

PARK CITY MUNICIPAL CORPORATION  
HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD  
MINUTES OF APRIL 16, 2014

BOARD MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE: John Kenworthy, Puggy Holmgren,  
David White, Gary Bush, Hope Melville

EX OFFICIO: Thomas Eddington, Anya Grahn, Makena Hawley

---

ROLL CALL

Chair Kenworthy called the meeting to order at 5:06 p.m. and noted that all Board Members were present except for Clayton Vance and Marion Crosby who were excused.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

November 13, 2013

MOTION: Board Member Holmgren moved to APPROVE the minutes of November 13, 2013 as written. Board Member Melville seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

February 19, 2014

Board Member referred to page 40 of the Staff report, Page 1 of the minutes, last paragraph, "Board Member Melville noted that the historical plaque that was placed on the Zoom Building disappeared..." She corrected the minutes to accurately reflect that the plaque was placed **near** the Zoom building. It was not on the building.

Director Eddington reported that he was working with them as part of the overall construction and he was unsure exactly when the plaque would be replaced. Most of the construction was proposed more for the summer. The concern is if they put up the plaque sooner it could get damaged during construction. Board Member Melville asked if the original placement was on City land or the owner's land. Director Eddington replied that the City has the easement but it was actually placed on the owner's land.

Board Member Melville preferred to have the sign put back up rather than wait for the completion of the construction, because when people see that the Zoom Building looks like a railroad station it makes a good impression.

Historic Preservation Board Meeting  
April 16, 2014

MOTION: Board Member Holmgren moved to APPROVE the minutes of February 19, 2014 as corrected. Board Member Bush seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

March 5, 2014

MOTION: Board Member Holmgren moved to APPROVE the minutes of March 4, 2014 as written. Board Member Holmgren seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

#### PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS

There were no comments.

#### STAFF/BOARD COMMUNICATIONS

Planner Grahn stated that several months ago the HPB reviewed the determination of significance for 632 Deer Valley Loop. The applicant appealed their determination to the Board of Adjustment and provided additional research and investigative history as new evidence. The Board of Adjustment felt that the new evidence was substantial enough to remand it back to the HPB. The Board should expect to see it again at the May 21<sup>st</sup> HPB meeting.

Planner Grahn reminded the Board of the joint work session with the City Council at 4:00 p.m. the following evening. It would start with a meet and greet and the Staff would present an overview of current preservation activity. The HPB was welcome and encouraged to stay for the presentation.

Planner Grahn reported that the Planning Department had scholarships from the State for the Utah Heritage Annual Statewide Preservation Conference on May 9<sup>th</sup>. Anyone interested in attending should contact her as soon as possible.

Planner Grahn noted that the next Historic Preservation Board meeting would be May 21<sup>st</sup> instead of May 7<sup>th</sup>. In addition to the remand of 632 Deer Valley Loop, she had also invited Cory Jensen and Chris Merrick from Utah State History to attend the meeting to talk about tax credits and National Register eligibility of different buildings.

Chair Kenworthy encouraged the Board members to attend the joint meeting with the City Council if possible. He believed a strong showing would make a good impression.

Board Member Melville stated that the Historical Society Historic Home Tour was scheduled for June 14<sup>th</sup>. Anyone interested in volunteering for the home tour was welcome. The time commitment would be a 2 to 3 hour shift. There would be a reception following the tour for the homeowners and volunteers. Volunteers are admitted to the Home Tour free of charge.

Chair Kenworthy asked for an update on the Historic Preservation award. Planner Grahn stated that her goal is to present a painting or piece of artwork every year in May as part of Historic Preservation Month. It would be the piece that the HPB commissions and it would be presented to the recipient jointly with the City Council. She was still working with the Legal Department to put out the RFP. Planner Grahn questioned whether they would make the May deadline this year. She would update the Board as soon as the RFP goes out.

#### REGULAR AGENDA – Discussion, Public Hearing and Possible Action

##### 343 Park Avenue – Grant (Application PL-14-02259)

Planner Grahn reported that 343 Park Avenue is a Landmark structure that was built in 1898. It is a one-story truncated pyramid-style structure originally constructed as a square plan. It is one of 28 pyramid houses currently listed on the Park City Historic Sites Inventory. In 1984 the State Historic Office did a survey of the neighborhood and recognized that the house at 343 Park Avenue had National Register eligibility. At that time there was a small shed addition off the back, as well as gable dormers. An in-line addition replaced the shed addition around 1983. Planner Grahn clarified that even though the survey was dated 1984, the addition was probably built right after the survey was conducted.

Planner Grahn noted that the house was listed on the National Register of Historic Places in 1985. The HSI Form recognized it as being in fairly good condition. She stated that these structures were built as mining shacks and were not intended to last 100 years like they have. Planner Grahn remarked that in looking at the work involved in rehabbing and refurbishing the buildings, a lot of times the cost is relatively expensive even if the structure is in good condition, because of the building codes required and the amount of work that needs to be completed to preserve it.

Planner Grahn presented slides showing the existing structure and the in-line addition. The applicant was proposing to take advantage of attic space by adding dormers on the roof. Windows would be changed beyond the midpoint. For the most part, historic materials are in place on the front façade and on the side.

Planner Grahn stated that the applicant was requesting a grant to offset the costs of foundation work, windows and doors, and any structural stabilization if needed. Planner Grahn explained that the foundation was built around 1983 when the addition was made. The Staff did not think there were footings underneath the current foundation beneath the historic portion of the house. It is a single stem wall. The stud wall construction and wood roof rafters need to be upgraded as they insulated the house. The heat no longer melts snow off the roof and that could cause the roof to collapse. There is some wood rot. The historic windows on the front of the house are painted shut and the applicant was proposing to restore the wood windows. Two historic doors on the building would also be restored.

Planner Grahn stated that on two previous applications, one at 335 Woodside and the other at 1049 Park Avenue, the HPB only funded the foundation work. They did not fund excavation, house lifting or bracing the house. For that reason, Planner Grahn had not included those three items in the eligible expenses.

Planner Grahn reviewed the breakdown of rehabilitation expenses on page 83 of the Staff report. The total estimated cost of work on the historic portion of the house was \$148,393. The total of what the City would pay through the grant fund program was \$43,915. Planner Grahn noted that this would be one of the larger grants awarded by the HPB. She pointed out that the overall cost of grants has increased recently. Therefore, for this request, Planner Grahn suggested that the HPB limit the amount of the grant to \$30,000, which would still help the applicant fund most of the work on the house.

Planner Grahn stated that typically the house at 343 Park Avenue would fall under the Main Street RDA neighborhood; however, the Main Street RDA no longer has funds available for the grant program. Most of the grant funds have been coming from the Lower Park Avenue RDA for projects in that neighborhood. If the grant is awarded for 343 Park Avenue, the funds would come from the CIP fund, which is a General Fund Transfer. Planner Grahn explained that each year \$45,000 is awarded into this fund. Currently, there was only \$6,319 available; however, another \$45,000 would be placed in the fund in July. By the time the applicant begins submitting receipts, the funds would be available. Planner Grahn stated that the CIP is a use it or lose it fund. Any money that is not used in the fiscal year gets recycled back into the fund.

Planner Grahn requested that the HPB review the request for the grant and consider awarding the applicant a portion of the cost up to a maximum of \$30,000. Other alternatives included awarding the applicant the full amount of \$43,915, awarding a portion of the cost in an amount to be determined by the Board, or denying the grant request.

Michael Stoker, representing the applicant, was available to answer questions.

Board Member Holmgren asked if this would be the owner's primary residence. Mr. Stoker stated that it would not be the primary residence. However, it is a family trust and it would be used by family members when they visit Park City. He understood that it would not be used as a rental.

Chair Kenworthy asked Mr. Stokes for his assessment on the foundation. Mr. Stokes stated that the foundation on the back side of the house with the new addition was done in the 1980's and it is in relatively good condition. Additional exploratory work has been done since the application was submitted in March. Mr. Stokes explained that the foundation is a six to eight inch stem wall that goes slightly under grade approximately six inches. With the freeze/thaw cycle over the last 100 years coupled with the steep site, the building has started to tilt and creep to the northeast corner of the property towards Park Avenue. Inside the house the floors are starting to sag and tilt towards the northeast corner. Mr. Stokes stated that basically the foundation was non-existent around the perimeter of the house on three sides. There is a bearing point down the center of the house for the main level floor joist without any foundation. The condition of the house is in relatively good condition as it appears from the right-of-way, but upon closer inspection a fair amount of dry rot has occurred at the ground level. Due to excessive snow and ice from the adjacent buildings during the winter, a significant amount of dry rot has occurred on the siding and the underlayment, which is a planking system that was commonly used in Old Town. Mr. Stokes stated that there was major damage in the crawl space and lack of ventilation.

Mr. Stokes stated that the owner originally intended to only put a new foundation to stabilize the structure. He has since decided to add a lower level basement at the same time. There are major seismic concerns with the barn wood walls and the structural engineer advised that it be brought up to current Codes. The barn wood walls on the main level will be 2 x 6 walls with insulation and plywood sheathing on the inside, along with more modern structural in place in around the foundation at window openings, corners and in the walls. New floor joists would be added to the existing floor joists on the main level and the upper level. Areas of the roof need structural stabilization.

Mr. Stokes pointed out that most of the proposed work was structural, but some of it was cosmetic, such as the doors and windows. They tried to maintain the design of the existing front porch and at the same time stabilize the soil underneath, the concrete supports and the columns. Mr. Stokes stated that when the owner first started the project he did not consider assistance from the City; however, he later decided to apply for funds to help with the historic parts of the house. He is dedicated to maintaining the front façade and the integrity of the design of this historic home as much as possible.

Mr. Stokes remarked that some exploratory work was done in the Fall and holes were cut in the floor. The owner has since pulled a demolition permit and sheet rock was removed a few weeks ago.

Chair Kenworthy asked when the front porch was removed. Mr. Stokes replied that the decking and framing was removed a week ago. The interior of the house was gutted to get a better idea of what needed to be done. The owner was waiting for the results of this meeting before proceeding to pull a building permit.

Chair Kenworthy understood that grants could not be awarded on work that has already been done. He asked if exploratory work fell under that requirement. Director Eddington clarified that the applicant was not requesting a grant for the exploratory work that was done.

Planner Grahn understood that the demolition permit was for the interior demolition, which is not eligible for grant money. She understood that the work that was done on the porch was exploratory. Mr. Stokes replied that the front porch was stabilized with diagonal bracing from the roof so the historic porch would not be damaged. He pointed out that the planks have been removed on the exterior to look at the concrete stem wall on the front of the house.

Board Member Melville asked if historic material had been removed. Planner Grahn believed the decking was new material because the porch was redone in the 1980's. Board Member Bush stated that he had walked around the entire house and he did not believe the materials had been removed. A few windows were broken but nothing else was apparent.

Board Member Melville understood that part of the plan was to keep the porch in its historic form. Mr. Stokes answered yes. Board Member Melville asked about the siding. Mr. Stokes stated that the siding on the front is in good shape under the front porch roof and that would remain as is. The siding on two sides at least halfway back on the historic house would remain. A few boards on the bottom 12-18 inches may have to be repaired or restored due to the buildup of snow and ice. The plan is to leave all the existing exterior materials on the walls and the front porch, other than the porch decking.

Board Member Melville thought it was a beautiful project and exactly what they were trying to encourage in the Historic District. The building would remain in its actual location, restored to look historic and made habitable for use.

Board Member Holmgren referred to the original tax photos on page 95 of the Staff report, and the changes that have been made to this point. In one photo the porch was very basic and plain and it did not look raised. In another photo the porch looked lower. Board Member asked when the rock retaining wall was constructed. Mr. Stokes believed the rock retaining walls in the front and the

steps going up to the house might have been done prior to 1985. It may have been when the remodel was done to the back of house. Mr. Stokes stated that at one point the stairs were more towards the downhill side of the property on the north rather than in the center. Board Member Holmgren agreed. In looking at the original tax photo it also appeared to be a shingle and metal roof.

Planner Grahn assumed that when the new basement foundation was added the porch was raised enough that the vertical siding needed to be added. She noted that the rock walls are not historic; however, the applicant likes the walls and believes they contribute to the look and feel of Old Town. They intend to leave the rock walls in place and add terracing.

Board Member Holmgren asked if the porch stairs would remain in the center. Planner Grahn and Mr. Stokes answered yes. Director Eddington asked if the existing stairs would remain or be replaced. Mr. Stokes replied that the intent is to keep the existing stairs that are 6" to 8" sandstone slabs if they can meet the current Building Code requirement from the sidewalk to the porch with the amount of risers and tread widths and depths. The applicant proposes to add three to four additional steps to accommodate the 2-foot increase in elevation of the house due to the new foundation for the basement. Planner Grahn stated that the front would be re-graded so a railing would not be required along the front of the house. The landscape would appear the same.

Mr. Stokes stated that they were also proposing to add a third retaining wall to match the existing walls and to add three or four additional steps. Board Member Bush thought the steps appeared to go right from the street up to the front porch. Mr. Stokes replied that the steps do go from the street to the front porch and he believed the steps were 8" to 9" inches high. Board Member Bush suggested that they look at issues related to the elevation of the porch before they decide to raise the house. He was unsure if the 2-foot elevation would allow them to add the extra steps. Mr. Stokes stated that currently there is a 3-1/2 foot landing off the porch before the first step, and they were making up the extra stair treads in that landing. Therefore, instead of stepping off the porch on to the landing and then down the stairs, the steps would go directly to the porch. He believed there would be enough room for the extra steps.

Board Member Bush noted that the building would be restructured as needed. He asked if the engineer or someone else would be making those decisions. Board Member Bush wanted to know how much of the roof would be taken apart. An engineer would probably not sign off on a 2 x 4 roof and would recommend new members, which would require taking off the old roof and replacing it with a new roof. If that occurred it would take away a lot of the existing structure. Mr. Stokes stated that the entire historic roof would remain intact. The roof was framed with 2 x 8 boards and it is in relatively good shape. The engineer has already inspected the roof. Mr. Stokes remarked that nine out of 20 sheets of

plans submitted to the Building and Planning Department were structural in nature and provided the detailed plans for the roof.

Chair Kenworthy asked about the historic roof. Mr. Stokes noted that the historic roof goes back approximately 25' to the 1980s addition. Planner Grahn stated that the new dormers start at the halfway point of the house and go back to the addition. Planner Grahn pointed out that the proposed restructuring would occur on the interior. However, a condition of approval on the HDDR states that if for some reason the roof would have to come off and be reconstructed, it would require a separate HDDR review and approval.

Director Eddington clarified that the proposed dormers for the roof was no higher than the existing dormers. Planner Grahn replied that this was correct. She noted that they also kept the dormers off the ridge. Mr. Stokes stated that the new dormers would be slightly lower than the existing dormers.

Chair Kenworthy opened the public hearing.

Ruth Meintsma, a resident at 305 Woodside Avenue, was pleased to hear that the structure was being raised because she could not tell from the plans. It is an important factor in the guidelines and she suggested a notation in the future for clarification indicating that this house was being raised. Ms. Meintsma has seen previous projects where railings were not required but people added them later for safety reasons. She believed railings change the look of the house and liked the fact that the front yard would be raised to avoid the need for a railing. Ms. Meintsma thought this was a remarkable project because it allowed a Landmark structure to remain Landmark. The amount of work proposed was amazing and the front façade would remain. Ms. Meintsma thought it was unfortunate that the full eligible amount could not be awarded because of lack of funds. She believed the funding issue needed to be addressed because there is not enough money for people who are willing to invest the time and energy to maintain a Landmark structure. In her opinion, \$45,000 a year in the CIP fund is not enough for one project, much less two. She understood the \$30,000 cap but she thought the owner should be awarded the amount they requested to complete the project. Ms. Meintsma volunteered to do whatever she could to support increasing the funds for these types of projects.

Chair Kenworthy closed the public hearing.

Board Member Melville concurred with Ms. Meintsma in terms of awarding the full amount eligible for this application. If the CIP fund only has \$45,000 per year for these projects, it somehow needs to be increased by the City Council. Director Eddington suggested that it would be a good discussion for the joint meeting with the City Council. Ms. Melville recalled that the cost of the Intensive Level Survey was less than what was budgeted, and she thought the unspent



money should go into funding historic projects. Director Eddington stated that currently the budget would allocate \$45,000 to the fund on July 1<sup>st</sup>. If they awarded the full amount to this project, there would be nothing left to help with other good projects that may come in within the next 16 months. Board Member Melville thought they should approach the City Council to find additional funding for these projects to preserve historic structures. She did not believe the commitment from the City Council was consistent with the goal discussed in the General Plan.

Director Eddington reiterated his suggestion to raise the issue with the City Council at their joint meeting the following evening. Chair Kenworthy pointed out that the City Council members believe in historic preservation and he assumed they would like to contribute more to preservation.

Board Member Holmgren agreed that the City Council should and possibly would step up, but that was not happening now. She knows of people in her area who are planning to work on their houses and may need funding. She could not justify awarding the full amount and depleting the funds. Planner Grahn noted that the people in Ms. Holmgren's neighborhood would qualify under the Lower Park Avenue RDA. Board Member Holmgren replied that they were not all her neighbors. Some were people who live around the area. She reiterated her previous sentiment that she intended to be very conservative on granting this money.

Board Member Bush agreed. In the past all the applications were reviewed at one time and the money was disbursed among the projects appropriately. That process allowed the City to look at all the projects competitively and fund the best projects. He thought it was better to accept the applications year around as they currently do, but it is a matter of spending the resources they have responsibly. Board Member Bush understood the intent to keep the structure and materials intact, but during the course of the project some things change and other things could be done less expensively. He did not believe this was the right project for panelization, but panelization is an example of how to save money and achieve the same result. Board Member Melville disagreed that panelization always achieves the same outcome. Board Member Bush was willing to have that debate and to discuss the merits of panelization.

Board Member Bush thought this was a great project and he would like to fund it. However, he could not support awarding the full amount without knowing what other projects might come before them with grant requests. Board Member Bush was willing to award the applicant the \$30,000 recommended by Staff.

Chair Kenworthy referred to the cost breakdown and noted that the total cost for the basement was \$33,793. Planner Grahn replied that it was the cost of the foundation work. Chair Kenworthy asked if half of the foundation amount was

half of the entire foundation work or if it was less the original foundation. Mr. Stokes replied that there is no existing foundation per se under the historic house. He recalled that the \$33,793 was for the historic three walls on the north, south and east. Planner Grahn explained that the builder laid out the invoice to only include the work that was being done under the historic house. She clarified that the \$33,793 was only for the basement work beneath the historic portion. Planner Grahn pointed out that her suggestion was for the City to only pay for the foundation and not the excavation, the house lifting and the bracing.

Chair Kenworthy liked the project and thought it was worthwhile, but he was not comfortable depleting the funds. He pointed out that they were using CIP funds because they had used all the money in the Main Street RDA. He preferred to leave some money in the fund for additional projects.

Chair Kenworthy assumed there was agreement among the Board to fund this project. The Board concurred. Board Member Melville preferred to fund the entire amount but she would definitely support awarding \$30,000 for this project. Board Member Holmgren agreed to fund \$30,000 to this project and leave remaining funds available for other projects. Chair Kenworthy was comfortable awarding the recommended \$30,000 to leave money available for future projects.

Board Member Bush asked if the applicant would have the ability to come back and apply for additional funding. Planner Grahn stated that if the applicant finds that additional work is required during the course of the project he could reapply for a second grant.

Board Member Melville asked how the Main Street RDA could get funded again. City Council Member Matsumoto understood that all the money for the Main Street RDA went to the parking garage. Director Eddington explained that there was tax increment financing on the property and that increment is allocated to and pays for the bonds on the parking garage. He believed the Main Street RDA would end when the bonds are paid off and the City would have to find another funding source for the grant program. Board Member Melville clarified that there was no other current historic preservation funding except for the CIP fund. Director Eddington answered yes, with the exception of the money left in the Lower Park Avenue RDA, which applies to a separate geographically defined area.

**MOTION:** Board Member Holmgren moved to APPROVE the grant request for 343 Park Avenue in the amount of \$30,000. Board Member Melville seconded the motion.

**VOTE:** The motion passed unanimously.

Historic Preservation Board Meeting  
April 16, 2014

The Board adjourned the regular meeting and left for a walking tour of historic Main Street.

The meeting adjourned at 6:06 p.m.

Approved by \_\_\_\_\_  
John Kenworthy, Chair  
Historic Preservation Board