

PARK CITY MUNICIPAL CORPORATION
HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD
MINUTES OF APRIL 18, 2018

BOARD MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE: Douglas Stephens, Lola Beatlebrox, Puggy Holmgren, Jack Hodgkins, John Hutchings, Randy Scott

EX OFFICIO: Bruce Erickson, Anya Grahn, Polly Samuels McLean, Liz Jackson

ROLL CALL

Chair Stephens called the meeting to order at 5:00 p.m. and noted that all Board Members were present except Alex Weiner, who was excused.

ADOPTION OF MINUTES

April 4, 2018

MOTION: Board Member Holmgren moved to APPROVE the minutes of April 4, 2018 as written. Board Member Scott seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS

There were no comments.

STAFF/BOARD COMMUNICATIONS AND DISCLOSURES

Planner Grahn thanked the Board for their willingness to have a second meeting in April. They were also scheduled to meet twice in May on May 2nd and May 16th.

REGULAR AGENDA – Discussion, Public Hearing and Possible Action

1. 1011 Empire Avenue –Historic District Design Review – Material Deconstruction on Significant Site. The applicant is proposing to impact the following: stacked stone retaining walls, picket fence, and at-grade steps dating post-1981; demolition of additions on the west and south elevations built between 1941-1981, addition to the north elevation built c.1981, and basement expansion addition made in 1995; removal of portions of the c.1900 roof form; removal of portion of the west elevation; demolition of foundation dating from c.1900, c.1981, and c.1995; demolition of c.1995 deck; removal of non-historic and contemporary windows and doors; demolition of post-1960s garage.
(Application PL-17-03519)

Planner Grahn reported that the house at 1011 Empire Avenue was originally constructed around 1900 and it remained in the McDonald and Henderson family for several decades. The first major change occurred by 1929 when the existing full-width porch was added. By 1941 an addition was added off the north side. She clarified that the addition has been removed.

Planner Grahn stated that the house remained in the same form; however, a number of material alterations had occurred. As shown in the 1941 site plan, a garage was added. Based on the method of construction in the photographs, the Staff believed the garage was added after 1960. There were also a number of material changes, which included aluminum siding, decorative shutters, and replacing an upper window with a slider. She indicated a lean-to that was used for storing fire wood that had been enclosed. A shed addition was added off the side in 1981. In 1995 the basement was expanded to be underneath the porch. The house was used in the early 1990s as a bed and breakfast.

Planner Grahn noted that stairs were built in the front. The retaining walls in the front are not historic, and there is a sidewalk. The applicant was proposing to redo the site by adding a basement level addition that comes in off the garage into the basement. It will have a green roof and the house will sit on top to maintain the integrity of the site. The applicant was also proposing to go through the plat amendment process and subdivide this lot to accommodate new development. She pointed to the lot that was already at the building permit stage. Planner Grahn presented a photo of the house as it exists today. The retaining walls shown are random stacked stones. The stones are narrow and the walls do not line up with any of the historic photos. Planner Grahn commented on several non-historic additions that the applicant was proposing to remove, which included the addition on the south side, an addition on the north side, a non-historic chimney, a deck, and a one-story addition on the west elevation.

Planner Grahn stated that this house was having minimal changes. The house needs a new foundation, but the structure, the roof, and the exterior walls are in fairly good condition. She believed the applicant was moving in the right direction to restore the original form without adding a large addition. Any restructuring that needs to occur is proposed to be done from the interior. The roof does not need to be removed and rebuilt. The exterior walls need minimal maintenance and repairing rotted boards where necessary. The applicant was proposing to remove 26 linear feet of the back wall in order to add an addition, but the addition is set in from the walls and will be shorter in height than the existing historic house.

Planner Gran believed the foundation dates between 1981 and 1995. It is not historic and does not contribute to the historical significance of the house. The

addition would be removed and a new foundation will be poured. Planner Grahn stated that the deck on the north side that was added in the 1980s and 1990s will be removed. The applicant was proposing to restore the original railings and some of the porch details.

Planner Grahn stated that there are no historic doors currently on the house. The applicant is proposing to put in a replacement door on the front door that is consistent with the appearance of a historic door. The doors would be removed as part of removing the additions. Planner Grahn noted that there were minimal windows on the house and the windows were all original. She had highlighted the historic windows in green. The applicant was requesting to temporarily remove the windows to restore the wood windows. The windows shown in red were either part of a non-historic additions and some of the window openings would be covered by the new addition.

Planner Grahn reported that the applicant was requesting permission to demolish the garage. She reiterated that the Staff believed the garage was built after the 1960s based on construction methods used, the materials, and the fact that post-1960s was when most people could afford two cars and two-car garages became popular.

Planner Grahn introduced the project architect, Bill Van Sickle, who was present to answer questions.

Board Member Hodgkins asked if the building was being raised. Planner Grahn replied that it would be temporarily raised. It would have to be put up on cribbing, excavated underneath, and a new foundation poured. She did not believe the actual elevation of the house would change. It will be put back in its current location. Planner Grahn stated that the conditions of approval that were previously discussed to address problems with lifting were reflected in this recommendation for approval.

Board Member Hodgkins asked if the house changed elevation when the current foundation was put in. Planner Grahn did not know for sure; however, in comparing the photographs, it looks like the house always had a fairly tall porch skirt around the edge. She assumed some regrading was done when the garage was added, which might be when the retaining walls were done.

Board Member Hodgkins asked if a historic house can be raised two or three different times with different renovations. He noted that lifting is limited to two feet to keep it closer to its original elevation. Planner Grahn thought it was a good question and one the Staff has been working on. She pointed out that a lot of the first foundations were in the 1950s through the 1970s. However, there are no records to show whether the house was lifted at that point or what actually occurred. The best they can do is compare photographs and other documented

evidence. Foundations that were added in the 1980s forward typically do have a building permit, which makes it easier to determine whether or not the house was lifted.

Board Member Hutchings asked if the Board was deciding on the addition this evening. Chair Stephens answered no, they were only talking about the deconstruction and demolition portions. Chair Stephens assumed from the report that everything related to demolition and removal of materials was all non-historic. Planner Grahn replied that he was correct. It was being done in an attempt to restore the original house.

Board Member Hodgkins commented on the replatting and asked if there were new sites on either side of the property. Planner Grahn presented the survey and pointed to the property that was currently platted as four lots of record. It was platted as Lots 3, 4, 5 and 6 of the block by the surveyor in the 1800s or 1900s. When the historic house was built there was also a lot next to it. The historic house has an interior lot line running through it. The applicant was proposing to combine three lots so each one becomes 1-1/2 and the historic house no longer sits over an interior lot line. She pointed to the lot that was already a legal lot of record because it was platted as a clean lot. That was able to be developed. The other lots were going through the plat amendment process to clean up the interior lot lines and to create 1-1/2 lots. Planner Grahn stated that the plat amendment process is fairly common in Old Town because most of the houses were built over the interior lot lines.

Chair Stephens clarified that with this application, four lots would be turned into three lots. Bill Sickle, the project architect, answered yes. There would be one single lot, which already exists, and then the other lots.

Chair Stephens opened the public hearing.

There were no comments.

Chair Stephens closed the public hearing.

MOTION: Board Member Scott moved to APPROVE the material deconstruction of non-historic and non-contributory materials at 1011 Empire Avenue, pursuant to the Finding of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Conditions of Approval found in the Staff report. Board Member Beatlebrox seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

Finding of Fact – 1011 Empire Avenue

1. The property is located at 1011 Empire Avenue.

2. The site is designated as Significant on the Historic Sites Inventory.
3. On November 28, 2017, the Planning Department received a Historic District Design Review (HDDR) application for the property at 1011 Empire Avenue; it was deemed complete January 31, 2018. The HDDR application has not yet been approved as it is dependent on the HPB's Review for Material Deconstruction approval.
4. The house was likely constructed ca.1900 by Roderick W. MacDonald who did not own the land until 1903 when the Townsite Company transferred it to MacDonald.
5. The house first appears on the 1907 Sanborn Fire Insurance map. By 1929, the full-width front porch was constructed across the façade.
6. Sometime between 1960 and 1991, a new two-car garage was constructed at the front of the lot.
7. By the 1981 historic resource survey, the original lattice porch skirt had been replaced with new horizontal aluminum siding, the porch railings replaced, decorative wood shutters added to the exterior, and a lien-to addition constructed to the south side of the house.
8. In 1991, additional modifications were made to the front deck and stair and the north side addition was remodeled. The basement addition was expanded beneath the historic front porch in 1995, introducing windows on the porch skirt.
9. A number of existing site features were constructed after 1941, including a picket fence, stacked stone wall, and landscape steps to the house. The applicant proposes to retain the non-historic picket fence as it does not detract from the character of the site or neighborhood. The concrete landscape steps will be reconstructed. The existing stacked stone wall differs from the one depicted in the ca.1941 tax photograph as it is a rectangular stacked stone wall and not a rubble stone wall; the applicant will maintain this wall, where feasible, but remove a portion of it to accommodate a new driveway. The proposed exterior changes will not damage or destroy the exterior architectural features of the property that are compatible with the character of the historic site and are not included in the proposed scope of work.
10. There are several additions to the historic house. The earliest of these, constructed sometime after 1941, are the addition across the west side of the house and a shed roof enclosure on the south side of the house. Another addition was constructed across the north elevation, prior to 1981, and included a wrap-around deck that extends from the historic porch and around this later addition. This addition includes a large rectangular chimney. Finally, in 1995, the basement was expanded beneath the front porch and new windows were added. The applicant is proposing to remove these additions to restore the original rectangular form and appearance of the house. The material deconstruction is required for this restoration; however, these additions have also been found to be non-contributing to the historic integrity and historical significance of the structure.
11. The applicant proposes to improve the structural stability of the roof and floor

structures by sistering the existing historic members with new materials. The work will be completed from the interior of the structure. The proposed work is routine maintenance and will not change the design or general appearance of the elements of the structure. The work does not require Historic Preservation Board Review (HPBR).

12. The roof is in overall good condition; however, a portion of the roof on the north side will need to be reconstructed in order to restore the original house form when the north addition is removed; the proposed scope of work is necessary to restore the original house form. The applicant is also proposing to construct one new shed dormer on both the north and south sides of the historic roof form, beyond the midpoint of the historic building. These exterior changes will not damage or destroy the exterior architectural features of the subject property as the dormers will be placed beyond the midpoint of the historic structure and will not damage or destroy any features that are compatible with the character of the historic site.

13. The exterior walls are in good condition. The applicant is proposing to repair the walls as needed and repaint. The proposed work is routine maintenance and does not require HPBR.

14. The applicant is proposing to construct a small, two-story addition to the back of the historic house on the west side. The addition will impact about 26 linear feet of the historic wall plane on the west side. The proposed work mitigates any impact that will occur to the historical significance of the building as the addition is to the back of the building and will not be largely visible from the primary right-of-way.

15. The basement has been expanded at least twice to accommodate the addition along the north side of the building, prior to 1981, and then again beneath the historic porch in 1995. The applicant is proposing to remove the existing foundation and pour a new foundation. The proposed exterior changes will not damage or destroy the exterior architectural features of the subject property which are compatible with the character of the historic site and are not included in the proposed scope of work.

16. The original full-width porch on the façade of the historic house is original and likely constructed between 1907 and 1929. The porch posts and railings have been replaced several times, and were likely built to their current appearance in 1995 when the basement was expanded beneath the porch skirt. The applicant proposes to maintain the porch, but the porch skirt will be rebuilt with the new basement and clad in lattice, similar to that seen in historic photographs of this building. The proposed material deconstruction on the historic front porch is required for the restoration of the building.

17. The porch was extended into a deck that wraps around the north side addition likely between 1995 and 2007. The applicant is proposing to remove this non-historic addition that includes the wrap-around deck. This addition has been found to be non-contributory to the historic integrity or historical significance of the structure and site.

18. There are no historic doors on this building. The historic front door opening is

original, but the door is new. The applicant is proposing to remove this door, make repairs, and replace it. The other doors on the building are located on non-historic additions that are proposed to be removed. The proposed work on the front door is routine maintenance and does not require HPBR. The other doors are on additions that have been found to be non-contributing to the historic integrity of the house.

19. There are existing historic windows on the east and south elevations of the historic house that are in good condition. The applicant proposes to remove these temporarily for repairs and then re-install them. The proposed scope of work is routine maintenance and does not require HPBR.

20. The existing windows on the basement-level of the east elevation are from 1995 and other picture and double-hung windows are located on non-historic additions on the west and north elevations. The removal of these windows is necessary for the restoration of the historic house. The other windows are on additions that have been found to be non-contributing to the historic integrity or historical significance of the structure.

21. On the west elevation, two second story windows will be removed to accommodate the construction of a new addition. The proposed scope of windows mitigates any impacts that will occur to the historical significance of the building.

22. The garage was likely constructed between 1960 and 1991, when two-car garages became popular as American families could afford two automobiles. The applicant is proposing to demolish the garage. This addition does not contribute to the historic integrity or historical significance of the site.

Conclusions of Law – 1011 Empire Avenue

1. The proposal complies with the Land Management Code requirements pursuant to the HR-1 District and regarding historic structure deconstruction and reconstruction.
2. The proposal meets the criteria for relocation pursuant to LMC 15-11-12.5 Historic Preservation Board Review for Material Deconstruction.

Conditions of Approval – 1011 Empire Avenue

1. Final building plans and construction details shall reflect substantial compliance with the HDDR proposal stamped in on October 14, 2016. 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. Where the historic exterior materials cannot be repaired, they will be replaced with materials that match the original in all respects: scale, dimension, texture, profile, material and finish. Prior to replacement, the applicant shall demonstrate to the Historic Preservation Planner that the materials are no longer safe and/or serviceable and cannot be repaired to a safe and/or serviceable condition.

3. Should the applicant uncover historic window and door openings that were not documented at the time of the Historic Preservation Board's review, the applicant shall schedule a site visit with the Planning Department and determine if the window or door opening should be restored. Any physical evidence of lost historic window and door openings shall be documented to the satisfaction of the Preservation Planner, regardless of plans for restoration.
 4. The Preservation Plan must include 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.
 5. An encroachment agreement may be required prior to issuance of a building permit for projects utilizing soils nails that encroach onto neighboring properties.
 6. 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.
 7. Within five (5) days of installation of the cribbing and shoring, the structural engineer will inspect and approve the cribbing and shoring as constructed.
 8. Historic buildings which are lifted off the foundation must be returned to the completed foundation within 45 days of the date the building permit was issued.
 9. 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.
 10. 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 financial guarantee for historic preservation or ACE could take place.
2. 158 Main Street –Historic District Design Review – Material Deconstruction on Significant Site. The applicant is proposing to impact the following: non-historic sidewalk, non-historic concrete block retaining wall, c. 1997 driveway, contemporary stone retaining wall, non-historic wood-steel fence, contemporary wood patio, c.1948 concrete block

foundation, portions of c.1997 concrete foundation, c.1997 roofing materials, c.1997 additions to the rear elevation, c.1997 front porch, c.1997 doors and windows. (Application PL-17-03464)

Planner Grahn reported that Ruth Gezelius had provided public comment in the form of photographs from the 1990s. She handed out the photographs to the Board. Planner Grahn explained that it was showing the previous remodel. Ms. Gezelius had no comments on what the Board was reviewing this evening, but she wanted to provide evidence and documentation of what occurred in the 1990s.

Planner Grahn stated that the house at 158 Main Street was built around 1886. It first appears on the 1889 Sanborn map. It was a hall-parlor and had a small covering over the stoop. There was an addition running east and west and a second addition. By 1900 the house was expanded and it looks like they were trying to even out the walls of the back addition. In 1907 the wrap-around porch was introduced, and by 1927 a roof structure was rebuilt to cover all the rear additions. The Staff believed that was when the truncated roof form appeared. The house remained the same in the 1941 tax photo; however, it was starting to show signs of deteriorating. The historic site inventory form indicates a number of different profiles of siding, and it appears they were reworking a few things at that time.

Planner Grahn reported that sometime between the 1940s and 1968 the house appears to be remodeled again, but with some of the post-war architectural styles such as wider siding and pictures windows. The wrap-around porch was removed, and the Staff believes it was removed to accommodate the addition of a driveway. Planner Grahn presented a photo of the house in 1982. The pictures windows were replaced with slider windows, but the house remains similar to the photo from the 1960s.

Planner Grahn stated that between 1997 and 1998 the house was significantly remodeled. The owner had received a \$10,000 grant at that time, and from looking at documentation and photos it appears the roof was rebuilt and the walls were restructured from the interior. The window openings were used, but the windows were replaced with double-hung windows. They tried to bring back some of the historic character of the site. Planner Grahn thought this applicant was taking it another step further to try to restore it more accurately.

Planner Grahn presented the site. The applicant was proposing to completely redo the site. Some of the retaining walls, the rear deck, the sidewalk, and the driveway would all be altered. They were all non-historic features of the site. She pointed to the historic house, the one-car garage, and a small bedroom addition that was added in 1997 and 1998. When a new foundation was poured for the house, the foundation underneath the garage was backfilled with gravel.

The applicant is able to use the existing foundation, but they intend to remove the gravel and come in lower to use the current elevation of the garage as more living space. Planner Grahn emphasized that the garage is not historic and no historic material would be affected.

Planner Grahn indicated the truncated roof and some of the additions. She showed what the structure looked like in 1997 prior to the remodel that occurred. The structure is in fairly good condition, and the applicant only proposing to do routine maintenance and upgrading the structure where needed. The roof was also in good condition. The applicant believed that any structural upgrades could be made to the attic. However, the applicant was planning to use the truncated roof form to add in a rooftop deck.

Planner Grahn noted that the applicant was proposing to pour a new foundation. The current basement is from 1997, but there are issues with the foundations and it will be upgraded. The same conditions of approval would apply to this application as far as limiting the number of days the house can be up on cribbing, making sure it is structurally sound on the cribbing, etc. The applicant was proposing to raise the house two feet.

Planner Grahn stated that historically the house had a wraparound porch. In 1997 an eyebrow was added. The applicant was proposing a wider version. They have talked about creating a full-width porch that mimics the wrap-around porch, which would require a conditional use permit from the Planning Commission if they decide to do it. There are no historic doors on the house. The applicant was proposing to replace the existing doors with new doors that comply with the design guidelines. All the windows were replaced in 1997. She had highlighted the non-historic windows in blue. There was a window that was evident when the foundation was poured in the 1990s, and the applicant intends to replace that window. They were also adding windows beyond the midpoint. There are two double-hung windows in the openings of the 1950 picture windows, and the applicant was proposing to bring back a single double-hung windows consistent with what existed historically. A standard condition of approval was added to address how the replacement windows on the façade have to exactly match what was there.

The applicants and the project architect were present to answer questions.

Chair Stephens recalled that the Staff report requested discussion regarding the roof. Planner Grahn explained that the applicant was proposing to maintain the original truncated roof form. Chair Stephens asked if they planned to retain the size and dimensions, as well as the form. Planner Grahn replied that they were not changing the dimensions of the flat spot on the roof. They were proposing to utilize the flat spot to create a rooftop deck. Instead of just having a membrane, there would be decking and railings around it. The architect did not believe the

deck would be visible from the street or detract from the character of the historic building.

Chair Stephens wanted to know what historic material the Board was being asked to review with regards to the roof. Planner Grahn stated that they were only reviewing the existing material on the roof that would be removed, based on compliance with the criteria. Chair Stephens asked if they were talking about restructuring and reframing the house.

Kevin Horn, the project architect, explained that the only change is to provide access on to the existing roof. The roof will remain the same but it will be replaced with a more permanent durable membrane. Chair Stephens asked if the roof would be accessed from below the flat portion of the roof. Mr. Horn stated that the rear addition, which is not part of the historic building, would be removed and replaced with a new addition. The new addition will have access to the roof from inside the building.

Board Member Beatlebrox asked if it would be a green roof. Mr. Horn answered no. At one time they considered a green roof. He noted that the access would be at the rear portion of the roof, and the railings will be back from the ridgeline so it will not be visible from the sidewalk. Ms. Beatlebrox wanted to know what the design guidelines say about rooftop decks. Planner Grahn stated that this application was vested before the Guidelines were revised. There was a misunderstanding by the applicant that every flat roof has to be green, but that is not the case. They may eventually decide to do a green roof, but it was not required by Code. Planner Grahn showed the view from the street and pointed out that the railing was not visible. She also presented a roof plan and explained what the applicant was proposing. Ms. Beatlebrox asked about the adjacent neighbors. Planner Grahn stated that they would need to be careful about following the LMC and the Design Guidelines; however, that did not fall under their purview this evening.

Chair Stephens recalled that the flat roof on the addition in the rear goes all the way through and up to the ridgeline on the original historic house. Mr. Horn answered yes. Planner Grahn presented photos to help the Board understand what the house would look like without the existing additions. Chair Stephens stated that the discussion should focus on removal of non-historic materials; however, he thought it would eventually be a design issue. He assumed the Staff would work with the applicant, but he thought it would be difficult because Park City is not a town with only one elevation. The house will be visible from various views and a flat truncated roof is different from a deck.

Board Member Beatlebrox suggested that they relook at roof decks in the next iteration of Guideline revisions. Director Erickson stated that the current Guideline revisions that were recently approved have rigorous controls on decks.

He was confident that Planners Grahn and Tyler had addressed the issue as best as possible. Director Erickson believed this plan was consistent with the Code at the time the application was submitted. The Planning Department consulted with the Community Development Director to make sure they were consistent with the Guidelines and with the needs of the architect. Director Erickson concurred with Planner Grahn's recommendation, subject to public input.

Chair Stephens asked why a conditional use permit would be required for a full-width front porch. Planner Grahn replied that it was due to the front and side setback. It can be done, but the Planning Commission needs to approve an addition to a historic building.

Chair Stephens opened the public hearing.

There were no comments.

Chair Stephens closed the public hearing.

MOTION: Board Member Hutchings moved to APPROVE the material deconstruction of non-historic and non-contributory materials and 158 Main Street, pursuant to the Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Conditions of Approval found in the Staff report. Board Member Holmgren seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

Findings of Fact – 158 Main Street

1. The property is located at 158 Main Street.
2. The site is designated as Significant on the Historic Sites Inventory.
3. On July 25, 2017, the Planning Department received a Historic District Design Review (HDDR) application for the property at 158 Main Street; it was deemed complete on August 1, 2017. The HDDR application has not yet been approved as it is dependent on the HPB's Review for Material Deconstruction approval.
4. The house was likely constructed ca.1886 by Joseph Webber.
5. The house first appears on the 1889 Sanborn Fire Insurance map as a hall-parlor with centered front entry porch. There were two small additions on the back of the house in 1889.
6. Under the ownership of Annie and William Reynolds, a third rear addition was constructed to the back of the house, as indicated by the 1900 Sanborn Fire Insurance Map.
7. By the time of the 1907 Sanborn Fire Insurance Map, a wraparound porch had been added across the front (west) and side (north) of the house. An accessory

building labeled —All for —Automobilell had also been constructed in the backyard and was identified by the address 158 ½ Main Street.

8. Then, under the ownership of M.N. —Nimmoll and Mae Matheson, the addition on the southeast corner of the house was extended and a new gable roof was constructed over the entire rear addition. This is evident in the 1929 Sanborn Fire Insurance map.

9. From 1939 to 1975, the house was owned by John M. and Margaret C. Leahy. The 1941 Sanborn Fire Insurance map and the c.1941 tax photograph reflect the house changes that were made to the house by 1929.

10. The first major remodel to the house was made in 1949. The house was upgraded with shake shingle siding, a patterned shingle roof, and an eyebrow porch roof over the front entrance. The 1949 tax card also shows a 20 foot by 18 foot garage, with a dirt floor. Staff finds that the wraparound porch was likely removed at this time in order to make room for a driveway along the north side of the property. The changes made to the house during the 1948 remodel reflect Postwar housing styles.

11. The 1968 tax photo shows the wide siding profile, large divided light picture windows on the façade, and a new gabled roof overhang above the front door.

12. In 1982, Ellen Beasley conducted a reconnaissance level survey to determine eligibility for the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) and found that the house was —non-contributingll likely due to the changes that had occurred between 1948 and 1968.

13. On September 30, 1997, the Sardarini Replat was recorded with the Summit County Recorder's Office.

14. Between 1997 and 1998, a new 505 square foot addition was made to the back of the 954 square foot historic house. The addition was one story in height and included a bedroom, bathroom, and attached one-car garage. At the time of the application, a two-car garage in the backyard was approved to be demolished. This was approved by the Historic District Commission in July 1997.

15. In 1998, the site received a \$10,000 (\$1,250 for painting the house and \$8,750 for other repairs) Historic District Grant from the City to cover the costs of replacing the roof sheathing and material, mechanical upgrades, window replacement, water supply line replacement, as well as drain repair.

16. During the 1997-1998 remodel, only the walls of the historic house were preserved and braced in-place. The roof was entirely rebuilt to accommodate structural upgrades and new roofing materials. The walls were framed from the interior of the wall planes. The aluminum windows on the façade were replaced with wood doublehung windows, using the same picture window openings from 1948.

17. The applicant is proposing to remove a concrete block wall that runs across the north property line; the driveway; as well as a stone retaining wall, wood-steel fence, and wood patio in the backyard. The proposed work mitigates any impacts that will occur to the visual character of the neighborhood. These additions to the site are not historic and do not contribute to the historic integrity or historical significance of the structure/site.

18. The applicant is proposing to alter the rear addition that was constructed during the 1997-1998 renovation that includes living space and a one-car garage. The proposed exterior changes will not damage or destroy the exterior architectural features of the subject property which are compatible with the character of the historic site. These additions do not contribute to the historic integrity or historical significance of the structure.

19. The applicant is not proposing to modify the wood frame structure that was built during the 1997-1998 remodel. Any changes to the structure are routine maintenance and do not require Historic Preservation Board Review for Material Deconstruction.

20. The applicant proposes to remove the attic structure from the interior to create a vaulted ceiling on the interior. Any structural upgrades to accommodate this will be made from the interior. This material deconstruction mitigates any impacts that will occur to the architectural integrity of the building and any impact that would compromise the structural stability of the historic house.

21. The applicant is proposing to maintain the original roof form but utilize the flat portion of the historic truncated roof as a rooftop deck. The proposed work mitigates any impact that will occur to the visual character of the neighborhood where material deconstruction is proposed to occur; the impact will not change the historical significance of the building, and the impact will not detract from the architectural integrity of the building, or compromise the structural stability of the historic building.

22. The exterior walls were repaired and maintained during the 1997-1998 remodel. Some of the boards have rotted and have been replaced over time due to rot. Much of the siding is not original, but likely milled to match the original during the 1997-1998 remodel. These repairs are routine maintenance and do not require HPB review.

23. The foundation was largely replaced during the 1997-1998 remodel but maintained the existing elevation of the house. The applicant is proposing to raise the house 2 feet in order to mitigate drainage issues. The applicant will remove the fill from the footing level of the foundation to create a basement-level garage. New foundation level windows already exist close to the driveway and the applicant will expand these to meet egress requirements. The proposed foundation work mitigates to the greatest extent practical any impact to the historical importance of other structures located on the property and on adjacent parcels. The proposed exterior changes will not damage or destroy the exterior architectural features of the subject property which are compatible with the character of the historic site and are not included in the proposed scope of work.

24. Historically, this house had a wraparound porch that extended across the full-width of the façade and along the north side of the house. The porch was removed early on, likely in an effort to make room for a driveway leading to the two-car garage that was constructed before 1949. The existing porch appears to have been built during the 1997 remodel and is very simple in form; it is small in scale and not reflective of historic porch styles. Applicant proposes to expand the existing porch and construct a partial-width, centered hip

roof porch over the front door. The proposed scope of work mitigates any impacts that will occur to the visual character of the neighborhood where material deconstruction is proposed to occur, and will not impact the architectural integrity of the building.

25. There are no existing historic doors on the house. The existing non-historic doors are in good condition, but they are inefficient. The applicant is proposing to replace these doors with new doors that comply with the Design Guidelines. The proposed exterior changes will not damage or destroy the exterior architectural features of the subject property which are compatible with the character of the historic site and are not included in the proposed scope of work.

26. The existing windows on the house are in good condition, per the applicant's Physical Conditions Report; however, these windows are all replacement windows. There are no historic windows on the house.

27. The windows on the façade have been altered from the original dimensions, but mimic the dimensions of the picture windows installed during the 1948 remodel. The applicant is proposing to restore the original window openings on the façade and replace these windows with new casement windows. The proposed exterior changes will not damage or destroy the exterior architectural features of the subject property which are compatible with the character of the historic site.

28. On the north elevation, new windows will be added to the basement level foundation. The existing window on this level will be expanded to meet egress and a second foundation-level window will be constructed to the east. The proposed exterior changes will not damage or destroy the exterior architectural features of the subject property which are compatible with the character of the historic site.

29. On the south elevation, the two windows behind the original hall-parlor will be removed. These windows are behind the midpoint of the structure and are not visible from the primary right-of-way. The proposed exterior changes will not damage or destroy the exterior architectural features of the subject property which are compatible with the character of the historic site.

30. On the east (rear) elevation, the only window on the historic house as well as those on the new additions will be removed as it will be blocked by a new addition. The window on the back of the garage gable is proposed to be removed as well. Again, staff finds the proposed exterior changes will not damage or destroy the exterior architectural features of the subject property which are compatible with the character of the historic site.

Conclusions of Law – 158 Main Street

1. The proposal complies with the Land Management Code requirements pursuant to the HR-2 District and regarding historic structure deconstruction and reconstruction.

2. The proposal meets the criteria for relocation pursuant to LMC 15-11-12.5 Historic Preservation Board Review for Material Deconstruction.

Conditions of Approval – 158 Main Street

1. Final building plans and construction details shall reflect substantial compliance with the HDDR proposal stamped in on March 28, 2018. Any changes, modifications, or deviations from the design that have not been approved by the Planning and Building Departments may result in a stop work order.
2. Where the historic exterior materials cannot be repaired, they will be replaced with materials that match the original in all respects: scale, dimension, texture, profile, material and finish. Prior to replacement, the applicant shall demonstrate to the Historic Preservation Planner that the materials are no longer safe and/or serviceable and cannot be repaired to a safe and/or serviceable condition.
3. Should the applicant uncover historic window and door openings that were not documented at the time of the Historic Preservation Board's review, the applicant shall schedule a site visit with the Planning Department and determine if the window or door opening should be restored. Any physical evidence of lost historic window and door openings shall be documented to the satisfaction of the Preservation Planner, regardless of plans for restoration.
4. The Preservation Plan must include 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.
5. An encroachment agreement may be required prior to issuance of a building permit for projects utilizing soils nails that encroach onto neighboring properties.
6. 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.
7. Within five (5) days of installation of the cribbing and shoring, the structural engineer will inspect and approve the cribbing and shoring as constructed.
8. Historic buildings which are lifted off the foundation must be returned to the completed foundation within 45 days of the date the building permit was issued.
9. 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.
10. 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 financial guarantee for historic preservation or ACE could take place.

12. Replacement windows on the façade shall exactly match the historic windows in size, dimensions, glazing pattern, depth, profile, and material.

The Meeting adjourned at 5:35 p.m.

Approved by _____
Stephen Douglas, Chair
Historic Preservation Board

APPROVED