

PARK CITY MUNICIPAL CORPORATION
HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD
MINUTES OF JANUARY 14, 2009

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

EX OFFICIO: Thomas Eddington, Kirsten Whetstone, Kayla Sintz, Jeff Davis, Polly Samuels McLean, Patricia Abdullah.

Chair Todd Ford called the meeting to order at 6:04 p.m. and introduced Roger Durst and Adam Opalek, the two new Board members

WORK SESSION

308 Ontario Avenue – Advice and Guidance

Planner Whetstone reported that on September 19, 2008, the applicant submitted a revised application for a Historic District Design Review for an addition to an historic home at 308 Ontario Avenue. An application for a Steep Slope CUP was also submitted. On December 12, 2008, during a steep slope review, the Planning Commission requested that the applicant seek advice and guidance from the Historic Preservation Board regarding mass, scale, compatibility and design of the addition as it relates to the historic structure. The Planning Commission also requested guidance on whether the addition would change the historic designation of the house, which is currently listed on the 2007 Park City Historic Building Inventory.

Minutes from the December 12th Planning Commission meeting were included in the Staff report.

Planner Whetstone reviewed the application for an addition to the historic home at 308 Ontario Avenue as outlined in the Staff report. The addition is being proposed with a connector to the historic home, eliminating the need to do anything to the historic structure.

Planner Whetstone stated that the applicant had requested a variance in the front to allow access to the garage. Planner Whetstone reviewed a site plan to show the orientation of the structures on the lot. She noted that the design contemplates constructing a landscaped tunnel over the portion of the driveway closest to the garage doors. This is proposed to minimize the visual impact of the retaining walls, garage door and alteration of natural topography. It would also result in a two-story massing for the first 31 feet. The garage doors and driveway would curve away and you would only see landscaping from the street.

Planner Whetstone reported that the Planning Commission was mainly concerned with the west elevation.

Regarding the concern from the Planning Commission as to whether the addition would affect the home remaining on the inventory list, Planner Whetstone had consulted with

Dina Blaes and the home would continue to be a significant site on the inventory. It is not eligible for landmark status because of existing changes to the original structure.

Bill Mammen, the project architect, stated that he has lived and worked in Park City since 1979. He was a member of the original Historic District Commission and participated in writing the current design guidelines. Mr. Mammen did not believe there was any controversy regarding this application and that the Planning Commission only wanted the HPB to confirm that the addition was acceptable under the guidelines.

Mr. Mammen presented drawings showing the proposed addition in relation to the historic home. He noted that the tallest portion starts 10 feet from the back of the original house and explained how the addition was made to look like a separate structure.

Board Member Durst asked about the length of the proposed tunnel. Mr. Mammen replied that the tunnel is 22 feet before you reach the garage door. He noted that in front of the house, Ontario Avenue is across the street and not in the driveway, which is part of the problem. They need to cross 30 feet before they reach the front of the house. In that 30 feet the grade raises to 18 feet before the right-of-way meets the front of the house. The solution was to design and construct a tunnel, as opposed to having 18-foot tall retaining walls. Mr. Mammen believed this solution works for the owner and the City and it preserves an old house. It would look like 2 or 3 buildings clustered together and would not have a massive appearance.

Planner Whetstone explained that the garage would require an encroachment agreement from the City Engineer. That agreement would have to be in place prior to building permits.

Chair Ford asked if the Planning Commission specifically identified issues for the HPB. Planner Whetstone replied that the Planning Commission asked the HPB to look at the front façade and the connection. The Planning Commission had also requested a model. Mr. Mammen stated that he preferred to explain his plan with drawings instead of a model.

Board Member Werbelow noted that the Planning Commission also requested input from the HPB on design mass and scale.

Board Member Kimball wanted to know how much of the addition would be visible from Ontario. Mr. Mammen stated that the existing house is barely visible from Ontario because of a large evergreen tree in the street right-of-way. Parts of the new structure would be visible from Ontario. Mr. Mammen stated that the existing stone steps that go between Ontario and McHenry would be reconstructed and those would become the front steps to the new entrance of the house. He indicated the current entrance to the house, which is through a sliding glass door on the porch.

Chair Ford clarified that the new primary street access to the house would be from the street to the front door. Mr. Mammen stated that someone could park in front of the garage and walk up the steps to the front door. Chair Ford asked if the entrance would be the sliding glass doors on top of the garage or if it would be the original stairs. Mr. Mammen replied that it would be on the south side off of 3rd Street.

Planner Whetstone stated that she was unable to find an old picture of the original entrance. The Sanborn map shows a structure that had a porch facing Main Street.

Board Member Durst understood from the plans that the delineation of portal to tunnel was facing west. Mr. Mammen replied that this was correct. Board Member Durst asked if the site plan suggests that the cover on the tunnel comes out to where the sidewall on the tunnel makes a break. Mr. Mammen answered yes. Board Member Durst was interested in knowing what the sidewalls would be and the material.

Mr. Mammen replied that the sidewalls of the tunnel would probably be stone veneer on cast in place concrete. The span going across would probably be sandblasted concrete. He was unsure of the exact depth and noted that it is currently drawn at 3 feet. Mr. Mammen expected it would be somewhere between 36 and 42 inches. Board Member Durst understood that this would become the identification of the living unit from Ontario. Mr. Mammen replied that this was correct. He visually put 308 on the beam for identification.

Board Member Durst referred to the dotted line just below the level where the doors come out and felt it was reasonable to put some kind of railing at that point. Mr. Mammen stated that he would like to landscape that area in a way that is not user friendly to keep people from walking through there to avoid having to have a 36 inch railing.

Chair Ford indicated the double doors in the front of the new elevation and he assumed there would be a patio in front of those doors. The assumption is that if you walk out far enough there would be a cliff where the overhang goes over the driveway. Chair Ford believed the Building Department would mandate some type of railing. He pointed out that the visual impact of that railing was not demonstrated on the plans. Mr. Mammen presented his plan for landscaping that he believes would preclude people from walking down. Board Member Durst believed the design of the portal is critical to this building in terms of whether or not a railing is included and the construction materials. Board Member Durst understood that the wall beyond the determination of the southern wall is a block rubble wall that would taper down. Mr. Mammen answered yes.

Mr. Mammen stated that if a handrail is required by the Building Department, he would prefer an iron railing that is inconspicuous as possible. He noted that the railings on the old house are wood. He would like to use 2 x 2 tube steel for the railing on the new portion. For the guardrail, he would probably suggest $\frac{3}{4}$ or $\frac{1}{2}$ inch steel verticals with a steel cap. He would propose a rust color that melts away into the landscaping. Mr. Mammen was hopeful that guard railing would not be required with proper landscaping.

Board Member Martz referred to the front elevation and the suggestion to take off the non-historic porch of the old building. Mr. Mammen replied that the non-historic porch that would be removed is where the connection is between the new and the old building. The porch in front with the railing is historic and would remain. Mr. Mammen explained that everything on all four sides of the house would remain. The only difference will be where the sliding glass door butts into the house. Board Member Martz noted that the historic pictures of the house show a different porch. Mr. Mammen stated that at some point the roof on the historic house was redone. He intends to preserve the house as is. Mr. Mammen pointed out that he was forced to do a curved driveway into the garage because of the street right-of-way.

Board Member Martz thought the very top roof appeared massive in comparison to the historic house in terms of height differentiation. Mr. Mammen stated that looking from McHenry, the front of the house back to the ridgeline is almost 50 feet. Board Member Martz clarified that his concern was the height looking from Ontario. Mr. Mammen did not believe the back porch would be seen from Ontario Avenue.

Planner Whetstone reviewed the drawings and discussed the height and mass and scale of the historic house. Board Member Martz noted that the minutes from the Planning Commission meeting indicated some concern with the vertical height. Mr. Mammen noted that the proposed height does not exceed the 27' height limit. He tried to keep the scale commiserate with the mining era.

Chair Ford felt this was one of the more sensitive additions and he commended Mr. Mammen for not trying to maximize the space. He thought the plan shows a fair amount of restraint and it is fairly sensitive.

Chair Ford asked if the existing walls on the property have been identified as historic. Planner Whetstone was unsure and noted that Dina Blaes would look into that in researching individual elements for the inventory. The inventory is now a site inventory that addresses walls and other elements beyond buildings. Mr. Mammen did not believe the walls were significant but offered to check with Ms. Blaes.

Chair Ford pointed out that the majority of comments this evening relate to landscaping. He recommended that Mr. Mammen submit a final landscape plan to the Planning Commission so they could have an accurate representation of how the landscaping on top of the concrete would look and how it will be accomplished. Chair Ford suggested that Mr. Mammen get clarification from the Building Department on the railing issue prior to requesting final approval from the Planning Commission. He recalled comments about making sure the materials for the large wall that generates the pedestrian experience to the house would be historically compatible.

Board Member Durst asked about the roof slopes. Mr. Mammen stated that the original house has a 5/12 slope and the addition has a 6/12 slope. The intent is to make it look like two different houses. The east roof is a flat seam. The historic roof is a standing seam. Mr. Mammen stated that he personally disliked standing seams for this climate because it channels the snow.

Board Member Holmgren commented on the importance of walls.

Board Member Durst was less complimentary about the design. He was concerned about the number of things going on, such as lapsiding, vertical board siding, a stone wall and exposed concrete walls. He wondered about the correlation between the railings as they are observed from Ontario. Board Member Durst thought that replicating the older siding on to the new building confuses the relationship between the older section and the new. He stated that the addition needs to grow from the original house or be something distinct. Board Member Durst complimented Mr. Mammen on keeping the massing well within the envelope.

Planner Whetstone stated that they would take a second look at some of the materials.

1110 Woodside Avenue – Advice and Guidance

Planner Whetstone reported that the Staff received an application for a Historic Design Review for an addition to a historically significant house located at 1110 Woodside. After conducting the design review, the Staff found that the application was not in compliance with some of the guidelines. The historically significant building is listed on the National Register at the request of the previous owner. It is also listed on the 2007 Park City Historic Building Inventory. Planner Whetstone consulted with Dina Blaes regarding this property and Ms. Blaes suggested that this property would very likely be a landmark site.

Planner Whetstone stated that the building sits on two flat lots and a plat amendment would be required. The applicant would like input on the design review before submitting a plat amendment application. She noted that the structure sits further back than the required front setback. The structure takes up most of the lot, which makes it a unique situation. Adding a basement could be done without raising the house too much from its original elevation.

The Staff was mostly concerned with the rear addition, because it would go across the entire back of the house. Planner Whetstone requested direction from the HPB regarding the rear elevation.

Bill Mammen, representing the applicant, provided examples of houses that he felt were similar to what was being proposed and indicated comparisons that he felt made this application more acceptable. Board Member Holmgren pointed out that the examples shown were approved before the inventory list was established and the new guidelines were updated.

Mr. Mammen felt the door was being shut on this applicant because the new guidelines have not been adopted. He reviewed the proposed addition and noted that from the street view, the addition does not overwhelm the front façade of the existing bungalow.

Mr. Mammen presented a photo of the house at 1110 Woodside, which showed exactly where the ridge line would be on the addition and how the two outside walls would be visible. He noted that the additional footprint of the addition is a quarter of the size of the original bungalow. Mr. Mammen remarked that the Staff questioned compliance with Guideline 49, which talks about altering the front façade, and stated that they are not altering the front façade. He pointed out that they are back 10-1/2 feet from the first peak of the roof and 8 feet from the middle of the middle. This puts them so far back from the front façade that he did not think it was an issue.

In terms of preserving the original shape of the roof, Mr. Mammen stated that the plan was designed in a way that shows the original roof and honors and respects what historically exists. He pointed out that the addition would not be seen from the street.

Mr. Mammen stated that Guideline 62, which talks about preserving the character of the roof line, was being misapplied to this project. The guidelines talk about skylights and putting dormers on old roofs. He did not believe the guideline was intended to apply to additions. He agreed that the guideline would apply if he changed the roof shape, but that is not the case.

Mr. Mammen referred to Guideline 73, to maintain the typical roof orientation, and stated that he debated whether or not to do gable roofs on the new portion or distinguish it from the old. He decided to use gable roofs to match the gable roof on the old because it makes the addition less noticeable. Mr. Mammen stated that when he designed this project he was very sensitive to the guidelines and he believes this addition complies.

Chair Ford reminded the Board members that this was a work session item and the purpose was to hash out thoughts and ideas. Planner Whetstone preferred that the Board provide direction on specific guidelines.

Mr. Mammen reviewed the site plan. Chair Ford asked about the rear setback. Planner Whetstone replied that ten feet is the required setback. Mr. Mammen stated that he was considering bringing the house 5 feet forward to the front setback. Mr. Mammen noted that the City has requested that he bring the driveway back to allow two cars to be parked in the driveway and off the street.

Board Member Durst asked if this would allow them to eliminate one of the two parallel parked cars in the front. Mr. Mammen stated that he could; however, the City did not want him to do that. Mr. Mammen stated that the two tandem spaces would be for the property owner, but they cannot preclude anyone from parking on Woodside.

Planner Whetstone stated that the City would like to see a landscape plan because a lengthy portion of the front would be landscaped and not just paved. Chair Ford thought that they should start asking for landscape plans for both private and public space.

Board Member Durst appreciated the photographs Mr. Mammen provided showing similar additions. He was not familiar enough with the structures photographed, but it appeared as though the siding material on those additions was identical to what was on the original house. He also noticed that the window proportions on the newer additions were similar and their function appears to be the same. He noted that Mr. Mammen had universally gone to a divided light casement window and he wondered why the proportions were not more similar. He also wanted to know why Mr. Mammen elected to use a divided light.

Mr. Mammen explained that the casements are all for egress. The bedrooms have divided light casements. If they use a double hung window it would not meet the egress requirements. The intent is to look like double hung windows from a distance. Board Member Durst pointed out that the casement windows on the front are divided into squares and those are respectively the bathroom and closet. He wanted to know why those were not shown on the renderings. Mr. Mammen replied that those windows could not be seen so they were out of the picture. Board Member Durst clarified that he was talking about the casement windows down below the porch. Mr. Mammen stated that he took the photograph of the house as it currently exists and it does not have a basement. Mr. Mammen clarified that the house has a basement now but there are no windows except for a few coal chutes. He would raise the basement by digging it deeper, thereby keeping the house at the same elevation.

Board Member Martz commented on the work that was done on the inventory and the design guidelines and the comments that were made during public hearings. He thought that the yellow house across from the library with the large addition was identical to the house at 1110 Woodside in many ways, particularly from the front. The addition on the

back is larger than the addition being proposed. He referred to another yellow house with an addition and noted that both of those projects were approved by the City under the guidelines that are currently enforced.

Board Member Martz referred to comments Ms. Blaes made regarding the inventory and he believed it was partially connected to the Planning Commission's concern with the project at 308 Ontario. Board Member Martz understood that the smaller yellow house received a historic grant for approximately \$20,000 to improve the original historic house. The addition was outside of the purview of the HPB. Board Member Martz stated that this house came up in discussions with Ms. Blaes because it was de-listed from the historic inventory due to the mass and the height of the addition. He believed another structure across the street was also de-listed because of the front mass of the addition as viewed from the street. Board Member Martz commented on the issue of having an approved project cause the de-listing and loss of historic structures on the inventory. He believed those were the issues behind the comments from the Planning Commission for requesting an HPB review.

Mr. Mammen agreed that the perhaps the de-listing of historic structures may be a concern, which the Board should address in the creation of new guidelines. This is not an issue, nor was it a concern in the current guidelines.

Assistant Attorney, Polly Samuels McLean stated that this application came in under the existing guidelines and those are the guidelines that apply. However, if the guidelines were wrongly applied, the HPD does not need to continue that mistake. Ms. McLean noted that there is a purpose statement in the Land Management Code that talks about trying to maintain the historic value of houses and that is an overriding concern.

Planner Whetstone believed that delisted structures are structures that did not make it on to the 2007 inventory. Board Member Holmgren disagreed and stated that some buildings were specifically taken off because of their additions.

Chair Ford referred to the basement windows on the front elevation and thought there was a section of the City Code that addresses the visibility of new basement windows in historic structures. Planner Whetstone replied that it is in the guidelines but not in the Code. She explained that the Staff was mainly concerned with the addition from the back. The Staff had not yet done a detailed design review and they have not talked about windows, material or other details. Planner Whetstone stated that at this point they were looking for direction from the HPB on mass and scale and the location of the addition.

Chair Ford stated that in his opinion, the visibility of the front basement windows was an issue.

Board Member Kimball pointed out that all the examples shown were handled by Staff and were never seen by the HPB. Planner Whetstone replied that this was correct. Board Member Holmgren noted that several of those buildings were opposed by the neighbors who could not understand why they were allowed to be built.

Mr. Mammen stated that he could eliminate both of the basement windows in the front, but he would need to add a window on the north side. Chair Ford recalled that visibility of those additions from the right-of-way was an element they tried to address in the revised guidelines. He stated that one of the problems is the 2-dimensional nature of the

architectural drawings. The rendering was helpful, but additional renderings and street views would also be helpful to show various alternatives.

Chair Ford stated that these are the types of additions where making the addition look completely separate comes back to bite them. He thought the examples Mr. Mammen had presented demonstrated the City's preference to make these types of additions look more like an organic growth of the original structure, rather than a modern extension. He was concerned with the vertical siding and how the foundation wall comes up, but he felt those were elements that could be addressed.

Board Member Durst wondered about trying to maintain the visual integrity of the original hip roof and creating a flat valley against the new building. Mr. Mammen replied that it would have to be a sloped plane building. Mr. Durst suggested continuing the ridge. Mr. Mammen replied that he had originally done that but the Staff wanted to see the old roof line. Mr. Mammen explained his original plan. He was willing to take their comments and work with the Staff on a design that was acceptable to the HPB and the neighbors. He did not believe this was the same type of looming addition like he had shown on the two Park Avenue homes. Mr. Mammen felt that the examples he showed of approved projects were bad design that should not have been approved.

Planner Whetstone noted that the north elevation showing the roof did not address the Staff's preference for the roof at all. Board Member Ford felt the overall width of the back of the addition needs to shrink. He believed that would help with the roof form and with preserving the entire north elevation, with the exception of the basement window. Mr. Mammen argued that if they want him to push it back, he would like a compromise to let him go forward. If he could go two feet towards the front, he could take two feet off the north.

Chair Ford suggested that Mr. Mammen prepare a drawing that demonstrates that the two feet of visual intrusion would be minimal.

Board Member Holmgren was astounded at what was being proposed for the west elevation.

Planning Director Eddington clarified that the HPB was talking about taking off some of the north addition, so it does not appear to be a symmetric second story over the first story when looking at the west elevation. This would result in the loss of square footage on the north elevation and sliding it over.

Chair Ford stated that the four feet was taken off the north elevation in exchange for potentially two additional feet towards the west. Director Eddington asked if two feet would take it to the top of the ridge. Mr. Mammen stated that his preference would be to take it to the top of the ridge. Chair Ford pointed out that doing that would solve snow and drainage issues. Mr. Mammen was unsure if he would take the entire east wall out that direction and instead was considering maybe half of it. Mr. Mammen used a drawing to explain what he would like to do.

After further discussion, Chair Ford clarified that the entire historic roof line would be seen from the north elevation. Board Member Werbelow believed that would help maintain the potential for this house to remain on the National Registry. Mr. Mammen replied that the house would stay on the National Registry with the addition as proposed.

Planner Whetstone noted that the house was placed on the National Register at the request of a previous owner and this current owner has the ability to request that it be removed. Board Member Werbelow asked if the owner was interested in keeping it on the National Register. Mr. Mammen answered yes. He stated that the owner would also tear down the house if it kept him from getting the house that he needs.

Director Eddington clarified that the owner could not just decide to tear down the house.

Planner Whetstone stated that the Staff was looking for more direction and suggested that Mr. Mammen prepare renderings based on the requests made this evening to be reviewed at a future meeting. Director Eddington believed Mr. Mammen was looking at the issue from a square footage perspective, whereas the Staff was looking at it from a planning and design perspective. He thought the Staff could work with Mr. Mammen to come up with a few conceptual drawings.

Chair Ford clarified that Mr. Mammen was making the point that if he moves beyond the ridge line he would not be able to fit a hall, a bedroom and a bath. He might be able to accommodate a studio and a hall but that would be all. Chair Ford looked forward to seeing the revisions.

REGULAR MEETING/PUBLIC HEARING

ROLL CALL

Chair Ford called the regular meeting to order and noted that all Board Members were present.

Chair Ford requested that the Board Members provide a brief statement on their backgrounds and interest on the Board.

Board Member Sara Werbelow stated that she is a real estate broker who has worked in Old Town and Deer Valley for the last seven or eight years. She owns property in Old Town and has a personal, vested interest in the future of the Historic District.

Board Member Gary Kimball stated that he is a Park City native. He has lived in Park City all his life and intends to stay die there. He loves Old Town.

Board Member Puggy Holmgren stated that she has lived in Park City for over 20 years. She lives in the purple house on Park Avenue and she is very active in Old Town activities. Like Board Member Kimball, she does not intend to leave.

Board Member Roger Durst stated that he is an architect and he has worked in Park City for 13 years. He graduated from University of California at Berkeley and he is still licensed to practice in California. He currently serves on the Utah Heritage Foundation Board, as well as the Historic Preservation Board.

Board Member Ken Martz stated that he has been a resident of Park City and the area for 36 years. He has a restored historic house on Upper Park Avenue. He served on the Historic District Commission in the 1990's and has been a member on the Historic Preservation Board for 2-1/2 years. He is also on the Board of the Park City Historical

Society as their representative member to the HPB. He retired from the State Court System after 30 years and he has a lot of interest in history and Old Town Park City.

Chair Ford stated that he runs the Riverstone, which is a land use, planning, architecture and civil engineering firm in Park City. He has lived in Park City for four years. He owned a historic house in Old Town and sold it right before the market crashed.

Board Member Adam Opalek stated that he has lived in Park City for 13 years. He came to ski and never left. He does not plan to leave anytime soon. Board Member Opalek stated that he saw this position advertised in the paper and applied because he wanted to get more involved in the community. He has lived in Old Town for a number of years.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES – December 3, 2008

Chair Ford made corrections to the minutes. On page 58 of the Staff report, third paragraph from the top, the third sentence that read, “It has a second story addition is will...” and noted that either “is” or “will” needed to be eliminated. In the following paragraph, he noted that “Department of Interior” needed to be capitalized. On page 57, third paragraph from the top, Chair Ford referred to the sentence, “She was certain any structure not currently on the historic building inventory would qualify for landmark status”, and corrected it to read, “...would **not** qualify for landmark status.”

Board Member Durst referred to page 57, third paragraph from the bottom, and corrected “three to give years” to read, “three to **five** years.” Board Member Durst wanted to know what happened to the design review team that was described in the last issue of the guidelines in terms of who serves on the design review team. He noted that the minutes did not reflect any discussion about that team.

Chair Ford replied that the design review team may have already been established prior to the December 3rd meeting. He noted that the intent of the December 3rd meeting was to principally discuss the differences between the landmark sites and the significant sites.

MOTION: Board Member Martz moved to APPROVE the minutes of December 3, 2008 as corrected. Board Member Holmgren seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

PUBLIC COMMUNICATION

There was no comment.

STAFF/BOARD COMMUNICATIONS AND DISCLOSURES

Director Eddington reminded the Board members of the visioning session scheduled for February 10, 2009. The next regular HPB meeting is scheduled for February 5th, 2009.

Director Eddington stated that an email would be sent to all the Board Members regarding the design camp. This camp, which will assist the HPB, the Planning Department and any Council Members and Planning Commissioners who are interested

in attending, with regard to how to utilize, interpret and implement the new design guidelines. Director Eddington believed the dates were February 22nd and 23. He would confirm those dates and forward that information.

Chair Ford asked if the design guidelines would be adopted before that training camp. Director Eddington answered no. He stated that the purpose of this camp is to provide training prior to implementing the guidelines.

Chair Ford recalled at the last meeting that the LMC amendments relevant to the design guidelines were going to the Planning Commission on January 7th. Director Eddington stated that the amendments were presented to the Planning Commission on January 7th and they will be moving forward to the City Council, so the new historic site inventory will meet the provisions of the LMC.

Board Member Werbelow disclosed that she would be recusing herself from 1323 Woodside Avenue.

Board Member Durst stated that last July he had hoped to serve on this committee to render an opinion. He would like to hear the testimony on 1323 Woodside and make comment, but he would not be voting.

PUBLIC HEARING/ACTION ITEMS

1. 1323 Woodside Avenue – Determination of Significance

Planner Jeff Davis reported that on February 29, 2008 the City received a completed application for determination of historic insignificance for the structure at 1323 Woodside Avenue. The property is currently listed on the Park City historic building inventory, which was approved in 2007. The applicant is requesting a determination of significance in order to determine future development plans for the property.

Planner Davis noted that the Staff report contained a copy of the Historic Building Inventory fact sheet for the property. The Staff recognizes that the existing condition of the structure is poor; however the Planning Department does not support deferred maintenance or demolition by neglect as a method to remove structures from the Inventory. Additionally, reconstruction of the historic structures is an approved method of preservation in Park City.

Due to the fact that the structure was found to be historic on the original 2007 historic inventory, the Staff recommended that the HPB find the single family home located at 1323 Woodside Avenue to be historically significant based on the findings of fact and conclusions of law contained in the Staff report.

Planner Davis remarked that the applicant has the opportunity and the burden to prove whether or not the property is historic.

Steve Bremmer, the architect representing the Elliott Work Group, stated that this item was before the HPB because the Staff had requested discussion on Criteria #6. He remarked that the lapboard siding typically found on historic type structures does not exist on this building. After further investigation, they found that the shingle sheathing is straight on and there is no lap siding to salvage or save. Mr. Bremmer referred to a

photograph that was referenced as a 1930's Tax ID photo. They were not aware of that photo when they first ventured into the project, but they believe this may be the original siding and the structure may never have had lap siding. He clarified that this was their opinion and not based on fact.

Mr. Bremmer commented on the number of items referenced in the criteria and the Staff analysis that relates to the mining era. He felt this project strays from the mining era in its context. He presented a map of the RC District and pointed out that the red units reflect the buildings currently labeled as historic on the inventory. The black portion of the map represented the surrounding context, which is not on the inventory. In looking at the street elevations and the density of the RC District surrounding this house, Mr. Bremmer believed it was no longer appropriate to preserve that single family dwelling in its current context.

Mr. Bremmer stated that historic districts have contributing and non-contributing elements and this residence, in its existing condition, no longer fits into the context of contributing to the historic district. Mr. Bremmer stated that they found very little architectural character in this building worth preserving. In its current condition it is not salvageable. With direction from Staff, they would have to look at reconstruction and the question is whether or not that would be appropriate.

Mr. Bremmer presented the 1907 Sanborn map and noted that there was a different house on 1321 Woodside at that time. That house was torn down and a new house was built that sits in between the properties further off the street.

Chair Ford opened the public hearing.

Gary Knudsen, an adjoining property owner, stated that he spoke with Craig Elliott, with the Elliott Work Group. Mr. Knudsen believed the City would like to see one nice project and the existing house would be a sore tooth inside the project. He believes the proposal would be beneficial to the City and better for tax purposes. Mr. Knudsen agrees that the house is not compatible for the reasons stated by Mr. Bremmer. He noted that the area is zoned RC and there is a lot of traffic. It is no longer a residential area. Mr. Knudsen could not see how the house would benefit that area. He stated that a survey was done 20 years ago and wondered if the HPB or the City listened to the people. Mr. Knudsen believes they are on two sides of the fence. He urged the HPB to be compassionate and to consider how this request would benefit the City. Mr. Knudsen recognized that this was a hard decision but he felt strongly that a nice project would better benefit the RC zone.

Chair Ford closed the public hearing.

Board Member Holmgren stated that when it is cool and convenient to be historical, people want to replicate. When it is not, people want to tear it down. She noted that the building is on the Historic Inventory. In addition, they spent over a year drafting new guidelines to meet all the criteria. Board Member Holmgren felt the Staff did a good job and did the proper research before making their recommendation. She walks past the building once or twice a month and in her opinion, the structure is historically significant.

Chair Ford clarified that the HPB was reviewing this determination against the six criteria in the Land Management Code that determines if a building is significant or insignificant.

During the process of compiling the historic significant list, this building was deemed to be historically significant and was added to the inventory. Chair Ford understood that the HPB was judging the information submitted by the applicant this evening to determine if any of that information warrants a change to one or more of the criteria that would change the status from significant to insignificant.

Board Member Martz stated that two months ago he and Board Member Kimball toured this building and another building with Ron Ivie and the City Council. They did not go inside because the structure is dangerous. This building and another building further up Woodside are in bad condition because they have been vacant for years. Board Member Martz stated that no one has lived in the structure at 1323 since 1990.

Board Member Martz stated that unrelated to the criteria, he did not think the building itself was salvageable because of its deteriorating condition. However, he believes it is a candidate for replication and would fall underneath the new guidelines in terms of duplication.

Board Member Kimball commented on the imitation brick installation. He noted that a good salesman sold a lot of that brick in Park City during the late 1940's. He did not think the brick was used before that time.

Chair Ford asked the Board Members if any of the information presented this evening was enough to change the evaluation of the property and its significance.

Board Member Martz stated that after reading through the criteria, he felt that compliance is made in each case. He understood the issues regarding the isolation of the project, but based on the criteria, the building is significant. He reiterated his earlier comment that the building is a candidate for duplication but not restoration.

MOTION: Board Member Holmgren moved to find that the building at 1323 Woodside Avenue is historically significant. Board Member Kimball seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

Findings of Fact – 1323 Woodside

1. The home at 1323 Woodside Avenue is located in the Recreation Commercial (RC) Zoning District.
2. The property is listed on the Park City Historic Building Inventory (HBI).
3. The home was built in approximately 1910.
4. The current condition of the home is poor and the roof has some structural damage and is partially collapsed due to neglect.
5. The home is found to be associated with the mining era.
6. The architectural and historic features and value of the home have been found to contribute to the area and are comparable to others found in the district as a whole.

7. All findings from the Analysis section are incorporated herein.

Conclusions of Law – 1323 Woodside Avenue

1. The Building is Associated with the mining era.
2. The structure embodies the distinctive characteristics of type and period; one-story, “four-square” form, hipped roof, window type and placement, symmetry of façade.
3. The architectural and historic value of the structure contributes to the significance of the property and area.
4. The home demonstrates a quality of integrity of location, design, setting, materials, and workmanship.
5. The structure was built approximately 1910 with subsequent alterations.
6. The architectural and historic features are comparable to those on other structures in the area.
7. The home substantially complies with the standards of review found in LMC Section 15-11-12(A) and therefore is historically significant pursuant to LMC Section 15-11-12.

The meeting adjourned at 8:05 p.m.

Approved by _____
Todd Ford, Chair
Historic Preservation Board