

PARK CITY MUNICIPAL CORPORATION  
HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD  
MINUTES OF JULY 20, 2016

BOARD MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE: Lola Beatlebrox, Cheryl Hewett, Puggy Holmgren, Douglas Stephens

EX OFFICIO: Bruce Erickson, Anya Grahn, Hannah Turpen, Polly Samuels McLean, Louis Rodriguez

---

The Board had a site visit to 1057 Woodside Avenue prior to the meeting.

ROLL CALL

Vice-Chair Stephens called the meeting to order at 5:00 p.m. and noted that all Board Members were present except for Jack Hodgkins and David White, who were excused.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

June 1, 2016

Board Member Beatlebrox referred to page 9, the paragraph where Ruth Meintsma commented on the rock walls. She corrected “nice rubber” walls to correctly read, “rubble walls.” In that same paragraph, “rubber material” should be corrected to “rubble material”.

It was noted that Board Member Hewett was absent from the June 1<sup>st</sup> meeting. Assistant City Attorney McLean suggested that Board continue approval of the minutes to the next meeting when they would have a quorum of members who were present for that meeting.

MOTION: Board Member Holmgren moved to CONTINUE Adoption of the June 1, 2016 minutes as amended, to the meeting. Board Member Beatlebrox seconded the motion.

PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS

There were no comments.

STAFF/BOARD COMMUNICATIONS

Planner Anya Grahn reported on the Historic Preservation Award. She received visuals from the plaque maker to choose which plaque they wanted to use. Example A had mountains; example B had the Park City logo. Planner Grahn stated that since there were only four Board Members present, they had the option to the next meeting when the full Board was present to make the decision.

Board Member Hewett favored the plaque with the Park City Logo. Board Member Holmgren also liked the Park City logo. Board Member Beatlebrox had no issues with either plaque.

Vice-Chair Stephens agreed. However, he noted that nothing on the plaque indicates that it is a plaque for any historic nature. Planner Grahn stated that she would add something about it being the Historic Preservation Board, and that it is the Historic Preservation Award. Mr. Stephens did not think they needed to mention the Board because it is a historic award. The plaque needs to indicate that it reflects historic preservation.

Planner Grahn clarified that there was consensus for the plaque with the Park City logo.

Director Erickson reported that the Staff had a tour of the California Comstock Mine restoration. Planner Grahn stated that a condition of Vail's conditional use permit in 2015, they were asked to stabilize some of the Mine Sites. Vail contributed \$50,000 towards stabilizing the California Comstock. They hired Clark Martinez of the excavation company to do the work. The condition of the structure was assessed last Fall, and when they returned this summer they realized how much of it had fallen apart. It had desinigrated and collapsed within itself. The debris was removed and the northeast side was reconstructed. Planner Grahn commented on the character defining feature of the angled roof, and noted that it was the portion that was behind the angled roof. It is post and beam construction. The project should be completed by mid-August.

Planner Grahn noted that the Staff would be updating the City Council with a report and photos the following evening.

CONTINUATIONS – (Public Hearing and continue to date specified)

Design Guideline Revisions—Staff recommends that the Historic Preservation Board take public comment on the proposed changes to the Design Guidelines for Park City's Historic Districts and Historically Significant Buildings. Universal and Specific Design Guidelines will be reviewed for: Site Design; Primary Structures: Foundations; Exterior Walls; Roofs; Store Fronts; Doors (Not included in Storefronts); Windows (not included in storefronts); Gutters & Downspouts; Historic Balconies/Porticos; Decks, Fire Escapes, and Exterior Staircases; Chimneys and Stovepipes; Architectural Features; Mechanical Equipment, Communications, and Service Areas; Paint & Color; Additions to Primary Structures: Protection of Historic Sites and Structures; Transitional Elements; General Compatibility; Scenario 1: Rooftop Additions; Scenario 2: Rear Additions; Basement Additions; New Storefronts; New Balconies; New

Decks; Handrails; Awnings; and Reusing Historic Houses as Commercial Structures. The Board will provide specific amendments to be made to the document if necessary; and make a recommendation to City Council (Council review will be after the entire Guidelines are reviewed by the HPB).  
(Application PL-GI-13-00222)

Vice-Chair Stephens opened the public hearing. There were no comments.  
Vice-Chair Stephens closed the public hearing.

MOTION: Board Member Beatlebrox moved to CONTINUE the Design Guideline Revisions to August 3, 2016. Board Member Holmgren seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

1302 Norfolk Avenue- Determination of Significance for a house  
(Application PL-16-03181)

Vice-Chair Stephens opened the public hearing. There were no comments.  
Vice-Chair Stephens closed the public hearing.

MOTION: Board Member Hewett moved to CONTINUE 1302 Norfolk Avenue until August 3, 2016. Board Member Beatlebrox seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

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

1. 416 Ontario Avenue – Determination of Significance  
(Application PL-16-03181)

Planner Turpen reviewed the application for a determination of significance for 416 Ontario Avenue. The proper consists of a 1-1/2 story wood frame modified pyramid house that was constructed in 1904. This property shows up in the 1907, 1929, and 1941 Sanborn maps. There are no changes to the property during that time. The tax photograph from 1940 shows exactly what the house looked like. It was typical of a pyramid house in Park City. Planner Turpen pointed out the elements of the pyramid house, which includes an off-centered front door with a transom above, and two pairs of double-hung windows on either side, and a porch. He indicated the truncated pyramid roof in the front, which is also known as a clipped hip roof, and the historic siding. Planner Turpen remarked that the roof was easier to see in the tax photo for 412 Marsac Avenue, showing the clipped top on a perfect pyramid.

Planner Turpen stated that according to the 1949 and 1958 tax appraisal cards, the house was approximately 624 square feet. Based on the measurements of the house, it is likely that it was the square footage of the house in the original Sanborn maps. Based on that information, the Staff believed the house was not changed until at least 1958. However, in 1983 the house was part of the Reconnaissance Level survey. As shown from the photo taken in February 1982, significant changes were made to the structure. The porch is lost. There is a west dormer, a northeast addition, and the siding has changed. There was snow on the roof so it was difficult to determine whether or not the roof had changed.

Planner Turpen pointed out that recent photos show changes beyond what was changed in the Reconnaissance level photo. However, some elements of the structure have remained the same, and those include the window and door configuration on the front. Even with the larger dormer at the top, it is easy to see that this is a pyramid type structure that has been altered. The siding has changed. The north, south, and west walls are still the same and it is still possible to read the footprint, which goes with the profile of the roof.

Planner Turpen stated that the Staff conducted an analysis and did not find that this house meets the criteria for Landmark designation. The Staff recommended that the HPB make a determination as to whether or not it meets the criteria for significant designation. The Staff had not forwarded a formal recommendation. However, it does meet the criteria of being at least 50 years old. In regards to Criterion B, HPB discussion was requested by Staff. Planner Turpen noted that the site has never been listed on a Reconnaissance Level Survey and it has not received a grant.

Planner Turpen stated that while the alterations detract from the actual historic form, historic form was still identifiable. The Staff would like the HPB to discuss whether or not it retains its historic form despite the out-of-period alterations.

Planner Turpen commented on Criterion C and D. On the issue of whether the house maintains its historic scale and context, the Staff finds that it does retain its historic scale, because the alterations can be removed and the historic form could be restored. The dormer additions could be removed and the historic roof would return to its original truncated pyramid form. The Staff finds that the house is important to local or regional history, and that it is a part of the Mature Mining Era. The pyramid form is typical of Park City and this house is a good example of that form.

The owner, Brooks Jacobsen, stated that he purchased the home in 1989. In 1990 he went to the City for a historic grant, and at the time he was told that it had been altered too much and it did not meet the grant criteria. Mr. Jacobsen stated that ten years ago he met with Brooks Robinson and they went over the

Historic Sites Inventory at the time, and it was not on the inventory. Mr. Jacobsen noted that any changes he has made to the house has not been towards the historic. He put a roof on in 1995. The roof shown in the 1983 photo was a flat roof off of the back and it was not functional. There are multiple layers of roofing on the house. Mr. Jacobsen pointed out that putting a historic designation on this house would not be a benefit for him. He believed this home has been altered too many times for it to be historically significant.

Board Member Hewett recalled that the Board had previously requested site visits for this type of decision. She thought this was another example where a site visit would be helpful in making their decision.

Vice-Chair Stephens believed that in the past they've done site visits primarily on demolitions. He agreed that determinations of significance were no less important. Board Member Holmgren gave a head nod that she also wanted to look at the house. Vice-Chair Stephens thought the Staff report was complete, but at the same time, it is hard to visualize from photos. He had visited the site himself. It looked vacant and he took the opportunity to walk around it.

Vice-Chair Stephens asked if the original siding was underneath the exterior siding. Mr. Jacobsen replied that there were a few places where the original siding exists. Mr. Stephens asked if it was on the northwest or the south sides. Mr. Jacobsen stated that it is not on the south side. He has seen some siding on the side facing his neighbor. Mr. Stephens asked if Mr. Jacobsen knew if it was horizontal lap siding or vertical board. Mr. Jacobsen believed it was lap horizontal. Mr. Stephens pointed out that it would have been consistent with that period.

Board Member Beatlebrox stated that in looking at the pictures of the house, the historic pyramid shape was still visible. She believed if the removed the dormer and some of the vegetation and materials in front, it would look like a period historic house. Ms. Beatlebrox pointed out that the house is located in a neighborhood that already has many historic homes on the street. She would not want to lose that house. If they do not determine significance it would be demolished.

Vice-Chair Stephens stated that if the Board deemed this to be a Significant home, he understood that it would not preclude a future applicant to apply for remove additions. Planner Turpen replied that an applicant could request to remove an addition. The Planning Department could not force someone to remove the dormer additions, but it would be a welcomed proposal.

Assistant City Attorney explained that a determination of significance would protect the house and keep it from being demolished. The house could be altered and returned to its original form. Director Erickson pointed out that a

future applicant could request additions consistent with the Design Review process.

Planner Turpen noted that the property owner was anxious to get a decision from the HPB because the house is for sale. She suggested that the Board ask the property owner if he was willing to wait for a site visit. Mr. Jacobsen stated he has lived in the home for a long time. He now has a young family and they can no longer live on Ontario Avenue. When he decided to sell it there was a lot of interest because it was not on any historic register. Since he received the letter from the City, the discussion is completely different and people are not interested in buying the home. Mr. Jacobson thought the process was wrong and there should be bonuses for having a historic home. Instead, he could be saddled with a house that would cost him financial hardship.

Vice-Chair Stephens asked what letter Mr. Jacobsen referred to. Planner Turpen stated that when a DOS is filed they always send the property owner a notice that there is a pending application on the property. Mr. Stephen wanted to know what triggered the application. Planner Turpen explained that the Staff has been trying to clean up the properties that were missed from any past surveys. Summit County references the date of the construction versus whether the structure is on the HSI. In the process of updating, they determined several properties that need a determination. That was why the HPB has seen so many on their agenda.

Vice-Chair Stephens understood that Mr. Jacobsen would like the Board to make a decision this evening. However, if they were uncertain as to what decision to make, he asked if Mr. Jacobsen preferred that they visit the site to gather additional information to help make the decision. Mr. Jacobsen was not opposed to waiting for a site visit if it could help his cause.

Planner Turpen noted that the property owner had supplied all of the photos in the last exhibit in the Staff report. There were extensive photos of the interior and the exterior. She agreed that visiting the site gives a completely different perspective.

Board Member Beatlebrox favored a site visit. Board Member Holmgren walked up to the site yesterday and she thought it helped with distance and depth perception to see the original structure.

Director Erickson stated that the HPB needed to make its determination rigorously on the criteria Planner Turpen mentioned. If the applicant needed additional time to prepare an argument inside the four criteria for why it does not meet those tests, a continuance would provide him the opportunity to do so. Mr. Jacobsen believed the criteria basically determines that the house complies. Director Erickson pointed out that the Staff recommendation was that it complies.

The Board can weigh additional information and make a different determination. Planner Turpen clarified that the Staff had made a neutral recommendation, and requested that the Board review the criteria to make the determination.

Mr. Jacobsen asked if any building permit in the future would require those additions to be removed. Director Erickson answered no. Planner Turpen reiterated that the Planning Department could not require it, but they could be removed if requested by an applicant. For example, if an owner wanted to put in new windows, they could not be required to remove the dormer before the windows would be approved.

Assistant City Attorney McLean stated that any changes compliant with the Code for a Significant house could be done while the determination is pending. However, the one thing that could not be done is demolition because an application for Significance was filed under is still under consideration.

Vice-Chair Stephens explained what Mr. Jacobsen or another applicant could do with the house under a Significant determination and the appropriate process to follow. Board Member Beatlebrox noted that the house would be eligible for a grant, and potentially tax credits.

Mr. Jacobsen understood from the comments that the Board was leaning towards approving a Significant determination. Vice-Chair Stephens stated that he had not yet made his decision. Assistant City Attorney McLean stated that she had not heard anything to give that impression. If Mr. Jacobsen wanted the Board to proceed with a vote this evening, that could happen if the Board was comfortable moving forward. She did not believe it would be a due process issue if the HPB continued this for two weeks to do a site visit and evaluate whether or not the criteria are met. Mr. Jacobsen stated that he would be out of town on August 3<sup>rd</sup>.

Board Member Hewett clarified that she asked for the site visit because she had questions after looking at the photos and seeing modern windows and all the additions. Since if this house was determined not to be Significant twice before, she was undecided and was leaning towards it not being Significant.

Mr. Jacobsen was willing to wait for a site visit. If they schedule it for August 3<sup>rd</sup> he would have a friend meet them at the site since he would be out of town. He offered to remove some of the siding so they could see what was underneath. Director Erickson noted that the Board would want to have their discussion on August 3<sup>rd</sup> following the site visit. Vice-Chair Stephens assumed the HPB would be prepared to make their decision at that time. Director Erickson recommended that they wait until a time when Mr. Jacobsen could be present, unless he felt comfortable having someone attend the meeting to represent him. Mr. Jacobsen decided to wait until September when he could be present.

Planner Turpen informed Mr. Jacobsen that he would need to obtain an exploratory demolition permit before he removed any siding.

Vice-Chair Stephens opened the public hearing.

Ruth Meintsma had read the Staff report in detail and she believed it was complete and informative. She also visited the site but did not learn anything more than what was in the Staff report. Ms. Meintsma talked about what this house has to offer. She believed the compelling elements to support a Significant designation were the portions of the original roof form, the pitch, which was highly important, the eve deck, the fascia profile, the primary façade wall, the doors and the windows, the north and south wall that are still there, the small historic footprint could still be interpreted and related to the Sanborn map, the historic scale and the historic context. Ms. Meintsma stated that the biggest reason for Significant designation is that the house can be restored to its historical form. She commented on the advantages to the owner if the house is designated Significant. For example, the east wall that was removed could be imposed on without restriction because it is an existing non-conforming situation and could continue to be imposed on as long as it follows the criteria of mass and scale. She pointed out that it is the same criteria that needs to be followed for a new structure. Ms. Meintsma informed the owner that there would be a lot of room for flexibility within the restrictions.

Vice-Chair Stephens closed the public hearing.

MOTION: Board Member Holmgren moved to CONTINUE the determination of significance for 416 Ontario Avenue to September 7, 2016 to allow for a site visit. Board Member Beatlebrox seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

2. 1057 Woodside Avenue – Historic District Design Review - Material Deconstruction (House) of the Historic north addition and partial chimney of the Landmark Single-Family Dwelling to restore the ca. 1918 Period of Historic Significance and Historic Form. (Application PL-14-02387)

The HPB visited the site prior to the meeting.

Planner Turpen noted that this discussion was only for the material deconstruction of the north addition. The Board would discuss the garage in the next agenda item.

Planner Turpen provided development background on this house. The site is designated as a Landmark site on the Historic Sites Inventory. The property consists of a one-story wood framed dwelling with a T-shape plan and a front



porch. The single family dwelling was constructed around 1889, and it has undergone a series of alterations. Development on the site has spanned over three different designated Park City eras. Planner Turpen noted in the 1889 Sanborn map that the house had a cross-gable rather than a hip roof that is present today. There was also a stable and a small shed in the back yard. Planner Turpen noted from the 1900 Sanborn Map that an addition and porch were added in the rear. The small shed was no longer present. She stated that the 1907 map documents that no changes to the home were made, but the lots were now recognized as one. She clarified that the lot line was removed, but that does not mean it was a legal lot combination.

Planner Turpen reported that the property was seized in a tax sale in 1911 by Summit County, and it was not sold until 1918, when it was sold to the Workman's. The Workman's contracted for repairs and work on the property, which was likely in poor condition, because the original property owners could not pay their taxes. Planner Turpen stated that Anne Oliver of SWCA, the City's Historic Preservation Consultant, conducted a site visit and formal analysis on the property. Ms. Oliver concluded that based on the current style and materials of the building as seen today, the work was completed around 1918. Between 1918 and 1921 the house was greatly altered and modernized. By removing the vertically oriented windows and changing the roof form, the house became the popular bungalow style of the period.

Planner Turpen reported that the Workman's sold the property in 1924 and it changed hands multiple times until 1926 when the Birkbeck's purchased the property and conducted a number of items to the actual site. They constructed the single-car garage and the north addition. Planner Turpen noted that the single car garage could only be seen in the 1103 Woodside Avenue tax photo, which gives an idea of the context on the site. The stable was eliminated to construct the single-car garage.

Planner Turpen stated that the house has not changed much since the tax photograph, which is rare in Park City. The Staff finds that removing the addition would return it to its circa 1918 historic period. The site is designated for that historic Era. By doing that the roof section would be removed and repaired. The siding would also be repaired. Planner Turpen presented photos, noting that the shaded red areas were the areas of the house proposed to be removed.

Ryan and Katie Patterson introduce themselves as the property owners. Ms. Patterson stated that they have lived in Park City for ten years and they purchased the property two years ago. They are average people trying to make changes to their property, and they were present this evening to answer questions.

Vice-Chair Stephens opened the public hearing.

There were no comments.

Chair Stephens closed the public hearing.

Board Member Beatlebrox understood that they would see the siding inside the shed, and that they could use the siding once the shed is gone. Ms. Patterson stated that they could see the siding behind a missing piece of drywall. They have not pulled off all the drywall to see how much siding is there, but they would definitely use it if they can.

MOTION: Board Member Beatlebrox moved to APPROVE the Material Deconstruction of the historic north addition to the Landmark single family dwelling at 1057 Woodside Avenue pursuant to the Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Conditions of Approval found in the Staff report. Board Member Holmgren seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

Findings of Fact – 1056 Woodside Avenue - Material Deconstruction

1. The property is located at 1057 Woodside Avenue. The property consists of Lot 15 and Lot 16, Block 9, Snyder's Addition to Park City.
2. The historic site is listed as Landmark on the Historic Sites Inventory.
3. The house was originally constructed c. 1889, per the Historic Site Inventory (HSI) Form, and has undergone a series of alterations since.
4. Development on this property has spanned across three (3) of Park City's designated Historic eras, including the Settlement and Mining Boom Era (1868-1893), the Mature Mining Era (1894-1930), and the Mining Decline and Emergence of Recreation Industry Era (1931-1962).
5. The Period of Historic Significance for the single-family dwelling is the Mature Mining Era (1894-1930) due to the major alterations that occurred in ca. 1918. The late 1930s north addition with partial chimney was constructed after the Period of Historic Significance.
6. On February 23, 2015, the Planning Department received a Historic District Design Review (HDDR) application for the property at 1057 Woodside Avenue. After working with the applicant on the materials of their submittal, the application was deemed complete on May 4, 2016. The HDDR application is still under review by the Planning Department.

7. The applicant is proposing to remove the late 1930s north addition (with partial chimney) of the single-family dwelling to restore the ca. 1918 Period of Significance and Historic Form.

8. The applicant will reuse the siding on the north addition on the exterior wall of the single-family dwelling after removal of the north addition.

9. The applicant will repair the roof where the north addition is currently attached and is to be removed.

10. Staff finds that the removal of the late 1930s north addition and partial chimney would restore the single-family dwelling to its ca. 1918 Historic Form, specifically the c. 1918 bungalow-style form. Staff finds that the removal of the late 1930s addition would allow for the restoration of the north roof to its ca. 1918 form and exterior horizontal siding of the north elevation to its ca. 1918 appearance.

11. In May 1918, Summit County sold the property to Charles A. Workman, a blacksmith in the mining industry, and his wife, Florence Reddon Workman. The Workmans completed major alterations to the single-family dwelling at about this time (ca. 1918).

12. The Workmans sold the property in 1924.

13. 1936, Robert J. Birkbeck, a shop foreman for a mining company, and his wife Lillian P. Langford Birkbeck purchased the property. The Birkbecks made a series of changes to the site including, the construction of the north addition to the single-family dwelling, the single-car garage and the storage shed.

14. The ca. 1940 tax photograph of 1057 Woodside Avenue documents the changes to the single-family dwelling. At the far right edge of the photograph, the corner of an outbuilding is visible; the front (east end) of this building is roughly aligned with the east face of the addition. In the background stands a large, rectangular outbuilding with a wood-shingled roof.

15. The single-family dwelling has had the following alterations since ca. 1889: New porch and new addition which changed the plan (occurred ca. 1900); Changes to the original window openings (occurred ca. 1918); Changes to the roof shape (occurred ca. 1918); and North addition with partial chimney (occurred late 1930s).

16. The proposed removal of the late 1930s north addition will allow for alterations that occurred to the historic single-family dwelling after the Period of

Historic significance to be removed; thus, restoring the ca. 1918 bungalow Historic Form.

Conclusions of Law – 1057 Woodside Avenue – Material Deconstruction

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

Conditions of Approval – 1057 Woodside Avenue – Materials Deconstruction

1. Final building plans and construction details shall reflect substantial compliance with the HDDR proposal stamped in on February 23, 2015, May 12, 2015, and April 29, 2016. Any changes, modifications, or deviations from the approved design that have not been approved by the Planning and Building Departments may result in a stop work order.

2. Where the historic exterior materials cannot be repaired, they shall be replaced with materials that match the original in all respects: scale, dimension, texture, profile, material and finish. Prior to removing and replacing historic materials, the applicant shall demonstrate to the Planning Director and Project Planner that the materials are no longer safe and/or serviceable and cannot be repaired to a safe and/or serviceable condition. No historic materials may be disposed of prior to advance approval by the Planning Director and Project Planner.

3. Any deviation from approved Material Deconstruction will require review by the Historic Preservation Board.

3. 1057 Woodside Avenue – Historic District Design Review - Disassembly and Reassembly (Panelization) of the Historic Single-Car Garage on the Landmark Site. Relocation of the Historic Single-Car Garage on the Landmark Site. (Application PL-14-02387)

Planner Turpen noted that the Staff report was broken into two separate proposals. Each item would be addressed individually with separate actions.

Disassembly and Reassembly of the Garage (Panelization)

Planner Turpen stated that the applicant was proposing to panelize the garage, and the Chief Building Official finds it to be feasible. The Staff finds that panelization would not greatly alter the context of the site, nor diminish the historic integrity of the structure or the site. The applicant had submitted a

license engineer's report stating that the garage is compromised structurally. The structural engineer advised for demolition; however, the Chief Building Official and the applicant both find that panelization is possible. The garage meets Criteria 1.

Planner Turpen commented on Criteria 2 and noted that the Chief Building Official had provided a formal assessment of the structure and found that panelization of each wall in whole is feasible due to the structural deficiencies.

The Staff recommended approval of the proposed panelization of the single car garage.

Board Member Beatlebrox asked where the panels would be stored. Mr. Patterson replied that the location had not been decided, but there is room on the site to store them. Planner Turpen stated that she did not ask the applicant to formally submit a panelization plan as part of the historic preservation plan until panelization was actually approved. However, before the owners can do a financial guarantee or get their building permit, they have to have submit all of those plans, and they must be approved by the Planning Director and the Chief Building Official.

Vice-Chair Stephens clarified that the Staff was only looking for the Board's analysis of whether or not the garage should be disassembled and reassembled, and relocated. Planner Turpen replied that he was correct. The owner will be building a new structure, and regardless of whether it is built in the current location or the new location, it will be wrapped with the panels to look exactly like to does now. She noted that the garage is currently leaning and that will be fixed. Historic material will be used where possible. The Chief Building Officials finds that the interior structure is in good condition, but some of the exterior boards are not. Those will have to be approved by Staff before they can be discarded.

Board Member Beatlebrox was delighted that the owners wanted to preserve the building and she appreciated their willingness to go through the effort. Mr. Patterson stated that the entire house was neglected, and they were trying to make it look nicer.

Vice-Chair Stephens opened the public hearing.

Ruth Meintsma strongly favored the deconstruction and reconstruction of this garage. She thought this might be the first opportunity for it to be done right. Ms. Meintsma offered her services to draw up digital drawings. She wanted to be a part of this and offered to scrape or do whatever work needed to be done to be involved. Ms. Meintsma also offered the services of her brother who is a finished carpenter. She believed this garage needed to be done as an example for the

City. Ms. Meintsma commented on the structural engineer's recommendation to demolish the structure. She reminded everyone that the City Engineer is more on the side of historic, but when an engineer comes into town they look at structures from a completely different point of view. They are not historic oriented and only do their job as they see fit. Ms. Meintsma thought the timeline of the house on page 161 of the Staff report was amazing and she commended whoever had put it together with the Sanborn maps, the timelines, the dates, and photos of the image.

Planner Turpen stated that she had done the graphics but Anne Oliver had done the research.

Vice-Chair Stephens closed the public hearing.

Board Member Holmgren also commended the owners for wanting to redo the garage structure. Board Member Beatlebrox stated that it should not look too new or too perfect. They just want it to be stabilized and look like it did historically.

Vice-Chair Stephens agreed with Ms. Meintsma regarding the timeline. It was very clear and helpful in understanding what took place and when. He commented on how much better the Staff reports were becoming.

**MOTION:** Board Member Holmgren moved to APPROVE the disassembly and reassembly (panelization) of the Historic single-car garage on the Landmark Site at 1057 Woodside Avenue in accordance with the Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law found in the Staff report. Board Member Beatlebrox seconded the motion.

**VOTE:** The motion passed unanimously.

#### Relocation of the Historic Single-Car Garage on the Landmark Site.

Planner Turpen reported that the applicant was proposing to relocate the garage 20 feet to the east on the property. The Staff recommended denial based on the following analysis.

Regarding Criterion 1 and 2, the Staff finds that this is not applicable because the house is not threatened by demolition in its current location.

Regarding Criteria 3, the Staff does not find unique conditions that would warrant relocation. The single-car garage and the associated house are an excellent example of how our properties evolved in Park City, and it also characterizes this specific area of Park City. No alterations have occurred to the site since the late 1930s, giving the site a high degree of historic integrity and its Landmark

designation. Planner Turpen stated that this area of Old Town was historically characterized by larger lots with outbuildings and houses. The evolution in transition between the use of stables and automobiles is very clear here. This section of Old Town has not lost its context and is predominantly historic. Seventy-three percent of the properties between 10<sup>th</sup> and 12<sup>th</sup> Street on Woodside still retain their historic outbuildings and are designated to the HSI.

Planner Turpen remarked that the current orientation of the structures on the property convey a clear development pattern. Altering this relationship will alter the context of the site.

Regarding Criteria 4, Staff finds that relocation is not necessary because the structure is not threatened by demolition, development is possible in its current location, and the historic context of the site would be altered as a result.

The Staff recommended denial for the relocation portion of this proposal.

Board Member Beatlebrox did not understand why an application was submitted to move the structure.

Mr. Patterson replied that over time preferences change to meet current needs. They would like to have an accessory building closer to the Landmark historic home for the ease of access through a main door to the house, particularly in a winter scenario. The garage is tucked up in a corner of the lot and away from the house. Mr. Patterson stated that since they intended to rebuild it, they would like to rebuild it in a location that works best for their needs.

Board Member Beatlebrox asked if it the opening would be on the same plane. Mr. Patterson stated that based on the Staff's recommendation, if they pursue the relocation they could step it back off the front façade approximately 10 feet. That was their proposal, but it was also tied to the ruling on the disassembly/reassembly because the north addition would be in the way. The door would be existing but it would shift closer to the Landmark historic home. The driveway would be shorter, you would pull up and go out the main door and into the main historic home.

Ms. Patterson stated that they also felt that if they were going to panelize the garage and bring it back to how it was, it made sense to make it a more prominent feature on the site, and associate with the house. It gets lost in its current location. Mr. Patterson thought it would highlight the historic shed in the back yard because it would be seen from the Woodside view corridor.

Vice-Chair Stephens understood that the existing garage is closer to the property line. Mr. Patterson replied that it is on the property line.

Vice-Chair Stephens stated that historically the garage sitting back where it was would not have had a concrete driveway going back to it. He agreed with Planner Turpen that where the garage sits established context with the house that is different than if it were moved closer to the side door. However, the garage will be remodeled and restored, and he assumed they would put in a long concrete driveway to get to back it. His preference would be to move the garage forward, but not necessarily closer to the home. Mr. Stephens would like to see it keeps its context away from the home, but he thought there would be design issues having a long concrete driveway back to the house.

Mr. Patterson stated that based on the research done by Anne Oliver, the shed was built around 1939, and the Model A was gone. He stated that the original plan was to move the shed forward to current setbacks and lot lines, because they thought if they relocated it they had to meets those requirements.

Planner Turpen stated that if the garage is relocated, it has to meet setbacks. She thought that might be more appropriate because it has to be behind the front façade. The Staff directed the owners to move it closer to the house because this is a separate lot. The property is for sale and if they were to sale the second lot separately, they would still want it to be associated with its historic house. If the garage were to be moved directly forward on the lot and a new house would be attached, they would no longer be able to read the connection between the red house and the garage because the garage would be connected to a new single-family dwelling.

Vice-Chair Stephens understood that if the garage is left in its current location, there would be no reason to do a lot combination. Planner Turpen replied that a lot combination would be up to the owner. However, the Staff finding is if the garage is moved directly forward they lose the historic context and the garage is associated with its new house. Mr. Stephens pointed out it would be more difficult for current or future homeowners to have flexibility with the properties. Planner Turpen emphasized that development is possible in its current location. The garage could be moved, and if it is moved, the Staff wants it very clear that it is associated with the red house.

Vice-Chair Stephens asked if the HPB was ruling on whether to move the garage closer to the home. Mr. Patterson replied that it was the proposal they submitted. Ms. Patterson clarified that the home is for sale and under contract, but to one buyer for the whole property. The same person is buying both lots.

Vice-Chair Stephens asked if 1057 Woodside was under contract at this time. Ms. Patterson answered yes. Assistant City Attorney McLean did not believe it was relevant. The Staff looked at the request in terms of it being this applicant. Mr. Patterson explained that they were still representing the fact that this was their house and if the real estate deal falls through they would still be pursuing



what they have for two years. Ms. McLean pointed out that a new owner could sell the other lot as well. They have that right because it is two separate lots. Ms. Patterson stated that after having a child their needs have changed, but until they sell they are definitely the owners.

Vice-Chair Stephens understood that if the HPB makes a determination, the decision pertains to this owner or any future applicants. Planner Turpen replied that it is only a 12-month approval. If the new owner does not do the work without requesting an extension, this approval would expire and they would have to go through the process again. Assistant City Attorney McLean clarified that if someone came in years from now and the Code had not changed, it would be difficult to defend a change of decision if the circumstances had not changed because they would be applying the same criteria.

Vice-Chair Stephens opened the public hearing.

There were no comments.

Vice-Chair Stephens closed the public hearing.

Vice-Chair Stephens thought the Staff had done a good job in their analysis. He was not sure if the Board had any flexibility to look at this much differently, because moving the garage would definitely change it. He thought there may be ways to move it and mitigate the impact, but moving it so it appears more like a new home is different. Mr. Stephens was more concerned about the unintended consequence. There are very few of these garages left and they are past the era where homes are being demolished by neglect. He questioned whether they were going down a path where these garages collapse through neglect. Planner Turpen stated that if the garage falls over due to neglect, the City would make the owner rebuild it. She pointed out that the site is designated on the HSI as a whole and it does specify the outbuildings.

MOTION: Board Member Hewett moved to DENY movement of the garage at 1057 Woodside per the Staff recommendation and in accordance with the Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law found in the Staff report. Board Member Holmgren seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

Finding of Fact (for Proposal 1: Disassembly and Reassembly of the Historic Single-Car Garage on the Landmark Site).

1. The property is located at 1057 Woodside Avenue. The property consist of Lot 15 and Lot 16, Block 9, Snyder's Addition to Park City.

2. The historic site is listed as Landmark on the Historic Sites Inventory.
3. The house was originally constructed c. 1889, per the Historic Site Inventory (HSI) Form, and has undergone a series of alterations since.
4. Development on this property has spanned across three (3) of Park City's designated Historic eras, including the Settlement and Mining Boom Era (1868-1893), the Mature Mining Era (1894-1930), and the Mining Decline and Emergence of Recreation Industry Era (1931-1962).
5. In 1936, Robert J. Birkbeck, a shop foreman for a mining company, and his wife Lillian P. Langford Birkbeck purchased the property. The Birkbecks made a series of changes to the site including, the construction of the north addition to the single-family dwelling, the single-car garage and the storage shed.
6. The ca. 1940 tax photograph of 1057 Woodside Avenue documents the changes to the single-family dwelling. At the far right edge of the photograph, the corner of an outbuilding is visible; the front (east end) of this building is roughly aligned with the east face of the addition. In the background stands a large, rectangular outbuilding with a wood-shingled roof.
7. The ca. 1940 tax photograph of 1103 Woodside Avenue, which is the property on the north side of Crescent Street, provides a better view of the two (2) outbuildings. The white-painted, board and batten building with a wood-shingled roof is clearly the single-car garage in the same location on the property today.
8. On February 23, 2015, the Planning Department received a Historic District Design Review (HDDR) application for the property at 1057 Woodside Avenue. After working with the applicant on the materials of their submittal, the application was deemed complete on May 4, 2016. The HDDR application is still under review by the Planning Department.
9. The applicant is proposing to disassemble and reassemble (panelize) the Historic single-car garage. The existing condition of the single-car garage is poor. The structural members of the single-car garage are compromised, exterior siding material is deteriorating, and the building is leaning significantly to the south.
10. The applicant is proposing the removal of the non-historic garage door (modified to accommodate a human entrance) which will allow for the installation of a historically accurate garage door.
11. According to the licensed structural engineer (hired by the applicant), the structural integrity of the single-car garage is compromised due to inadequate structural

members on the interior of the structure. The structural engineer has recommended demolition; however, the applicant is proposing to disassemble (panelize) the single-car garage and reassemble after a new structure has been built on the interior.

12. Staff and the Design Review Team find that disassembling and reassembling (panelizing) the historic structure will not significantly change the context of the site, nor diminish its historical significance. The single-car garage is a contributing feature of the Landmark Site.

13. The structure is not threatened by demolition.

14. The Acting Chief Building Official found the building to be in fair condition. The Acting Chief Building Official found that there are structural deficiencies, including but not limited to signs of deformation, displacement and settling, and deterioration. The Acting Chief Building Official found that wall-by-wall panelization is possible, rather than complete disassembly and reassembly.

15. Due to the poor condition of the building and its structural deficiencies, the building could not be temporarily lifted or moved as a single unit. The physical condition of the existing materials prevent the temporary lifting or moving of a building and the applicant has demonstrated that panelization will result in a greater amount of historic materials as all four walls of the structure can be salvaged and preserved.

16. The specific techniques for panelization will be approved as a part of the Historic District Design Review and Building Permit. A panelization plan will be submitted prior to the approval of the Building Permit. The Building Department will review the panelization plan in detail. Conditions of Approval will be added to the Building Permit addressing such. A Financial Guarantee will be required prior to Building Permit issuance. The Financial Guarantee will require that the single-car garage be reassembled within 18 months of Building Permit issuance. A Building Permit must be issued within one (1) year of approval of the Historic District Design Review.

#### Conclusions of Law

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

#### Finding of Fact (to deny request for Proposal 2: Relocation of the Historic Single-Car Garage on the Landmark Site)

1. The property is located at 1057 Woodside Avenue. The property consist of Lot 15 and Lot 16, Block 9, Snyder's Addition to Park City.

2. The historic site is listed as Landmark on the Historic Sites Inventory.
3. The house was originally constructed c. 1889, per the Historic Site Inventory (HSI) Form, and has undergone a series of alterations since.
4. Development on this property has spanned across three (3) of Park City's designated Historic eras, including the Settlement and Mining Boom Era (1868-1893), the Mature Mining Era (1894-1930), and the Mining Decline and Emergence of Recreation Industry Era (1931-1962).
5. On February 23, 2015, the Planning Department received a Historic District Design Review (HDDR) application for the property at 1057 Woodside Avenue. After working with the applicant on the materials of their submittal, the application was deemed complete on May 4, 2016. The HDDR application is still under review by the Planning Department.
6. The applicant proposes to relocate the existing historic single-car garage approximately 20 feet east on the property. The applicant claims that the historic context of the site and neighborhood has been lost and that moving the single-car garage closer to the single-family dwelling will recover the site context.
7. The relocation will comply with the required ten foot (10') front yard setback and three foot (3') side yard setback, as dictated by the Historic Residential (HR-1) zoning district, described in Land Management Code (LMC) 15-2.2-3.
8. The Design Review Team finds that relocating the historic building on its existing lot will significantly change the context of the site.
9. The structure is not threatened by demolition.
10. Staff, including the Chief Building Official and Planning Director, find s that there are no unique conditions that warrant the proposed relocation of the historic structure on the existing site.
11. No major alterations have occurred to the site since the late 1930s, giving them a high degree of integrity and justifying the property's designation as a Landmark Site. The single-car garage is a contributing feature of the Landmark Site.
12. Sanborn Fire Insurance maps show that historically, the neighborhood was characterized by lots larger than 25' x 75', single-family homes, outbuildings (first

stables, then single-car or double-car garages), larger yard spaces, and increased setbacks between structures.

13. Overall, the historic context of the single-car garage on its own site, and in the context of the neighborhood still remains.

14. The relocation of the structure 20 feet to the east will alter the character of the site in terms of the relationship between the outbuildings and the single-family dwelling.

15. Development of the site is possible with the single-car garage in its current location.

16. The proposal to relocate the historic single-car garage does not comply with LMC 15-11-13 Relocation and/or Reorientation of a Historic Building or Historic Structure. There are no unique conditions that warrant the relocation of the historic single-car garage on its site as the context of the building's setting has not been altered that its present setting conveys its history; the integrity and significance of the historic building will be diminished by relocation and/or reorientation; and all other alternatives to relocation have not been reasonably considered prior to determining the relocation of the building.

17. 1936, Robert J. Birkbeck, a shop foreman for a mining company, and his wife Lillian P. Langford Birkbeck purchased the property. The Birkbecks made a series of changes to the site including, the construction of the north addition to the single-family dwelling, the single-car garage and the storage shed.

18. The ca. 1940 tax photograph of 1057 Woodside Avenue documents the changes to the single-family dwelling. At the far right edge of the photograph, the corner of an outbuilding is visible; the front (east end) of this building is roughly aligned with the east face of the addition. In the background stands a large, rectangular outbuilding with a wood-shingled roof.

19. The ca. 1940 tax photograph of 1103 Woodside Avenue, which is the property on the north side of Crescent Street, provides a better view of the two (2) outbuildings. The white-painted, board and batten building with a wood-shingled roof is clearly the single-car garage in the same location on the property today.

#### Conclusions of Law

1. The proposal does not meet the criteria for relocation pursuant to LMC 15-11-13 and/or Reorientation of a Historic Building or Historic Structure.

4. Legislative Consideration of an ordinance amending the Land Management Code Section 15, Chapters 2.5, 2.6 to require Historic Preservation Board review of Historic District or Historic Site Design Review for both historic and non-historic structures, as well as Chapter 11 Purposes and Relocation and/or Reorientation of a Historic Building or Historic Structure

Planner Turpen reported that this item was an amendment to the LMC to expand the role of the HPB to include design review of commercial structures on Main Street; as well as amendments to relocation and reorientation.

Planner Turpen provided background on the design review component. On April 6<sup>th</sup> the Board reviewed the topics that Planner Grahn would be taking to the City Council regarding the Historic Preservation Update. Design Review was one of the topics and the HPB voted unanimously not to be the design review authority. However, when the topics were presented to the City Council, the Council had concerns about Main Street and gave the direction for Design Review to occur on all Landmarks structures.

Planner Grahn clarified that the City Council wanted a review of all Landmark structures; however, the Staff thought it was better to use Main Street as an example to perfect the Design Review before extending it beyond the HCB and the Heber Avenue subzone.

Planner Turpen explained that after the City Council made their recommendation, she met with Planner Grahn and Director Erickson and they determined that one of the biggest challenges would be to maintain the National Register District. Instead of just looking at Landmark structures they decided to look at all commercial structures in the HCB and the HRC Heber Avenue Subzone because they all contribute to the District. New construction has to be contributing as much as Landmark structures. To be consistent, the Staff thought it made sense from the standpoint of Design Review to look at all structures on the street.

Planner Turpen noted that the amendment expands the purpose of the HPB to include the Design Review component of those commercial structures. She stated that the Board would be reviewing the structures under the same criteria as the Staff in this specific section of the Code.

Planner Turpen pointed out that the noticing matrix was updated to reflect that noticing will be done when a structure comes before the HPB.

Director Erickson understood that this would also change the appeal of their action. Planner Grahn stated that appeals already go to the Board of Adjustment because of material deconstruction. The Board of Adjustment would remain the appeal body for this additional action.

Planner Grahn stated that she and Planner Turpen initially thought the HPB should only do reviews for Universal Guidelines because it was high-level and more detail oriented. However, after discussing it further, they decided that the Staff would do their analysis regardless, and if the Staff finds that it could not be approved or did not meet the LMC requirements they would not bring it to the HPB. Since the Staff analysis would already be done, the Staff thought it would be beneficial to share with the Board how it meets each specific design guideline. Planner Grahn thought the reviews could be done quickly.

Vice-Chair Stephens understood that the structure would go through the Design Review process and the HPB would be the last review in the process. Mr. Stephens asked since the Board would be reviewing those particular designs, whether they could be involved in the process earlier and sit in on the DRT meetings. Assistant City Attorney McLean replied that the Staff would be vetting the project and researching background information, and the HPB would make the final determination. However, the HPB would not be acting as a judge, which was the previous issue. Ms. McLean stated that unless the entire Board attended the DRT, there would be quorum issues and other problem related to the process. It would be more appropriate to request further information if necessary, or to request a presentation on certain aspects that could be given to the entire Board to make the determination.

Assistant City Attorney McLean pointed out that the process would become public sooner, since the goal is to be more transparent in terms of daylighting the process for the most treasured portion of the City. Mr. Stephens stated that he has the utmost confidence in the Planning Staff. However, there were occasions and occurrences in the past where applicants felt like they had gone through the design process with Staff, only to be turned away and denied by the Historic Board at that time. He wanted to know how they could educate and include the Board members before it gets to that final point. Ms. McLean suggested that the HPB could have a special meeting with the preservation consultant, but it would have to be a public meeting. She understood Mr. Stephen's concern because it is a complaint they hear quite often.

Director Erickson thought they could back off a little on the project specific review. He believed the difficulties between the Staff and the Historic Board and the public trust in operations, was due to a philosophic difference between the Board and the Staff. Instead of looking for a mechanism to involve the HPB earlier, he preferred a mechanism to avoid philosophical misunderstanding, or outright obstinacy on the part of former Staff members who had their own interpretation of not replicating history buildings and decided to insert contemporary. Director Erickson thought a better approach would be to find a way to discuss the guidelines and for the Staff to interpret the Board's philosophy with respect to the guidelines, rather than inserting the HPB into an individual

project. However, if the Staff hits an impasse in the process, they could bring it to the Board in a work session for guidance, or they could bring the project forward for approval or denial. Director Erickson stated that the current Staff spends a lot of time listening to the Board to make sure they are philosophically aligned. They will continue to do that as the Guidelines move forward.

Planner Grahn noted that the Guidelines for commercial buildings was scheduled to come before the HPB on August 3<sup>rd</sup>.

Vice-Chair Stephens did not disagree with Director Erickson. He thought it might work, primarily because of the high level of confidence he has in the Staff. However, the Guidelines are good, but they can be difficult to apply to unique properties or unique situations. Mr. Stephens stated that as Board members they have a responsibility to make themselves aware if there is an important project on Main Street.

Board Member Beatlebrox thought public input was also an important part of the process because people can see what the Staff has been working on with the owner or developer. It gives the public the opportunity to provide their comments and thoughts. Ms. Beatlebrox thought more care and priority needed to be given to high-profile projects. She believed it was important for the HPB to be involved in the review process for projects on Main Street.

Vice-Chair Stephens did not necessarily agree that the HPB needed to be involved in the review process because it is important to have confidence in a qualified Staff. He thought their involvement should relate more to the bigger picture.

Director Erickson stated that he was considering a mechanism to make sure the HPB knows the Staff is struggling with a difficult design problem and they might involve the HPB in the process sooner rather than later in terms of having a policy discussion. Mr. Stephens remarked that projects on Main Street are always important, and he would need more time than Friday to Wednesday, when the reports go and the meetings take place, to really understand the issues. Mr. Stephens thought it was less of a legislative issue and more of an administrative issue in terms of communication between the HPB and the Staff. If the Board wants to be involved and the Staff wants them involved, they would need the time to get up to speed on the processes the Staff has gone through and the problems they had to deal with. The packet should describe the process the Staff went through and would take more than just a cursory read to understand that process.

Planner Grahn stated that the question would be how much time the Board would need; noting that the Staff needs to plan ahead in terms of internal reviews for the Staff reports, noticing, and posting on the public website. Mr. Stephens



thought it could be as simple as putting in the Staff report that the Planning Department received this application. It would put the HPB on notice and each Board member would be responsible for pursuing whatever information they needed.

Vice-Chair Stephens opened the public hearing.

Ruth Meintsma stated that in the past she heard all the hesitations about dealing with Design Review and having confidence in Staff. Previously the Guidelines were difficult in vague areas and the language has changed. These Guidelines are so specific and clean, and she believed their level of discussion would be very different. When the Staff report is written on these projects, those Guidelines will be listed for their discussion. Ms. Meintsma thought it would empower them as a Board, and it would also give them the opportunity to not only back up a Staff decision, but they will begin to learn which guidelines are less effective than others. Ms. Meintsma believed the Board was entering into a new area with this design review, and she thought it would be an exciting responsibility at their level. She looked forward to seeing it happen.

Cindy Matsumoto stated that she was commenting as a private citizen and not as a Council member. She believed it was important for the HPB to take this step forward, because even though the HDDR has a public component, it is not at a regular scheduled meeting that the people is aware of and can follow. Ms. Matsumoto remarked that Main Street belongs to the community, and historic preservation is the community's responsibility. Having a meeting where the public can comment on the different aspects of a project helps the community to become educated on the Guidelines; and that education enables them to talk about specific guidelines that they do or do not support. Ms. Matsumoto reiterated that public input is important and the HPB would allow that input in a more democratic way.

Board Member Beatlebrox agreed, and she believes the community expects it. It is all about perception, and it would be good for the community to have the perception that there is another set of eyes looking at these high priority projects.

Vice-Chair Stephens closed the public hearing.

Board Member Stephens understood that the review under discussion was limited to the HCB and HRC zones. Planner Turpen replied that it was for commercial structures in the HCB and HRC sub Heber Avenue zones. Assistant City Attorney McLean remarked that as written, it was not clear that it was only for commercial. It was written to include all structures in those zones. Planner Grahn explained that in some cases former residential structures have become commercial structures, such as the High West Annex. Those structures fall into

the Heber Avenue Subzone, which is still part of the commercial core, and they have to maintain that integrity.

The Board had no further comments regarding design review.

Planner Grahn commented on the amendments for relocation. She explained that these were redone in an effort to be as clear as possible and to make sure there is consistency. Planner Grahn referred to Item A on page 225 of the Staff report, which was about abating demolition. She explained that they were not abating demolition by neglect. For example, if a road project goes through and expands SR224, they would not want the expansion to take out the barn, so the barn would have to be relocated on the site to abate demolition.

Planner Grahn believed the second item was fairly obvious. For example, if there was danger of the mountain or cliffside falling into a house it would create a hazardous situation and relocation would be necessary.

Planner Grahn stated that the third item was an effort to emphasize that if a structure is relocated, it would either enhance the ability to interpret the structure, or it does not diminish its overall physical integrity in its relationship with the District. They want to make sure they preserve as much historic integrity and significance as possible. Planner Grahn stated that a significant main point is that the City requires that a license structural engineer look at the structure to make sure that it can survive relocation. She pointed out that if it was also a panelization project, the Board would be looking at it for both panelization and relocation, similar to what they did on 1057 Woodside this evening. Planner Grahn stated that the preservation must be enhanced by relocating it. It is important to make sure that the relocation would not have a detrimental effect on the soundness of the building.

Planner Grahn referred to Item B on page 226, which were procedures for locating the structure to a different site in Old Town. The language was being changed for more clarity, and to make sure that even if the structure is being relocated to a new site, that it maintains its integrity and significance, that it does not have a negative effect on the District, and it does not threaten the structural soundness of the building. A structural engineer needs to make sure that it can sustain relocation. They also want to make sure that the applicant looked at all the options on the site and that restoring it on that site is not viable.

Planner Grahn stated that a Landmark structure is listed on the National Register of Historic Places. The National Register generally frowns upon relocation, although in some cases relocated structures are listed on the National Register. For that reason, Park City limits relocation to only Significant structures because they are not listed on the National Register of Historic Places. Significant is a lesser designation and it allows more flexibility.

Vice-Chair Stephens asked if reorientation or relocation includes the case where a home is lifted and replaced. Planner Grahn replied that the amendment addresses relocation of placement. It would be more horizontal on the lot or turned around, rather than vertical up and down.

The Staff recommended that the HPB forward a positive recommendation to the Planning Commission and the City Council on these amendments to the LMC.

Vice-Chair Stephens opened the public hearing.

There were no comments.

Vice-Chair Stephens closed the public hearing.

Board Member Holmgren liked the direction they were going with these amendments. She understood that many people are afraid of the changes, but she thought it was very positive for the people who live in Park City.

Vice-Chair Stephens was comfortable with the amendments because it is restrictive. He is not a design professional, but he was pleased with what the Planning Department has been doing as far as design approvals.

**MOTION:** Board Member Holmgren moved to forward a POSITIVE recommendation to the Planning Commission and the City Council to adopt an ordinance amending the Land Management Code of Park City to amend the Architectural Review Section 15-2.5-7, and Section 15-2.6-8, Purposes of the Preservation Board; Section 15-11-5 Relocation and/or Reorientation of a historic building or historic structure, Section 15-11-13. Board Member Hewett seconded the motion.

**VOTE:** The motion passed unanimously.

The meeting adjourned at 6:50 p.m.

Approved by \_\_\_\_\_  
David White, Chair  
Historic Preservation Board