

PARK CITY MUNICIPAL CORPORATION
HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD
MINUTES OF AUGUST 2, 2017

BOARD MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE: Douglas Stephens, Puggy Holmgren,
Lola Beatlebrox, Jack Hodgkins

EX OFFICIO: Bruce Erickson, Anya Grahn, Hannah Tyler, Polly Samuels
McLean, Louis Rodriquez

ROLL CALL

Chair Stephens called the meeting to order at 5:00 p.m. and noted that all Board Members were present except Randy Scott, who was excused.

ADOPTION OF MINUTES

June 7, 2017

MOTION: Board Member Beatlebrox moved to APPROVE the minutes of June 7, 2017 as written. Board Member Hodgkins seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS

There were no comments.

STAFF/BOARD COMMUNICATIONS AND DISCLOSURES

Planner Anya Grahn stated that because Labor Day falls on the same week as the HPB meeting, the meeting would be moved to September 20th, 2017.

Planner Grahn reminded everyone that the Historic Preservation Board and the City Council are scheduled to hold a special meeting at 9:30 on August 29th to talk about the Historic District Grant Program. Once she confirms that date with the consultant she will notify the Board.

Director Erickson reported that the City Council would be appointing two new members to the Historic Preservation Board the following evening, and re-appointing Board Members Holmgren and Beatlebrox.

CONTINUATIONS – Public hearing and continue to date specified.

424 Woodside Avenue – HDDR Review for Reorientation - Reorientation (rotation) of a "Significant" Structure towards Woodside Avenue and lifting of the

Historic Structure 7 feet 7 ¾ inches. The primary façade of the Significant Structure is currently oriented towards Main Street and the applicant is proposing to rotate the structure 180 degrees so that the primary façade is oriented towards Woodside Avenue. Upon reorientation, the Historic Structure would be lifted 7 feet 7 ¾ inches. (Application PL-16-03379)

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

MOTION: Board Member Puggy Holmgren moved to CONTINUE the item at 424 Woodside Avenue to a date uncertain. Board Member Beatlebrox seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

REGULAR AGENDA – Discussion, Public Hearing and Possible Action

1. 632 Deer Valley Loop —Disassembly/Reassembly (Panelization) and Material Deconstruction—Significant House. The applicant is proposing to disassemble and reassemble the north, east, and west walls of the existing historic house on its lot. In addition, the applicant will be removing non-historic broken wood stairs and overgrown landscaping; historic c.1918 floor structure; c.1941 enclosed porch addition; c.1969 rear addition; c.1918 fire-damaged roof structure; c.1918 brick chimney; non-historic c.1969 concrete block chimney; c.1969 T-11 siding; 18 linear feet of the historic c.1918 west wall; historic c.1918 front porch and c.1969 ornamental porch posts; c.1930 exterior door on north façade; non-historic service door on west elevation; 9 non-historic single-pane, replacement windows. (Application PL-PL-17-03512)

Planner Grahn reported that some of the Board members visited the site prior to this meeting; however, there was not a quorum present. They walked around the house and talked about the applicant's plans and where the subdivision would occur to give everyone a general understanding of the site. Planner Grahn commented on noticeable conditions. A hole in the wall from previous exploratory demolition revealed wood horizontal planks, a framed wall, the novelty siding, some Bricktex, and the T-11 on the exterior. Those who looked inside the house found it to be in poor condition. The back half was burned out.

Board Member Hodgkins noted that during the site visit a measurement was taken of the interior wall. Planner Grahn remarked that the inside of the wall was measured to see if it was historic dimensional lumber. It was only ¾" deep.

Planner Grahn provided a brief history of the home. It was owned by the BLM until 2013, when they granted a land pad to the Bertagnole family, who were the former owners. From 2013 to 2014 there were a series of meetings and appeals over whether or not the building should be designated as historic. It remained on the Historic Sites Inventory as Significant, as the Bertagnole's withdrew their appeal. In 2016 the Bertagnole's sold it to a new owner, and they went through the plat amendment process to create a legal lot of record from the metes and bounds parcel that the BLM had granted. In 2017 it was sold to the current owner and they would like to redevelop the site. The Staff was in the process of going through the subdivision to subdivide the one lot that was created in 2016 into two lots.

Planner Grahn stated that the HPB was being asked to review the material deconstructions and the plans for panelization.

Planner Grahn stated that based on the Sanborn maps and the physical evidence that is still visible in the house, she believed it was built as a two-room cabin or a hall-parlor with a side porch. It remained that way through 1904. By the 1927 Sanborn there was an addition to the front, which created the symmetrical gable that can be seen today. The side porch remained. It was still showing the same in the 1941 tax card. By 1969 a rear addition was added and the porch was expanded.

Planner Grahn presented slides showing the parts of the house that can be seen today and where the additions occurred. She presented an old photo which showed a building in the back. She was unsure whether it was a shed further in the back or whether it was actually attached to the house. There is no documentation to show that the house had a rear addition before 1969. Planner Grahn pointed out that in looking at the structure today, there is no longer a symmetrical gable and the porch has been enclosed and obliterated. Planner Grahn presented a photo showing the condition of the rear addition. It was damaged in a fire in 1999 and the house has been vacant ever since.

Planner Grahn reported that the applicant initially wanted to do a complete reconstruction of the house. She and Chief Building Official, Dave Thacker, conducted a site visit and compared the structural engineer's findings. They found that even though the house is in poor condition, it could be a lot worse given that it has been exposed to nature for nearly 20 years. Planner Grahn stated that they concluded the best approach would be to panelize the structure, which would save the two sidewalls and the front wall. The south wall was damaged by the fire.

Planner Grahn remarked that they were proposing panelization. However, if they find that the panels are in worse condition than they originally thought and the panels cannot be salvaged, it would come back to the HPB for reconstruction.

Planner Grahn noted that the first criteria is that the structural engineer has certified that the historic building cannot be reasonably moved intact. She believed that was obvious. The back half is fairly burned out. The fire went up into the roof structure of the historic building and the structure is decimated there as well. Planner Grahn remarked that moving the structure intact was not an option.

Planner Grahn thought panelization would abate demolition of the historic building and preserve some of the historic material. The intent is to save three out of the four historic walls. The south wall and the roof would have to be reconstructed.

Planner Grahn reported that the Chief Building found it to be a dangerous building on August 21, 2013. One of the questions asked on site was why it took so long for the Park City Building Department to give a Notice and Order. She explained that the BLM still owned the property in 1999, and the City was not able to take action until it was under private ownership. Planner Grahn stated that David Thacker found that it was still a very dangerous building, and that was reiterated in his letter.

Planner Grahn stated that another criteria relates to whether or not there are unique conditions. The Staff found it very unique that a building has stayed standing after such a severe fire for as long as it has. Even though the back half of the roof has caved in probably caused some shifting, keeping the panels is better than scraping and starting over. Planner Grahn pointed out that the applicant has demonstrated that panelization would preserve a greater amount of historic material.

Planner Grahn commented on the materials deconstruction. She noted that the site is overgrown and there is no historic material to salvage. The applicant was proposing to re-landscape the lot and clean it up. The re-landscaping will not require HPB review because it does not impact historic materials.

In terms of the structure system, Planner Grahn stated that when the Bertagnole's filed their appeal they provided evidence that they believed parts of the house were single-wall construction consistent with the mining era. Looking at it today, there was some framing with horizontal planks on the interior and siding on the exterior. The applicant was proposing to panelize the north, east, and west walls. Therefore, the scope of work is necessary to rehabilitate the building. They will try to salvage the walls in the largest pieces possible. The structure will be updated and the walls will be put on top as a cladding.

Planner Grahn stated that there are two additions on the house. The first was on the side of the house. She reviewed a photo showing the original open porch

that was enclosed sometime after 1949, and then extended in 1969 when the addition was added. She noted that the porch no longer contributes because it does not reflect the workmanship, feeling, and association. There was no evidence of old porch posts. The Staff finds that this is no longer contributory. It is beyond the midpoint of the historic house, and it is not a primary elevation. The Staff believed it could and should be demolished.

Planner Grahn remarked that the second addition occurred in 1969. They know the age based on the tax records and the Sanborn maps. The addition was in the way of where the application is proposing to subdivide the light. The Staff finds that the addition built in 1969 was not contributory to the historic integrity and historical significance of the structure, and it can be demolished.

Planner Grahn indicated the portion of the roof that had caved in due to the fire, which was putting stress on the historic roof members. The historic roof structure had a 9:12 pitch and dimensional framing; however, a lot of it had been fire damaged and burned out. The applicant was proposing to demolish the roof structure and reconstruct the roof. The Staff found this to be necessary for the restoration and rehabilitation. Planner Grahn stated that the Staff looked at the roof structure with the Chief Building Official in hopes that some of the members could be salvaged, but they all looked bad.

Planner Grahn pointed to a brick chimney in the center of the house that appears to be original to the historic house. She was unsure how the chimney could be salvaged given the structure of the roof. The applicant was proposing to reuse the brick to reconstruct a new chimney. The Staff had added a condition of approval to make sure the chimney is reconstructed properly. Planner Grahn pointed to a second chimney on the porch, which she believed was added in the 1960's. It is not historic and does not contribute to the historic integrity. The second chimney could probably be removed.

Planner Grahn commented on the exterior walls, which was clad in a mustard yellow T-11 wood siding. That siding also added in 1969 and appears to have been nailed over some Bricktek siding that covered the shiplap siding. Because the Staff was unsure of the condition of the historic wood siding, a condition of approval was added to make sure the applicant will keep any salvageable siding. The Staff will give them approval in writing and make sure that any reproduction siding matches the original in every aspect.

Planner Grahn remarked that 18 linear feet of the west wall would need to be removed in order to accommodate the transitional element between the historic house and the new addition. She had indicated that line in red. Planner Grahn noted that there is no foundation and the house will be lifted no more than 2' to pour a new basement foundation. The new house will be placed on top of the foundation. The porch also has new materials. The porch posts were probably

added in 1969. The roof structure looked original, but the decking was probably replaced at some point. The applicant planned to restore the porch to its original appearance as shown in the tax photo.

Planner Grahn stated that there were two existing doors on the house. The Staff would determine whether or not the historic front door could be salvaged and reused as an operable door. The Staff will make that determination in writing. A second exterior door on the enclosed porch addition is a hollow wood door that is not historic and does not contribute to the historic significance of the house.

Planner Grahn stated that many of the windows currently in place are either homemade or the original openings that have aluminum windows, or the openings have changed. Once the applicant removes the T-11 siding, they will have a better idea of what is behind it and where the original windows were located. Therefore, a condition of approval was added to state how the applicant will work with the Staff to identify the original window openings, and to make sure they update the preservation plan and restore the original openings where possible. Planner Grahn thought the ones shown in blue were likely historic window openings. The ones shown in red were on the non-historic addition.

Chair Stephens asked if there was a plan for how the panels would be stored. Planner Grahn stated that the panels would be stored vertically onsite with plywood behind them to provide rigidity. They will be stacked in a frame and tarped and protected from the weather. A condition of approval stated that if there is any further damage during the storage, the City will hold part of the financial guarantee.

Chair Stephens had visited the site last week but he had not gone inside. He understood from the presentation that there is framing inside but the original structure is board on board. Planner Grahn thought it was difficult to determine because it did not have the traditional single-wall construction that is normally seen, which is horizontal siding and vertical plank. It was stud walls with plank on the outside and plank on the inside, and siding on the outside. However, some of the photos taken by the Bertagnole's show that in other places of the house it looks like the horizontal plank seen in single-wall construction.

Board Member Hodgkins asked about the plot plan. Planner Grahn reviewed the plan that was in the packet for the City Council agenda the following evening. Mr. Hodgkins asked how it compared to the early Sanborn maps in terms of the shape and size of the site. He asked if it was the same as the original lot. Planner Grahn replied that she would have to double-check the Sanborn maps, but she recalled that it was one of 14 houses that were randomly scattered on the hillside. Planner Grahn presented the 1907 Sanborn map, which showed it as an open, rural lot.

Board Member Beatlebrox understood that the new addition would be on the rear. Planner Grahn replied that the addition the applicant was currently proposing would come off the side. She explained that the south wall of the historic house is the rear wall. That wall has to be rebuilt because it is fire damaged. With the way the street is and how the lot lines are drawn, the applicant will add a single-car garage with living space above just to the side of the historic house.

Board Member Hodgkins asked if there was a 1930s or 1940s map. Planner Grahn had a 1929 Sanborn map available. Director Erickson did not believe the lot configuration that was transferred from the BLM under color of title reflect the lot lines, because that section of town was not subdivided in the original Park City Survey or the Snyder's addition. They were simply squatters on mine claims. The subdivision reflects the property from BLM as part of the mine claim from Bertagnole.

Chair Stephens stated that based on past experiences, he is always nervous when they panelize a building like this and what happens to the material afterwards. He assumed the siding was in fairly good shape having been covered up. However, many times during the construction process it is just easier not to work with it. Chair Stephens believed the Staff had included the necessary constraints to make sure it is worked with. For that reason, he was comfortable with the Staff recommendation.

Board Member Beatlebrox was thrilled that this project looked like a blessing for the area. She has watched those three homes and she was sorry that the BLM still owned the other two. Ms. Beatlebrox was excited to see the progress of this project.

Chair Stephens opened the public hearing.

There were no comments.

Chair Stephens closed the public hearing.

Director Erickson stated that a motion would be to approve the reconstruction of the historic house and material deconstruction of non-historic and non-contributory materials at 632 Deer Valley Loop pursuant to the following findings of fact, conclusions of law, and conditions of approval found in the Staff report.

MOTION: Board Member Beatlebrox moved to APPROVE the reconstruction of the historic house and the material deconstruction of non-historic and non-contributory materials as stated by Director Erickson. Board Member Holmgren seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

Findings of Fact – 632 Deer Valley Loop

1. The property is located at 632 Deer Valley Drive.
2. The site is designated as Significant on the Historic Sites Inventory.
3. Based on Sanborn Fire Insurance map analysis, the house was constructed as a two-room frame dwelling c.1900. Between 1912 and 1918, the structure was expanded to create the four-room cottage seen today by adding a new addition across the façade. A front porch was also built at this time.
4. Following the end of the Mature Mining Era (1894-1930), an open porch on the west elevation was enclosed. This porch was later expanded again in the c.1969 remodel to create a larger mudroom that extended beyond the south wall of the historic house and on to the c.1969 rear addition that was constructed.
5. In 1981, William and Julie Bertagnole purchased the property from Harold and Mary Dudley and used it as an income property.
6. On May 17, 1999, a fire severely damaged the rear portion of the house. The house has been abandoned since that date.
7. On May 2, 2013, the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) granted the Bertagnoles a land patent for ownership of the parcel.
8. On August 21, 2013, the Park City Building Department issued a Notice and Order to Vacate and Repair the structure due to fire damage and the dilapidated state of the building.
9. On November 13, 2013, the Historic Preservation Board (HPB) held a Determination of Significance (DOS) hearing and found that the house should remain designated as —Significantll on the City’s Historic Sites Inventory (HSI).
10. The Bertagnoles appealed the HPB’s determination of significance on April 15, 2014, to the Board of Adjustment (BOA). It was remanded back to the HPB for further review due to the applicant submitting additional information; the HPB reviewed the application again on May 21, 2014, and the Bertagnoles again appealed the determination.
11. On July 9, 2014, the Bertagnoles withdrew their appeal of the DOS.
12. In February 2016, the Bertagnoles sold the property to 632 DVL, LLC.

13. On October 20, 2016, the Park City Council approved the Lilac Hill Subdivision as Ordinance No. 16-32.

14. On March 2, 2017, the property was purchased by the current owners, Lilac Hill LLC.

15. On March 9, 2017, the Planning Department received a subdivision application to subdivide the existing lot into two lots of record. The proposed subdivision was heard by the Park City Planning Commission on July 12, 2017. The subdivision is dependent on the HPB allowing for the rear addition on the south elevation to be removed. The plat has not yet been approved by City Council.

16. On March 28, 2017, the Planning Department received a Historic District Design Review (HDDR) application for the property at 632 Deer Valley Loop; the application was deemed complete on April 11, 2017. The HDDR has not yet been approved as it is dependent on the HPB's review for Material Deconstruction and the proposed disassembly/reassembly (—PanelizationII) of the historic house.

17. The applicant proposes to panelize the historic c.1900-1912 historic four-room house. The proposal to disassemble/reassemble (panelize) the house complies with LMC 15-11-14 Disassembly and Reassembly of a Historic Building or Historic Structure. A structural engineer has found that the Historic Building cannot be reasonably moved intact due to its poor structural condition. The proposed disassembly and reassembly will abate demolition of the Historic Structure; the existing roof is severely compromised due to the c.1999 fire and the structure is no longer structurally sound. Panelization will preserve a greater amount of materials than a complete reconstruction. The Building Department issued a Notice and Order on August 21, 2013, and the Chief Building Official found that this was a dangerous building on July 26, 2017. There are unique conditions that warrant the panelization of this structure including its poor structural condition and that panelization will preserve a greater amount of historic materials.

18. The applicant intends to remove broken wood stairs leading from the gravel parking area to the front porch and clean-up the overgrown landscaping on the site. The proposed scope of work on the site design does not impact any historic materials and thus does not require HPB review.

19. The applicant proposes to remove the existing floor structure that rests directly on dirt and construct a new wall structure. The proposed scope of work is required for the rehabilitation of the house.

20. The applicant proposes to remove a c.1941 enclosed porch located on the west elevation; the enclosed porch was further expanded in 1969 and no longer maintains its integrity as it does not reflect the workmanship, feeling, and association with the Mature Mining Era (1894-1930). The addition is non-contributory to the historic integrity and historical significance of the structure and can be demolished.

21. The applicant is also proposing to remove a c.1969 rear addition along the south elevation. The addition is non-contributory to the historic integrity and historical significance of the structure and can be demolished.

22. The applicant proposes to reconstruct the roof as the existing gable roof structure was severely damaged by the 1999 fire and has been exposed to the natural elements since that time. The proposed scope of work is necessary for the restoration and rehabilitation of the building.

23. The applicant proposes to salvage and reconstruct the existing c.1900 brick chimney. The material demolition of the chimney is necessary in order to reconstruct the roof.

24. The applicant proposes to demolish a metal chimney flue on the south elevation and a concrete block chimney on the west elevation—both of these were likely added during the c.1969 remodel. These additions do not contribute to the historic integrity and historical significance of the structure and may be demolished.

25. The applicant proposes to remove the existing T-11 wood siding that was introduced in c.1969 and previous layers of Bricktex and other siding that may be covering the original c.1900 wood siding. The removal of the non-historic siding is necessary for the restoration of the historic wood siding.

26. The applicant proposes to construct a new addition along the west elevation of the historic house, which will require the material deconstruction of 18 linear feet of the west wall in order to accommodate a transitional element between the historic house and new addition. The proposed exterior changes will not destroy the exterior architectural features of the subject property which are compatible with the character of the historic site.

27. The applicant proposes to construct a new foundation beneath the historic house, removing any remnants of a historic foundation or piers that may currently exist. The material deconstruction of the deteriorated floor system is necessary in order to rehabilitate the historic house.

28. The applicant proposes to reconstruct the historic porch based on photographic evidence. The current framing is in poor condition and has settled.

The historic hip roof is failing and is supported by ornamental metal posts, likely introduced in c.1969 remodel. The proposed material deconstruction is necessary in order to restore the appearance of the original porch.

29. The applicant proposes to restore the four-panel door with half-light on the north façade; the material deconstruction is necessary for the restoration of the house. The applicant proposes to demolish a non-historic service door on the west elevation; the door does not contribute to the historical integrity or historical significance of the house.

30. It is unclear if the existing window openings are historic or were introduced as part of the c.1969 remodel. Only the double-hung windows on the east and west sides may be the original openings; however, all of the existing windows are replacement, single-pane windows built-in place or with aluminum frames. The applicant is proposing to restore the original window openings with new wood windows. The material deconstruction is necessary in order to restore the original window openings.

31. There are nine (9) non-historic windows on the enclosed porch addition on the west elevation as well as the non-historic addition across the south elevation. These windows do not contribute to the historical significance of the house and can be removed along with the non-historic additions.

Conclusions of Law – 632 Deer Valley Loop

1. The proposal complies with the Land Management Code requirements pursuant to the HR-M District and regarding historic structure deconstruction and reconstruction. The proposal meets the criteria for Disassembly and Reassembly pursuant to LMC 15-11-14. Disassembly and Reassembly of a Historic Building or Historic Structure.

Conditions of Approval 632 Deer Valley Loop

1. Final building plans and construction details for the historic house shall reflect substantial compliance with the HDDR proposal stamped in on June 13, 2017. 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. Written plans detailing the disassembly and reassembly steps and procedures shall be submitted and approved by the Planning and Building Departments as part of the building permit.

3. The applicant shall document through photographic means the disassembly of the building. As each component is disassembled, its physical condition shall be noted, particularly if it differs from the condition stated in the pre-disassembly documentation.

4. The wall panels shall be protected with rigid materials, such as sheets of plywood. The wall panels shall be securely stored on-site until needed for reassembly. The City may hold a portion of the financial guarantee should further damage or destruction occurs to the panels while they are stored on site.

6. When reassembling the structure, its original orientation and siting shall be approximated as close as possible.

7. Should the historic chimney not be able to be removed in one piece, the applicant shall disassemble the chimney in the largest workable pieces possible. All the elements of the chimney shall be systematically separated from the chimney. The markings shall be removable or made on surfaces that will be hidden from view when the chimney is reassembled. The process of the disassembly shall be recorded through photographic means.

8. Where the historic exterior materials cannot be repaired, they will be replaced with materials that match the original in all respects: scale, dimension, texture, profile, material and finish. Prior to replacement, the applicant shall demonstrate to the Planning Director that the materials are no longer safe and/or serviceable and cannot be repaired to a safe and/or serviceable condition. The Planning Director shall approve the removal of the historic materials in writing prior to any removal of the materials. The Historic Preservation Plan shall be updated, as necessary, to reflect the conditions of the original wood siding.

9. The applicant shall work with the Historic Preservation Planner to determine whether or not the historic door on the historic house can be salvaged and reused as an operable door on the rehabilitated house. The Historic Preservation Planner shall make a determination in writing prior to material deconstruction on the door. The applicant shall also be responsible for recording addendums to the Historic Preservation Plan with the Summit County Recorder's Office.

10. Following the removal of the non-historic T-11 siding, the applicant shall update his Historic Preservation Plan with a conditions report detailing the locations of original window openings. The applicant shall base any window modifications on the façade (north elevation) or secondary facades (east and west elevations) that will be visible from the Woodside Avenue right-of-way on physical, measured evidence uncovered during the demolition process. Planning staff shall review and approve the updated window configuration based on this new physical evidence.

2. Consideration of an ordinance amending the Land Management Code Section 15, Chapters 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, and 2.5 regarding roof pitches and limiting the use of flat roofs to protect streetscape façades.
(Application PL-16-03352)

Planner Hannah Tyler noted that the HPB has previously seen these LMC amendments to address flat roofs in Old Town in all of the H Districts. She would quickly review the amendments and requested that the Board provide feedback. The Staff would be presenting these amendments to the Planning Commission next week and passing along the feedback from the HPB.

Planner Tyler remarked that the biggest changes were to the definitions to add clarification. The names were very close and it was easy to get them confused. The definition for primary roof form did not change, but they ended up changing contributory roof form to bring it back to how they were looking at the streetscape with some of the contributory status. Director Erickson explained that the primary roof form is the largest chunk of roof, and the contributory roof form is from the streetscape and contributes to the rhythm and scale of the street.

Planner Tyler added clarification on c) roof pitch. This is where they try to address the roof pitch at the street. She noted an error in the language which states, "The roof pitch of a structure's primary roof form shall be between....". She corrected "primary roof form" that to say "contributory roof form." The Staff requested that to be between 7:12 and 12:12 to maintain a pitch rather than having flat roofs on the streetscape that the Staff finds would not contribute to the overall style of Old Town. The language was also changes to say, "They shall occupy a minimum of 20' from the front façade", meaning that anything after 20' feet could then go into a flat roof or less than 7:12. Planner Tyler emphasized that the intent was to add clarification on how they were treating the roof at the street.

Chair Stephens understood that the contributory roof and the primary roof could be the same roof. Planner Grahn replied that they could be but they do not have to be.

Planner Tyler stated that the intent is to add flexibility to keep it from being so predictable that every house looks the same. There was a push to allow some type of flat roof in these designs. Chair Stephens asked if part of the roof on the streetscape, if it is not the primary roof or the contributory roof, could be flat. Planner Grahn replied that as long as it is clear that it is a secondary roof form, for example a porch roof, it would probably be acceptable because the pitched roof would be the most visible at the street. Porch roofs or side roofs would be the secondary roof form. Chair Stephens stated that he was not as concerned on a single lot. However, on a larger lot a flat roof on a larger new home could

help minimize the massing from the street and keep it more in the rhythm of the street. He was having a hard time finding the flexibility and the intent.

Planner Grahn thought they needed to keep in mind that in revising the Design Guidelines they have been pushing for the modules to match the volumes of historic structures. She thought that would help them key in on the secondary forms. Chair Stephens clarified that he wanted a better understanding of how the Planning Commission would interpret that. He asked if it was just that they were trying to avoid flat roofs except for porches. Planner Grahn replied that the Staff would prefer not to see any flat roofs on the street front, unless it is on a porch or another element. The intent is to have a pitched roof because it contributes more to the streetscape.

Director Erickson stated that the intention is to hold rooftop decks below 23' and minimize the appearance of flat roofs from the primary façade, but also consider them positively if they reduce the appearance of bulk and mass of the building. For example, if the building looks bigger for whatever reason, they would probably look at a flat roof to reduce that appearance.

Board Member Hodgkins asked if there would still be a height limit on that flat roof. Director Erickson stated that if it is not a deck the height could be up to 17', which is the zone height. Planner Grahn remarked that if someone intends to add a rooftop deck, the maximum height would be 23' with the railings to avoid having third or fourth story party decks.

Chair Stephens understood the interpretation and he agreed with it because it could allow for good architecture. Director Erickson noted that the pictures this amendment was modeled after were not included in the Staff report. The HPB previously reviewed some of the picture during their discussion about rhythm and scale on the street for the Historic District Guidelines. They developed the model to reduce volume and mass and maintain the pitched roofs as best as possible. The Staff also wanted to make sure they could accommodate a transitional element between the historic structure and new construction that may want a flat roof.

Chair Stephens thought the pictures would be helpful. His concern was how the design community would interpret the flexibility. Director Erickson believed there was motivation on the part of the City Council to eliminate flat roofs generally. The Staff see theoretical benefit in a green roof, as well as a benefit in the less than steep roof to reduce bulk, mass and scale, and the effect of the contributory roof form. Director Erickson commented on the flat roof at the Washington school and other structures with flat roofs. Director Erickson stated that if the HPB votes to move this forward, he would work with Planners Grahn and Tyler to see if they can clarify that the contributory roof form flat area cannot be more than x-amount of the total contributory roof. He noted that the 20' modular is

roughly that of a historic building form module. Once they step out of that module it can probably go to a flat section and transition.

Chair Stephens was satisfied that his concerns had been answered. He does not want all the new construction in Old Town to look the same and this amendment allows creativity for the design community to design something that helps keep the rhythm and pattern. Chair Stephens thought this was going in the right direction.

Board Member Beatlebrox understood that the contributory roof form was not the secondary roof form, but the secondary roof form can be a flat roof. However, the language states, "a roof that is not part of the contributory roof form may be below the 7:12 roof pitch". She thought that would be the secondary roof form by definition. Planner Grahn answered yes. Planner Tyler stated that the language should correctly read, "a secondary roof form may be below 7:12".

Chair Stephens asked if the zone height was 27' or 35'. Planner Grahn stated that the zone height is 27' above existing grade. Chair Stephens read, "A structure containing a flat roof shall have a maximum height of 35' measured from the lowest..." Planner Grahn thought that related to the interior height, but she would relook at the numbers. Planner Tyler noted that if he was referring to the language on page 272, Item 4, that is Code and the language is correct. It basically allows a maximum of 35 from the lowest floor plane to the top plate. It is the internal height. Director Erickson clarified that the external measurement is 27' and the internal measurement is 35'. Chair Stephens confirmed that there is not a height benefit for doing a flat roof. Director Erickson replied that he was correct.

Board Member Hodgkins believed they were focused on this in an effort to get some continuity in roofscape as they look out over Old Town. He asked if there were spots on the hills that would not be considered in this jurisdiction where they could end up with large flat roof structures that would work against what they were trying to accomplish. Planner Grahn thought there could be further down on Lowell as it gets closer to the Resort, or directly across going up the hill. Director Erickson believed the rest of the Historic District was well protected from incursions other than the R-1 on Deer Valley. There may also be weak spots in the RC zone north of the Library where those lots on Woodside and Empire are in the HRM and the HR-1 zones. Planner Tyler stated that parts of Woodside down by the Library Park was in the Historic District, and the rest was in Resort Commercial. Director Erickson remarked that that transition area could be affected as well.

Director Erickson stated that Echo Spur took the green roof option as opposed to the design review option. At the time the Planning Director had the authority to approve a green roof, which allowed it to be flat rather than meet the Design

Guidelines. The one-story contemporary house at 11th and Lowell also took the green roof option. He pointed out that it was still in the model, but the intrusive rooftop decks would be eliminated once this ordinance is approved.

Board Member Beatlebrox referred to the public comment from Pam Malpin and Bill Tew that was included in the Staff report. They were concerned about the infill on Rossi Hill Drive and Echo Spur road. She asked if that would be allowed if this ordinance is passed. Planner Grahn replied that with the proposed ordinance they would at least be required to have a pitched roof at the front of those buildings. She believed that would reduce the amount of flat roof that is visible on those designs.

Director Erickson clarified that the new Historic District Guidelines, including this ordinance, would revise the larger windows down to a more architecturally compatible size and scale of the windows. The materials could probably move forward as shown. The flat roof deck would go away. Solar panels on the roof are not defined as a green roof so they have to add grass. Director Erickson believed the solar panels were too steep to meet the current Code. He assumed that three-quarters of the unit would not be approved.

Chair Stephens understood that you could have a flat green roof but without an active deck on it. Planner Grahn answered yes. A roof plan would have a pitch at the street, and could have a series of steps depending on the grade. However, if the majority of the roof form would be flat, it is required to be green. Chair Stephens stated that in reading the green roof ordinance, it thought it was one or the other. Someone would either choose the green roof ordinance or the design review process. He understood that if a builder or designer chooses the green roof ordinance they could design a totally flat roof. Planner Grahn explained that under the new provisions, they would be required to pitch the roof at the street for the first 20'. After that it could be flat at the zone height, which is 23'. Chair Stephens clarified that the new ordinance would impact the green roof ordinance. Director Erickson replied that he was correct. Chair Stephens asked if that was stated in the proposed ordinance so there would be no confusion. Planner Grahn thought the language regarding the contributory roof form and the requirements for a flat roof would make it clear.

Director Erickson understood that the HPB was saying that the contributory roof form could not be a green roof or flat at zone height. It would have to be 23' for the deck height, or a secondary roof form. Planner Grahn offered to add a sentence to clarify the intent.

Director Erickson stated that this proposed ordinance would go to the Planning Commission and then to the City Council. If the HPB was comfortable with this ordinance and did not need to see it again, they could forward a recommendation this evening.

Chair Stephens opened the public hearing.

Ruth Meintsma, 305 Woodside, stated that the contributory label was genius and she commended the person who came up with it. Ms. Meintsma remarked that primary is the roof shape with the largest area. She understood that largest area means it has to be 51% or more. She pointed out that a pitched roof could be a lot more area if it was calculated by the decking.

Director Erickson replied that the total level squared. They were not counting the pitch.

Ms. Meintsma noted that the language talks about 20' to the rear of the building measured from the façade as viewed from the public right-of-way. However, she asked if there could still be confusion as to what is the façade.

Planner Grahn stated that she could add "primary façade", but the façade is always the face of the building. She did not think there would be too much confusion.

Ms. Meintsma understood that if there are two public right-of-ways, it has to be the primary facade. For example, if a house is on the corner, it would be on the main street.

Chair Stephens closed the public hearing.

Chair Stephens liked how they were not permitting decks, hot tubs, outdoor cooking areas and seating areas on green roofs. He commented on the parapets around it and asked if there was something in the Building Code to address it. Director Erickson stated that it is not perfectly clear in the Building Code. Some buildings with green roofs do not have parapets at fence height, and other people claim they need to have the railings to meet OSHA standards. He did not believe there was a reason for the parapet for anyone doing maintenance on the roof.

Chair Stephens asked about stairs for access. Planner Grahn replied that stairs and access would be addressed on a case by case basis based on the size of the lot. Chair Stephens remarked that a green roof could be active at 23'. Director Erickson answered yes. Planner Grahn pointed out that an active deck would not be allowed at the zone height of 27'.

MOTION: Board Member Holmgren made a motion to move the proposed ordinance forward to the Planning Commission and the City Council for input and approval. Board Member Hodgkins seconded the motion.

Historic Preservation Board Meeting
August 2, 2017

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

The meeting adjourned at 5:54 p.m.

Approved by _____
Douglas Stephens, Chair
Historic Preservation Board

APPROVED