

PARK CITY MUNICIPAL CORPORATION  
HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD  
MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 18, 2009

BOARD MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE: Todd Ford, Roger Durst, Puggy Holmgren, Gary Kimball, Ken Martz, Adam Opalek, Sara Werbelow.

EX OFFICIO: Thomas Eddington, Francisco Astorga, Kayla Sintz, Jacquy Mauer, Samuels McLean, Patricia Abdullah.

---

REGULAR MEETING/PUBLIC HEARING

ROLL CALL

Chair Ford called the regular meeting to order at 6:01 and noted that all Board Members were present except Sara Werbelow, who arrived later.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES – February 4, 2009

Chair Ford noted that the minutes incorrectly stated that the meeting of February 4<sup>th</sup> was opened at 10:30 a.m. He referred to page 8, 5<sup>th</sup> paragraph, first line and corrected “Norfolk not” to read “Norfolk no”.

MOTION: Board Member Durst moved to APPROVE the minutes of February 4, 2009 as corrected. Board Member Holmgren seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

PUBLIC COMMUNICATION

There was no comment.

STAFF/BOARD COMMUNICATIONS AND DISCLOSURES

Planning Director, Thomas Eddington, updated the Board Members on current projects, pursuant to their request at the recent HPB visioning session. Director Eddington reported that the Planning Commission is continuing to the Treasure Hill CUP matter. The conditions currently being discussed relate to traffic and circulation. The Planning Commission held a meeting on February 11<sup>th</sup>, at which time there was significant public input and discussion with regard to mitigation of transportation issues. The Planning Commission continued the discussion on those issues to March 25<sup>th</sup>.

Director Eddington stated that on February 12, 2009, the City Council heard and approved the LMC amendments for the financial guarantees. The HPB was provided with copies of the new ordinance language. The financial guarantee relates to historic preservation plans and other site and public improvement projects through the City.

Director Eddington reported that the project at 333 Main Street, the Main Street Mall was submitted for design review. It is a by-right approval and no zoning changes or variances were proposed as part of the project. The plans were preliminarily approved through the Design Review conducted by Staff.

Director Eddington noted that 313 Park Avenue was also given preliminary determination of compliance.

With regard to upcoming events, Director Eddington reported that the CAMP training session is scheduled for February 26<sup>th</sup> and 27<sup>th</sup> at the Treasure Mountain Inn. In addition to the CAMP Training, the State Historic Preservation Office will be in the Planning Department on March 3<sup>rd</sup> between 10:30 and noon for an Architectural Literacy Training with regard to design guidelines and design review. The HPB was invited to attend.

Director Eddington noted that the next HPB meeting is scheduled for March 4<sup>th</sup>. He stated that language changes were made in the preamble of the design guidelines with regard to the Significant Landmark Status. He asked the HPB to review that language and possibly forward a favorable recommendation to the City Council at the March 4<sup>th</sup> meeting. Director Eddington asked if the Board members would be willing to meet at 5:00 on March 4<sup>th</sup>, since the Planning Commission would be holding a special meeting that same night at 6:30 p.m. The Board agreed to meet at 5:00 p.m.

Director Eddington stated that he would continue to update the Board on current projects.

Chair Ford thanked Director Eddington, the Staff and the Board members for attending the visioning session. He felt it was a great start to a productive year for the HPB. Chair Ford appreciated the current project update Director Eddington had just provided. As they move forward, he expects to see more work sessions on their agendas as an opportunity to work through some of the issues discussed during the visioning session and their attempts to turn them into actionable items.

Chair Ford recalled comments from the last meeting about red flagging sites in the Historic Sites Inventory for Dina Blaes to consider. He asked if the Board members had sites to put forth for discussion this evening.

Board Member Martz stated that he had sent a list of eight sites to Director Eddington. Director Eddington noted that the list was forwarded to Dina Blaes. Some of those sites included the head frames of the Ontario and the Daly Mine, the Tramway Wall, the mine site at the Ontario Loading Station at the top of Marsac, the building near the Judge shop. Board Member Martz commented on a number of historic homes on Snow Lane that that were not on his list but should possibly be considered.

Board Member Kimball thought the Spiro Tunnel and the Snow's Ranch area should be looked at closely. Board Member Martz also suggested looking at the Armstrong red barn in the Snow's Lane/Thaynes Canyon area.

Chair Thomas noted that the next step would be to schedule those sites for work session once Ms. Blaes and the Staff have the appropriate information. Director Eddington encouraged the Board Members to directly email him, Ms. Blaes, or Patricia Abdullah with any sites they want considered. The Staff will research the entire compilation and schedule work sessions when the research is completed.

Chair Ford commented on the article in the newspaper about the houses the City had purchased. Director Eddington clarified that through the Redevelopment Authority, the

City purchased two houses just south of the 7-11 on the east side of Park Avenue. He believed those houses would be considered for development and potential work force housing. The City is interested in looking at opportunities to expand the opportunities for restoring those homes.

Council Member, Liza Simpson, reported that the City Council was well aware that those houses are on the Historic Significant Inventory.

Chair Ford noticed that the Park Record had not mentioned the HPB approval of the Sites Inventory or the expiration of the moratorium. He thought the City's positive use of that six months and the HPB's ability to pass the Sites Inventory should be recognized. He asked the Board Members if acknowledging that in a brief letter to the editor would be appropriate. The Board concurred that it was appropriate. Chair Thomas offered to draft a letter for the Board to review.

## ACTION ITEMS

### 637 Woodside Avenue – Appeal of Planning Director's Determination – Quasi-Judicial Hearing

The Staff was requesting that the HPB review an appeal of the Planning Director's determination of compliance with the Historic District Guidelines for 637 Woodside Avenue.

Planner Astorga noted that the Staff report addressed objections raised by the appellant, John Stafsholt, relative to the historic significance of the house that was demolished at 637 Woodside, as well as Guidelines #71, 74, 75, 77, and 79, the easement along the back, the building height, the snow release, building form and scale and the dwelling volume.

The applicant, William Heinz, represented by Jonathan DeGray, had submitted plans and a model.

The Staff recommended that the HPB review the appeal of the Planning Director's Determination of the Historic District Design Guidelines for 637 Woodside Avenue and uphold the determination of the Planning Director.

Chair Ford noted that the appeal addressed some issues outside of the purview of the HPB. He reminded everyone to keep the topics and discussion focused on Design Criteria #71, 74, 75, 77 and 79.

Planner Astorga referred to page 21 of the Staff report and noted that the date of the TZO should be corrected to August 7<sup>th</sup> and not August 4<sup>th</sup> as stated.

Board Member Martz understood that there were two appeals and asked if the HPB should respond to both. Planner Astorga explained that the Historic District Design Review application is first reviewed by Staff. Once the Staff finds preliminary compliance with the Guidelines, the adjacent properties are notified and a physical sign is posted on the site. Following that, the adjacent property owners are given ten days to appeal that decision. In accordance with the process, The Stafsholt family appealed the Staff determination. As prescribed by the LMC, that appeal is reviewed by the Planning

Director for determination. That determination was also appealed by the Stafsholt family, which is the appeal being reviewed this evening.

Planner Astorga clarified that the HPB was only looking at the appeal of the Planning Director's determination of compliance with the design guidelines. Board Member Martz asked if the rest was only information of what had transpired in the interim. Planner Astorga replied that this was correct.

In terms of process, Chair Ford wanted to hear from the appellant first, then the applicant if appropriate, and then discuss the guidelines individually.

John Stafsholt, the appellant, passed out two letters with photos that were not contained in the Staff report. Mr. Stafsholt thanked the HPB for their work on the Historic Sites Inventory. He felt that would do a lot to avoid demolition situations in the future. Mr. Stafsholt stated that demolition is a taking of their history in Park City. He appreciated what the HPB did to help get the TZO approved for six months to avoid these problems.

Mr. Stafsholt responded to the comments in the Staff report and the Planning Director's Determination. Regarding the Historic Significance, Mr. Stafsholt stated that the TZO prohibited the demolition of any building built prior to 1963. However, the TZO was adopted on August 7<sup>th</sup>, on the same day the pre-1889 home at 637 Woodside Avenue was demolished. Mr. Stafsholt read Findings of Fact #6, "A demolition permit was issued by the City at the owner's request on July 3, 2008". He felt the finding implies that the owner had the demolition permit for five weeks before demolishing the house, when in fact, the City issued the demolition permit on August 7<sup>th</sup>. Mr. Stafsholt read Finding #7, "The demolition of the non-historic structure and garage took place in August 2008". He felt it was important for the finding to specifically note that the date was August 7<sup>th</sup>.

Mr. Stafsholt remarked that the home was accessed for demolition by improperly crossing neighboring properties at 655 Woodside and 666 Tramway. This was done without the property owners' permission using heavy equipment. The demolition was also carried out against the Park City Code by having live electrical service hooked up to the home. He presented photos showing the wires still attached to what was left of the home after the demolition. Mr. Stafsholt had taken the picture five days after the demolition. Rocky Mountain Power did not come until twelve days after the demolition. It was a dangerous situation for everyone in the neighborhood. He presented another photo showing the live gas main sitting in the rubble.

Mr. Stafsholt stated that the sewer main was also live and could have plugged the neighbors' sewer line. He presented photos taken on October 28<sup>th</sup>, showing the sewer line being repaired. Mr. Stafsholt indicated a picture taken on November 18<sup>th</sup>, showing the sewer line sitting open. He noted that the neighborhood still has an uncapped sewer lateral with no backfill.

Mr. Stafsholt noted that the property is adjacent to a ski run. A skier went through there yesterday and was lucky he did not go over the top. Mr. Stafsholt presented a picture showing that the demolition at 637 Woodside was partial. The Findings of Fact indicate that the garage was demolished at the same time, but it was actually demolished five days later and only partially. Mr. Stafsholt presented a photo of his own home showing

that the foundation on his historic home from 1883 was totally undermined by the excavation and that has not been remedied.

Mr. Stafsholt read from the Staff report and felt the Staff comments relative to the new plans were premature. He and his neighbors are trying to keep the history, yet their homes are being compromised. He worried about property values and wanted to know why the neighbors are the ones enforcing the regulations. Mr. Stafsholt could not understand why there were still issues six months later.

Mr. Stafsholt commented on neighborhood compatibility and noted that the new house proposed is over 7.5 times the size of the original historic home. The project is maximized in every respect as evidenced by a 2,333 square foot footprint. He noted that the house would be 7,517 square feet, four stories, six bedrooms, six full baths, three half baths, fireplaces and elevators. Also proposed are five decks, a porch and a two-car garage.

Mr. Stafsholt noted that a letter submitted by the neighbors in July stated that there was not a certified survey and the two surveys in the Staff report had discrepancies. To date, that has not been addressed. He went to the City after his appeal was denied and found that the elevations on the surveys being used for the project are more than 60 feet different in elevation from the surrounding homes. Mr. Stafsholt did not understand how the HPB could move forward with any determination if the surveys are 60 feet different. He pointed out that no streetscapes have been provided and the applicant needs to accurately show the size, mass and scale of the project. Mr. Stafsholt noted that there are no surveys of the existing houses on both sides and the impacts they would incur. He remarked that the Staff report is not complete and does not provide accurate information.

With regard to the HPB's purview, Mr. Stafsholt noted that the main ridge line is visible from the street and parallel to Woodside Avenue. He believed this goes against the Historic District Design Guidelines. Mr. Stafsholt stated that height exceptions are based on the top roof line, which is called a bastardized 5:12 roof line. It starts at the back of the property and runs perpendicular to Woodside. It is granted a 20% exception and then it breaks over forward, making the mass of the entire roof visible. This was done to get additional square footage on the property and he believed that was against the design guidelines.

Mr. Stafsholt thought the exception for a 5:12 roof should be denied. He also believed that 5:12 roof pitches should not be allowed throughout the house due to its significant location adjacent to a property line bordered by a popular ski run. Mr. Stafsholt presented pictures of his home and the yellow house and noted that they had 10:12 and 12:12 pitches. The photo was taken from the ski lift chair. Mr. Stafsholt indicated two ski runs in between the chair and the houses, which he believed demonstrated why steep pitches on the sides and back are critical. Mr. Stafsholt stated that three decks and one porch overlook Woodside Avenue. The deck on the second floor extends into the fifteen foot required setback for the deck and the roof above it. Mr. Stafsholt noted that the two third floor decks that overlook Woodside are inconsistent with anything else in the historic district.

Mr. Stafsholt read from Item 9 in the Staff report, under Snow Release, "The appellant does not contest any specific Historic District Guideline, but rather contests the criteria in

regards to snow release issues as it is outlined in the review of development on steep slopes CUP criteria for height exceptions. The plans have been reviewed by the Building Department and have been found to be appropriately designed to the satisfaction of the Chief Building Official for snow release". He believed this was blatantly incorrect. Mr. Stafsholt clarified that he contests the snow release on the basis of the LMC Lot and Site Requirements, subparagraph J. He realized this was an LMC issue, however, in his opinion it is relevant to the overall approval of the project and has nothing to do with the Steep Slope CUP. Mr. Stafsholt stated for the record that he had made this objection but it was withdrawn because his objection was upheld.

Mr. Stafsholt felt that another relevant issue is that the plans had not been reviewed by the Building Department and have not been appropriately designed to the satisfaction of the Chief Building Official for snow release. He thought this was evidenced by the lack of a Building Department stamp and Ron Ivie's initials. This fact was also noted in his letters and discussions, but no action has been taken by the applicant. In addition, the Planning Department has not required the applicant to obtain the required snow shed easements or approvals. Mr. Stafsholt stated that legal snow shed agreements or approval by the Chief Building Official is required before the Planning Department can grant approvals. He felt that breaching this rule brings the whole project into question and begs the question of why they would approve it without the required snow shed approval.

Mr. Stafsholt read the Order from the Staff report that "The appeal is denied in whole and the Planning Director's determination is upheld." He took issue with that Order. The Planning Director did not require the applicant to make a minimum of six revisions to the project based on his appeal and at least six items were found to be upheld.

Mr. Stafsholt stated that discrepancies continue to abound and he used the drawings to point out discrepancies in elevations, floor plans and other relevant issues addressed in the HPB guidelines.

Mr. Stafsholt requested that the Planning Director relook at this project due to discrepancies in the surveys, the drawings and lack of streetscapes. He asked that he also relook at the heights with respect to the LMC. If this project is approved, he would look for additional conditions such as, 1) the applicant should be held to build to the current plans; 2) changes to the plan should necessitate restarting the process as required; 3) the new house should not be built forward of the existing adjacent houses on either side, as per Guideline #77 in the Historic District Guidelines; 4) no additional decks, porches or pads are to be added after approval; 5) the existing easement in the back of the homes should not be displaced. Mr. Stafsholt pointed out that the easement exists for the benefit of 627 and 633 Woodside and they should be allowed to maintain continuous use of this easement. This is a concern because the Crescent Tramway easement across the street was stopped for public use for three years.

Mr. Stafsholt requested that the applicant make every effort to keep the adjoining garage that is built against the partially demolished garage at 633 Woodside Avenue intact. He also requested that the applicant tap and buy the sewer lateral as required by Code. This should have been done prior to demolition and they have been in violation for six months without penalty. Mr. Stafsholt reiterated the dangerous conditions and felt it was time to fix those to lessen the liability for the City and the applicant.

Jonathan DeGray, representing the applicant, commented on a number of issues raised by Mr. Stafsholt. Mr. DeGray stated that the survey is a certified survey and he was unaware of the discrepancies that Mr. Stafsholt referred to. However, in keeping with Chair Ford's direction, it was not a relevant matter to be discussed this evening under the HPB jurisdiction.

Mr. DeGray stated that a streetscape was submitted to the City and he was happy to provide that again at any time. Planner Astorga stated that the streetscape was not include in the Staff report, but it was available for review in a power point presentation.

Mr. DeGray was unsure if height and ridge issues were relevant to the HPB. In terms of decks, he had a number of photographs of nearby buildings on Woodside showing similar deck configurations on second and third floors, and sometimes on a fourth level.

Mr. DeGray stated that the plan had been modified to satisfy the Building Department and Planner Astorga had told him that the modifications were accepted. Regarding discrepancies, Mr. DeGray noted that he offered an alternative elevation with reduced window sizes on the front elevation, but the plans were not changed to reflect that window layout. They are in agreement with Staff to use the alternate elevation shown in the packet, which has a 33% window ratio on the elevation.

Mr. DeGray stated that in terms of approval, they have modified the plans as recommended by Staff and they are happy to continue working with Staff to make sure the project is the best it can be. Mr. DeGray believed the project was in compliance from the beginning and they have been willing to make modifications at the Staff's request. Regarding process, Mr. DeGray assumed the Staff would make a determination and provide specifics changes to the plan and the applicant would present construction documents that include all of those changes. The construction documents would be reviewed by Staff to insure compliance with the approval.

Mr. DeGray addressed the issues in the appeal regarding the items in the design guidelines. He referred to Mr. Stafsholt's statement that based on Guidelines 71, new construction should include facades that have similar widths and heights of those found elsewhere on the street. Mr. DeGray pointed out that further language in Guideline 71 allows the ability to break up the facades into reasonable forms in new construction if the width of the lot dictates a larger building. He did that in accordance with the guideline and the Staff found that to be in compliance. Mr. DeGray noted that Mr. Stafsholt contends that no other homes have third floor balconies, and he believes that is an incorrect statement. Mr. DeGray distributed a packet of photographs showing homes in the immediate area with upper level decks.

Mr. DeGray referred to Mr. Stafsholt's statement that the roof lines are equal in height to his home, yet the house is six foot higher in elevation. He used the model and the updated streetscape showing the alternate elevation, to show a vertical change in elevation between the buildings.

Regarding Guideline 74 and Mr. Stafsholt's comment about using roof shapes similar to those found historically in the neighborhood, Mr. DeGray referred to photographs showing a number of buildings in the area that have lower roof pitches. He stated that they came to the Building Department with a Code compliance design at 7:12 on the front gables, and at the request of Staff they made the pitches steeper to 9:12.

Mr. DeGray referred to Guideline 75, the direction to maintain the orientation of the porch, and noted that the building has a front entry porch seventeen feet lot. He again referred to the photographs to show that a number of buildings in the neighborhood have entry porches. Mr. DeGray stated that it is common for uphill projects to have staircases leading up to them. He noted that photograph 8 was a similar configuration to what they were proposing, with a doorway underneath and a garage door relevant to the lower level.

Mr. DeGray referred to Guideline 77, to maintain a typical setback, front façade. He stated that the existing structure sat behind a parking structure similar to Mr. Stafsholt's and it shared a common wall. The new construction would be setback 15 feet, which complies with the Code for the size of the lot. Mr. DeGray reviewed a site plan in the Staff report, showing the relationship of the proposed structure to Mr. Stafsholt's structure. He pointed out that Mr. Stafsholt's structure measures 16 feet from the property line and the proposed structure would be 15 feet. He was unsure why there would be an issue with Guideline 77.

Mr. DeGray offered to discuss any of the LMC issues if the Board Members were interested. Mr. DeGray noted that this has been a lengthy process. The original application was submitted in March of 2008 and he has been revising plans since that time. The applicant willingly made all the requested modifications and they believe it meets all of the requirements of the LMC and the design guidelines. Mr. DeGray encouraged the HPB to favorably consider this project and take into consideration the Staff recommendation.

Shawn Kotter, with Tesch Law Offices, represented the applicant. Mr. Kotter stated that the scope of the appeal is limited to the issue of whether or not the Planning Director made an error in his determination of compliance with the Historic Design Guidelines. Mr. Kotter remarked that the appellant has the burden of proving that the Planning Department erred in its determination.

Assistant City Attorney, Polly Samuels McLean, clarified that the standard of review is de novo for the factual. Therefore, the Historic Preservation Board was looking at this matter anew and they should not give deference to Staff.

Mr. Kotter understood that the adjacent property is owned or encumbered by Board Member Kimball. He was unsure if that was relevant to the discussion.

Board Member Kimball stated that he owns property behind his brother's property, which abuts in to the right-of-way. He pointed out that everyone else, including the previous owners, signed off to close down the right-of-way, except for him. He left it open as pedestrian right-of-way. Board Member Kimball stated that he would not vote on this matter due to those conflicts.

Mr. Stafsholt referred to the streetscape Mr. DeGray had presented and noted that it inaccurately showed his house five feet taller than it is. He urged the Planning Commission to look at the photos he submitted and compare it to the streetscape. Mr. Stafsholt wanted the record to reflect that the streetscape was inaccurate.



Chair Ford asked the Board for discussion on Guideline #71 – maintain the typical size and shape of historic facades.

Board Member Holmgren thought the house proposed looked much larger than the other homes on the street.

Board Member Durst asked about the proposed exterior materials and window elements. Mr. DeGray stated that the roofing material is an architectural composition shingle. The exterior material is wood siding and the windows are aluminum clad wood windows. The small front canopy is a standing seam metal roof.

Chair Ford felt the entire project lacked specific information. He preferred to see the actual height of each building within the streetscape at the front façade. That information is necessary in order to do a thorough analysis of Guideline 71. Planner Astorga noted that the streetscape shows one house to the north and four houses to the south. He asked if those five houses would be sufficient to meet Chair Ford's request. Chair Ford suggested that the Staff conduct their analysis on four houses to the south and four houses to the north. Board Member Kimball pointed out that there is only one house to the north. Given the parameters of the area, Chair Ford thought the suggestion from Planner Astorga was fair.

Chair Ford called for discussion on Guideline #74 – use roof shapes found historically in the neighborhood. Planner Astorga noted that a graphic within the guideline states that, "typical roof shapes can be combined in ways to create compatible infill buildings."

Chair Ford understood that the Staff thought the front façade roof pitches were adequately steep; however, the Staff and the appellant questioned the rear and north elevation. Planner Astorga replied that this was correct. He used the model to show the areas of the 7:12 pitch, which the applicant had modified to a 9:12 roof pitch. He noted that everywhere else on the structure remained a 5:12 pitch. The Staff found that from the right-of-way, most of the 5:12 pitch would not be exposed. Planner Astorga stated that the variety in pitch meets the intent of the guideline.

Board Member Durst noted that the elevation and the streetscape appeared to show a hip roof offset from the gable, but he did not see that reflected on the model. Planner Astorga agreed that there was a hip. He noted that in order to satisfy the snow release issues a gable was added over the chimney. Board Member Durst asked if the chimney cap was a standing seam metal. Mr. DeGray answered yes.

Board Member Holmgren thought the hip section made everything look big in proportion. Board Member Werbelow asked if the hip was added to break up the long parallel form of the roof to the street. Planner Astorga stated that the hip was there when the original application was submitted to Staff. Without the hip on the gable end, it would exceed the maximum building height of 27 feet.

Chair Ford noted that Guideline #74 does not mention the public right-of-way or the front. He did not think the guideline distinguished between the roofs of the front elevation, the side or the rear. Chair Ford read from guideline #74, "...because steep slopes expose the roofs to view from above and from across the canyon". Based on that language, he believed all the roof pitches should be considered.

Chair Ford called for discussion on Guideline #75 – maintain the orientation and dimensions of porches. Planner Astorga read from Guideline 75, “Historically the porch protects the entrance to the house. The main porch faced the street and it ran across the entire front of the house or a portion of it. A modern interpretation of a conventional porch strongly establishes a relationship with the neighborhood.”

Board Member Durst asked if the railing construction on all the balconies is intended to be the same configuration and detail. Mr. DeGray replied that they would all have picket design railings.

Chair Ford called for discussion on Guideline #77- maintain the typical setback of front facades. Board Member Durst asked if the sighting of the house was within the range of various setbacks from the street. Planner Astorga stated that it meets the minimum standard of 15 feet. He believed the Kimball residence was also within that range. The garage at 633 Woodside encroaches into the right-of-way approximately 6 feet.

Chair Ford stated that since the guideline is very specific that the block is to be analyzed, the HPB needed to see an analysis of the block and the front yard setbacks within that block before they could apply the guideline appropriately.

Board Member Martz stated that because there is no yard, the applicant and the City should consider making the front setbacks ten feet greater than the minimum, due to the size of the house on the lot and the lack of opportunity for landscaping. This would help make the house fit within the area.

Chair Ford called for discussion on Guideline #79 – use ratio of windows to walls similar to historic structures. The Guideline contains illustrations showing inappropriate and appropriate ratios.

Board Member Durst asked if two-thirds of the average is solid. Planner Astorga replied that two-thirds is the average for historically significant homes. The ratio should be two-thirds solid and one-third windows/doors. The Staff analysis on the alternative elevation proposed showed 34% windows/doors. Based on the average, that figure should be 33.3%. Planner Astorga noted that 34% included the front façade on the garage level, entry level and main level. Chair Ford asked if it included the actual garage door. Planner Astorga answered yes. The only portion not included was the façade on the main level that was incorrectly illustrated on the model at 7 feet behind the front and covered by the steps. Director Eddington noted that page 42 of the Staff report showed the accurate design.

Board Member Martz asked for clarification on the backyard easement and right-of-way issues. Chair Ford preferred not to allow that discussion because it would open the door to issues outside of their purview. He trusted that the appropriate City Departments, as well as the Planning Commission and City Council would address Items 7, 8, 9, 10 and 11 in the Staff report, which are matters outside of the HPB jurisdiction.

Planner Astorga explained the differences between the model and the redesigned plans.

Board Member Werbelow felt the analysis Chair Ford had requested regarding the height was a crucial piece of information. This is a visible site from Main Street and she was interested in seeing how it blends with the neighborhood.

Chair Ford summarized that the Board had requested three pieces of information. One was the height comparison at the front façade of the homes on the street. The second was information on the pitches of all the roofs. The third was an analysis of the front yard setbacks of the entire block.

Board Member Durst remarked that improvements made along the street frontage have resulted in a remarkably eclectic assemblage of buildings. He recommended that the HPB receive the additional information requested, and either individually or collectively take the knowledge obtained this evening and survey the street to determine whether or not the proposal is an appropriate design.

Chair Ford thanked the appellant and the applicant for the photos and additional information they both presented this evening.

MOTION: Board Member Durst moved to CONTINUE this item. Board Member Holmgren seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

Chair Ford noted that the item would be continued until the Staff could provide the additional information requested.

The meeting adjourned at 7:30 p.m.

Approved by \_\_\_\_\_  
Todd Ford, Chair  
Historic Preservation Board