

PARK CITY MUNICIPAL CORPORATION
HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD
MINUTES OF DECEMBER 2, 2020

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

EX OFFICIO: Caitlyn Barhorst, Liz Jackson, Mark Harrington, Jessica Nelson

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

Election of Chair

Board Member Lola Beatlebrox nominated Randy Scott as the HPB Chair to conduct the meeting. Board Member Hodgkins seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

ROLL CALL

Chair Scott called the meeting to order at 5:00 p.m. and noted that all Board Members were present.

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. To comment virtually, use eComment or raise your hand on Zoom. eComments submitted before the meeting date will be attached to the packet as appendices. eComments submitted on HPB meeting days will be read aloud. For more information on participating virtually and to listen live, please go to www.parkcity.org/public-meetings

Chair Scott read from Exhibit A, Determination of Substantial Health and Safety Risk. On December 2, 2020, 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 Governor Herbert declared a Covid-19 State of Emergency on November 8, 2020. Summit County has extended its emergency declaration and public health emergency declaration through January 8, 2021. Statewide Covid cases and hospitalizations are increasing.

This determination is valid for 30 days and is set to expire on January 2, 2020.

Dated December 2, 2020.

ADOPTION OF MINUTES

MOTION: Board Member Hutchings moved to APPROVE the minutes of November 4, 2020 as corrected. Board Member Holmgren 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

City Attorney Harrington reported that he had originally intended to do the annual Public and Open Meetings Act Training this evening; however, due to a lack of communication it was not scheduled on the agenda. Mr. Harrington noted that he had email the presentation to all the Board Members as a PDF. He asked the Board members to review the information over the next month and be prepared to have the full presentation in January. If the Board Members have questions prior to the January meeting they should contact City Attorney Harrington.

CONTINUATIONS – (Public hearing and continue to date specified)

- 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 Barhorst reported that she was requesting a continuation to allow her additional time to do more research on the property to see if there is a historic photograph of this property. She has not been able to find any photos in the records she has researched or with the Museum.

Chair Scott opened the public hearing. No eComments were submitted and no hands were raised on Zoom. Chair Scott closed the public hearing.

MOTION: Board Member Holmgren moved to CONTINUE 1003 Norfolk Avenue to January 6, 2021. Board Member Hutchings seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

REGULAR AGENDA

- 6.A. 221 Main Street – Historic District Design Review Historic Preservation Board Review for Material Deconstruction of a Landmark Historic Site – The Applicant is Proposing to replace an existing window on the side façade with a door. (Application PL-20-04462)

Planner Liz Jackson reviewed the application for material deconstruction on a Landmark site at 221 Main Street. The Board was being asked to review material deconstruction for an existing window changing to a door.

Planner Jackson reported that the historic site at 221 Main Street has been known as the Bogan Boarding House and Imperial Hotel, formerly owned by John and Anna Bogan as a boarding house for miners. The structure has had various alterations throughout its lifetime, including roof and upper-level reconstruction due to a fire, as well as a restoration in the 1970s after it was condemned.

Planner Jackson stated that in relation to this application, in 2011 the windows were replaced with wooden windows across the structure. As it stands today, the structure is currently mixed commercial and residential space. Planner Jackson remarked that in looking at the existing conditions, the upper levels include livable space that is accessible via a rear entry and pathway that is owned by the property to the south at 205 Main Street. She noted that 221 Main has a current agreement with 205 Main in order to use that space in order to access the rear entry.

Planner Jackson stated that the applicant was requesting better access to the upper levels by changing a north side facade window to a door. The intention is to add stairs in order to better access these levels. Planner Jackson presented a slide showing a blue arrow pointing to the subject window in the application. The window is currently six feet tall and it would change to be seven feet tall.

The Staff found that the proposed modification does not negatively impact the historic integrity of the site. There would be a condition that any process moving forward would not negatively impact any historic material, and the impacts would be as minimal as possible.

Planner Jackson reported that the applicant has been working with the owner of the Star Hotel at 227 Main Street to develop an encroachment agreement. However, the applicant was first seeking HPB approval for the subject door because the encroachment agreement hinges on that approval. Planner Jackson remarked that this approval is also subject to the stair encroachment agreement. She clarified that changing the window to a door would not occur if the stairs cannot go in.

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

Board Member Toly disclosed that she serves as the Vice-President of the HPCA and the applicant, Seth Adams, is on the Board.

Board Member Holmgren disclosed that she sits on the HPCA Board and has been on the Board for a very long time.

Board Member Beatlebrox asked for the full name of HPCA. Board Member Holmgren replied that it is the Historical Park City Alliance. Ms. Beatlebrox clarified that it was the Main Street Alliance. Ms. Holmgren answered yes.

The applicant, Seth Adams, stated that he wanted to be able use the property the best they can. It is a great looking piece of property and the condo is amazing, but the access is a deterrent for anyone who wants to get in. People need to go in the garage, up three floors, and down the stairs into the condo. Mr. Adams stated that they would like to upgrade the building with access from Main Street that makes it more accessible for a long time.

Board Member Beatlebrox understood that the access to the second-floor condo is actually through the store. Mr. Adams replied that there is one access through the back of the store, which was done for egress, as well as access for Sundance. However, when the store is closed people cannot access the condo without going over to Grappa and down the stairs there, or through the garage and down the poorly lit alley.

Mr. Hodgkins asked Mr. Adams to explain what he means by garage. Mr. Adams stated that they have parking in the 205 Brownstone garage for the condo.

Board Member Toly asked about fire code. She asked how people would currently get out of the building in the event of a fire. Mr. Adams replied that all the windows are fire windows that were replaced a few years earlier. There are fire escapes into the Provisions space and on the side going towards the alley.

Planner Barhorst presented a slide showing the current rear access. She noted that the previous renovation met all the fire code requirements for the building review. However, the current access is dysfunctional and difficult to reach. Mr. Adams reviewed the slide to show the current access.

Board Member Stephens noted that this would become a building permit issue which was not within the HPB purview; however, he believed the Building Code requires a 36" wide door for at least one door out of the condo. He asked if that requirement was met by the door on the 205 Main Street side because the proposed door is shown as 2'8". Planner Barhorst did not believe the proposed door would serve as the main fire access. The current access meets those requirements and she assumed it would still act as the main access.

Board Member Beatlebrox asked if the top floor condo on the third floor was accessed from a parking lot. Mr. Adams replied that the third and fourth floor was one large four-bedroom condo. Ms. Beatlebrox thought she saw a rear egress on the top floor. Mr. Adams explained that the walkway shown in yellow connects to the third floor, and the fourth floor is accessed from the interior space of the condo.

Board Member Hodgkins asked if the condo was three levels. Mr. Adams replied that the condo is 2-1/2 levels. He noted that the very top is not accessible space and contains some of the mechanical equipment for the commercial space.

Board Member Beatlebrox referred to the floor plan of the third floor and asked if there was no egress to the rear at all. Mr. Hodgkins noted that the drawing said Level 1 and there was a front entrance. He assumed it was the first floor of the building. Planner Barhorst thought it appeared that way because of how it was drawn. It looks down on the plans below, which is the main staircase that goes up to Provision. That is what they were seeing on the right-hand side.

Planner Jackson pointed out that the drawing was oriented differently than the actual building. Board Member Beatlebrox found that to be confusing because the building was oriented towards Main Street on the left, and she assumed that was the rear. Chair Scott understood they were looking at Provisions in the layout, which is below the condo. Planner Jackson stated that everything shown was already in existence except for the potential stairs on the top.

Chair Scott understood from the drawings that there is no door or structure other than whatever structure the stairs are on going up to Provisions. There is no enclosure added to the front. Mr. Adams replied that he was correct.

Board Member Beatlebrox asked how the stairs would be attached to the building. Planner Barhorst replied that it was still being reviewed. The encroachment agreement between the two property owners needs more

progress towards finalization. The Staff will be discussing how those stairs should attach and how to appropriately protect the historic siding from any snow issues, as well as the plan for snow removal.

Mr. Adams stated that the stairs will be similar to the stairs that go up alongside Grappa, and the snow will fall through them. He remarked that the applicant will be purchasing the air space over the Star property to support the stairs. Mr. Adams noted that the engineer was at the property earlier this afternoon looking at this in conjunction with the Star to support the stairs from just below. It might not be necessary to attach the stairs or have them supported by the structure itself.

Board Member Hodgkins asked how close the stairs will be to the Star Hotel. Mr. Adams replied that there were still several feet. At the top of where the stairs would end, the Star put a chiller or heating and air that comes closer to his property than the stairs would on that side. Mr. Hodgkins asked if there was a way to pull the stairs off the building. He still wanted to be able to see and feel the historic building. When the stairs run against the building it is hard to see the volume without seeing the stairs. Mr. Adams thought there was room and opportunity to do that. He stated that there is virtually dead space between the two buildings, and he believed there definitely was room.

Mr. Adams stated that when it was engineered, it was determined that a landing needs to occur coming out the proposed door, which works with the Star designers and engineers with a landing to come out the door, which is potentially there with the chiller they created.

Board Member Stephens recalled when this building was first done, and he recalled that originally the condominium was accessed from the center door off the main entrance of what is now Provisions. He believed there was retail on each side of that hallway. Mr. Adams replied that he was correct. Mr. Stephens understood that access became an issue due to trying to make Provisions a successful operation. Mr. Adams pointed out that there is still a staircase on the interior that goes up, but it does not go to the front door. Mr. Stephens thought there used to be a hallway going from the front door back to the staircase. Mr. Adams recalled that the stairs were very close to the second level entrance to the front door. People actually walked right up the stairs and there was a door on each side and a vestibule going into the retail.

Chair Scott opened the public hearing.

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

Chair Scott closed the public hearing.

Chair Scott agreed with Board Member Hodgkins about having the stairs disconnected from the structure to help keep the historic feel. Once they put a staircase that long and large up against the structure, they lose all visibility at the bottom.

Chair Scott asked if any architectural elements were being modified or added. He was referring to Universal Guidelines, page 11, #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 are visually modified or alter the original building design". Planner Barhorst believed that guideline relates to adding ornamentation detailing such as scroll work, etc. She stated that a staircase can be done in a manner that if it is removed in the future the structure can be restored back without any issues. Planner Barhorst felt certain that #7 addressed detailed ornamentation. She thought it was a good point to be clarified.

Planner Barhorst thought the comments regarding the spacing from the building were also important. The Staff will definitely make sure to review that once the plans are further developed. One of her initial thoughts when they started talking about this project is that it should not be pushed against the building. Since the space between the Imperial and Star became a utility corridor for the Star reconstruction, she thought it was compatible in use as a utility corridor type concept between the two structures. Planner Barhorst stated that this issue was on her final approval checklist when the stairs get further along in design to make sure they are separated.

Board Member Holmgren stated that she was thinking streetscape, and whether it would be that intrusive when looking at it from the street. Planner Barhorst remarked that the space between the two buildings is minimal and it will be taken up mostly by utilities. Adding a stair as a pedestrian element may help soften the mechanical units and provide a more pedestrian oriented feel. Planner Barhorst did not think the stairs would be too visible standing on that side of the street or across the street.

Board Member Stephens agreed with Chair Scott and Board Member Hodgkins. The change from a window to a door is not as bothersome as having the staircase right up against the siding. He thought it would be helpful if architecturally this looked more structural, a different style, and there were a few inches between the staircase and the building itself. It would also preserve the siding from standing water. Mr. Stephens noted that the door shown is a 2'8" six panel exterior door. He did not believe six panel doors were that common in Park City. Most were four panel doors.

Board Member Holmgren stated that her original door was still hanging, and it is identical to a six-panel door.

Board Member Hodgkins noted that the facade was not clearly visible in some of the older photos. He asked if the size of the window coming out was historic. Planner Barhorst replied that the size cannot be supported by any photographic evidence or records they were able to research. It was difficult to see the window so far back on the facade, especially when the Star was up. Planner Barhorst stated that the Staff was treating it as though it was a historic window opening. She pointed out that one of the exhibits was a photo that she took leaning out the subject window, and she could see existing siding modifications, which indicates window alterations in the past. She presented photos of other windows on the structure that she thought were infilled. Mr. Hodgkins stated that the fact that the windows have been infilled and look like the same size as the subject window suggests that this window may be its original size.

Board Member Hodgkins questioned whether it was appropriate to have a typical historic door on the second floor of a building. He thought there were examples in Park City where the original building became the second floor with a new floor built underneath and the front door opens into the upper levels. Mr. Hodgkins did not think the proposed door needed to look like a historic Main Street door per se. However, he would not be opposed if the applicant wanted to continue the fenestration and glaze the same opening within the door to keep the rhythm of what already exists.

Mr. Adams remarked that he said from the beginning that he would make the door look like whatever would be most appropriate from anyone's standpoint. His focus is on access. The look of the door is not important to him.

Board Member Stephens stated that the door is so far back from the street that the door material actually becomes immaterial. He suggested that Mr. Adams make the door feel more like an entrance since that is the primary goal. Mr. Stephens acknowledged that this was a design issue and Mr. Adams could make the door look however he wanted.

Board Member Hodgkins stated that using other corridor staircases within Park City as examples he did not believe sliding a staircase within that space would be much different. However, it would be different if it was shoved against one building versus the other because that would look more like a fire escape. Planner Barhorst stated that moving forward the Staff would make sure there is enough separation to address their concerns.

Board Member Beatlebrox asked if Mr. Adams was thinking of a metal staircase where the snow falls through or if the stairs would be wood. Mr. Adams replied that idea is to have metal so the snow will fall through and to avoid ongoing maintenance issues.

Board Member Toly assumed they would be similar to the existing staircases on 4th Street and 10th Street, as well as the ones that go up to Marsac and City Hall.

Board Member Hutchings asked if the Code allows turning a window into a door or vice versa. Planner Barhorst replied that the material deconstruction review is to address the issue of removing historic material to accommodate new construction. She pointed out that the material deconstruction code was changed specifically for this type of project where the alteration has some impact to the historic material and the historic building. Planner Barhorst stated that based on the guidance in the Design Guidelines, this proposal appears to be a compatible change to allow for the use. If they work on the detailing of the door to read like another fenestration opening, the Staff finds the proposal to be appropriate. However, that decision is up to the HPB based on their review.

Board Member Toly noted that the discussion has primarily been focused on the staircase. She clarified that the HPB was only being asked to decide whether it was appropriate to change the window to a door, and the stairway was not part of their decision. Planner Barhorst replied that the issue this evening is the door; however, if the door cannot be installed without a staircase, and the staircase encroachment is still in negotiations. She pointed out that if the HPB does not approve the door proposal, there is no point in pursuing an encroachment agreement for a staircase. Ms. Toly clarified that she was asking whether the Board has the purview to weigh in on the type and location of the staircase. Planner Barhorst stated that it is technically approved by the Staff but the comments regarding separation were appropriate for the Board to discuss.

Board Member Hodgkins remarked that the staircase was not part of the decision this evening. The Board would only be voting on removal of the historic material below the current window that would allow for a door to be inserted.

Board Member Hutchings understood that removal of historic material under the Code is allowed. He just wanted to make sure that the Code would allow what has historically always been a window to become a door. Mr. Hutchings remarked that there are other locations where turning a window into a door on the back half of the historic structure would be very visible. He wanted clarification that the Code allows for that.

Planner Jackson replied that the Code states that new door openings can be considered on secondary facades, and that it needs to be similar in location, size, and type. Mr. Hutchings was more comfortable with the proposal after hearing that clarification.

Board Member Holmgren noted that page 53 of the Staff report emphasizes that it is a non-historic window. Board Member Hodgkins thought that was still undetermined because there were no photos to confirm one way or the other.

Planner Barhorst stated that the fascia of the window themselves is 9 or 10 years old, but there is no way to definitively determine whether the opening has been there historically. However, they are treating it as the historic opening because there is evidence that the other windows are the same size it is very likely that this one is original to the structure.

Board Member Hutchings strongly supported a separation between the building and the stairwell.

MOTION: Board Member Hutchings moved to APPROVE the proposed material deconstruction at 221 Main Street, consistent with the Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Conditions of Approval as found in the Staff report. Board Member Holmgren seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

Findings of Fact – 221 Main Street

1. The Site is located at 221 Main Street.
2. The Structure is designated as Landmark on the Historic Structures Inventory.
3. The Site is located within the Historic Commercial Business (HCB) Zoning District.
4. On October 28, 2020, the Planning Department deemed a Historic District Design Review (HDDR) Application complete for the property at 221 Main Street. The HDDR Application has not yet been approved as it is dependent on the HPB's Review for Material Deconstruction approval.
5. The Structure was constructed circ. 1904, per Summit County's records.
6. The Historic Structure Form has identified this Site's era of historical significance as the Mature Mining Era, 1894 to 1930.
7. The Structure first appears on the 1907 Sanborn Fire Insurance map as a 2 ½ story frame rectangular boarding house ("Lodge"), facing east toward Main Street.
8. The first photograph of the Structure on file was taken circ. 1930 from a cross canyon viewpoint.
9. In 2011, a Historic District Design Review waiver letter was issued to replace the windows of this Site via permit PL-11-01301.
10. This Site was listed on the National Register of Historic Places in 1984 as part of the Park City Mining Boom Era Residences Thematic District.
11. The Applicant proposes to remove an existing non-historic window on the north side façade and replace it with a door. This will be the main entrance for the living space above the commercial levels. The existing window's glass Area is 6' tall by 2' 5 ½" wide. The proposed door will be 7' tall by 2' 8" wide.
12. The proposed exterior changes shall not damage or destroy the exterior architectural features of the subject property which are compatible with the character of the Historic Structure.

13. In 2014, a Termination of Easements and Declaration of New Easements was recorded with Summit County (Entry no. 01004481). More specifically, this is a Parking and Access Easement, giving 221 Main Street “perpetual easement that will allow the 221 Property Access to the Parking Area in the basement of the Building and exclusively use two parking stalls and then to travel by foot up the elevator in the 205 Building, out the back door and down the sidewalk that will connect to the improvements on the 221 Property.” This sidewalk also allows for emergency egress for the living space on the upper levels of 221 Main Street. In 2016, emergency egress was further clarified in a Modification and Clarification of Easement (Entry No. 01043772 with Summit County) that 221 Main Street could utilize 205 Main Street’s walkway and exit onto Main Street.

14. The Applicant is working with the property owner of 227 Main Street (AKA the Star Hotel) to produce an Encroachment Agreement to allow for stairs to be constructed over the 221 Main Street property line that will lead to the door proposed in this permit (PL-20-04462). Per the Applicant, the door proposed this permit will not be required if an agreement is not formed and the stairs cannot be constructed.

15. This Application’s Affirmation of Sufficient Interest has been signed by the owners of 221 Main Street and 227 Main Street to indicate the owners’ intention to create an Encroachment Agreement for stairs that cross over the property line between the two Sites.

16. 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.

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:

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 Applicant has proposed minimal change to the distinctive materials and features as the proposal affects a secondary façade. The Use is not proposed to change.

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

- ☐ Complies; the Applicant has not proposed removal or modifications to changes to the building that have acquired Historic significance.

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

- ☐ Complies; the Applicant proposes to retain and preserve the Historic exterior features. The proposal affects a secondary façade and does not negatively impact the Historic Integrity of the Landmark Historic Site.
- 4. Distinctive materials, components, finishes, and examples of craftsmanship should be retained and preserved.
 - ☐ Complies; the Applicant proposes to retain and preserve the distinctive materials, components, finishes, and examples of craftsmanship. The siding will be replaced and repaired as needed.
- 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. Non-historic alterations that have been made to elements of a property, such as window replacements, eave enclosures, or porch element substitutions, that are in place prior to the adoption of these Design Guidelines may be maintained. However, if additional alterations to these elements are proposed, the elements must be brought into compliance with these Design Guidelines.
 - ☐ Complies; The existing window is a non-historic window replacement as permitted in the 2011 application. The proposed modification complies with the Design Guidelines as provided in this analysis.
- 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 additions, exterior alterations, repairs, upgrades, etc. shall not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the historic site or historic building. New construction shall differentiate from the historic structure and, at the same time, be compatible 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 the Historic District.
 - ☐ Complies; the proposed exterior alteration does not destroy the Site's character defining features as the proposed alteration is located on a secondary façade that is beyond the mid-point of the wall.
- 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.

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

- ☐ Complies; the proposed modification does not negatively impact the Historic Integrity as defined by the National Park Service in terms of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association.

B. Specific Guidelines:

2. Primary Structures

b. Exterior Walls

(1) Primary and secondary facade elements, such as window/door configuration, wall planes, recesses, bays, balconies, steps, porches, and entryways shall be preserved and maintained in their original location on the façade.

- ☐ Complies; the proposed door location is to be located within an existing window opening on the secondary façade.

(2) Exterior historic elements including wood siding (drop siding, clapboard, board and batten), frieze boards, cornices, moldings, shingles, etc., as well as stone and masonry shall be preserved and maintained. Deteriorated or damaged historic elements shall be repaired using recognized preservation methods appropriate to the specific material.

- ☐ Complies as Conditioned; See Condition of Approval #4.

(4) When an exterior historic element cannot be repaired, it shall be replaced with materials that match the original in all respects: scale, dimension, profile, material, texture, and finish. The replacement of an existing historic element is allowed only when it can be demonstrated that the historic element is no longer safe and/or serviceable and cannot be repaired to a safe and/or serviceable condition.

- ☐ Complies as Conditioned; See Condition of Approval #4.

e. Doors (not included in Storefronts)

(7) New door openings may be considered on secondary façades. A new opening shall be similar in location, size, and type to those seen on the historic structure.

- ☐ Complies; The proposed door will be replacing an existing window opening on the secondary façade, near the rear of the Building and beyond the midpoint. This door shall be similar in design and scale to doors seen in the Historic Districts (COA #3).

f. Windows (not included in Storefronts)

(8) New window openings may be considered on secondary façades but only when placed beyond the midpoint. New window openings shall be

similar in location, size, scale, type, and glazing pattern to those seen on the historic structure.

- ☐ Complies; The proposed door will be replacing an existing window opening on the secondary façade, near the rear of the Building and beyond the midpoint. This door is similar in design and scale to doors seen in the Historic Districts.

18. The Design Review Team, Building, Planning and Legal Departments reviewed this Application.

19. Per LMC § 15-1-21, staff published notice on the City's website and the Utah Public Notice website, posted notice on the property, and mailed a courtesy notice to property owners within 100 feet on November 18, 2020. The Park Record published notice on November 18, 2020.

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

Conclusions of Law – 221 Main Street

1. The proposal complies with the Land Management Code requirements pursuant to 15-2.6 Historic Commercial Business (HCB) District.
2. The proposal meets the criteria for material deconstruction pursuant to LMC 15-11-12.5 Historic Preservation Board Review for Material Deconstruction.
3. There is good cause for this HDDR Application, as the proposed project will minimally impact the Historic integrity of the Structure, as well as give a more easily accessible access point to the upper levels.

Conditions of Approval – 221 Main Street

1. Final Building plans and construction details shall reflect substantial compliance with the HDDR proposal approved by the Historic Preservation Board on December 2, 2020. Any changes, modifications, or deviations from the approved design that have not been approved by the Planning and Building Departments may result in a stop work order.
2. The Applicant is responsible for notifying the Building and Planning Departments if changes are made.
3. Replacement doors and windows shall exactly match any Historic doors in size, material, profile, and style. Doors and windows that are non-historic will abide by the requirements within LMC 15-13 Design Guidelines for Historic Districts and Historic Structures and the International Residential Code. The proposed door design shall be similar to the Historic doors seen on the Historic structure.
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 Project 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 Project Planner. Deteriorated or damaged historic elements shall be repaired using recognized preservation methods appropriate to the specific material.

5. This material deconstruction approval is subject to an Encroachment Agreement to be recorded with Summit County. Said Agreement shall include the staircase proposed to cross the North Side property line of 221 Main Street over the South Side property line of 227 Main Street.

The Historic Preservation Board Meeting adjourned at 6:00 p.m.

Approved by _____
Randy Scott, Chair
Historic Preservation Board