMC 15-2.4-6 Existing Historic Structures. The request is to construct a basement addition beneath the existing historic structure's footprint that currently does not meet setbacks. This CUP application was approved by the Planning Commission on September 23, 2020.
14. The proposed addition complies with the required Front and Rear Setbacks. The minimum Front and Rear Setbacks are ten feet (10') each; the Applicant is proposing a ten foot (10') Rear Setback for the addition.
15. The proposal complies with the Side Setbacks. The south Side Setback is five feet (5') and the north Setback is five feet (5') with the Conditional Use Permit application to approve the construction of the basement addition within the Setback.
16. The proposal complies with LMC 15-2.4-7, with a maximum height of twenty-seven feet (27') from Existing Grade. The maximum height of the proposed structure is 27 feet (27'). Per LMC 15-2.4-5(A) Any proposed building height exceptions will be reviewed by the Planning Director. No proposed building height exceptions are approved with this action letter.
17. On September 2, 2020, the Historic Preservation Board approved the Material Deconstruction for the Landmark Historic Site consisting of removal of the Historic foundation including lifting the existing floor elevation by two feet (2') for the construction of a basement. The applicant proposed to lift the Historic Structure from its existing USGS elevation of 6925'- 8 ½" to a new elevation of 6927'- 8 ½" in order to accommodate the new basement foundation.
18. Per LMC § 15-11-12.5(A)(2) Historic Preservation Board Review for Material Deconstruction the Historic Preservation Board shall review the Removal of Historic Material to Accommodate New additions, New Construction, or Structural Upgrades. Prior to issuance of a Building Permit for any Material Deconstruction work, the Review Authority shall review the proposed plans for compliance with

the Land Management Code 15-13 Design Guidelines for Historic Districts and Historic Sites.

19. Staff has reviewed the proposed Material Deconstruction for compliance with LMC § 15-13-2 Design Guidelines for Historic Residential Sites, including the following applicable Design Guidelines. Staff has found that the proposal complies with the 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 distinctive circ. 1909 cross-T footprint is proposed to be preserved.

2. Changes to a site or building that have acquired historic significance in their own right should be retained and preserved.

- Complies; the proposed restoration retains the circ. 1909 footprint

3. The historic exterior features of a building should be retained and preserved.

- Complies; the historic exterior features are proposed to be retained and preserved.

4. Distinctive materials, components, finishes, and examples of craftsmanship should be retained and preserved.

- Complies; no distinctive materials, components, finishes, or examples of craftsmanship is proposed to be altered.

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.

- Not applicable; the applicant does not propose to maintain any features that do not contribute to the significance of the building.

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 proposal does not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the proposed restoration of the circ. 1909 footprint.

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

a. Protection for Historic Structures and Sites

(1) Additions to historic buildings should be considered only when it is demonstrated that the new use of the building cannot be accommodated by solely altering interior spaces.

- Complies; the applicant desires to construct an addition to achieve additional square footage that cannot be accommodated by solely altering interior spaces.

(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.

- The Administrative Staff Review of the Historic District Design Review will confirm compliance with this Design Guideline.

(3) Additions should be visually subordinate to historic buildings when viewed from the primary public right-of-way.

- The Administrative Staff Review of the Historic District Design Review will confirm compliance with this Design Guideline.

(4) Additions to historic structures shall not be placed so as to obscure, detract from or modify historic roof forms.

- The Administrative Staff Review of the Historic District Design Review will confirm compliance with this Design Guideline.

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

- Complies; the material proposed to be removed does not contribute to the circ. 1909 restoration footprint.

(6) Where the new addition abuts the historic building, a clear transitional element between the old and the new should be designed and constructed. Minor additions, such as bay windows or dormers do not require a transitional element.

- The Administrative Staff Review of the Historic District Design Review will confirm compliance with this Design Guideline.

(7) Maintain and preserve additions to structures that are significant to the era/period of restoration.

- Complies; the proposed circ. 1909 restoration footprint proposes to maintain the cross-T addition that is significant to the era/period of restoration.

(8) In-line additions shall be avoided.

- Complies; the proposed addition is not in-line with the Historic Structure.

b. Transitional Elements

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

20. The Design Review Committee, Development Review Committee, and Planning and Legal Departments reviewed this application.

21. Staff did not receive any public input at the time this report was published.

Conclusions of Law – 1128 Park Avenue

1. The proposal complies with the Land Management Code requirements pursuant to LMC § 15-2.4 Historic Residential Medium Density (HRM) 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 – 1128 Park Avenue

1. Final building plans and construction details shall reflect substantial compliance with the plans approved by the Historic Preservation Board February 3, 2021 for the Material Deconstruction of the Historic foundation for the construction of the basement 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 provide documentation of the original shotgun entry door upon building permit issuance. The applicant shall work with the Planning Department to revise the proposed door detail and dimensions to reflect the findings determined on-site.
6. 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.
7. An encroachment agreement may be required prior to issuance of a building permit for projects utilizing soils nails that encroach onto neighboring properties.
8. 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.
9. Within five (5) days of installation of the cribbing and shoring, the structural engineer will inspect and approve the cribbing and shoring as constructed.
10. 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.
11. The Planning Director may make a written determination to extend this period up to 30 additional days if, after consultation with the Historic Preservation Planner, Chief Building Official, and City Engineer, he determines that it is necessary. This would be based upon the need to immediately stabilize an existing Historic property, or specific site conditions such as access, or lack thereof, exist, or in an effort to reduce impacts on adjacent properties. The applicant is responsible for notifying the Building Department if changes are made. If the cribbing and/or shoring plan(s) are to be altered at any time during the construction of the foundation by the contractor, the structural engineer shall submit a new cribbing and/or shoring plan for review. The structural engineer shall be required to re-inspect and approve the cribbing and/or shoring alterations within five (5) days of any relocation or alteration to the cribbing and/or shoring.

12. 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.

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

14. 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.

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.

Planner Toly asked Planner Barhorst to explain why the new information did not come out until now. She thought there might be information about other houses that they did not know about. Planner Barhorst stated that her recommendation in the Fall was based on the research she had time to conduct and what was presented by the applicant at the time of the proposal. In doing research for the appeal, she was able to look into more records and found additional photographs.

Board Member Beatlebrox pointed out that this is the first time this has happened in the five years she has been on the Board. Chair Scott agreed. He noted that the Board needed several site visits to make sure they saw everything. He noted that sometimes timing goes against the applicant and the Board to make the best decision.

5.C. 901 Woodside Avenue – Historic District Design Review – Historic Preservation Board Review for Material Deconstruction – The Board Approved the Material Deconstruction of the Landmark Historic Site on August 7, 2019. The Applicant has Revised the Proposed Material Deconstruction of the Foundation for Construction of a Basement Addition and Garage. (Application PL-18-04030).

Planner Barhorst reviewed the application for a material deconstruction review of 901 Woodside Avenue. The proposal was approved by the HPB on August 7, 2019 for the construction of a basement with a garage addition. The proposal has been revised and the location of the garage and the historic foundation

material that is being deconstructed has changed. Planner Barhorst clarified that the item for review this evening is the specific historic material that is proposed to be removed for the construction of the garage beneath the historic structure.

Planner Barhorst reviewed photographs and history of the site. The original house was a single-story cross-T gable house. It was lifted sometime prior to 1900 and the original single-story house now sits on the second story, and the current first story was added to it.

Planner Barhorst reported that panelization of this project was also part of the August 7, 2019 approval and that will not change. Board Member Hodgkins recalled that the Board also had a site visit. Planner Barhorst replied that he was correct. She noted that there was a complete interior demo down to the stud structure in the Fall of 2019.

Planner Barhorst reviewed the existing elevations. She noted that in the proposal from 2019, the garage was proposed to be located on the south elevation secondary facade beneath the existing porch. She provided a number of images of the proposal. Planner Barhorst stated indicated the small area of the removal of the historic foundation for the actual garage entrance. It was an approximate 9' x 8' opening. She noted that the revised proposal has the location of the garage facing the primary facade still beneath the porch. She also showed the elevation of the historic foundation wall to be removed to construct the garage.

The Staff recommended approving the updated proposal revising the location of the garage entry based on the Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Conditions of Approval as found in the draft action letter and as amended. Planner Barhorst explained that she usually uses a template form for these draft action letters. For this proposal, she amended her recommendation to remove Conclusion of Law #1, since this proposal only relates to material deconstruction review 15-11-12.5 in the LMC.

Planner Barhorst reiterated that the HPB was only being asked to review and contemplate the historic material that will be removed for the garage addition beneath the historic structure.

Board Member Hodgkins asked for clarification as to why the garage was being relocated. He thought moving the garage to the primary historic facade significantly affects the historic facade; however, he understood that it was allowed in the LMC. In this instance the structure is on the corner and the garage could be on the side. He wanted to know why that was not done.

Board Member Beatlebrox understood that Park City owns the right-of-way to the left of this facade. The driveway as originally proposed would be on the portion

that Park City owns. Unless there is a right-of-way, the applicant could not use the side facade. She pointed out that they were using the front facade instead, but there was still an encroachment.

City Attorney Mark Harrington explained that the Planning Commission had deadlocked 3-3 on review of the conditional use permit for the encroachment. One Commissioner had recused himself due to a conflict which left no one to break a tie. The City Council called it up and denied the use of the public-right-of-way for that particular design of the driveway for a number of reasons stated in the Council's decision. That decision is on appeal and the parties agreed to stay the litigation on the appeal to see if there was an alternative proposal that could meet the Code. Mr. Harrington stated that the applicant was before the HPB to see if the proposal has any merit from this Board, and they will also go through another public process for reconsideration by the City Council. He pointed out that it would not go back to the Planning Commission; however, he was certain the City Council would give the Commissioners who participated in the original proposal the opportunity to weigh in on the new proposal in the public process if this moves forward.

City Attorney Harrington stated that this was just the first step because the HPB is the first to review in terms of material deconstruction determination. The applicant was here this evening to see if it was worth going through another public process. He noted that the Staff would also need to re-evaluate the final design for the HDDR process, which would also have a public input process.

Board Member Bealtebrox wanted to know what recourse the homeowner would have if the HPB decides they do not want this garage in the front.

City Attorney Harrington stated that the appeal on the original denial would proceed to Third District Court and the Court would answer that question. He did not believe the Board should worry too much about that implication because they face that implication with any proposed design if they find that it does not comply with the criteria. Mr. Harrington remarked that the owner determines whether they have reasonable alternatives and go through the alternative process, or they can go through a variance process or a takings process if they think the decision is unreasonable and prohibits them from use of their property. In this case, it is more difficult because of the City ownership interest and the ownership capability of the City Council to decide yes or no. He explained that deference to the historic preservation interest is why the first proposal went as far as it did before the Planning Commission and the City Council had the opportunity to evaluate the encroachment element. Regarding the question of which process should come first, Mr. Harrington pointed out that the HPB was first because the Staff thought historic preservation would dictate the stronger outcome as they explored alternative of both the front of the east facing facade, as well as the south facade, which was decided on for the first option, or even as a shared

option between this property and the adjacent property. City Attorney Harrington felt that no stone had been left unturned in trying to prioritize the historic preservation element. However, for other reasons that are equally valid, the City Council decided not to permit the south facing option. At that point, the applicant decided to see if another option could work before deciding whether to fight it further.

City Attorney Harrington reiterated that the HPB should not be concerned with the applicant's option. They are all trying to achieve prioritization of historic preservation, and the Board needs to determine whether the removal of historic material on the east front facade is more damaging than what they were willing to permit on the south facade. That was the question for the Board this evening. Mr. Harrington remarked that the Board members were also welcomed to participate in subsequent processes and provide input on the encroachment at the appropriate time.

Board Member Beatebrox asked Planner Barhorst for a reminder of what the stone consists of and how much is going to be removed. She did not think it looked like a lot of material, especially now that she sees the historic foundation.

Board Member Hodgkins commented on the bigger picture. Based on the explanation by Mr. Harrington, he did not think the City prioritizes historic preservation as much as the HPB since they were not opposed to putting a garage off the primary historic facade to avoid the right-of-way issue. Mr. Hodgkins did not understand why the other entrance into a garage is contentious for the City Council and the Planning Commission.

City Attorney Harrington replied that the nature of the encroachment for the width was so great that it impaired both the perception and the reality of continued availability for public use. His interpretation of the City Council findings is that the driveway came out all the way and encapsulated changing that entire open area. The way the retainage needed to work at the back gave the appearance of no public passageway, as opposed to the linear retainage with the new proposal. In addition, even though public utilities would be technically accommodated, it also had limitations and impacts on the utilities. Mr. Harrington stated that the Board should not interpret the City Council's action in any way as prioritizing those issues over historic preservation. They only bifurcated the two issues. The HPB made the best decision given historic preservation, and the City Council and the Planning Commission received significant public input with valid points. Mr. Harrington pointed out that the CUP criteria and additional ownership criteria was different and did not include consideration for balancing the historic preservation interest. Mr. Harrington clarified that it was a separate decision that stands on its merits. He explained that the City Council was fully briefed on why the HPB prioritized the south entrance. The Council took that into consideration, which made it a harder decision.

In hearing the explanation, Board Member Hodgkins thought the City Council went with public perception over reality and against preservation. City Attorney Harrington believed that the criteria were separate and the City Council tried to validate both the best they could, but in the end they could not meet the criteria on the other alternative. He did not think the Council underprioritized the historic preservation component. They just were not willing to give it that much weight towards the solution given the other criteria that needed to be considered to approve the encroachment.

Board Member Toly asked if this new proposal would also encroach on City property. Mr. Harrington answered yes. Ms. Toly questioned why this would not go to the City Council on the encroachment issue first, and then if they were comfortable with the encroachment it would come to the HPB. Mr. Harrington thought the City Council was sensitive to that position and they wanted it to go through an organic process. He noted that the City is in the process of changing that process going forward. However, in this case, they wanted the HPB to have the freedom to evaluate the proposal on its merits without the weight of City Council approval.

Board Member Toly asked if there was any option for the proposal that would not encroach. She asked if every possible solution had been considered and proposed. Mr. Harrington stated that they looked at an alternative on the other side that does not involve an encroachment. Those preservation options were much more significant, and the Staff could not support it. For that reason, those options were not explored further.

Board Member Beatlebrox pointed out that it does not look like a road, but it is a right-of-way. In the original proposal it looked like a private driveway and she understood why the neighbors had the perception that public access was cut off. Ms. Beatlebrox stated that Park City owns the right-of-way and the City could not allow this to occur because at some point in the future they might need that right-of-way.

Board Member Beatlebrox repeated her earlier request regarding the amount of historic material that would be removed. Planner Barhorst stated that she had not actually measured it, but she could if the Board was interested in the actual dimensions. Board Member Beatlebrox thought it looked at least 6'.

Jonathan DeGray, the project architect, stated that the portion in red is part of the existing home that would be removed. He estimated the size to be 8' x 9'. Mr. DeGray pointed out that the entire foundation will be removed because it does not meet code. A new concrete foundation will be installed, and the stone would be reinstalled on the concrete foundation. Mr. DeGray noted that all the stone would be saved and used on the site, including the area where it is being

removed. He clarified that the material would be removed initially to reconstruct the foundation.

Board Member Hodgkins thought it would change the historic streetscape as well as the historic facade. Planner Barhorst agreed. She explained that this was not the first revised proposal. The Staff had reviewed other iterations. One was to put it beneath a bay window feature, which is an important character defining feature to this Landmark site because of how the foundation undulates with the shape of the bay window. The extant staircase is also very character defining to this Landmark site. For that reason, the bay window and the staircase need to be retained. Planner Barhorst stated that it is a balance between the previous proposal from 2019 versus this new proposal. It changed from being on the secondary facade to now being on the primary facade. The HPB was being asked to review the removal of the material for the addition of the garage.

Planner Barhorst reported that she had received significant public comment through email and eComment. If the material deconstruction is approved this evening, those public comments will be included in the encroachment review with City Council because they all relate to the encroachment into the right-of-way.

Board Member Beatlebrox reiterated that it is a path, not a road. Planner Barhorst stated that it is a platted unbuilt right-of-way. Board Member Stephens pointed out that it is a public right-of-way, and the public has the right to go through that property.

Board Member Hutchings asked if the garage extends the porch on the south side of the house. Planner Barhorst replied that the initial design keeps the porch railing where it currently exists, but it looked strange without additional site grading to bring grade back up to where the garage wall ends. In the revised proposal they talked about extending the porch around to add on to that area. Planner Barhorst noted that extending the porch was not completely refined at this point and could still be discussed. Board Member Hutchings personally thought it was problematic, but he recognized that it was not part of this review.

Board Member Toly understood from the picture that all the brick to the left of the stair would be removed. Board Member Beatlebrox asked if there was a garage underneath the porch of the yellow house. Mr. Hutchings answered yes. Ms. Beatlebrox stated that she was initially concerned that no other house in the neighborhood had a garage under the house. Mr. Hutchings remarked that there are also houses in the neighborhood that do not have parking because the historic home and lot did not allow for it. There are examples of both on the street. Street parking is permit only.

Chair Scott opened the public hearing.

Peter Tomai raised his hand on Zoom to speak.

Peter Tomai stated that he has lived in Park City for 30 years. Compared to the proposal that was approved last Fall, he thought the impact on the public right-of-way and the openness along that street is far improved with this proposal, notwithstanding the fact that the end result is a garage door at the front of the house. Mr. Tomai pointed out that the garage promotes the City's goal of getting parked cars off the street. He believed this was a good trade-off and much better than what was approved last Fall.

Chair Scott closed the public hearing.

Board Member Stephens did not think this proposal would materially alter the front of the house, the facade, or how it is viewed from the street. He thought the HDDR would be a more difficult process for the Planning Staff in terms of minimizing the garage and the impact of the drive up to the garage. Regarding the item under review this evening, Mr. Stephens had no issues with removal of the stone foundation.

Board Member Hutchings agreed with Board Member Stephens. However, he thought altering the porch significantly alters the historic structure of the home. Mr. Hutchings supported the garage itself. Planner Barhorst appreciated his feedback regarding the porch and the Staff will consider his comments when refining the design.

Board Member Toly was concerned about setting a precedent for other owners of historic homes to request removing a portion of the historic home to build a garage. If the City is pushing for no cars on the streets then more people will want a garage, which completely changes the look of the historic home. Board Member Hutchings agreed that they need to think about precedent because each house is unique, but under similar circumstances they need to be looked at the same.

Chair Scott pointed out that the LMC allows for a historic home to be raised up to 2-feet with a garage underneath. Board Member Toly stated that the house next to hers on Empire was lifted and a garage added. However, in this case, the house was not being lifted to accommodate the garage. Instead, they were removing a portion of the house. Chair Scott clarified that a portion of the foundation was all that would be removed. He agreed with Ms. Toly that when a house is raised a new foundation is created and no historic material is removed.

Board Member Beatlebrox asked why the right-of-way needs to look like a driveway. She thought the owners could drive up on the dirt road and go into their garage. Ms. Beatlebrox thought the north facade in the original proposal

was the right location for a garage. Planner Barhorst stated that it was because of the site retention. The floor elevation of the existing structure stays the same, and excavation of the site to access the garage in the previous approval called for retaining walls. The size of the driveway into the right-of-way for the turnaround and to maneuver a car took up that space.

Board Member Hodgkins asked if raising the house 2' would mitigate using the right-of-way because there would be less excavation. Planner Barhorst believed the driveway would still be in the right-of-way. Mr. Hodgkins thought it was less about using the right-of-way and more about excavating and making the driveway so fancy that it looks private.

Board Member Beatlebrox suggested that the owners could park along the side or have a hardscaped front lawn for parking which would eliminate removing the tree. She thought they could look at other alternatives besides a garage.

Board Member Stephens noted that alternatives and other design issues are HDDR decisions. He thought the Board needed to focus on whether removing the stone significant to the decision being made this evening. It was a yes or no answer and then it goes to the HDDR for the Staff and applicant to come up with a design that works with the site and the architecture of the historic home. Mr. Stephens clarified that before the Staff can go through the design process, they need to know whether the HPB agrees with removing the stone from the front facade of the foundation. Mr. Stephens was comfortable moving forward with the revised proposal and allow the process to begin.

Board Member Stephens stated that when the LMC was changed to allow the house to only be raised 2', it mitigated the number of homes that could be raised to accommodate a garage underneath. He thought the City did a good job of mitigating the impact of the garage, but the reality is there is always a garage door in the front. Mr. Stephens agreed that garages alter the look of the historic house. Board Member Hodgkins stated that it also makes the house look a story taller than it ever was. With the 2' rule, all the historic homes on the uphill side of the street look bigger than they ever did, and the streetscape is compromised from a historic perspective.

Planner Barhorst remarked that the Design Guidelines as written allows for the addition of a garage. The Guidelines state that the foundation or basement addition shall not raise the historic structure more than 2'. Historic Buildings on downhill lots may be raised to accommodate a basement garage addition, provided the access of the garage is from the side. The basement garage addition shall not extend beyond the exterior wall planes of the historic structure's primary or secondary facade. Planner Barhorst stated that the HPB should decide whether this proposal complies with the Design Guidelines and that

allowing construction of the garage as proposed will not negatively impact the historic character of the Landmark site.

Board Member Hutchings asked for further clarification on the garage addition not extending beyond the wall plane of the historic structure. Planner Barhorst read the entire guideline, "A basement garage addition shall not extend beyond the exterior wall planes of the historic structure's primary or secondary facades. In limited situations, site setbacks and topography may allow for a projecting garage without adversely affecting the historic character of the structure. In these cases, a step design with associated site grading and landscaping plan may be considered". Planner Barhorst believed this proposal was under the limited situation.

Board Member Hodgkins thought the language in the guideline was contradictory because it says it cannot protrude from a secondary facade. He understood that to mean they can only protrude from something that is very tertiary, which does not apply to either of these facades. Planner Barhorst pointed out that the language says, "only in limited situations, site setbacks and topography may allow for a projecting garage without adversely affecting the historic character of the structure".

Board Member Toly stated that if the garage adversely affects the look of the house, the LMC would not allow it and the HPB could vote against it. Board Member Hutchings agreed. Board Member Toly thought the garage would definitely change the looks of the house. Planner Barhorst remarked that any new construction will change the historic character. The purpose of the Guidelines is to mitigate and minimize the impacts as close as possible to retain the historic integrity of the site.

Board Member Hodgkins remarked that the way the garage is offset from the side of the house makes it appear even wider, and that is a bigger issue than it being underneath and in the front.

Board Member Hutchings thought it would be interesting to see a picture of the house with the garage underneath it, and instead of extending the porch have a landscape element that deals with that odd corner if the garage extends beyond the plane of the house.

Planner Barhorst noted that other alternatives were proposed to the Staff prior to the one before the Board this evening. Board Member Toly asked if the HPB could deny this proposal and ask the applicant to come back with another alternative; or if they deny whether the applicant could come back with a different design.

Chair Scott stated that the HPB typically does not get involved with the Land Management Code. In this situation, the LMC talks about things adversely affecting historic character, which brings it within the HPB purview. Planner Barhorst replied that it is within the HPB purview in the circumstance of review for the material deconstruction, which the Board was reviewing against applicable design guidelines. The applicable guidelines were outlined in the Staff report.

Planner Barhorst believed the HPB could continue this item and ask the applicant to explore other alternatives if the main concern is the projection of the garage encroaching into the right-of-way.

Board Member Stephens stated that earlier in the discussion, Planner Barhorst talked about the garage going underneath the bay window and how they also wanted to protect the main entrance walkway up to the front door. Those alternatives did not work for various reasons, which resulted in the alternative being discussed this evening. Mr. Stephens commented on the small amount of space to the left of the photograph. He believed the garage was pushed out towards the right-of-way because the applicant was trying to build a Code compliant garage and it needs to go out that far to fit.

City Attorney Harrington stated that the priority was to preserve the two front columns, which pushed the garage to the left. The garage would fit on the property without the front columns.

Board Member Stephens noted that the applicant still had an uphill battle with the Planning Commission and City Council processes. It still needed to go through the Design Review process. Mr. Stephens pointed out that the Board keeps talking about the garage, but their role is not design review.

Board Member Beattlebrox reiterated her earlier comment about a parking pad to get the cars off the road. She pointed out that many homes in Old Town live with that type of parking situation. Board Member Toly pointed out that there are people on every street that do not have a garage or a parking pad. They use parking permits and park on the street. Board Member Hodgkins wanted to know why this applicant could not park in the alley on the side of the house.

City Attorney Harrington advised the Board to focus on their findings and tie the material deconstruction that is enabling the garage in this location to some of the criteria outlined in the Staff report; or determine how it differs from the yellow house on the left, which is also a Landmark structure. The Board could give direction in terms of asking the applicant to come back with more details to look at the relation of the porch facade element to the landscaping and retaining walls to make sure compliance will not have a negative impact on the above grade facade that is being preserved. The Board could also determine that removal of the historic material is consistent as long as it is preserved. A third option would

be denial with direction to Staff regarding the findings proposed in the report or other findings related to incompatibility due to the protrusion the material deconstruction would enable.

Board Member Beatlebrox preferred to continue this item and request additional information. She believed there could be other solutions. Ms. Beatlebrox thought reducing the stone and putting a garage in that location would ruin the looks of an elegant house.

Board Member Hodgkins remarked that very few houses in Park City have the story of this historic house. It was built, raised up, and an addition was built underneath it. Putting in an off-centered garage detracts from that story. Mr. Hodgkins wanted to investigate other options with design elements that can mitigate the garage trying to look like part of the house.

Chair Scott stated that in general he was comfortable with the concept of a garage, but he was conflicted with the LMC where the plane does not line up with the primary or secondary facade. He would like to see whether there are other options with more creativity to minimize the garage.

Mr. DeGray clarified that there is no room for a parking pad in front and still keep the minimum dimensions on the property. It would still extend into the public right-of-way. He noted that 18' is required for a 9' x 18' parking space and there is only 10' from the front of the building to the property line. Mr. DeGray stated that the applicant has been looking at the garage alternative from the beginning. He noted that they already looked at several alternatives with the Staff and this option appeared to be the best possible solution for a garage on this property with the constraints placed by the City Council's determination. He pointed out that there is a piece of plywood under the porch railing which was put in to structurally stabilize the house. There is no stone under the porch. The stone is to the right at the staircase and further around to the right to the bay window.

Mr. DeGray requested that the Board make a decision on whether the material deconstruction was appropriate for the garage.

Board Member Stephens asked if that was just framing under the porch, what stone they would be removing. Mr. DeGray replied that there is stone that follows the outside all of the house, but under the porch it is just framed. He stated that they would eventually run into a section of foundation in the back. With the current design application, that wall of the house would be removed and replaced, and that area would become part of the living space in the basement.

Board Member Beatlebrox asked whether the 18' required was vertical into the property or horizontal so the car is parallel to the road. Mr. DeGray replied that the City does not usually allow parallel. It needs to be perpendicular. It would be

a perpendicular dimension from the street to the house. Board Member Stephens pointed out that the house is only 10' back. Mr. DeGray agreed. There is not enough dimension to accommodate the 18' and it would extend into the public right-of-way.

Board Member Beatlebrox understood that the original stone is still used as a facade around the staircase going up to the porch. Mr. DeGray replied that she was correct. All that stone would be reused in that area. They were also proposing to put stone around the garage door entrance and down the side. Anything exposed below the main level floor would be stone veneer. Ms. Beatlebrox wanted to know who was building the staircase on the left. Mr. DeGray replied that it is a City staircase in the City right-of-way. The applicant was in discussions with the City on who would build that portion.

Board Member Beatlebrox was surprised that the Planning Commission would allow a stairway instead of letting someone use the right-of-way to park their car. She was also shocked that they would allow changing the front facade to remarkably that it mars the historic look of the house. Board Member Stephens believed Mr. Harrington explained that it was due to the grade change and the retention of the hillside in the public right-of-way. It also visually precludes the public feeling like they can use the right-of-way. He pointed out that the Planning Commission and the City Council made that decision. The HPB can disagree with it but they cannot change it.

Board Member Hutchings stated that his issue with the garage is that it breaks the primary plane. He thought it was an issue with the Code and the garage is not mitigated. Chair Scott had the same struggle, and he was unsure what to recommend.

Board Member Stephens asked if the front porch above the garage to the south goes against the LMC guidelines Planner Barhorst read earlier. Planner Barhorst re-read the guideline, "A basement garage addition shall not extend beyond the exterior wall planes of a historic structure's primary or secondary facades. In limited situations, site setbacks and topography may allow for a projecting garage without adversely affecting the historic character of the structure. In these cases, a stepped design with an associated site grading and landscaping plan may be considered". Planner Barhorst stated that the question is whether "projected garage" adversely affecting the historic character of the structure per that design guideline.

Board Member Toly clarified that they were adding an additional 5' on the side. Planner Barhorst replied that it was 5'4" from the actual footprint. She pointed out that the LMC only allows it if can be mitigated through landscaping and grading and it does not adversely change the character of the house. Ms. Toly

thought the question for the Board was whether the additional 5' would change the historical character of the house.

Board Member Hutchings understood that the Board was being asked to approve the material deconstruction of the section shown in red to add a garage. He believed the concern is that the result of removing the material is a garage that adds 5' beyond the primary plane of the historic structure. Mr. Hutchings stated that in theory they could approve the material deconstruction, but he was uncomfortable with the design of the garage that extends beyond the plane because it is not mitigated very well as proposed.

Board Member Beatlebrox commented on the number of projects in town where people ask how it was allowed to happen. This may be a small bunch of stones, but the overall impact could be great. She was not prepared to approve the material deconstruction this evening and preferred to continue until they could look at other options.

Planning Director Milliken agreed that it is very difficult to just look at the material deconstruction on one section without considering what that would mean, or that it might give a green light to something that is beyond the HPB determination. She explained that it is a chicken and egg situation in terms of who this should go to first. She believed all the Board members raised very valid points.

Board Member Toly asked if it was possible to send this to the HDDR first and then come back to the HPB. City Attorney Harrington asked if the HPB had appeal authority on the HDDR. Planner Barhorst replied that the appeal authority is the Board of Adjustment or the City Council. She stated that when the material deconstruction code was changed a year ago, it gave more to Staff review for upgrades and routine maintenance. However, they kept the HPB as the body to review the removal of historic material to accommodate new additions, new construction, or structural upgrades. The supplemental material deconstruction checkpoint list from years ago no longer exists and it is all reviewed in compliance with the Design Guidelines. Planner Barhorst pointed out that it is a little bit of design review because the guidelines point to topography and other issues.

Board Member Stephens recalled that the intent was to make sure the Board was not in a situation where the Planning Staff approved something that the public questioned. It was a check and balance process to make sure the Planning Department was complying with the community values. Mr. Stephens stated that another part was to give the applicant the ability to go through the process in an efficient way. The applicant would come to the HPB to find out what they could work with to start designing. Once the applicant is given approval, they can go through the design process with certainty on how to proceed forward. Mr. Stephens reiterated that the design professionals look at

ways to mitigate this garage and its impact on the house and the site. If they cannot do that, it will not go through the HDDR to be approved. If it does go through the HDDR and the Staff and applicant agree on a plan, it would still go through a formal public process where the public can provide input. Mr. Stephens pointed out that the applicant may not be successful in coming up with an appropriate design, but he thought the HPB should give the applicant the opportunity to move forward with trying to design an acceptable plan.

MOTION: Board Member Stephens moved to APPROVE the material deconstruction for 901 Woodside, pursuant to the Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Conditions of Approval as found in the draft action letter, and as amended to includes removing conclusion of Law #1, and adding a Condition of Approval stating that in reviewing the HDDR the Planning Staff shall make particular findings with regard to the two provisions in the LMC regarding primary and secondary separation, the porch and additional landscaping, and a basement addition with a garage pursuant to the Guidelines in LMC 15-13-5(B)(2). Chair Scott seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously. Board Member Holmgren was not present for the vote.

Findings of Fact - 901 Woodside

1. The property is located at 901 Woodside Avenue in the Historic Residential (HR-1) zoning District.
2. The Site is designated as Landmark on the Historic Sites Inventory.
3. On April 18, 2019, the Planning Department received a complete Historic District Design Review (HDDR) application for the property at 901 Woodside Avenue.
4. On April 19, 2019, the Planning Department received a complete Conditional Use Permit Application (PL-19-04152) was deemed complete on. The applicant was requesting 1.) a setback exception for construction of a basement using the footprint of the Historic Structure per LMC § 15-2.2-4 and 2.) construction of a private driveway within Platted, Unbuilt City Streets per LMC § 15-3-5.
5. August 14, 2019 – Planning Commission. The item was unanimously continued to a date certain.
6. September 11, 2019 – Planning Commission. The item was continued to September 25, 2019.
7. September 25, 2019 – Planning Commission. The item was continued to November 13, 2019.
8. November 13, 2019 – Planning Commission. The motion for approval made by Commissioner Sletten was seconded by Commissioner Thimm. The motion failed on a 3-3 split vote. Commissioners Sletten, Van Dine, and Thimm voted in favor of the motion. Commissioners Suesser, Kenworthy, and Hall voted against the motion.

9. December 19, 2019 – City Council Call Up of a Conditional Use Permit for a Private Driveway within a Platted, Unbuilt City Street.
10. On February 6, 2020, City Council repealed LMC § 15-3-5 Driveway Standards for Private Driveways Within Platted Unbuilt City Streets through Ordinance 2020-12.
11. On December 28, 2020 the Planning Department Received a revised set of plans altering the location of the garage addition in order to lessen the encroachment into the public right of way.
12. Development on this property has spanned across three (3) of Park City's designated Historic eras, including the Settlement and Mining Boom Era (1868-1893), the Mature Mining Era (1894-1930), and the Mining Decline and Emergence of Recreation Industry Era (1931-1962).
13. The house first appears on the 1889 Sanborn Fire Insurance Map as a simple, onestory T/L Crosswing cottage style house with a single-story L-shaped front porch and bay window on the east (front) elevation.
14. The 1900 Sanborn Fire Insurance map shows that the house as a two-story wood frame structure with a one-story L-shaped porch and a large addition in the rear, which means the house was most likely lifted and a new first level was constructed beneath the original form. The L-shaped front porch was recorded as two-story in the 1907 Sanborn map. The house remained unchanged through 1929, with where the front porch used to be recorded as two-story in the 1941 Sanborn Map and a section of the back circ. 1900 L-shaped addition removed.
15. The first photograph of this house appeared as part of the circ. 1941 tax assessment. At this time of the 1949, and 1958 tax assessments it was clad in Bricktex asphalt siding and shows the second-floor porch was enclosed with a shed roof sometime after circ. 1900 and pre-circ. 1907. The original pitch of the L-shaped roof can be seen in Figure 2, and was changed before circ. 1982 when windows were added to the second-floor and enclosed the porch as livable space. The first floor porch was also opened up and wood columns were added prior to circ. 1982.
16. The owner of the property received a Historic District Grant in 1987 for \$4,850 and in 1990 for \$1,000. There are no records of any building permits documenting the work done using the Grant money.
17. The proposed Material Deconstruction of the Historic foundation has been reviewed for compliance with LMC § 15-13-2 Design Guidelines for Historic Residential Sites, including the following applicable Design Guidelines:

B. Specific Guidelines:

2. Primary Structures

b. Foundation

(1) The historic placement, orientation, and grade of a historic building shall be retained, as shall the original grade of the property where feasible.

- Complies, The building orientation will remain the same as the historic placement; original grade will be returned where feasible at the perimeter of the site following construction of the garage.

- (2) A new foundation shall not raise or lower a historic structure generally more than two (2) feet from its original floor elevation.
- Complies, The applicant proposes to raise the structure no more than two (2) feet from its original floor elevation.
- (3) A 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.
- Complies, see Condition of Approval #13.
- (4) Re-grade the site so that all water drains away from the structure and does not enter the foundation.
- Complies, see Condition of Approval #13.
- (5) 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.
- Complies, see Condition of Approval #13.
- (6) Any re-grading of the site shall blend with grade of adjacent sites and shall not create the need for incompatible retaining walls.
- Complies, grade will be returned following construction. No incompatible retaining walls are proposed.
- (7) The form, material, and detailing of a new foundation shall be similar to the historic foundation (when extant) or similar to foundations of nearby historic structures.
- Complies, the new foundation will be made of board formed concrete.

Conclusions of Law – 901 Woodside

1. 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 – 901 Woodside

1. Final building plans and construction details shall reflect substantial compliance with the plans approved by the Historic Preservation Board September 2, 2020 for the Material Deconstruction of the Historic foundation for the construction of the basement 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 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. 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.

15. Staff shall review the design of the basement garage addition for compliance per 15-13-2(B)(2)(5)(b)(2): A basement garage addition shall not extend beyond the exterior wall planes of the historic structure's primary or secondary facades. In limited situations, site setbacks and topography may allow for a projecting garage without adversely affecting the historic character of the structure. In these cases, a stepped design with an associated site grading and landscaping plan may be considered.

16. Staff shall review the design of the porch railing location in relation to the projecting garage wall plane.

5.D. 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 and LMC Chapter 15-15.

Due to technical issues, the Board discussed continuing this item to the next meeting. Planner Barhorst stated that it could be continued; however, since it was noticed for public hearing, the Board open the public hearing and take public input.

Planner Laura Kuhrmeyer stated that this LMC Amendment addresses shared parking structures below grade. Currently, the Code allows these structures in certain lots; however, they are difficult to achieve based on constraints in other parts of the Code. The Staff was proposing to amend the LMC to eliminate the conflict.

Chair Scott opened the public hearing.

Kevin Horn raised his hand on Zoom to comment.

Mr. Horn asked if there would be another opportunity for public comment if this item was continued this evening.

Planner Barhorst answered yes.

Mr. Horn stated that he would hold his comments until the next meeting.

Chair Scott closed the public hearing.

MOTION: Board Member Barhorst moved to CONTINUE this item to March 3, 2021. Board Member Toly seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

Chair Scott noted that Caitlyn Barhorst was leaving the Planning Department, and this was her last meeting. He commended her work and diligence and thanked her for her service. She will be missed. All the Board members thanked Planner Barhorst and wished her luck on her next venture.

The Historic Preservation Board Meeting adjourned at 8:35 p.m.

Approved by _____
Randy Scott, Chair
Historic Preservation Board