



**PARK CITY MUNICIPAL CORPORATION
HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD MEETING
MARSAC MUNICIPAL BUILDING
COUNCIL CHAMBERS
445 MARSAC AVENUE
PARK CITY, SUMMIT COUNTY, UTAH
MINUTES OF NOVEMBER 17, 2025**

BOARD MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE: Douglas Stephens - Chair, Puggy Holmgren, Dalton Gackle, John Hutchings, Lola Beatlebrox, Katie Noble (arrived at 5:04 p.m.)

EX OFFICIO MEMBERS: Rebecca Ward, Planning Director; Jacob Klopfenstein, Planner II; Chief Building Official, Dave Thacker; Mark Harrington, Senior City Attorney

1. CALL TO ORDER

Chair Douglas Stephens called the meeting to order at approximately 5:00 p.m.

2. ROLL CALL

A roll call was conducted. Board Member Randy Scott and Board Member Katie Noble were absent. All other Board Members were present at the Historic Preservation Board Meeting.

3. MINUTES APPROVAL

A. Consideration to Approve the Historic Preservation Board Meeting Minutes from October 1, 2025.

MOTION: Board Member Holmgren moved to APPROVE the Historic Preservation Board Meeting Minutes from October 1, 2025. Board Member Gackle seconded the motion.

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

4. STAFF AND BOARD COMMUNICATIONS AND DISCLOSURES

There were no Staff or Board communications and disclosures shared.

5. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS

There were no public communications.

6. **REGULAR AGENDA**

- A. **1003 Norfolk Avenue – Request for Modification to Material Deconstruction – The Applicant Requests a Modification of the March 5, 2025, Modification of Material Deconstruction Approval (PL-25-06240) to Panelize the Exterior Walls of the Landmark Historic Structure to Construct a Rear and Basement Addition and to Repair the Foundation in the Historic Residential - 1 (HR-1) Zoning District. PL-25-06722. Application Withdrawn.**

Planning Director, Rebecca Ward, reported that the application for 1003 Norfolk Avenue was noticed for a public hearing. However, on the date that the Meeting Materials Packet was intended to be published, the applicant withdrew the application. As a result, no public hearing is needed. It was noted for the record that Board Member Noble joined the meeting.

- B. **218 Sandridge Road – Request for Modification to Material Deconstruction – The Applicant Requests a Modification to the February 7, 2024, Material Deconstruction Approval (PL-23-05692) to Reconstruct the Historic 1889 and 1907 Roof Forms of a Significant Historic Structure in the Historic Residential - 1 (HR-1) Zoning District. PL-25 06745.**

Planner II, Jacob Klopfenstein, presented the Staff Report and explained that this is a request for a Modification to Material Deconstruction at 218 Sandridge Road. The applicant is requesting a modification to the original Historic Preservation Board approval from February 7, 2024, to deconstruct and reconstruct the 1889 and 1907 era roof forms of the Significant Historic Structure. The current project involves rehabilitating and remodeling the Significant Historic Structure as well as constructing an addition and a detached accessory building at this site. Planner Klopfenstein shared a graphic supplied by the applicant that shows the additions that have been added over time. On the far-left side shown in red is the 1889 original structure. Second from the left is the 1907 addition. The other additions shown on the graphic were added in the 1940s and 1960s but are not currently being discussed.

Planner Klopfenstein shared photographs of the structure that were taken in 2021, prior to the construction that is happening at the site now. The photograph on the left shows the original portion of the historic structure, which dates back to 1889. He pointed out the 1907 roof ridge. Planner Klopfenstein next shared a photograph that shows the current state of the structure. It highlights the interior of the roof. The applicant is proposing to reconstruct the two roof forms. However, at this time, Staff does not find the applicant proposal complies with Land Management Code (“LMC”) 15-11-15 – *Reconstruction Of An Existing Historic Building Or Historic Structure*. The Chief Building Official did not find that the Historic Structure was hazardous or dangerous pursuant to Section 116.1 of the International Building Code. The Chief Building Official and Planning Staff determined that temporary framing and shoring would support the structure to allow for the repairs of those roof forms.

Information about the Historic Preservation Plan for the project was shared. Planner Klopfenstein reported that it was approved as part of the February 7, 2024, Historic Preservation Board approval. The original Historic Preservation Plan did not include provisions for the reconstruction of the 1889 and 1907 roof forms of this structure. The Historic Preservation Plan outlined a plan for preserving the structure without the use of reconstruction. The Cash Deposit Agreement that the applicant entered into requires them to comply with that Historic Preservation Plan. Staff recommended the following:

- Review the modification to reconstruct the 1889 and 1907 era roofs of the Historic Structure at 218 Sandridge Road;
- Conduct a public hearing; and
- Consider denying the proposal based on the Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law outlined in the Draft Final Action Letter (Exhibit A).

The applicant team is present at the meeting to share additional information about the proposal. Molly Guinan from Elliott Workgroup reported that when the project started at 218 Sandridge Road, the home was occupied and seemed to be in surprisingly good condition for its age. There was an awareness that the house had been expanded upon numerous times over the 130 years and likely had questionable structural connections throughout.

There was also an awareness that the lack of foundations would need to be dealt with. Ms. Guinan explained that there was significant plant debris growing through at ground level, poor insulation, and water-damp issues that were discovered before the purchase of the home. With what was seen prior to the lengthy demolition process, there was an application submitted to remove the 1940s shed roof to be able to introduce a roof deck and flat roof dormer to gain the needed head height on the upper floor. This would also make it possible to reestablish the 1907 roof form. There was an application to remove a section of the non-historic south façade to accommodate a new entry and stair as well as point out areas where the siding sat on grade and would have to be replaced. Those were approved.

Other than those items, it was anticipated that the home exterior would remain. Based on research, it was discovered that the roofs had been replaced by previous owners, most recently in 2013. Due to the relatively good interior conditions and the modern nature of the exterior roofing materials, no one anticipated the poor build quality, lack of structure, or the level of rot and decay beneath the wall and roof cladding. After a lengthy approval process, the non-structural demolition work was started to better understand the conditions. Ms. Guinan shared some additional photographs of the home. Where the wallpaper is located, there is no structure on that wall. As for the exterior, the structure is leaning in certain areas.

A significant lack of structure was found throughout, specifically in the exterior walls and roofs. There was also insufficient structure found in the floors. When the insufficient floor build was discovered, there was an application submitted for a modification. There was approval to lower both the main and lower floors to accommodate new structure while maintaining required head height clearances. Ms. Guinan reported that when the full permit was received, there was extensive work done to secure the existing sections of the house

that were built without foundations, structure, and with questionable building practices. The team has been working diligently to secure as much as possible, starting with the primary and secondary facades of the 1889 portion. The walls of the primary 1889 one-story portion have had additional structure added and foundations poured. The secondary facades are two stories, but were added in the 1970s. Those newer structural members have helped secure the front portion and allowed the team to work without a lot of safety concerns.

As the team worked their way through the house to complete the interior demolition towards the rear tertiary façade it was apparent that there were much larger problems than originally known. At the rear of the house, there is a two-story unsecured façade with no structure, no foundation, and significant rot. These sections were built with no structure in 1907 and then expanded and stitched together in the 1940s, 1960s, and 1970s. Ms. Guinan reviewed images and explained that there is a lack of structure. The level of rot and decay is clear.

Ms. Guinan explained that the facades and roofs have been compromised with subsequent additions. As an example, the 1889 roof is now holding up the 1907 roof. The 1907 roof is being pulled down the hill due to the lack of structure and structural compromise from when the 1940s shed roof was added. In addition, the floors holding it all together are insufficiently sized. Ms. Guinan reported that the entire rear of the building is bowing out and leaning down the hill. She also noted that the bay window was never attached to the main structure. With all of the new information on the lack of structural members and the high level of decay, the Planning Department was approached to discuss some potential strategies.

Ms. Guinan reported that the request was to leave the primary and secondary facades of the front portion of the building and to remove the rear portion of the building as well as the roofs. She clarified that the rear portion is the 1907 and 1940s and 1960s sections that have been attached to the 1907 portion. There was a request to deconstruct or panelize the rear portion of the building in order to secure each section, remove and replace rotten members, and introduce both a structural system and weather proofing system that would protect the historic materials moving forward. There is a desire for the building to look the same as it does now for at least another 150 years. Ms. Guinan believes that panelization of the exterior walls would be the best practice to ensure that the historic fabric is protected and stays in the best condition. This would allow the walls to be taken down and analyzed for rot. Compromised boards could be removed and secured before reinstalling. She explained that the reinstallation would include proper waterproofing and building techniques.

There was a request made to remove and rebuild the roofs completely. Ms. Guinan explained that this is because all of the sheathing and members are rotten. In addition, the cladding on the exterior of the roof is from 2013 and is not historic. The roofs would be rebuilt to look exactly as they do now. She reported that the Planning Department asked if it would be possible to create an exoskeleton. The goal was not to panelize or deconstruct, but see if something could be created on site for the walls. Though she does not believe this is the best method, there was consultation with the full team to see if it was possible.

There is a plan that is theoretically possible, though there are still some remaining concerns. This plan was submitted to the Planning Department. Ms. Guinan explained that with this

proposal, there would be an exterior vertical bracing wall constructed and strapped to the new foundations in order to support the historic walls. This would allow the team to remove and replace the roofs and floors, and build a new wall and floor structure inside the historic exterior. Due to the level of rot and decay, as well as the lack of structural design and continuity in the existing roof structure, there is no proposal that can save the roofs in their current state. She shared photographs of the roof structures with the Board for reference.

Ms. Guinan reported that the standing seam metal was placed directly on the wood sheathing and shingles. This trapped in moisture and caused extensive damage, rot, and decay. The exterior sheathing under the standing seam metal is rotten and needs to be removed on all roof sections. The roof cladding is non-historic on all roof sections. As for the interior members, those are either rotten or notched and spliced. These are inadequate for modern building requirements and the local snow loads. This decay and lack of structural integrity occur on all roof sections. The 1907 roof form below the 1940s shed roof has been severely compromised and no longer functions as a roof or a structure. This is the same situation with the connection between the 1889 roof form, where that roof depends on the 1940s roof for stability. The level of decay makes some areas of the historic home impossible to save. Leaving rotten elements would be structurally unsound and cause significant health, safety, and welfare concerns for anyone in the building. Ms. Guinan expressed concerns about safety and outlined the risks for those working on the project.

There is a commitment to saving as much of the historic material as possible. Ms. Guinan reported that the recommendation is to panelize the walls and the rear portion of the building. It is also recommended that there be a reconstruction of the roofs. A second option is an exoskeleton with reconstruction of the roofs. Ms. Guinan asked that there be a decision made fairly soon, as there are concerns about a potential collapse when snowfall occurs.

Chair Stephens reported that the Historic Preservation Board will be discussing the original structure and the addition that was put on in 1907. He asked if there was foam insulation sprayed in those areas as well. Ms. Guinan confirmed that there is spray insulation in both the 1889 and 1907 sections. Chair Stephens stated that he has a difficult time supporting panelization. It is not something that has been done often. If there is an openness to the exoskeleton idea, it might be beneficial for the Board to discuss that proposal further. The Historic Preservation Board can determine whether panelization or an exoskeleton is best.

Chair Stephens discussed the exoskeleton proposal. He believed that what is holding the sides together right now is the floor and roof connections. The idea of the exoskeleton would be to put some framing around the outside of the house to hold it together. The proposal is either the exoskeleton or panelization, so he asked for Board Member feedback. Board Member Puggy Holmgren stated that she is not as familiar with the exoskeleton proposal, but she agrees that panelization is difficult to support. Board Member Noble agreed. The exoskeleton appears to be the most conservative approach, which is the one she would support. Board Member John Hutchings agreed with the other comments shared.

Chair Stephens asked for additional information about how the house was originally constructed. Ms. Guinan reported that there is currently exterior siding that is horizontal.

There are vertical floorboards used as interior stability against the siding and then there is wallpaper. There are some 1x1s, but none of them are continuous. The owner of the home was a builder, so it appears this was a side project. It was purchased after the 1889 portion was completed and then added onto it over the years. The 1940s section used to be a sunroom with some sort of exterior storage below. There have been many add-ons over the years. She explained that there is no foundation under the house. The front Sandridge side was resting on boulders, which have now been dug out. New foundations have been put in. At the back, there was no foundation, but there was a grade beam around. All of the plant debris grew underneath that. She noted that the lack of foundation is being corrected.

Chair Stephens wanted to understand the connection between the floor and the walls. Brent O'Keefe explained that he is with the builders on this project, Blackdog Builders. Right now, there are 2' x 4' joists that are connected, but none of them are continuous. These are nailed into the siding that was used as the structure. Chair Stephens asked how the roof is connected to the siding. Mr. O'Keefe reported that there is a 2x4 that is connected up to the ridge beam and is resting on less than an inch of the siding. There were some sporadic nails, but it is actually just resting. As for the foam, there were attempts made to spray fully.

Board Member Lola Beatlebrox asked to further review the photographs that highlight the existing conditions. Ms. Guinan discussed the photograph shown and pointed out some of the issues. Board Member Beatlebrox noted that it is impressive that this structure is still standing. There was discussion about the lean the structure has when viewed east to west.

Chief Building Official, Dave Thacker, explained that the challenge with this particular project has to do with the section of the International Building Code. That section goes into detail about determining whether a structure is safe to live in. This structure was lived in prior to construction starting. It is a challenge to go into a structure after it has been partially demolished and partially stabilized to determine whether it remains safe. The suggestion about moving toward an exoskeleton is a great idea. It makes sense and is something that has been seen on other structures. He acknowledged that there are concerns and challenges associated with the roof, especially with the support and the members that are rotting.

Chair Stephens asked if the original framing members are in the roof or if those were redone at some point. Official Thacker is not certain if those are original, but they appear to be. Chair Stephens next asked about the foam insulation. Official Thacker reported that it was newer foam. He agrees with the contractor that it was not installed in a code compliant manner as far as how it was applied to the underside. This creates moisture issues and does not allow the wood to dry thoroughly. This has resulted in rot issues. Discussions were had about the connections. Chair Stephens wanted to understand the original plan for support. Ms. Guinan explained that the original plan was to sister members on the roof structure and on the interior walls. The exoskeleton was discussed due to safety concerns.

Board Member Hutchings believed that in order to remove all of the rot, the entire roof would need to be removed. Ms. Guinan reported that there might be a handful of members in the 1889 section, but the sheathing above those members is all rotten. Chair Stephens asked

if the sheathing was over the existing cedar shingles or underneath. Ms. Guinan explained that it was both, depending on the section of the building. Additional discussions were had about the conditions. Board Member Beatlebrox asked how the exoskeleton relates to the roof sections. Chair Stephens explained that if there is not something secured around the exterior of the house, when the roof is taken off, there will be nothing to hold it all together.

Ms. Guinan reported that the exterior roof is not historic. What is seen from the outside is from 2013. However, there is historic material inside the roof that cannot be seen from the outside. That is the material that is rotten. The intention is to rebuild the roof to look the same as what is there currently. The 2013 metal roof would be removed along with anything inside that is rotten. There would then be a new roof put on to look the same. Board Member Noble asked about the material that would be used for the new roof. Ms. Guinan clarified that there would be re-roofing done with metal. The current application is to replace the roofing with a standing seam metal roof. She was thinking the color of the roof material would be dark black, but this has not been specified in the submitted application materials.

Chair Stephens stated that if there is an exoskeleton, he does not have an issue with roof removal and refabrication, given how this was constructed. He pointed out that this would remove materials that are not seen by the public. This work would not alter the look of the final product but result in a stronger product overall. However, he might feel differently about this proposal if it was coming to the Historic Preservation Board before the insulation was sprayed. If the work is done correctly, the home should last another 100 years in good condition. He expressed support for the exoskeleton proposal and the roof removal.

Board Member Hutchings asked to review the section of code to ensure there is consistency. In the past, the determination of the Chief Building Official has been an important factor in his decision-making process. He wants to understand what is different about this project. Senior City Attorney, Mark Harrington, reminded the Board to open the public hearing before final direction is provided. LMC 15-11-15 was reviewed by the Historic Preservation Board.

Planner Klopfenstein reported that LMC 15-11-15 outlines the criteria for reconstruction of an existing historic building or historic structure. For the Historic Preservation Board to approve a request for reconstruction, the Board has to find that the proposal complies with Subsection A of this code. Planner Klopfenstein reviewed the three items outlined:

- The Historic Building(s) and/or Structure(s) are found by the Chief Building Official to be hazardous or dangerous, pursuant to Section 116.1 of the International Building Code; and
- The Historic Building(s) and/or Structure(s) cannot be made safe and/or serviceable through repair; and
- The form, features, detailing, placement, orientation, and location of the Historic Building(s) and/or Structure(s) will be accurately depicted, by means of new construction, based on as-built measured drawings, historical records, and/or current or Historic photographs.

The code states that the Board has to find the project complies with all three of the criteria listed in order to approve a request for reconstruction. The Staff recommendation is to deny this proposal, because it does not comply with the first and second items in the code.

Ms. Guinan understands that the structure was safe because someone was living in the home before, but there was no way to know what was behind the walls. There are sections with no structure at all. As a result, she does not believe this would be considered a safe structure for someone to live in. Board Member Beatlebrox agreed and stated that it looks hazardous. It was pointed out that the photographs shown in the presentation are based on the current state. Those were taken after some deconstruction had taken place.

Official Thacker agreed that there are some elements that appear to be unsafe, but part of Section 116.1 of the International Building Code has to do with the determination that it can be made safe. That is the area that becomes challenging, because there are ways that most structures in these instances can be made safe. That is where the exoskeleton comes in as opposed to panelization. That is a unique way to consider preserving what is there, even though it is in a currently hazardous state based on the photographs. The roof is another challenge, because there are some members that are rotten. It is possible to state that rotten boards are likely unsafe, but there can be more discussion about the roof structure.

Official Thacker explained that the new members required to be built within the roof system need to have enough insulation to meet the current energy code criteria. The focus should be on finding a way to rebuild the roof to make sure it is safe. Board Member Hutchings is in support of removing the rotten material, but does not know how the Historic Preservation Board can approve the current application given the criteria included in the code. He wanted to know if there is an opportunity for a new determination or evaluation to be made.

Board Member Holmgren reported that the Meeting Materials Packet indicates that the structure can be made safer with temporary framing, shoring, and repair. Board Member Dalton Gackle pointed out that most of the roof materials have rotted. While the exoskeleton can help with one component, the roof seems to be a separate matter. He is not sure that legally, the Historic Preservation Board can allow for full reconstruction of the roof, but that seems to be the only path forward. Board Member Noble agreed that there seems to be a disconnect between the code and the reality of the circumstances at this property. If the Chief Building Official has not found it to be hazardous or dangerous, it is not possible for the Historic Preservation Board to move forward. What the Board wants to do and what the Board is bound to do based on the code seem to be two separate things in this case.

Board Member Gackle agrees with the official determination that the façade can be saved without needing to do a full reconstruction, but he does not necessarily agree with that determination for the roof based on what has been presented. He believes there should be two separate determinations made. Discussions were had about the code language.

Official Thacker explained that there could be other historic properties that come in for consideration of a rebuild and then once there is partial deconstruction, a request could be made for a new determination. He wants to be cautious when looking at what this

determination means. Official Thacker wondered whether the roof could be considered on a case-by-case basis for the members that can be preserved. Rather than removing the roof in its entirety, it might be possible to look at each one to determine whether sistering the roof and replacing the joist is a better approach and still meets the criteria established.

Board Member Hutchings asked if it would make sense to deny this application but allow the rotten material to be removed. Ms. Guinan pointed out that all of the rotten material has to come out, as it is unsafe to leave rotten material in the building. In addition, the 2013 roof material is not historic. It is now known that there is no structure holding up the roof. The team of professionals have thought a lot about what can be done to preserve this building. No one has come up with a solution for the roof, because the materials are rotten. If a contractor refuses to do the work because it is not safe, she wonders what will happen next.

Chair Stephens does not want to set a precedent that would create future issues. Director Ward reviewed the scope of the request. She explained that the request from the applicant is for complete reconstruction of the historic forms. There is also a proposal for the exoskeleton. For the historic materials that may be salvaged, that would be a Material Deconstruction application and review. The way that the code addresses Material Deconstruction is that the deteriorated or damaged historic features are required to be repaired rather than replaced. This would require the salvaging of the historic roof materials.

Director Ward reported that there appears to be consensus that the exoskeleton is preferred and panelization is not something the Board would consider. The exoskeleton would need to be constructed first to ensure that there is stabilization. She does not know what the timeline for that exoskeleton would look like. Ms. Guinan reported that it would move forward as quickly as possible. She explained that there are concerns that the structure will collapse.

The next Historic Preservation Board Meeting is scheduled for December 3, 2025. If there is a modification made to the request where it is not deconstruction and reconstruction proposed, but Material Deconstruction with a process in place to salvage as many of the materials as possible, then that could be evaluated after the exoskeleton is put into place. Director Ward reported that if the applicant is open to modifying the request to Material Deconstruction, it would be possible to re-notice this item before the next Board Meeting.

Ms. Guinan believed the suggestion is deconstruction while logging the members to see what could be saved. Director Ward reported that for the Material Deconstruction, there would be a review of the roof components. Ms. Guinan would like more clarity on that process. She is concerned that there is no structure in this roof, as the roof is currently being held up by siding. Though building the exoskeleton will work for the walls, it does nothing to secure the roof in the time between now and the next Historic Preservation Board Meeting. If there is a significant storm and the roof collapses, she wants to know where the liability will fall. Additional discussions were had about the safety of the roof and the materials.

Mr. O'Keefe reported that there is support for the exoskeleton keeping the sides intact, but there is uncertainty about how to keep the workers safe inside for the renovation. Once there is the exoskeleton in place, it is possible to take everything off from the inside to

reframe it. However, it is not possible to do that with the roof on, given the state of the rot. He also has concerns about attempts to salvage the material with rot. He does not want rot to be introduced to the new wood given the moisture stuck in the historic wood. Mr. O'Keefe explained that his trained workers do not feel safe in the structure currently. With the weather, there are also concerns about losing the structure if there is a large snowfall.

Chair Stephens asked if it would be possible to remove the roof, catalogue what could be used again, and then put it back in place, with the process that was previously described by Director Ward. Director Ward believed that would only exist with deconstruction. Board Member Gackle wanted to know if it would be possible to justify going against code in the interest of public safety and/or the total loss of a historic structure. Attorney Harrington believed the Chief Building Official would need to be asked whether he was willing to alter his recommendation. It is not possible to address any hypotheticals regarding liability.

Attorney Harrington stated that the Chief Building Official could be asked to partially reevaluate his recommendation or the Historic Preservation Board could consider Material Deconstruction, as described by Director Ward. Board Member Gackle thought it made sense to have a new determination made for the roof portion of the structure. He pointed out that there is so much of the roof that would need to be replaced that it would end up being fully replaced anyway. Board Member Noble explained that her concern is that the code mentions a historic building, so it relates to the safety of the historic building as a whole. The code could likely use an adjustment so a determination could be made for part of a building. For example, a determination could be made that part of a building is not safe. In this case, there is a safety issue in a portion of the building, but the code talks about the safety of an entire building. She feels that her hands are tied with the current application.

Board Member Noble asked if there is a way for this application to be for Material Deconstruction without waiting for another Historic Preservation Meeting. This was denied because it was not noticed as Material Deconstruction. The Board can process the application currently before them. Ms. Guinan reported that there have been a lot of discussions about making the building safe with an exoskeleton. The exoskeleton will preserve the walls, but the roof will still be unsafe. She finds it hard to understand the determination that the building can be made safe, because that is not the case if an exoskeleton is needed to protect the exterior and the roof is still unsafe. The only materials that have been removed so far were interior drywall. The building has not been made less safe from any of the actions taken during this process. She reiterated her safety concerns.

Ms. Guinan addressed the comments about potentially setting a precedent. There are always unknowns with buildings. If it is determined that something is unsafe without removing any materials, that is different than a contractor taking something out and making it unsafe. Although the building looked safe, there were no standard building techniques used. Board Member Holmgren asked if the exoskeleton would make the roof more stable, which was denied. Ms. Guinan explained that the roof does not have a structure under it.

Chair Stephens explained that under a Material Deconstruction application, the Board could proceed in some manner. Right now, it seems the hands of the Board are tied. Director

Ward reported that this item could be continued to the Historic Preservation Board Meeting on December 3, 2025, but it should be made clear that the exoskeleton is a requirement. The applicant has a Historic Preservation Plan that outlines the obligation to stabilize the structure and protect all of the historic materials throughout construction. Continuing this item does not delay the obligation of the applicant to immediately begin protecting the facades on the rear. Ms. Guinan reiterated that the exoskeleton will not protect the roof.

Chair Stephens explained that if the item was continued, it could be dealt with through a different process that will not create future issues. The first meeting in December is two weeks away. At that meeting, the issue of the roof could be addressed under a Material Deconstruction request. Board Member Gackle pointed out that with Material Deconstruction, it has to be worked on in place. There does not seem to be comfort in doing that due to the lack of support. The Board discussed the potential process moving forward.

Board Member Gackle wondered at what point Material Deconstruction would become reconstruction. At a certain point, it might essentially be what the applicant has proposed due to the condition of the materials. Board Member Hutchings noted that it might, but the Board is attempting to solve the problem that exists with the current code language. His assumption is that the applicant will more or less achieve the same goal, but it needs to be done under a code section that allows for it. The code section reviewed during the meeting does not allow the Historic Preservation Board to approve the current application.

The owner, Dennis Hranitzky, stated that the concern is that there is snow coming in soon. Once there is a snow load on the roof, there is a risk that the roof will collapse, with or without an exoskeleton. He understands that the Board is trying to harmonize the decision with the restrictions of the code, but he has a lot of concerns about the stability of the roof. He asked if it would be possible to remove the exterior metal, rotten shingles, and planks, and leave the framing of the roof. This would ensure that it did not accumulate the snow load.

Chair Stephens believed that it was approved under the original application. Director Ward explained that it is confirmed for the materials added in 2013. Mr. Hranitzky reported that the metal on the exterior was added in 2013, but underneath the metal on the exterior are shingles that are rotten. Underneath some of those shingles, there are rotten planks. If the shingles and the planks remain in place, they will accumulate snow as well. The question is whether it is possible to take off the metal and the rotten material, but not remove the entirety of the roof. The actual structural form could remain, and the work could proceed.

Board Member Gackle asked if the shingles would need to be considered under the Material Deconstruction application. If so, the shingles would need to remain until Material Deconstruction was voted on at the meeting on December 3, 2025. Director Ward reviewed the Final Action Letter for this property. She does not believe it addressed the 1907 or original roof form. At that time, there were proposed to be preserved and maintained throughout construction, so there would be a modification there. Ms. Guinan explained that the removal of the 2013 metal was not brought before the Board because it was not of historic consideration. The only request at that point was the removal of the 1940s roof.

Board Member Gackle wanted to know if the applicant could remove the shingles prior to the Historic Preservation Board Meeting on December 3, 2025. Chair Stephens was not sure why the applicant could not at least take it down to the original planking. Mr. Hranitzky explained that when the original application was made, no one knew that there were shingles underneath the metal roof. There was an awareness that it had been re-roofed in 2013, but there was a belief that everything underneath that had been removed.

Discussions were had about the appropriate process. Director Ward reported that the current agenda states this item is a Request for Modification to Material Deconstruction. She asked if that matches the notices that went out, which was confirmed. The Historic Preservation Board can direct Staff to issue a Final Action Letter that could be reviewed during the December 3, 2025, Historic Preservation Board Meeting on the condition that the exoskeleton be constructed first. The process was further outlined for Board Members.

Chair Stephens opened the public hearing. There were no comments. The public hearing was continued.

MOTION: Board Member Holmgren moved to CONTINUE the Request for Modification to Material Deconstruction at 218 Sandridge Road and instructed the Planning Department to Draft a Final Action Letter for Material Deconstruction, on the Condition that the Exoskeleton is Created by the Builders. Board Member Hutchings seconded the motion.

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

7. ADJOURNMENT

MOTION: Board Member Holmgren moved to ADJOURN. Board Member Hutchings seconded the motion.

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

The Historic Preservation Board Meeting adjourned at approximately 6:44 p.m.