

PARK CITY MUNICIPAL CORPORATION
HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD
MINUTES OF MAY 29, 2012

BOARD MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE: Sara Werbelow, Puggy Holmgren, David White, Katherine Matsumoto-Gray, Dave McFawn

EX OFFICIO: Thomas Eddington, Francisco Astorga, Mark Harrington, Patricia Abdullah

ROLL CALL

Chair Werbelow called the meeting to order at 5:38 p.m. and noted that all Board Members were present except for Alex Natt and Judy McKie

PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS

There were no comments.

STAFF/BOARD COMMUNICATIONS & DISCLOSURES

Director Eddington noted that this was a special meeting for the purpose of hearing the appeal on 335 Woodside Avenue. The next regular HPB meeting would be Wednesday, June 6th. The July meeting would fall on July 4th. Director Eddington asked if the Board preferred to change the June meeting to the third Wednesday in June, which would be June 20th.

Chair Werbelow was comfortable meeting on June 20th, unless the other Board members felt it was too long to wait to finalize the preservation award. Board Member Matsumoto-Gray was not opposed to two regular meetings prior to July 4th, but she was comfortable waiting until June 20th. Board Members White and McFawn concurred.

Director Eddington clarified that the next HPB meeting would be scheduled for Wednesday, June 6th. The Staff would work with the awards subcommittee prior to June 20th for more definitive information. He believed a grant application would also be on that agenda.

Planner Francisco Astorga reported on an email he received from a property owner who purchased a landmark site property at 109 Woodside Avenue. A few months earlier the Planning Department had approved work on the brown accessory building that is accessed off of King Road. Planner Astorga reported that the accessory building was the first reconstruction project approved under the new design guidelines. The site was pending a sale and the new owner had finalized the paperwork. There were some issues with a failing retaining wall on site. He met with the property owners on Friday and they were preparing to issue the financial guarantee. Planner Astorga recalled that the HPB and the City Council specifically requested to review this project since it was the first project approved under the new reconstruction criteria. The HPB should expect to see this on their agenda in the near future.

Planner Astorga noted that the demolition permit had not yet been issued, but the accessory building would come down within the next two weeks. He clarified that it was only the accessory building and not the main dwelling. As the project manager, Planner

Astorga encouraged the Board members to contact him if they had additional questions. Based on the new guidelines, property owners within 100 feet were noticed twice. He would send the Board members an email with a more specific time frame as to when the accessory building would come down, as well as the exact amount of the financial guarantee.

Board Member White disclosed that he was the project architect for 335 Woodside and would be recusing himself from hearing the appeal this evening.

REGULAR AGENDA – Discussion, public hearing, and possible action.

335 Woodside Avenue – Appeal of Design Review
(Application #PL-12-01541)

David White recused himself and left the room.

Planner Astorga reported that the Planning Department had received an appeal of the April 26, 2012 approval of the Historic District Design Review for 335 Woodside Avenue. Ruth Meintsma had submitted the appeal and she was prepared to give a presentation this evening.

Planner Astorga reviewed the project at 335 Woodside and explained the reasons for the HDDR approval. The Staff provided the HPB with an extensive packet of documents and relevant information to support their decision.

Planner Astorga reported that the structure at 335 Woodside is a landmark site and it is eligible for the National Register of Historic Places. The proposed work does not include reconstruction or panelization. The owner would like to lift the house a few inches to build a basement addition underneath the historic structure. The house would be brought back to its original elevation after adding a permanent foundation. The project also includes a three-story addition towards the rear of the property.

Planner Astorga reported that the approval was to completely renovate the structure and keeping all the facades in their current location. The project meets the LMC criteria for setbacks and applicable development standards. The appeal submitted by Ms. Meintsma was outlined into three separate principles or items. The first was the concept of integrity, which is a section found in the Historic District Design Guidelines. Planner Astorga provided an exhibit that defined the concept of integrity using the definition of the National Park Service. In the appeal, Ms. Meintsma also indicated issues with the footprint and massing, believing that it did not comply with Guideline #3.

Planner Astorga reviewed the Analysis on page 5 of the Staff report. The Staff believed the structure was built in 1893 and the same footprint was followed in the Sanborn map of 1907. Interior changes were identified in 1929. He presented maps from 1940 and 1958. Planner Astorga remarked that because digital formats were not available, Preservation Consultant, Dina Blaes had hand-sketched the maps. He noted that Ms. Blaes was present this evening to answer additional questions.

Planner Astorga compared the historic footprint to the existing footprint. The survey shows that the front of the structure was still the same; however, the rear was completely different. He indicated a jog on the rear façade, as well as bump outs on both sides. Planner Astorga stated that in terms of the concept of integrity, the mass and form was not intact as defined in the design guidelines. The Staff was unable to determine which rear façade was the original façade. Because it was extensively modified and considered a tertiary facade, the Staff approved the removal of approximately 4-1/2 feet along the rear of the property to accommodate a specific addition that meets the design guidelines. Planner Astorga remarked that the appeal was related to removal of that 4-1/2 feet in the rear.

The Staff found that the project met the design guidelines because the concept of integrity had been applied correctly. Planner Astorga clarified that the Staff was unable to determine the exact time frame of when the rear façade was removed, but there was evidence that it was done after 1958. For that reason, the Staff allowed the removal of the last 4-1/2 feet.

Planner Astorga understood that the structure may still have historic materials along the rear façade. A condition of approval was added requiring that all historic material be saved for any future repairs or maintenance.

Director Eddington clarified that the back 4-1/2 feet was the full addition and the material was different. Planner Astorga stated that the structural members had a newer construction, as submitted in the physical condition report. However, some of the exterior members resembled a more historic type of construction. It was unclear what had actually happened to the structure.

Board Member Matsumoto-Gray understood that the addition occurred to the back of the structure; however they were unable to confirm whether the changes to the back of the structure were part of the original house, whether it was completely new construction, or whether it was a combination of both. Planner Astorga explained that the structural members are new, but the siding may be historic. Director Eddington remarked that some of the siding could have been removed from the original rear façade and used on the new addition.

Chair Werbelow asked for an explanation of the origin of 1958 in the analysis. Planner Astorga stated that the Sanborn map of 1958 was not the same footprint configuration that existed in 1907. That was evidence that the rear façade was changed after 1958.

Board Member Matsumoto-Gray asked Planner Astorga to speak to the size and scale argument that the appellant had raised in the appeal regarding the mass of the addition. Chair Werbelow questioned whether that issue had bearing on what the HPB was being asked to review. She understood that the specific issue for the appeal was removal of the 4-1/2 feet.

Director Eddington clarified that the issue primarily was removal of the 4-1/2 feet, based on the determination that it was outside of the period of historic significance and was added after 1958. Planner Astorga remarked that the historic period was from 1896 to

1929. Director Eddington pointed out that the original historic structure would have been approximately 4-1/2 feet shorter during the period of historic significance.

Chair Werbelow stated that she was trying to understand the relevance of the addition specific to what the HPB was being asked to determine this evening. Planner Astorga clarified that the maps used for the analysis were not perfect or as accurate as current surveys. Graphics are changed and lines get moved. He had not done an analysis on scale because of the potential for error, and he was hesitant to have a discussion on scale for that same reason.

Board Member Matsumoto-Gray stated that her previous question related to Planner Astorga's comment that the appeal was broken into three arguments. One was integrity and the second was size and scale of the addition. Based on that comment, she asked whether size and scale was something the HPB needed to consider. Planner Astorga replied that the HPB could consider size and scale in reviewing the appeal. He explained the breakdown of the appeal and detailed each of the arguments. He stated that the HPB had the purview to review everything submitted under the appeal, including size and scale.

Board Member Matsumoto-Gray understood that the Staff determined that the mass, form and size of the addition obscured the original house, and the HPB had the purview to review their determination. Planner Astorga replied that this was correct.

Ruth Meintsma pointed out that the new addition and the back of the structure addition were two separate topics. She clarified that her appeal pertained to the back addition from 1958.

Chair Werbelow remarked that the HPB should be looking at the 4-1/2 feet that the Staff determined could be removed. They were not analyzing the addition to the home. Board Member McFawn referred to the last paragraph on the last page of the appellant's letter, which addressed Universal Guideline #3 for the historic exterior features of the building, and suggested that it may affect the roofline. He thought the HPB should look at the appeal from the standpoint of the roof line.

John Watkins, the owner of 335 Woodside Avenue, assumed that Ruth Meintsma had evidence to support her case, but he had not yet seen it.

Board Member McFawn understood that the road in front may have changed and for that reason the Staff had not addressed the setback. He noted that the 1900 Sanborn map showed approximately 23 feet from the back of the property line to the back of the home. Planner Astorga believed 23 feet was the distance from the accessory building to the side. He noted that the accessory building no longer exists.

Dina Blaes cautioned the HPB against referring to a Sanborn map with the same level of specificity and accuracy that they would a survey. She pointed out that the Sanborn maps were never intended to be scrutinized in that way.

Ruth Meintsma, the appellant and a resident at 305 Woodside Avenue, stated that she did not disagree with the assessment made by the City. However, she understood that

their conclusion made sense based on the information they had, and when there is uncertainty and confusion, the City has to weigh on the side of what is actually known.

Ms. Meintsma explained the concept of integrity she had submitted in her appeal, which was found in the Introduction of the Design Guidelines. She was very intent on the survival of physical characteristics that existed during the historic period. In her opinion, if the structure is truly pre-1900, it should definitely be kept. Ms. Meintsma remarked that the integrity is more than structure, materials and the slope of the back roof. It is the fact of how it illustrates life 112 years ago. She believed the back roof particularly illustrates that people built these houses quickly and then expanded them over time as their income allowed or their families grew. Ms. Meintsma thought the home at 335 Woodside was a perfect example of that characteristic.

Ms. Meintsma pointed out that 335 Woodside was the first landmark structure under the 2009 Guidelines to come under this level of scrutiny and this much change. Because there are many gray areas and uncertainties, if the structure is in fact historic and dates back to 1900, it is imperative that they hold on to it because it is a significant illustration.

Ms. Meintsma explained how she approached her conclusions. She recognized that the Staff put serious time and effort into their review. They gathered information from various sources and pieced them together to create a picture to help make their decision. It was like a large jigsaw puzzle and many pieces were missing. Without the pieces the picture was still discernible, but she intended to insert the missing pieces to create a more accurate picture.

Ms. Meintsma commented on integrity in terms of the life people lived and how they lived in the house. She noted that the back addition would be historic in its own right if it was constructed pre-1900.

Ms. Meintsma referred to the Analysis on page 5 of the Staff report. She agreed with the assessment that the rear half of the structure is different; however, she did not agree that it was completely different. Ms. Meintsma referred to the paragraph below the images, which stated that one could clearly identify the rear façade and there was a small change in the rear wall plane. There were some nuances at the back of the house that were understandable, but Planner Astorga had informed her that the primary issue was the back step-out that no one could figure out. She agreed with the language stating that there is clear evidence that the rear façade had been reconfigured from the original footprint; however, she was prepared to show evidence that once the step out is removed, the remaining portion was pre-1900 construction; both the construction and the siding as it now stands. Ms. Meintsma believed she could show that the existing rear extension, which was approximately 4-1/2 feet, was built as an add-on to the original plank frame and it was added on with stud frame construction pre-1900. It was sided simultaneously as a whole with the original structure. She believed bump outs were part of the pre-1900 addition, and that the rear extension was relieved of those bump outs after 1958. Based on her research, Ms. Meintsma believed the back of the house was opened up to make more room. It was boxed in with paneling and then the bump outs were added on after the fact. That is why the bump outs were easy to remove to maintain the original structure.

Ms. Meintsma referred to the third paragraph on page 6 of the Staff report and agreed that Planner Astorga made the best assessment possible without additional evidence. She disagreed with the statement regarding a tertiary façade, because if the house as a whole is historic, the guidelines do not say that one side is more historic than another.

Ms. Meintsma agreed with language on page 6 of the Staff report, stating “The construction of the rear portion of the structure is different from that of the rest of the building. The walls are 2” x 4” studs at 24” on center with tar paper on the outside and wood siding over it. She believed that statement was critical in the assessment of whether or not this is historic. Ms. Meintsma stated that the tar paper is not on the outside of the framing and it is not in between the framing and the siding. She believed that was an error. Tar paper and foam insulation are newer materials. If the tar paper was on the outside of the frame and on the inside of the siding, her thoughts about the original siding for both the structure and the back addition would be wrong. From all the photos she researched over and over again, she did not agree with the Staff assessment. When she visited the interior of the home she could see that tar paper was pushed back in, but it was not between the frame and the siding.

Ms. Meintsma stated that when she and Ms. Blaes went inside the home, she had certain ideas and Ms. Blaes gave her direction on areas where she could be wrong. Ms. Blaes told her to use the Sanborn maps, which she did. Ms. Meintsma presented the dimensional site plan and explained the formula she used to determine the footprint and configuration in 1900, 1907, 1929, and 1940. Ms. Meintsma believed the Sanborn maps and her calculations supported the fact that the house as it sits today was there through all those years. Using the 1900 map she used the same outline and colored in the shed extensions. That was where the footprint did not match. She believed the shed extensions created the confusion with footprint.

Ms. Meintsma noted that the lack of interior on the Sanborn maps does not indicate that no walls existed. She acknowledged that it was a gray area because there was no way to know for certain. Indications of interior walls were evident in pictures. Ms. Meintsma presented a series of photos to support her research and opinions.

Ms. Meintsma presented an exhibit which showed a rafter or an eve used as roof support. The cut-off piece of wood was not attached to the roof. There were originally two that went down the stud going below the wall. She had consulted people who work with historic houses and they all said it was where the wall had been. It was a wall support. Ms. Meintsma noted that it matched perfectly with the Sanborn map. She measured where the wall support comes in from the back wall and it was 8’10”. It measured 8’6” on the Sanborn map with her grid. It was not as exact as some of her other measurements, but it was still an indication that the back wall showed on the Sanborn maps consistently over the years. Ms. Meintsma presented another exhibit of the wall structure. She was told that the oxidation shows that the boards were older than 50 years.

Ms. Meintsma thought the bumps out on the north side looked like shed extensions. She showed a wall on the other side and noted that the back bump out was the one in question and one Planner Astorga had struggled with in particular. Ms. Meintsma read from the guidelines, “a bump out to add room to the interior could be counter-productive

for the efficiency and simplicity of the construction methods. She noted that the bump outs were added quickly and the siding was slapped on and the windows and doors were cut out. She commented on the amount of work and construction it would have taken to add a roof to make the room 20" larger.

Ms. Meintsma stated that the structure is sitting on timbers and railroad ties because there is no foundation. People dug the areas flat and they had to make them level. Leveling the ground to place a square or rectangle house is much faster and simpler than making the ground level for a structure and jut outs. It was counter-productive to what was occurring at the time to put a jut out in back to add 20" to a room. Ms. Meintsma remarked that if it was a shed step out, she questioned the purpose of a shallow shed. She was told by people who work with these types of structures that the shallow shed would be for storage of window and door paneling and siding. She noted that the door could have been saved and put back on in 1958. Other paneling pieces that were inserted were missed in the preservation plan and the physical conditions report.

Ms. Meintsma talked about the reason for putting the bump out on the north end of the west wall to be used as a storage shed. She noted that when the houses were built, people enjoyed the fact that they were symmetrical. It was the style at the time. So when bits and pieces were added to the house, it was added to the back.

Ms. Meintsma noted that the Sanborn map from 1900 did not show the shed in the back, but in 1907 and 1929, you could see how all along the neighborhood people dug into the back wall. If they put a shed on the back they needed to dig more and make it level. They did not want to do that much work so they just did what was minimal. Ms. Meintsma indicated a step up in the back and noted that the back wall was actually dug out to accommodate the house. She pointed out how the back wall wraps around the house.

Ms. Meintsma summarized that mining town architecture is unique and was built quickly to accommodate the rush of people into the area. Simplicity in design, symmetry and shape were primary characteristics to accomplish a quickly constructed sturdy, functional home. The simple rectangular shape was also key to more easily accomplish a level foundation on which to build a structure. Convuluted wall forms would complicate the process and so they were avoided.

Mr. Meintsma reviewed the elements of the house as it changed from one Sanborn map year to another.

After concluding her Sanborn maps analysis, Ms. Meintsma reported on her research regarding materials. She presented a graphic of the back end of the house showing how the planks were laid across the length of the house and where the new rafters for the extension were scabbed in. In order to scab in the rafter, they had to remove three planks in for access to add on rafters. Ms. Meintsma showed a picture of a plank on the roof that is now roof decking, and noted the wallpaper. She presented a photo of the original hall and parlor which had the same wallpaper. It appeared that someone had taken off the back wall with the wallpaper on it, deconstructed it, put in the rafters, made the extension and repurposed those back plank walls to the roof. That had to have

occurred in 1900 when the wallpaper was there. She noted that the boards were reused at the same time. Ms. Meintsma remarked that this represented consistency in material from the old to the new. Ms. Meintsma presented additional pictures showing the same wallpaper. After the wallpaper was put on the boards, batten was put in between and tacked on. There is still evidence of that batten, which indicates that it was an exterior wall because batten was added to keep out the wind.

Ms. Meintsma stated that at the turn of the century very little wood was available. After the industrial revolution there was an increase in population and the industry used all the wood. Therefore, wood in existing structures was kept and reused.

Ms. Meintsma presented a photo showing the tar paper between the framing and siding. In her research she found no tar paper on the outside, which indicates that the new material is later dated. She stated that if there was new material between the framing and the siding, the siding would have had to be put on after 1958. That was the reason why Planner Astorga reached his conclusion.

Ms. Meintsma presented a picture showing a gray material called house sheeting paper. She found a number of pictures showing the paper between the framing and the siding, both in the front portion, as well as on the back addition. She believed the photos showed consistency from the old to the new addition. She spoke with someone in Oklahoma who finds this material in old oil boom houses. However, he stays away from that material because it has asbestos in it. Asbestos was resistant to rot, insects and fire. Ms. Meintsma reported that someone at the State Historic Preservation Office found reference to a similar material in a 1952 catalog. The material was used to wrap hot pipes around boilers that were up against the walls. She remarked that someone could have found the material and repurposed it in the 1950's, but she believed that was a small possibility. Ms. Meintsma pointed out that in the 1940's insulation and sheeting materials changed drastically. It was 1900 when they first started considering holding heat inside the house and began by stuffing walls with newspapers. By 1940 better materials were available and the sheeting would have been hard to find. Ms. Meintsma believed the material was more available and used pre-1900, as opposed to post-1958.

Ms. Meintsma presented photos to support her comments regarding the flooring. She believed a small cutout of flooring in the front of the house was consistent from the very front to the very back of the house. It is very visible and very beautiful. Ms. Meintsma found a piece of flooring exposed in the foundation. She took a photo and sent it to five experts who confirmed that it was old growth wood based on the tightness of the rings in the wood. If that wood could even be found today it would be very expensive.

Ms. Meintsma presented a graphic showing the original back hall and parlor wall. She indicated the area where the rafters were shimmed in, and noted the difference where the eaves were kept on the front portion of the wall and where they were cut off for the added rafters. Ms. Meintsma stated that when the extension was first added, they kept one back wall and disassembled the other wall. The materials with the wallpaper were taken from the disassembled wall and repurposed on the back room. She explained why one half was cut off and the other half was left. In order to disassemble the wall, the rafters were cut off because they were in the way. Ms. Meintsma indicated the wall that remained, noting that it was consistent with the footprint.

Ms. Meintsma remarked that in looking at the back rafters, she could see the old wood and then the scabbed-in wood on the new extension which looked new. In looking closer, she found that the beams were both old wood and new wood. The second one back extends down and becomes darker. The old looking, weathered dark portion that was on the exterior moves up to what looks like new wood. She noted that it was pre-1900 ceiling rafters that did not look like old wood. Ms. Meintsma pointed out that the vertical wood that was added in December was not that much different from the old rafters in the back, yet the rafters were definitely pre-1900.

Ms. Meintsma stated that the Staff was working with new guidelines that had not been applied before. Planner Astorga had all the information required to make his determination, but she believed there were holes in the analysis. Ms. Meintsma commented on inconsistencies she had found in the physical conditions report that did not comply with the guidelines.

Ms. Meintsma presented a graphic of the proposed footprint of the structure with the approved back portion cut off versus the assumed footprint of the original house. She did not believe the Staff's assumption speaks to the history of the structure.

Ms. Meintsma read from the 1980 National Register regarding in-period rear expansion, which stated that an extension represents a major alteration to the original house and usually contributes to the significance of the house because it documents the most common and acceptable method of expansion of the small Park City house. The additions document an important factor in Park City's residential development. Ms. Meintsma pointed out that the structure itself may not maintain original integrity, but it has integrity in its own right because it tells a story.

Chair Werbelow thanked Ms. Meintsma for her presentation.

Mr. Watkins, the owner and applicant, stated that he had spent over two years working things out with the City, and over that time he submitted five to seven different designs. He appreciated Ms. Meintsma's attention to detail; however, the City reached their conclusion after a long investigation process. Ms. Watkins noted that he met with Ms. Meintsma after the appeal was filed, and he understood that she had also met with Dina Blaes and Planner Astorga. Ms. Watkins was interested in hearing a response from Ms. Blaes.

Planner Astorga asked to comment first. He noted that most of the drawings submitted by surveyors or architects usually come in a 24" x 36" format. The Staff requests that they reduce the size to 11" x 17" so they can be scanned to 8-1/2" x 11" to fit in the Staff report. When a 24" x 36" drawing is reduced to 8-1/2 x 11, the integrity is lost due to the smaller scale and some of the information is lost. He explained that this was the reason why he had not done the proportion analysis. The information available online and in the Staff report was already reduced. Even if they worked with the 24 x 36 drawings, once those are copied the scale is compromised and there is too much room for error.

Planner Astorga commented on primary, secondary and tertiary façades. He noted that a tertiary façade is a rear façade. Tertiary facades are treated differently and the

guidelines allow the additions to come off the back. Planner Astorga reiterated that there is too much room for error to make a true analysis based on the Sanborn maps. Therefore, the Planning Department based their decision on the original Sanborn configuration from 1900 to 1958.

Ms. Blaes remarked that regardless of the decision this evening, Ms. Meintsma should be commended on the level of detail of her investigation. One advantage of the appeal process is that it helps define how the Staff interprets different things. If the HPB feels that the Staff's interpretation was incorrect, they have the opportunity to provide guidance. Ms. Blaes understood Mr. Watkins' frustration, but she could also see the benefit of an appropriate appeal.

Ms. Blaes reported that Staff met on site with the applicant, Ms. Meintsma and some of the neighbors. She did not believe anyone doubted whether or not the rear wall was made of historic material and may have been an original piece. She clarified that it was not likely to have been built at the time of the original structure, but it could have been added fairly soon after the original structure was built. It was very typical in Park City to build a two-room home and parlor and then add a shed extension. She could name at least 30 structures that have the same configuration of a rear shed extension.

Ms. Blaes remarked that the question related to Universal Guideline #3 and the direction to receive most of their guidance from the Sanborn maps. In looking at whether the addition has integrity on its own, it does not have the same footprint. Based on the early Sanborn maps it was not likely that the structure was built as a salt box type. It is not a common building form in Park City, and even the structures that are salt box shaped were not built as salt box houses. Ms. Blaes believed the house at 335 Woodside was probably built circa 1893, and by the time the Sanborn maps were prepared it had the rear configuration that was more than just a simple shed extension. With that information the Staff needed to determine whether or not the rear addition maintained its integrity based on the definition in the Land Management Code and the design guidelines. The Staff concluded that it did not maintain its integrity based on available evidence.

Ms. Blaes stated that if the HPB felt that Ms. Meintsma presented additional information to suggest that the addition was built or extended as a salt box extension early in the period, they have the purview to determine whether the new information is sufficient to support that argument. The Staff took the position that the bump out additions were lost, and while there is no question that historic material exists on the rear of the wall and the north and south elevations, the Staff conducted the proper analysis to make their conclusion. Because the integrity of the rear portion was not fully intact, the Staff determined that the rear portion could be removed to accommodate an addition compatible with the historic structure.

Chair Werbelow asked Ms. Blaes to speak to the roof form issue and whether removing 4-1/2 feet would substantially impact the historic roof form. She also asked Mr. Blaes to address the change to the window that Ms. Meintsma had shown.

Ms. Blaes remarked that it was impossible to know what the historic roof form was, but she was certain that it was not built as a salt box. It was built as a hall and parlor with a

shed extension. One of the most important things about Park City and the reason for having the National Register of the Historic District for the mining boom residence, is that hall and parlor houses were one of the most commonly constructed building forms. An interior configuration defines the hall and parlor versus the salt box, and they are two different forms. The architectural aspect is critical because it informs how the vernacular elements were applied on the exterior. Ms. Blaes stressed that the evidence was clear that the structure was not built as a salt box.

Ms. Blaes remarked that the window change and the transoms were an important point. The guidelines state that if there are compatible elements in the house, the City cannot compel the owner to return them to their historic form. However, if an owner comes in for an approval to change the element, at that point the City can request the applicant to bring it back into compliance with the design guidelines. Ms. Blaes believed that was also echoed in the LMC.

Board Member Matsumoto-Gray asked Ms. Blaes to explain the assessment that some of the structural materials in the back part of the house are post-1958. She asked if a stud construction shed addition could have been done in the 1890's. Ms. Blaes replied that it was entirely possible. She did not think anyone would argue that some of the material was old. The issue is that the old material is not in its historic configuration that supports the integrity of the addition as contributing to the historic significance of the house. Ms. Blaes stated that the factor was more footprint than material. She clarified that the HPB needed to decide whether Ms. Meintsma had provided enough evidence to support retention of the existing addition that makes the house from a hall and parlor style to a hall and parlor with shed extensions.

Board Member Matsumoto-Gray clarified that the issue was not whether this addition was done in the historic period of significance for this structure. Ms. Blaes replied that timing was an issue; but not whether it was stud framed or single-wall construction. Ms. Matsumoto-Gray thought the type of construction could be potential evidence as to whether the addition was done in the 1960's or the 1890's. Ms. Blaes replied that the time period was not definitive. The Staff looks at elements that have the greater evidence and in this case it is the footprint that existed and the consistency that repeated year and year based on the Sanborn maps.

Chair Werbelow pointed out that the Sanborn maps start in 1900 and that presented an issue. Ms. Blaes replied that it was not an issue because it was still a historic period. If the original footprint was consistent in the most recent Sanborn maps, it would be an easier decision. The material could be completely new, but if the footprint was retained, it would be easier to argue maintained integrity. Ms. Blaes advised the HPB to look at the big picture and not focus on whether or not the wood is 100 years old. The question is whether the evidence Ms. Meintsma presented shows that the shed extensions were built during the historic period and supports and retains its historic integrity. She reiterated that the Staff could not find that evidence. In her opinion, the Sanborn maps do not suggest it at all. Ms. Blaes stated that in her experience she does not pay attention to interior wall configuration in Sanborn maps, except in Park City and a few other places where the construction methods were known and commonly used and the bump out extensions were fairly common.

Ms. Blaes recognized that this was a difficult position for the HPB. However, she felt their discussion would help the Staff understand the level of investigation they expect for future projects. Chair Werbelow asked if the Staff could have done anything more or different in their investigation. Ms. Blaes replied that the Staff could have gone to the same level of detail as Ms. Meintsma. The first step would be intensive level surveys, which is the City is looking at doing on some of the structures in Park City. She questioned whether the Planning Department had enough Staff to move to that level of detailed investigation.

Board member McFawn asked about the position of the tar paper relative to the framing of the house. Ms. Blaes replied that single wall construction had horizontal planes with tar paper in between horizontal plane. It was a common method.

Board Member Matsumoto-Gray pointed out that there were two potential scenarios. One was that the bump outs were intact or added pre-1900. The second was that the bump outs were a separate addition that used materials like the original structure or potentially an addition that had a slightly different shape. She felt it was important to look at the details and not rely solely on the Sanborn maps. Because the two scenarios were so similar she could only focus on the details.

Ms. Blaes remarked that having both detailed and non-detailed members on the HPB would benefit the discussion. However, in representing the City, they have to step back and look at the bigger picture of the preservation program, reasonableness within the preservation program, and the potential of making a decision that might possibly lose integrity.

Board Member McFawn agreed with Ms. Matsumoto-Gray about looking at the details, but he understood the advice to step back and look at the big picture. In regards to the question of why someone would build a 20" shed, he thought Ms. Meintsma presented a logical argument for why people would store items in that type of area. He asked Ms. Blaes to speak to that issue.

Ms. Blaes stated that the explanation was plausible, but it was not something they see anywhere in Park City. The additions on the north corner are the ones that indicate that these were not rectangular shed extensions and they were built as separate components. She did not believe people would go to the trouble of building a 20" storage shed. Ms. Blaes thought Ms. Meintsma had raised good points about salvage materials. Board Member McFawn remarked that re-purposing would be logical for the 1900's.

Board Member Holmgren remarked that the hall and parlor home is historic. Her home is the same situation. She sees the house as being historic but not the add-on shed. Ms. Holmgren clarified that she supports the historic significance of the freestanding sheds that they were trying to protect and help people refurbish. The small add-on sheds were different, and in her opinion, not historic.

Board Member Matsumoto-Gray and Ms. Blaes discussed other structures in Park City where additions to an original structure were deemed historic and protected under the current guidelines.

Mr. Watkins remarked that he was not a developer who came to alter the City or build large structures. He grew up in Park City and he wants to retire there and build memories with his children. He loves Park City. When he purchased this property he read all the documents, talked to architects and worked with the Planning Department. He purchased the property with the intent to preserve something unique. Mr. Watkins pointed out that the guidelines are just that, guidelines; and he went through many iterations with the City to meet those guidelines. He has been going through the process for three years and he would like to move forward. He appreciated Ms. Meintsma's diligence and he agreed with her assessment that the structure is very cool, which is why he purchased it. In the grand scheme of things, it is a deteriorating home on the hill and he intends to make it a beautiful site in the City. He had followed every direction given by the City to reach this point. Mr. Watkins felt it was unfair to ask him to change things now, after going through a three year design process. He understood this was an appeal of the City's decision and he believed it was a judgment call. Mr. Watkins left it in the hands of the HPB and asked that they allow him to move forward.

Lance Kincaid, a general contractor in town, spoke on behalf of Mr. Watkins. He has been in Park City since the early 1970's and has been a full-time owner since the 1980's. Mr. Kincaid stated that he has worked on historic homes since 1991 and his resume is on file with documentation for this house. Mr. Kincaid pointed out that Ms. Meintsma assumed many things in her presentation. She sent photos to people who offered their thoughts of what things might be. She assumed that existing holes in the foundation were cut for plumbing, and he disagreed with that assumption. He referred to Ms. Meintsma's comments assumptions regarding the rafters inside the building and explained why the stained rafters were clearly the end of the wall as it was built. He indicated the splicing where the two types of wood come together, and noted that many years separate the two types of wood. Mr. Kincaid also indicated a change in the flooring to indicate a separation from the old to the new. He also pointed out that the stud wall is nailed with manufactured nails, not the hand forged nails evident in the original structure.

Chair Werbelow opened the public hearing. There were no comments. Chair Werbelow closed the public hearing.

Chair Werbelow asked Ms. Blaes for clarification on the intensive level survey. Ms. Blaes replied that an intensive level survey involves more intensive research on buildings in terms of site visits, photography, title search, materials research, etc. She noted that the mining sites that came before the HPB for designation of the Historic Sites Inventory were closest to an intensive level survey. For example, mining manuals from the 19-teens were pulled to help understand the construction methods of the ore bins to help date them. Ms. Blaes explained that for the current surveys, McAllister and McAllister and the Utah Historic Architecture books are the bibles for historic building types and styles that help define those stylistic elements. Ms. Blaes remarked that an intensive level survey also involves far greater field work and far more photographs of ghosting, seams in siding, changes in materials, access to the exterior. An intensive level surveys also involves contacting the property owner to see if they are willing to allow an interior survey of the building. Interviews with former owners are also part of the intensive level survey as a way to gather additional history and photographic documentation.

Chair Werbelow wanted to know when an intensive level survey would come into play. Ms. Blaes stated that the HIS is based on a reconnaissance level survey. Typically, an intensive level survey is conducted on those same buildings once the reconnaissance level survey is completed. Ms. Blaes remarked that intensive level surveys are very expensive and require significant research time. Very few jurisdictions do them at all, or they do them in small pieces, such as one neighborhood or one historic subdivision. Intensive level surveys are also done more slowly and more systematically than reconnaissance level surveys because they are difficult to do.

Planner Astorga echoed Ms. Blaes in terms of the amount of time required for an intensive level survey. Ms. Blaes pointed out that it also involves full title searches and looking at old obituaries and newspapers.

Chair Werbelow stated that in this particular case for 335 Woodside, she had not heard new information this evening that was conclusive enough to make her want to overturn the approval and start over again.

Board Member Matsumoto-Gray did not feel there was enough information for her to feel confident about the amount of time the house looked like a salt box. However, she was inclined to err on the side of preservation. She heard enough evidence to feel comfortable that old materials were there in some fashion, and although it is not the exact footprint, in her interpretation of integrity it was all relevant.

Chair Werbelow understood that there was an additional step in terms of retaining historic material. Planner Astorga noted that a condition of approval requires the property owner to meet with the building inspectors and with the Planning Department to see if any or all of the historic material could be salvaged for future repairs and maintenance. Ms. Blaes remarked that it was the same protocol the City has followed in the past. If it can be safe and serviceable, it should be retained. If not, it should be replaced in kind. Planner Astorga believed that a lot of the material, particularly on the bottom rear façade, is rotten and the Planning Department would like the Building Department to inspect it.

Board Member McFawn appreciated everyone's input and all the work done by Staff and the applicant. He commended Ms. Meintsma for her efforts and level of detail. In his opinion, manufactured nails versus hand crafted nails was a key factor. The use of manufactured nails helped make his decision to uphold the Planning Department's findings and approval.

MOTION: Board Member Holmgren moved to stand behind the design guidelines and the report from the Planning Department, and deny the appeal of the Staff's determination for 335 Woodside Avenue based on the Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Conditions of Approval found in the Staff report. Board Member McFawn seconded the motion.

VOTE: 3-1. Board Members Werbelow, McFawn and Holmgren voted in favor of the motion. Board Member Matsumoto-Gray voted against the motion. Board Member White was recused.

Board Member Holmgren stated that Ms. Meintsma is very detail oriented and the material she presented this evening was fabulous. The design guidelines and the LMC are living documents and this was the type of detail that needs to continue appearing and be included in the documents. She appreciated the efforts of Planner Astorga, Ms. Meintsma and Ms. Blaes.

Director Eddington reported that the Planning Department is looking at the possibility of beginning intensive level surveys for the Historic District as early as July. It would take two to three years to get them all done. It is a lot of work, but depending on budget, the City Council is heading in that direction.

Findings of Fact – 335 Woodside Avenue

1. The rear wall is scheduled to be removed because it has been determined to be part of a non-contributory footprint/addition.
2. The Sanborn maps of 1900, 1907, 1929, 1940, and 1958 indicate the same exterior configuration.
3. The historic configuration shows the footprint of the front half to remain unchanged in its hall-parlor form with the porch covering the entire length of the front facade.
4. The historic configuration shows that the rear half of the structure is different from what exists today.
5. There is clear evidence that the rear façade and the rear portion of the side facades have been reconfigured from its original footprint.
6. The existing post-1958 rear façade was not built within the historic period and it has not reached historic significance on its own as defined in the LMC because it is not at least fifty (50) years old and does not meet the criteria for designation.
7. Staff finds that removal of the post-1958 rear addition/modification does not render the site ineligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places or for designation as a local Landmark Site.
8. The construction methods used in the extant rear portion of the structure are different from those used on the original hall-parlor portion of the building.
9. The wall structure of the rear façade is 2" x 4" studs at 24" on center with tar paper on the outside and wood siding over.
10. The wall structure of the front and side facades is of the typical historic construction, known as "single-wall construction", found in Old Town consisting of two (2) layers of 1" x 12" pine boards running perpendicular to each other.

11. Staff acknowledges that there is historic material on the exterior of the rear façade that is the same as the front and side facades, 1" x 7" pine drop siding.
12. This exterior material is in very poor condition.
13. The evidence found on rear façade as deteriorated historic material is not enough to support that the existing rear façade has achieved a level of historic contribution.
14. Generally, the majority of the structures' materials, structural system, architectural details, and ornamental features, as well as the overall mass and form must be intact in order for a building to retain its integrity.
15. Staff finds that the Concept of Integrity related to the material has been met and that this principle has been properly applied as the overall mass and form of the rear facade is not intact.
16. The footprint analysis of the Sanborn maps has been properly applied as this historical evidence has been utilized to compare the historic configuration to the existing shapes.
17. Staff finds that Universal Guideline No. 3 has also been met as the historic exterior features of the building are retained and preserved in conjunction with the historic preservation theory practiced by the Planning Department.
18. The existing configuration tends to reflect a residential building type/style resembling a saltbox structure.
19. As indicated on the HSI and confirmed on the Sanborn maps, the actual building type/style was a hall and parlor, which is more common to Old Town.
20. The discussion in the Analysis section in the May 29, 2012 Staff report is incorporated herein.

Conclusions of Law

1. The Historic District Design Review application is consistent with the Park City Land Management Code (LMC) and the Design Guidelines for Historic Districts and Historic Sites.
2. Approval of the Historic District Design Review application does not adversely affect the health, safety and welfare of the citizens of Park City.
3. The Concept of Integrity has been properly applied.
4. The Sanborn maps were corrected utilized to make a determination of contributory significance.

Historic Preservation Board
Minutes of May 29, 2012

5. Universal Guideline No. 3 has been met as the historic exterior features of the building are retained and preserved in conjunction with the historic preservation theory practiced by the Planning Department.

Order

1. The appeal is denied in whole and the Staff's determination is upheld.

Conditions of Approval

1. The architecture and contractor shall schedule an on-site meeting with the Planning and Building Department to inspect existing historic siding material along the rear façade to determine if there are any materials that can be retained for future repairs, maintenance, etc.

The meeting adjourned at 7:57 p.m.

Approved by _____
Sara Werbelow, Chair
Historic Preservation Board