

PARK CITY MUNICIPAL CORPORATION  
HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD  
MINUTES OF DECEMBER 5, 2017

BOARD MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE: Douglas Stephens, Lola Beatlebrox, Puggy Holmgren, Jack Hodgkins, Randy Scott, Alex Weiner

EX OFFICIO: Bruce Erickson, Anya Grahn, Hannah Tyler, Polly Samuels McLean, David Thacker, Liz Jackson

---

Board Member Stephens was not present this evening. The Board elected a temporary Vice-Chair to conduct the meeting.

MOTION: Randy Scott moved to nominate Lola Beatlebrox as temporary Vice-Chair. Puggy Holmgren seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

#### ROLL CALL

Vice-Chair Beatlebrox called the meeting to order at 5:00 p.m. and noted that all Board Members were present except Doug Stephens and John Hutchings.

#### ADOPTION OF MINUTES

November 1, 2017

MOTION: Board Member Holmgren moved to APPROVE the minutes of November 1, 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

Planning Director Erickson noted that Planners Grahn and Tyler had put together a meeting schedule for the next year.

In anticipation of a longer meeting this evening, Director Erickson recommended that the presentations and comments focus on the facts and be held to 30 minutes for each group.

Planner Grahn reported that the HPB Chair, Douglas Stephens, got his dates crossed because the Board was meeting on Tuesday instead of the regular Wednesday. He was in Salt Lake and was not able to attend.

REGULAR AGENDA – Discussion, Public Hearing and Possible Action

1. 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)

Planner Hannah Tyler reviewed the proposal for reorientation of a historic structure at 424 Woodside. She provided a brief overview of what to expect in her power point due to the complexity of this item. She noted that the photographs and renderings in her presentation were provided by the project architect, Jonathan DeGray; as well as photographs from CRSA.

Joe Tesch, a representative for the applicant, thought it was inappropriate to be dealing with past applications. The application being presented this evening should stand on its own merits; or not. In his opinion, what occurred in past applications was irrelevant and should not be talked about.

Planner Tyler reported that the site is designated as Significant on the Park City Historic Sites Inventory. The historic structure currently faces east towards Main Street. The current proposal before the HPB this evening is just the re-orientation. However, she wanted to explain the entire proposal, which includes re-orientation of the structure 180 degrees towards Woodside. The applicant is proposing to lift the structure 7-feet 7-3/4-inches. They are proposing to panelize. The applicant plans to construct an addition on the near rear, which will be on the east side. They also intend to remodel the existing structure.

Planner Tyler emphasized that the HPB would only be looking at the re-orientation. The Staff was recommending denial of the request, and she would outline the specifics later in her presentation.

In reference to past applications, Planner Tyler stated that in 1993 a south addition created a duplex, and that contains both the garage and living space. It was identified in a slide she had up on the screen. In 2005 a plat amendment combined the three existing lots into one legal lot of record. Today, the lot is 75 feet wide. In 2011 there was both an HDDR and a request for a variance for the

lifting and rotation, the addition, and a remodel of this structure. Both the HDDR and the variance were denied.

Planner Tyler commented specifically on the developmental history. She presented a slide showing the 1889 and 1900 Sanborn maps. Summit County references that this structure was built in 1900. However, as shown in CRSA's Exhibit D, Intensive Level Survey, the title search produced mortgages that were pulled out in 1886. Because the structure appears in 1889, and based on the title search history, the Staff believes it was constructed prior to 1900. Planner Tyler noted that this was not unusual because recordkeeping was not always exact.

Planner Tyler reported that in 1889 the structure was a hall-parlor with a small addition on the back, and it faced Main Street. By 1900 it had changed. Planner Tyler presented photographs. She noted that the photos were old and the applicant had obtained them from the Museum. She presented a view of the property facing east. She noted that the central door was flanked by a window on each side. She presented a series of photos from the same years to help orient the Board with the surrounding structures and the common development pattern of facing town. Planner Tyler presented a clearer photo showing the principal façade facing Main Street. Woodside Avenue was present behind it. She pointed out that all of the structures facing east and on the east side of any street were connected to a series of pedestrian paths. This structure would have shared a pedestrian path with both the Park Avenue houses and the rest of the houses on Woodside; and they would have connected to Fourth Street.

Planner Tyler presented the 1907 map and noted that a front porch was constructed on the east side, and there was some type of porch in the back. By 1929 nothing had changed. She pointed to a photograph from 1930 indicating that porch. Planner Tyler remarked that there are more photographs of this structure than most structures. Typically, the Staff does not have the benefit of so much photographic evidence. Planner Tyler stated that by 1941 the rear section of that structure had been enclosed, and the porch flanked the entire rear. The tax appraisal photograph showed that the porch had been removed, which was also reflected in the 1941 Sanborn map.

Planner Tyler addressed the specifics to the Land Management Code, beginning with the relocation and reorientation analysis. She stated that for either Landmark or Significant sites the proposal must meet certain criteria and requirements. The Staff found that this proposal complies with the first criteria because the applicant submitted a structural engineers report certifying that the structure can be relocated without impacting the historic nature of the structure. They also submitted evidence that the structure would meet Building Code in its final resting location.

Planner Tyler stated that the next criteria would not be applicable because the site is a Significant site on the HSI. The next criteria did apply. For a Significant structure at least one of the following must be met: The proposed relocation or reorientation will abate demolition. She remarked that the structure is not threatened by demolition in its current location. There are no notice and orders on it; therefore, the proposal did not comply with that criteria. The next criteria is that the Planning Director and Chief Building Official have determined that there are unique conditions in its current location. Planner Tyler stated that Exhibit L of the Staff was the Planning Director and Chief Building Official determination. They did not find any hazardous conditions that could not be mitigated by keeping the structure in its current location, and there was no reason to relocate to mitigate existing conditions on the site. They also found that due to extensive material loss and loss of site context that the preservation would not be enhanced by the relocation.

Planner Tyler reported that the next was a series of four criteria, and the proposal must meet all four in order to comply with A3C of 15-11-13 of the LMC.

Number one. The historic context of the building has been so radically altered that the proposed relocation will enhance the ability to interrupt the historic character of the historic buildings and the historic district in its current setting. Planner Tyler stated that the Staff finds that the proposal does not comply with this criteria, because the structure maintains the relationship with its earlier setting through that siting in that lower terraced area. Also, this setting is so important to the development pattern of the historic district.

Number two. The proposed relocation will not diminish the overall physical integrity of the historic district, or diminish the historical associations used to define the boundaries of the district. The Staff does not find that the application complies with this criteria, because reorientation will diminish the overall physical integrity and the site's association with the important development patterns of the district. Planner Tyler stated that this was consistent with the last finding. The Staff specifically finds that the physical integrity of the site is defined by both the historic structure siting on the lot, and the remaining pieces of its essential historic form. The three pieces of the essential historic form that this site contains are its scale, context and material. She would talk about those three aspects later in her presentation.

Number Three. The historical integrity and significance of the historic building will not be diminished by relocation and/or reorientation. The Staff finds that the application does not comply with this criteria, because it will remove the last few character defining features of this site; which includes context, setting, and materials. Planner Tyler stated that it would compromise the Significance on the Historic Sites Inventory.

Number Four. The potential to preserve the historic building will be enhanced by its relocation. The Staff finds that it does not comply with the criteria. Restoration can occur in its current location, and there is no need to reorient in order to facilitate preservation. Planner Tyler thought it was important to note that the applicant could maximize development potential of the site in its current location. Footprint, setbacks, height, etc., could be maximized without having to rotate the structure.

Planner Tyler commented on materials loss and presented a rendering of the structure in its current location. The bottom of the screen was Woodside Avenue, and the areas in green identified the existing pieces of the structure that would be considered historic. This was all derived from the Historic Preservation Plan, which was shown as Exhibit F. Planner Tyler noted that the applicant intended to do further exploratory demolition to determine the historic materials. However, what was currently shown in the application is what the Staff has determined as historic. Planner Tyler stated that if the structure is rotated, the north and west wall that currently faces south and east will be interior walls. Material deconstruction will come before the HPB at a later date, but she believed this information was important in the analysis of the reorientation and the impacts to the historic structure and the materials that are left. Planner Tyler remarked that the green areas identify what will be left. She noted that only a small portion will be retained if the structure is reoriented.

Planner Tyler moved to the Historic Sites Inventory Analysis. The Staff finds that the site retains all aspects of essential historic form, including the scale, context and material. The Staff finds that the reorientation would diminish the site's significance and association with the Park City mining history, because it will remove those last few pieces that are retained on site.

Planner Tyler stated that because they have talked extensively about context and material, she discussed historic scale. She indicated a rendering of the existing conditions provided by the applicant. The structure is currently 2'9" to 4" above grade, and it clearly reads as a single story structure in the historic piece. Once the structure is lifted, it will be between 13'2" above grade and 1' above grade, which would not read as a single-story structure when viewed from a corner angle. Planner Tyler explained that the structure would be lifted so high in the air that it would not read as it should historically, and the scale of the structure would be augmented. The Staff did not find compliance with the Design Guidelines; B(3) Foundations, as well as Protections for Historic Sites, specifically for Orientation. The structure would be lifted 7-feet 7-3/4 inches, which is over two feet above what is permitted in the design guidelines. Planner Tyler stated that the Staff has not determined any exceptions found in D(4) of the Design Guidelines to permit that.

Planner Tyler summarized that the Staff does not find compliance with the Relocation or Reorientation criteria. They have concerns about compromising the historic designation and they do not find compliance with the Design Guidelines.

Director Erickson asked Planner Tyler to clarify the relevance of the east orientation of this form of building relative to the other buildings. Planner Tyler explained that the east orientation of the structure represents a development pattern where, prior to the automobile, the structures would face town. A lot of the structures were associated with the series of pedestrian paths. The most well-know is Shorty stairs on the east side of Marsac Avenue. Many stairs go to all those structures. Planner Tyler remarked that there are only a few structures left on the west side of town that face Main Street that have not been demolished. Therefore, the Staff has the opinion that it is very important to preserve this structure since it is one of the last remaining pieces of that very common development pattern.

Board Member Weiner had walked around the property. In order to maintain the orientation facing east, she wanted to know how the homeowner accesses the property now, and whether it was more difficult now as opposed to the early 1900s. She pointed out that nowadays people pull up in front their house and walk to the front door. Planner Tyler presented a photograph and noted the arrows pointing to the 1993 addition. There is a driveway that is used for access from Woodside Avenue that was facilitated through the 1993 addition. The homeowner goes through that addition to get to the historic structure.

Joe Tesch, representing the applicant, stated that there is no access from the Main Street side, whatsoever. It is very dangerous and all of the paths have been destroyed.

Jon Berkley stated that he and his wife Heather were the applicant and owners of 424 Woodside Avenue. Mr. Berkley clarified that there is no direct access to the miner's cabin from the expansion of '93. They would have to go down the expansion, out the back door, across the lot and come back up. Mr. Berkley pointed out that the only access are wooden steps from the street down to the back door. He emphasized that there is no access from the expansion.

Dina Blaes, representing the applicant, disclosed that her firm was hired as a Preservation Consultant for Park City from 2005 to 2012. Her firm did the Design Guidelines for the City, the Land Management Code revisions, and the Historic Site Inventories that were done in 2006, 2008, and the upgrades and updates in 2011.

Joe Tesch thanked the HPB for caring about all of this as a Board, and he thanked them as citizens for taking the time to serve on the Board. Mr. Tesch

commented on the size of the Staff report and he started thinking about getting back to the basics. He questioned what the Board was doing and why they were preserving these old homes. They are not livable or big enough for families. They do not accommodate a modern way of living. The homes do not fit, and yet they spend money and time preserving historic and semi-historic structures. In trying to understand why they do this, he looked at the purpose of the HPB, which 1) is to preserve the City's unique historic character. Further down to e) it says to communicate the benefits of historic preservation for education, prosperity and general welfare of the students. Mr. Tesch focused on prosperity, because the City made a business decision that Park City is a unique town. People who come to Park City love Old Town because of all the historic commercial buildings and miners' homes. It creates a certain ambiance and classic view that draws tourists to town. Mr. Tesch could find no other reason for promoting preservation. Most people who live in Park City today did not grow up in these miners shacks and they are not preserving their own heritage. They are creating a tourist attraction.

Mr. Tesch stated that the value of historic homes and semi-historic homes is what they look like. The tourists and the skiers do not go into those homes. They see them, and they see what miners' shacks look like. It is part of the ambiance and charm of Park City that draws people here. Mr. Tesch remarked that prosperity of the community was as close as he could come to a statement of why they were here. He asked the HPB to keep that in mind. It is the big picture when they are dealing with 200 pages of nit-picky regulations. He asked the Board to keep in mind what they were really here to do and why they were here to do it.

Mr. Tesch commented on the Staff report, which he found to be disappointing. He stated that Hannah Tyler was the most conscientious person he has ever dealt with in the Planning Department. The Staff report is very good and very thorough, but he thought the HPB needed to analyze it; because it is their job alone to decide whether or not this orientation should change. Reading through the Staff report, the Planning Staff gives their opinion, and the applicant also provided their comments. Mr. Tesch referred to the opinion of the Planning Director, Bruce Erickson, outlined in the Staff report, which obviously, he agreed with his Staff. Mr. Tesch made the point that it was only one opinion. He referred to the opinion of the Chief Building Official, David Thacker, who was an engineer and knows very little about planning. He questioned whether Mr. Thacker had previous experience with historic structures. Mr. Tesch pointed out that Mr. Thacker's opinion on this project would be whether or not it was structurally sound and other things such as whether the utilities are dangerous.

Mr. Tesch noted that each side has an expert and the HPB needs to decide who they find more credible. Mr. Tesch pointed out that Ms. Blaes, the applicant's expert, was tasked from 2005-2011 with writing these regulations in the LMC that

address historic preservation and working on the Historic Inventory. She understands the City and the reason behind these regulations. Mr. Tesch thought she deserved high marks for credibility.

Mr. Tesch stated that he was particularly disappointed with page 18 of the Staff report that talks about the decision on a prior application of the Board of Adjustment. The Staff made it sound like the BOA, on a different application, had already made the decision that there was not a hardship. Mr. Tesch reminded the HPB that the Board of Adjustment is a different body and they are not trained and experienced in the same matters as the HPB. Also, the BOA based their decision on the issue of whether there was a hardship. That is different from the issues the HPB needs to consider. Mr. Tesch requested that the HPB ignore the suggestion that the Board of Adjustment holds power over them. It does not and that conclusion is not justified.

Mr. Tesch stated that with the idea that the view and cityscapes of preserved historic building are the only things that are important, it does not do the City any good or provide assistance in economics if the historic structure cannot be seen. It becomes a useless historic structure. Mr. Tesch presented three pictures that were included in the Staff report. One was the historic structure as seen from Woodside Avenue. It has an aluminum roof that was placed in 1989. When the historic structure was built, the roof was wood shingles. Mr. Tesch disputed the idea that the structure only adds ambiance and charm to the City in its current location. He noted that there is a home, and a roof that is 7 to 10 feet below the surface of Woodside Avenue. Mr. Tesch presented a second photo of the east side that faces Main Street, that noted that the house could no longer be accessed from that side like it was when it was first built. There is no ability for that side to be the front of the house. Mr. Tesch explained why the applicant should be allowed some ability to rotate and raise the building. In spite of musing to the effect that it could be built out, if someone spends a lot of money refurbishing and restoring this historic home, and it is below ground, they would never get their money back. Nothing would ever be done and the City would have condemned this building to remain as is. It is not a gem to Park City as it exists, but it could be.

Mr. Tesch presented another photo of what the house would look like if it could be raised and turned. If the house could be reoriented as proposed, it would add ambiance and charm to Park City. Mr. Tesch outlined the proposed changes. The non-historic porch enclosure would be removed and returned to its original place. The historic front porch would be rebuilt. The front door would be rebuilt in its historic location. The historic windows on either side of the front door would be added back. All windows would be replaced with historically appropriate wood windows. All non-historic siding would be removed and replaced with historic appropriate materials. All non-historic roofing will be removed and replaced with historic appropriate materials. Mr. Tesch stated that these



changes would bring the current building, which has almost no historic elements to the outside, back to a preserved miner shack. He suggested that this was what was important. Mr. Tesch stated that whether or not the house used to face Main Street when there was a path that allowed access from Main Street is no longer relevant because the path is gone. He stated that if the applicant is allowed to do this, then the stated purpose of the Historic District Commission to preserve and enhance and restore would be met.

Director Erickson clarified that when Mr. Tesch said Main Street, he actually meant Park Avenue. Director Erickson pointed out that the Staff may have made the same mistake in their discussion. Jonathan DeGray replied that it was the Main Street side but the house faces Park Avenue. Director Erickson emphasized that the discussion was actually the Park Avenue access.

Vice-Chair Beatlebrox asked if Director Erickson was saying that there is access from Park Avenue. Director Erickson clarified that everyone keeps referring to Main Street, but it is actually Park Avenue. He pointed out that whether or not that access occurs is a finding the HPB would have to make. Director Erickson explained that the west side of the house facing the street is on Woodside Avenue. The east side of the house, which is the front, faces Park Avenue. Vice-Chair Beatlebrox understood that the house looks down on Park Avenue. Director Erickson answered yes.

Jonathan DeGray thought the clarification was accurate and beneficial. However, he stated for the record that there is no longer any access from this house directly to Park Avenue as it was historically in its historic context. He emphasized that that context is gone.

Board Member Hodgkins understood that Planner Tyler had said that the HPB was only reviewing the orientation of the building this evening. However, the comments were tied specifically to reorientation and raising the building. Mr. Hodgkins asked if the HPB has jurisdiction over the height of the raising of the building. Assistant City Attorney McLean answered no. He thought the two were closely tied together, which made it hard to parcel out the Board's decision.

Board Member Holmgren recalled a 2' limit. Assistant City Attorney McLean agreed that there is a 2' limit in the Guidelines. She explained that the Board's purview is the reorientation and not the height. The height is an independent issue and a Staff decision under the Historic District Design Review. Any appeal of that decision would go to the Board of Adjustment.

Dina Blaes stated that she planned to address that issue in her presentation, because she has a slightly different interpretation. As stated in the Design Guidelines, generally, not more or less than two feet. However, based on her understanding, the project as proposed does not exceed the height requirements

for this zone. Mr. DeGray replied that she was correct. Vice-Chair clarified that they were talking about the 27' height requirement. Mr. DeGray answered yes.

Mr. Tesch suggested that if the HPB agreed to the reorientation, they could condition it upon the height being granted.

Ms. Blaes commented on the highlights of the Staff report from the standpoint of the applicant, beginning with the reorientation. She specifically pointed to the criteria that specifically addresses hazardous conditions, and that the preservation of the building will be enhanced. Ms. Blaes believed this is where the applicant begins to diverge from the City's interpretation. With regard to the hazardous conditions, the applicant is concerned about the drainage problems. The City and the Building Official have talked about the ability to mitigate those drainage problem. Ms. Blaes stated that this was true right now. However, the project would result in the long-term complete solution of the drainage problems that this site deals with on a regular basis. While there are hazardous conditions that cause problems with regard to drainage because of the encroachment of the roadway, the reorientation and lifting of the project would take care of those problems in perpetuity and guarantee that it would not be a further issue for the Building Department. Ms. Blaes pointed out that if that type of problem keeps reoccurring, over time it will begin to diminish the integrity of the structure itself.

Ms. Blaes remarked that another component in this section of the Code asks if the project will enhance the preservation of the building. The applicant believes that it will due to key, long term preservation of the building. She pointed out that the easy rehabilitation projects in Park City have already been done, and only the challenging projects are left. Ms. Blaes remarked on the importance of looking at the ability to adapt the structure for contemporary use. The Staff reports talks about restoring this building as it is. She assumed it could be done, but the question is whether it was being modified for contemporary use like any other building in the City. Ms. Blaes stated that the City talks about development patterns and the Staff report fixated on these development patterns. She suggested that this proposal was another part of Park City's development pattern. Ms. Blaes emphasized that she would not recommend that the HPB approve this application if it would in any way jeopardize the significant status of the structure. In her presentation, she would show how the HPB could approve this application and still retain the integrity and status of the building.

Ms. Blaes stated that mitigating the negative impacts of adjacent and compatible development is also critical to the long term preservation of a structure like this; as well as the ability to restore character defining features and architectural elements. She stated that currently the primary façade faces Park Avenue has been completely lost. Very little of it reflects or conveys its significance of a mining era property. She believed this project would bring back important and critical historic components to this building as part of the project.

Ms. Blaes referred to page 33 of the Staff report, where the Staff notes that the preservation of the building cannot be enhanced by relocating it; that all the improvements and a restoration could be made in its current location. She disputed that statement. Ms. Blaes stated that the ability to adapt this project and allow it to become part of the continued development in Park City requires the structure to be reoriented and lifted.

Ms. Blaes referred to the next section of the ordinance on page 34 of the Staff report. The criteria talk about the context having been so radically altered that the proposed relocation will enhance the ability to interpret the historic character of the building. Ms. Blaes shared Mr. Tesch's position that this was a decision for the HPB. The zoning code talks about input from the Planning Director and the Building Official, which is critical to their decision-making. She also thought the applicant's input would be critical to their decision; but the decision is ultimately the Board's. Ms. Blaes remarked that their responsibility to preserve and enhance the historic resources within Old Town and the City is paramount. The applicant was trying to present information that would find the path to approving this application.

Ms. Blaes stated that an important point was interpreting the historic character of the building. Throughout the Staff report there is a reference to setting and location that is repeated over and over. She noted that one of the earlier Staff reports from July had a very intensive historic analysis of the structure, but it used criteria that was not relevant to this building. Ms. Blaes believed this was important because it was the point in the Staff report where the reliance on location and setting begins, and then it continues again and again. As a foundation of the decision-making and the arguments that are built in the Staff report, she thought it was important to understand the differentiation between Landmark and Significant; and how integrity is determined between what is traditionally National Park Service designation criteria versus essential historic form, which is very Park City specific criteria. Ms. Blaes believed it was developed for a very insightful and important point of view.

Ms. Blaes commented on the Historic Sites Inventory in Park City. She noted that prior to 2006 any project that came through the City went through a designation process before a building application would be reviewed. The zoning code indicated a list, but a list never existed. Ms. Blaes stated that a Reconnaissance Level survey was done in 1995, but it was surrounded by controversy and it was never adopted. The City rejected it. Ms. Blaes remarked that 2006 her firm was hired to do a comprehensive Reconnaissance level survey, along with the State Historic Preservation Office and Park City. The intent was to give the City a list and the resources it needed to help understand what was or was not important in Park City. Ms. Blaes presented a few buildings

to show that if they applied the National Register Designation Standards, which was in Park City's Code at the time, those buildings came off the inventory.

Assistant City Attorney McLean asked if Ms. Blaes was talking about the National Registry or the Park City HSI. Ms. Blaes clarified that these were all from the City's inventory. She stated that determination work sheets were used based on the zoning code, and words of "substantial compliance" with the zoning code. She noted that when this information was submitted to the City and the buildings were removed, there was a lot of anger. Sandra Morrison with the Museum felt the buildings were critical for Park City's understanding of how it developed, and the size, scale, mass, and the types of buildings that were built. Ms. Blaes remarked that the City and her firm agreed to stop the process. The City did a design charrette in the community and had visioning meetings with the City Council. Based on that outreach, new guidelines were developed that bifurcated the designation process. Park City utilized the national standards of the National Register criteria to establish the Landmark sites. However, the City also wanted something that was very Park City specific, because the buildings were not meeting the standards that most preservation communities and programs accepted as historic. Ms. Blaes explained that Park City developed criteria of essential historic form as the definition of integrity. She pointed out that conservation districts are common now, but they were not common at that time and Park City was doing something unique. People from the National Alliance of Preservation worked with the Historic Preservation Board and said they were doing the right thing because it is not always about 100% historic material. Ms. Blaes remarked that many of the buildings she had on the screen did not have one piece of historic wood, but they were recreated from what is known to be the important building types that reflect Park City's mining history.

Based on that background, Ms. Blaes believed that the applicable criteria for this site is the Significant site, and the integrity is essential historic form.

Ms. Blaes remarked that throughout the Staff report the analysis falls to the National Register criteria, which are the seven elements of integrity. She believed that part of the problem in looking at the Staff report and trying to address the information was that the Staff was basing so many of the arguments on criteria for integrity and historic designation that was not applicable to this project. Ms. Blaes stated that the disappointing aspect in her mind is that The City has such a heavy reliance on the setting and location that they are not looking at what is really there. There are critical elements to this building, and if this proposal is approved they would be enhanced and brought back, and the building would be much strong in terms of the essential historic form.

Ms. Blaes believed it was critical for the Board to understand where those designations came from and why they were critical; and the difficult they were

having in trying to provide useful and beneficial information for the HPB to make a decision this evening.

Ms. Blaes stated that essential historic form concept from the HPB that was adopted in the Land Management Code was to look at what might be available. It was questioned by other communities, but the answer was simple. Park City has development pressures that hardly any other community in the State of Utah experience. They were casting a wide net and creating opportunities for building that had very little integrity based on the National Register designation, to stay within Park City's preservation program. It was very evident that if those buildings were removed from the inventory they would be demolished and disappear. Ms. Blaes thought the background was important to understand as they work through the Staff report, because it speaks to the potential preservation of this site.

Ms. Blaes referred to referred to the unique conditions outlined in the Staff report that Planner Tyler addressed in her presentation. Ms. Blaes thought the context was important and the historic character being enhanced. She read, "The proposed relocation will not diminish the overall physical integrity of the Historic District or diminish the historical associations". She stated that over the years her firm conducted several reports and studies for the City about diminishing integrity within historic districts. The benchmarks that are typically used include the number of historic resources in that district, the integrity of those individual resources as a means of contributing to the larger integrity of the district, and the impact of new construction. Ms. Blaes believed this historic district was at far greater risk of losing integrity from new construction encroaching on the scale, the rhythm along the street, size, roof forms and other elements, than it is from loss of historic materials and buildings.

Ms. Blaes noted that the zoning ordinance talks about historical association being critical; and those associations are dependent on the structures maintaining their designation. She stated that the Staff report has an underlying threat that the Significant designation would be lost. Ms. Blaes provided examples to show why she disagreed, and why the HPB would be on sound footing if they approve this proposal.

Ms. Blaes stated that number three of the unique conditions was that the integrity and significance of the historic buildings themselves would not be diminished by relocation and reorientation. She reiterated that the most important aspect of this building is the fact that it faced towards Park Avenue, and that was critical in terms of its development pattern. She argued that there is no context anymore. The City made decisions on whether or not to keep those foot paths. The City had done an excellent job over the years of keeping the stairways that go up the canyon and so forth. They had finite resources and the will of the policymakers to decide what is the most important. She believed what the HPB and the City

Council did in 2006 was the most important. They decided to change the way historic structures are designated and defined integrity, instead of spending money on a footpath. She pointed out that this would probably not be an issue if the footpath still existed, but the City decided the footpath was not a critical priority. She thought the City made a wise decision to reallocate its resources to protect more buildings.

Vice-Chair Beatlebrox asked a question regarding the footpath and the ability to see the façade from either across the canyon, Park Avenue, Main Street, from where the footpath used to be, or any other vantage point where a pedestrian might stand. She asked if anyone had done an analysis on what could be seen today. Planner Tyler identified one building that the original primary façade could be seen from. Jonathan DeGray stated that it could be seen if someone knows where to look; but from a pedestrian or tourist standpoint it is lost. Someone could not stand on Park Avenue and see it. Ms. Blaes explained that the resources and context that support the downhill view have all been lost for this building. They no longer exist and she personally thought it was unfortunate. However, she believed that this building could still contribute, could retain its historic significance, and still be an important part of Old Town. She was concerned that the Staff report was not allowing any alternatives for the Board to consider. Ms. Blaes suggested that the Board had a number of options; and one option was to approve this application.

Director Erickson stated that for the most part the pathways were casual intrusions on people's lots. In the absence of the sewer easement or any other easements, people were walking in someone else's back yard, just like they did on Shorty Stairs. He noted that the ability to see the house from other streets is independent of the criteria that asks, can you interpret this home in its historical orientation. The story of this house is the orientation. Whether or not it can be seen from the street is an independent variable that is not part of the Code. Director Erickson clarified that the issue is how would you interpret the home, if it was rotated 90 degrees or 180 degrees, as being part of the historic context. He believed they would be forced to have an artificial interpretation of that location.

Ms. Blaes stated that the setting Director Erickson talked about has a lot to do with the National Register criteria; and not the essential historic form. Regarding the threat of de-listing, if the City were to follow that logic on this structure, they would have to de-list other building as well. She provided examples of building that were all reoriented and approved by the City. One building in particular was done in 2009. It was lifted 12' and rotated 180 degrees to face Empire Avenue. It also had a substantial rear addition. Ms. Blaes noted that it was exactly the same proposal being proposed by this applicant.

Planner Tyler clarified that the Code was changed for reorientation after those projects were completed. The criteria outlined in the Staff report is from the

current Code. She agreed that Ms. Blaes presented great examples, but the review process was completely different. In addition, those projects were approved at the Staff level. The current process requires HPB approval. Ms. Blaes did not believe the Code was entirely different because much of the Code is what was written in 2009. She acknowledged that the Code had been modified since 2009 to provide clarity. However, she believed they could still achieve this preservation success under the current Code.

Ms. Blaes stated that the fourth criteria is the potential to preserve. She thought it was important to recognize the things that would be enhanced under the proposed application with regard to the essential historic form of this building. The improvements the applicants were seeking to accommodate that contemporary use and allow their development right within the zoning classification were critical, and could be done without having an unsuccessful preservation project.

Ms. Blaes referred to the Design Guidelines. The scale, context and materials. The Staff report says it's crucial to retain the remaining aspects of the essential historic form if the site is to remain a significant site on the inventory. She could not agree more. Ms. Blaes stated that it is not just about the setting and location. It is also about the fact that this is a hall-parlor, which was one of three of the most important building types in Park City in Park City during the Mining Era. It's about the scale, the mass, the materials, etc.

Ms. Blaes commented on the scale and context. She noted that the Staff report uses the word context in the same manner that it uses setting and location in the LMC arguments. She stated that context is specific to this site in that it faces downhill, but it is also the larger context of whether this building helps to convey the context of the development pattern. The applicant was suggesting that it did not. It is very weak. However, it is strong in the essential historic form and the things that will be preserved and enhance as part of this proposal. Ms. Blaes stated that scale has always been a big issue in Park City. She thought there were examples of projects that were less successful and other projects that were more successful.

Ms. Blaes thought it was important to note that neither the applicant nor anyone else knows what historic materials exist. They know that the exterior drop-novelty siding on the majority of the house was put on after 1978. They believe there might be some historic plank components within the wall. They do know that the majority of the house has been completely reframed. The roof has been reframed. The shed addition is all new material. Ms. Blaes remarked that the design guidelines arguments in the Staff report on materials have not been verified, which is why the applicants were only seeking reorientation at this point. They recognize that the next step is to do a more thorough analysis of what

material remains, and create a more specific plan for the HPB on how they would retain that material in a way that follows the Design Guidelines and the LMC.

Ms. Blaes commented on scale and materials. She noted that the Staff directly applied the criteria of Landmark status for this structure when looking at the architectural and historic elements of this building. Ms. Blaes stated that no one disputes that this building is important to Park City's historic. It is one of the best hall-parlor structures, which is indicative of the Mining Era.

Ms. Blaes commented that the last component of the Design Guidelines outlined in the Staff report, such as the preamble, the foundation discussion, and the relocation and reorientation. She pointed out that the preamble cites the Landmark status criteria, but this structure is designated a Significant building. Regarding the foundation issue, it does not say it is permitted 2'. The word "generally" was added because the Design Guidelines could not possibly anticipate every need to lift or lower a building. It was generally 2'. Ms. Blaes thought it was important to understand that the Guideline looks at trying to visually diminish any impact that raising or lowering a historic structure would have on the streetscape and the context of the building. Ms. Blaes thought the Staff was so narrowly defining this building's essential historic form that they were missing an opportunity for a very successful preservation project in the future.

John Berkley, the applicant, appreciated the time everyone puts in to make Park City great. He appreciates and respects the process. Mr. Berkley stated that he and his wife purchased this house 14 years ago; recognizing the challenges with buying a historic home and retaining it. They came to Park City because they love its historic nature. Mr. Berkley explained that 14 years ago, through their realtor, they reached out to the City to see if they would be able to lift the home and bring the front porch back to the street. They went through the process and expanded the lot as the first step in getting this done. He pointed out that they later requested variances on a completely different plan. They have gone through the steps for 14 years because they believe in it and they love this home.

Mr. Berkley noted that the home is literally under the street at this point. When snow is plowed, all of the snow comes off of the street on to the roof and the back of the house. The house does not have a foundation; it sits on pilings. The drainage issues are huge. In terms of what can be done with the house in its current form, Mr. Berkley stated that it could be rented monthly to someone like a bar tender or construction worker, because the house cannot be renovated in its current form and rent to tourists. It is economically not viable in its current form. Mr. Berkley stated that if a car slid off the road on ice, it would destroy the house. It is unsafe in its current form and unsightly. The only access to the house is down rickety wooden stairs. He could not economically justify restoring the house if he could not rent it or access it from the side he and his wife live in. Mr.



Berkley remarked that he has learned a lot through the process, which is why he has hired experts to help him address the 200-page Staff report that he disagrees with. Mr. Berkley clarified that he is not a developer. He and his wife were trying to save this home by putting it on a good foundation and utilizing the historic materials. It is currently an unworkable eyesore, and he asked the HPB to consider supporting the reorientation. In his opinion, it is logical and makes sense for saving this historic home.

Vice-Chair Beatlebrox stated that everyone on the Board appreciates homeowners like the Berkley's who want to do the right thing.

Board Member Wiener asked if any homes on this street have been reoriented. Ms. Blaes replied that to her knowledge most of the homes on that street were demolished and none were reoriented. Mr. DeGray stated that the historic photograph would show that a number of homes on either side of this one had the same orientation, but this is the only home remaining.

Board Member Scott understood that the site was listed as a Significant site; but the designation would be questionable if the house was reoriented. Ms. Blaes replied that the house would definitely retain its Significant designation if it was reoriented. It meets the test for essential historic form. Those arguments were made in the supplement information that was presented and included with the Staff report. Ms. Blaes felt strongly that the arguments the applicant put forward in their presentation and in the materials submitted, walks through why it would remain a Significant building. That was also supported by the examples of other Significant buildings.

Director Erickson wanted it clear that they would have to go back through the process and make the determination based on how this works and how much material was preserved. The Staff report talks about some of the walls that would not be preserved. There is no guarantee of anything except by the Board's ongoing action.

Board Member Holmgren reminded everyone that they were only being asked to review the reorientation. Vice-Chair Beatlebrox agreed, and suggested that the Board focus their comments and questions on that issue.

Vice-Chair Beatlebrox referred to Mr. Berkley's comments about the plows throwing snow, and she added rocks and ice. She asked how that would be mitigated if the building is rotated and the historic façade is restored, because it would still be close to the road. Mr. DeGray stated that when these homes are close to the road and at the same level, the snow plow operators do not have the inclination to fill the hole with snow. He assumed they would be looking at a site that would not be beneficial to put snow and the snow would be hauled when it is hauled off Woodside.

Vice-Chair Beatlebrox noted that Planner Tyler talked about the idea that no historic material would be on the interior walls if the house was turned. She asked if there was no historic material on the façade currently. She was not sure what Planner Tyler meant about the interior. Planner Tyler presented a slide which identifies the existing historic material that was identified as possibly being there in the Historic Preservation Plan. A second slide identified what happens to the walls after it is rotated. Those shown in red would be removed in order to facilitate the addition. Planner Tyler added the renderings to identify what happens to some of the existing walls that are preserved, and noted the significant amount of material that is lost. A big issue for Staff is that the amount was significant. In addition to other criteria that the Staff did not find compliance, they weigh heavily on that criteria as part of the review.

Ms. Blaes thought it was important to understand that the drop-novelty siding on the exterior of this building is not historic. What was in the Preservation Plan is that behind that there may be historic material. In terms of limiting the review to reorientation, Ms. Blaes suggested that if this Board approves the reorientation, they should make a note to the Staff to get a better robust review of material. If there is an opportunity to retain historic material, the City and the applicant have an obligation to retain it and reuse it if possible. Ms. Blaes noted that this has been done throughout the City, and it is a critical standard for the Board to point out as part of their recommendation if they choose to approve the application.

Director Erickson made some clarifications. First, the approval of the rotation does not raise the house to the level of the road. There would have to be a mechanism inside the LMC that would allow to raise the house up to that height. In addition, there are other processes by which compromises can be made to raise the house for a foundation. He agreed with Ms. Blaes that the word “generally” is in play, and that would be up to the Staff to make that determination. Director Erickson pointed out that the act of rotation leaves the house at its current elevation without additional action.

Planner Tyler commented on the question regarding material. She stated that it is not uncommon for most of the historic structures to have lost their material. Therefore, many of the preservation reviews for material deconstruction have been historic walls that the HPB has deemed historic that do not have historic material. Based on the Code, they would still consider the walls shown in red to be historic. Planner Tyler explained that this issue was addressed in 2015 when the Code was amended.

Board Member Holmgren understood that the City checks holes in the walls for materials. Director Erickson replied that the Staff would do some exploratory deconstruction to see what is inside the walls once the HDDR is in process and they begin to look at the Preservation Plan. He stated that it is also a key criteria

when reviewing the ability to panelize the house versus take it apart board by board. Director Erickson stated that the HDDR has a sliding scale of criteria where material preservation comes first. If the material cannot be preserved, the next level of material is restored. The last level is that the material is replaced. The sliding scale is in the Guidelines that the HDDR process allows to occur.

Mr. DeGray stated that once they get through the HPB approval, part of the process is to an interior demolition of the entire building and clean out all of the interior finishes. In the projects he has done, they bring the project planner back for a walk-through to verify the actual conditions when everything can be seen. Modifications can be made to the preservation plan at that time.

Director Erickson clarified that the Planning Department had no issues with this applicant and his architect in terms of how this process goes forward. It is about the two criteria of how to preserve the home in its context and how to protect the neighborhood.

Vice-Chair Beatlebrox noted that precedence was an issue that was raised as public input in the Staff report. She was unaware of other buildings that had been rotated, and she understood the guidelines have changed. However, she was familiar with the two instances in which the HPB has voted to allow moving a historic building because the context surrounding these two buildings had changed significantly, and the historical context was lost. Ms. Beatlebrox asked if they would be setting a precedent if they allowed this building to be reoriented when the HPB already allowed two other buildings to be moved because the context surrounding the building have changed.

Director Erickson stated every historic home is a special case and a special situation with special circumstances in each location. The City's model of precedence is primarily based on consistency and application of the guidelines. They look at code, clarity, and consistency. He commented on a good relocation that the HPB allowed on 1102 Norfolk. Planner Tyler noted that 1102 Norfolk was a Staff level reorientation. Director Erickson believed it was a good reorientation and the applicant kept the heights of the exposed foundation and the height of the reorientation within the Code requirements. He pointed out that it was done post-2009 Guidelines. Director Erickson thought it was important to remember that some of the examples shown this evening could not occur since the Code was changed to adjust how foundations are exposed. Director Erickson stressed the importance of following the Code that is in place, and make their interpretation based on the presentations by the applicant and the Staff.

Board Member Hodgkins recalled that the HPB did not vote to move those buildings because of the adjacent buildings and surroundings. He thought their vote was based on the fact that moving those two building would change the

historic significance by moving them closer to the street. Director Erickson clarified that Mr. Hodgkins was talking about the two structures at 1450 and 1460 Park Avenue. Mr. Hodgkins was unsure whether a precedent was by their vote because of its neighborhood.

Vice-Chair Beatlebrox had a different recollection. She recalled that it was the neighborhood and the fact that very few historic homes still existed. The intent was to keep those historic homes and to allow them to be moved because it would not change their historic home. Director Erickson stated that precedent is not a high priority in the criteria of how to apply the Code. It goes to consistency in applying the Code.

Board Member Hodgkins believed that Park City has chosen to individually site historic buildings, and they do not have historic neighborhoods. Considering its surroundings and what else has been done prior should not factor in on decisions of specifically designated addresses, because they have chosen to site specific buildings rather than neighborhoods. Director Erickson pointed out that the Code is written so as to not single out one house, but in context.

Vice-Chair Beatlebrox opened the public hearing.

Ruth Meintsma, a resident at 305 Woodside, thanked the Board for allowing her time to explain her point of view. She had made two scaled models of the manifestation of this beginning from 1886. She did that because she wanted to show how it was, how it is now, and how it still resembles the little house that was there 128 years ago. Mr. Meintsma noted that she had prepared the models to scale, including the grade, from all the plans. She reviewed the models. She commented on the grade. She remarked that in the first manifestation of the house there was a little shed in the back. The shed did not last long because from the Sanborn map it looked like it was either in the road or across the property line. Ms. Meintsma pointed out that the shed was removed and the house went to its simplest form, and that form is still there. The windows are shown on the photos, and the window fenestrations are historic. Ms. Meintsma noted that 1907 to 1929 was when the little porch was added, and in the tax card it was called the front porch. The value of the house was assessed by the square footage, and they included the 6' x 8' front porch. There was no mention of the other porch. Ms. Meintsma had a photo of the home in 1921, which showed the same house that is seen today, except for the shed extension. She stated that the form of the house that was there in 1921 is there today. The 6' x 8' porch was still mentioned in the tax report, and then it was enclosed. Ms. Meintsma pointed out that the structure that is being considered for reorientation is the exact same structure with the shed roof and the front porch taken off. She remarked that the distance from the street gutter and the street height was today's calculations. She had done a lot of mathematical work down to half of a millimeter.

Ms. Meintsma indicated the porch that was present from either 1907 to 1930; or from 1907 to 1941, because it was gone in 1941. She pointed out that in the age of the house, that porch was there only 17% to 27% of the life of the house. Ms. Meintsma wanted everyone to understand how critical that porch was for access to the house and the major entrance. The tax cards referenced the 6' x 8' front porch three different times. There was no mention of the porch on the back in terms of tax value. In separate photos from 1889, Ms. Meintsma noted that the entrance is not clear because there is no porch. There is a door but it was above grade. She concluded that the shed in the back was probably a coal shed because coal was dumped off the street. Because the least steep access is on the downhill side, she assumed the entrance would be on the northwest corner, because it was the closest and less steep to the road. Ms. Meintsma emphasized the significance of the porch and access.

Ms. Meintsma reiterated that the models were at the current grade. She had taken two picture on Woodside of homes that are actually below grade and similar to 424 Woodside. One home that was currently being renovated had the exact same issues of the downhill grade, drainage, and snow accumulation. That home was being raised two feet on a very critical corner in terms of pushing snow off of the 7<sup>th</sup> Street curve. The home would only be raised two feet, and engineered so that cars would not be sliding off the street and drainage would not be a problem. The house will still sit in a hole and the garage access will be higher. Ms. Meintsma presented a photo of another home on Woodside that was renovated and raised two feet. It has a porch that was always there and never rotated. Again, drainage and snow being pushed off the street are not problems because the engineering was done to keep the house on the same terrace that it sat on before, and it maintains the historic character and feeling.

Ms. Meintsma presented photos of the neighborhood and pointed to the historic structures. There are no historic structures next to the house at 424 Woodside, but there is a reconstructed house across the street. Ms. Meintsma stated that 424 Woodside overlooks the town overlooking the canyon. The view they had at the beginning at the last century is almost exactly there. That view and the way the house sits looks at all those historic structures still today. Those are all the historic structures that were in their view in the 1930 photo. Ms. Meintsma stated that the context is that the historic view is still there. It has not been taken away.

Ms. Meintsma presented a copy of photo Mr. DeGray had provided showing the house and the porch. She noted that the photo was from 1907. She had outlined a house in orange, and noted that the mass of that structure and where it sits accessible to the road, is not too different than the garage addition that sits next to 424 Woodside. She believed this showed the mix on the downhill side. Ms. Meintsma stated that the downside side of Woodside was developed very late because it was difficult. When people started filling in, they got created.

Some structures accessed the road, others sat down where there was a place for a structure to sit. At the beginning of the last Century Woodside was a rustic street. It was not graded. There was a wooden sidewalk on the west side of the street, which was actually a sewer ditch. There was no plumbing, so all the plumbing from all the homes came down on that road. Ms. Meintsma pointed out that facing that road was probably not ideal. It was much better to look down on the historic buildings, which is why the house was oriented the way it was.

Ms. Meintsma noted in the same picture a couple of pyramid roofs on Park Avenue and nice sized houses, but the tiny historic houses fit in because it was a mish-mash. The downhill side of Woodside was a mish-mash, and that is what the structure at 424 Woodside shows. If the house is reoriented, it would not have the same character it had when structures were placed wherever they would fit. She believed that was indicative of this part of Woodside and this part of Old Town.

Ms. Meintsma referred to comments from the applicant stating that 424 Woodside is dwarfed by the structures around it. She did not think that was accurate, because the garage addition was not too different in size from the structure. There were smaller houses, bigger houses and there was up, there was down. It was a mish-mash.

Ms. Meintsma stated that she always tries to figure out why things happened. In looking at this house she questioned why there were windows and a door, but no stairs or a porch for access. She thought the house was possibly built by unskilled labor with the standard two windows and the standard door, and they made the floor level where it was above grade because they did not want to dig into the side of the hill. Her assumption was that they used the front porch, which was access from the street.

Ms. Meintsma commented on another situation regarding access on page 27 of the packet. The image was from 1905-1907 and the circle around 424 was incorrect. It is not 424 Woodside. The image in the Staff report was actually up the street on Woodside on the uphill side of the street. This was critical because there is an obvious wall and footpath up to the house. She believed that was misleading and made people think that it was a major access to the house when, in fact, it was a different house. Ms. Meintsma stated that in the 1930 photograph, there are stairs around the houses, but there are no stairs around 424 Woodside. She could see a porch so she assumed there were stairs without a handrail, but she did not believe it was the major entrance. The porch came as an addition, and was later removed. The porch was not there for the majority of the life of this house. Ms. Meintsma remarked that his house could be seen clearly from the Marsac.

Vice-Chair Beatlebrox asked Ms. Meintsma about making her distinction between where the front door was and whether it was used. Ms. Meintsma stated that it was based on the importance of access. There was discussion about how the house was turned around, but the access was primarily from the street because most of the time that porch was not there. There was no access on the downhill side of the street. In her opinion, the way the house is currently oriented is the way it was used in history.

Ms. Meintsma had outlined the garage in blue, and noted that the same garage was still showing in the 1941 photo. She thought it was easy to see the location of the street in association with the house because the floor of the garage was right off the street. Ms. Meintsma did not believe the house is much different now than it was then. Ms. Meintsma pointed out that the garage was never shown on the Sanborn Map, but it was on the tax cards from the 1940s to 1965. The garage measured 10' x 18' deep. The space between 424 Woodside and the next house was 12'.

Ms. Meintsma remarked on the comments about how the house is dwarfed, it sits in a hole, the house is diminished; but it is no different than it always has been. The street level garage sits right next to it. In fact, changes were made and the historic house is more visible from the street. Ms. Meintsma explained that she was talking about the garage addition because it has been said that the garage changed the context of the house. She stated that when the old Historic District Commission approved the garage, the discussion was intense and focused on the importance of doing everything possible to make sure they kept the integrity and the location of this house. In looking at the 1930 photo, she believed the Historic District Commission had done a good job meeting that goal.

Ms. Meintsma read some of the comments made by the applicants and their representatives. One was that raising and rotating would establish the house as a visibly prominent element along the street. She pointed out that everyone knows that house and it is already visually prominent because of its character and uniqueness. Another comment by the applicant was that the new location would fit in with the current rhythm of building form along the street. Ms. Meintsma stated that they were not looking for the current building form. The purpose is to replicate the historic rhythm along the street; not to fit in the current rhythm of the building form along the street. That would be making everything modern and looking the same.

Ms. Meintsma agreed that in the past some houses were reoriented successfully. However, the Code and the Guidelines were changed because reorienting was not keeping the funky character. Ms. Meintsma commented on scale, context, and materials for the standards of a Significant designation. She believed that reorienting the structure as proposed would be like the house turning its back on the town. It would change the character of how the house appeared on the

hillside. She presented an image she had prepared to show the material that exists now. Ms. Meintsma agreed that the house needs a lot of work to make it safer and more accessible, but the manifestation of the house is still there after 128 years. The fact that the house is unsafe and unsightly has nothing to do with reorientation.

Ms. Meintsma remarked that the property is three lots and currently the structure is a duplex. If the applicants are creative they could make it work in its traditional orientation. She pointed out that the structure is proud of the garage, but if it is reoriented it would have to comply with the Code setbacks and the house would sit back from the garage. Ms. Meintsma disagreed with the photos that the applicant presented because they were the worst possible pictures of this house. There are much better pictures of the house. She stated that right now the roof form can be seen from the street. However, if the house is reoriented the setback would be 10' or more from the other structure per Code, which will push the house further back on the lot. If that occurs, the roof form would not be seen from the street.

Ms. Meintsma understood that one criteria for saving these houses is that if the previous owners or residents from the turn of the century come back, they should be able to recognize the house. That would be difficult if this house is reoriented.

Ms. Meintsma noted that Ms. Blaes had said that it was important to restore and adapt to make these structures modernly capable, habitable, and to bring them back into the community. Ms. Meintsma thought that could all be accomplished without reorientation. Ms. Blaes also talked about bringing back the important elements, such as the front above grade porch. Ms. Meintsma pointed out that the porch was only there for a short period of time and it is not critical. The critical porch is the back porch where people came in and out of the house. The context of where that porch sits on the terrace will be lost if the house is reoriented.

Ms. Meintsma reiterated her belief that reorientation of the house will diminish its character and it will not speak like it does now.

Vice-Chair Beatlebrox thanked Ms. Meintsma for a thorough presentation.

Vice-Chair Beatlebrox closed the public hearing.

Assistant City Attorney McLean pointed out that the Chief Building Official, David Thacker, was present to answer questions. Anne Oliver, the Historic Preservation Consultant for the City was also present.

Board Member Weiner stated that at the beginning of this presentation, the statement was made that the structural integrity of the building would not be



compromised by reorientation. She asked the Building Official to address that comment. David Thacker explained that the structural integrity of the homes was irrelevant to whether or not it is rotated or moved. It would have to be brought up to current Code standards whether it is rotated or remains in place. An evaluation would need to be done and structural engineering would be a requirement of the permitting process. Either way, the structure would be required to be structurally sound.

Board Member Weiner understood that nothing with rotating the building would compromise its historic integrity. Mr. Thacker stated that he was a Building Inspector and it was difficult for him to speak to historic integrity. However, he thought it was important to note that the City ensures that the structural integrity would be in place. He stated that there is always the chance when a structure is moved that things can be comprised. It depends on the process used. The Building Department does everything in their power through the permitting process to ensure that the process to lift and hold the structure in place is designed by an engineer; and the City inspects that process.

Vice-Chair Beatlebrox understood that drainage and snow were big problems because of where the building sits in relation to the road. She asked Mr. Thacker why he believed it was fine. Mr. Thacker stated that regardless of the rotation, a foundation would be put underneath the structure itself. At that point, the City adopted Codes would require the drainage to be upgraded. Depending upon the engineering report submitted, there would be drainage requirements for the footings and foundation. Mr. Thacker stated that if nothing is done, there is no Code that requires anything to be changed unless the structure is being compromised by moisture or any other deteriorating factors. Mr. Thacker clarified that when he visited the site he stood on Woodside and he walked around the structure, but he did not do a thorough evaluation to notice any type of deterioration of the structure. Mr. Thacker did not determine from the exterior that there were current drainage issues related to the deterioration; and it would take a full analysis to determine whether or not drainage is an issue.

Planner Tyler noted that the Findings written in the Staff report supports denial. If the HPB chooses to approve the request for reorientation, they would have to make findings for approval that are consistent with the Code.

Mr. Tesch noted that in terms of process, the HPB could make their decision and ask the Staff to draft Findings and Conclusions consistent with that decision.

Board Member Weiner thought it was compelling that there was no access from the property on the front side, which is the east side. There is no longer a footpath and the topography has changed. Also, in the older photos it looks like the street was further from the house. When she visited the property she noticed that the street is literally almost on top of the roof. Ms. Weiner believed they

could not hermetically seal an old building. They cannot bring the past to the present and have that building serve the same purpose when it is not in the same environment that it was in the 1900s. She noted that for many historic projects, they approximate the look of the mining community as best as possible. From everything she heard this evening, Ms. Weiner thought the applicants had the right spirit and were trying to duplicate the structure and make the site better than it is today. She agreed with the argument of the snow piling up, and the roof is literally right on the road. Ms. Weiner stated that she was inclined to approve the application.

Board Member Hodgkins thought they might be confusing the elevation change with the orientation. In his opinion, if you flip one of Ms. Meintsma's diagrams, it would not solve the access problem. The building would still be at a lower grade right up against the street. He pointed out that the Board was being asked to consider the orientation and whether or not it resolves some of the life safety issues or other livability issues. Mr. Hodgkins stated that in visualizing the house turned 180 degrees at the same elevation and right up against the road exactly where it is today, he was unsure whether it would address the issues of safety and livability that the applicant was hoping to solve. If he was being asked to consider the reorientation in and of itself, Mr. Hodgkins did not believe it resolved some of the arguments.

Board Member Hodgkins noted that previous examples were presented where historic houses have been reoriented. For him as a preservationist, that does not preserve any character whatsoever. If they continue to approve reorientation of homes, it would change the perception of the history of the built environment within Old Town. People walk down the street and question why the orientation is the way it is, and that is what the character of Old Town is about. Houses face all different directions. Mr. Hodgkins believed that Park City was trying to standardize these historic houses to any other town where the front orientation always fits the street. He assumed that the people who built the house at 424 Woodside did not think that facing the street was important. Mr. Hodgkins stated that his perception was a little different in making this decision, but he thought it was what the Board should be considering.

Board Member Weiner understood Mr. Hodgkin's position. However, she moved to Park City from Washington DC and she was with the National Trust for Historic Preservation for quite a while and involved with preservation in DC as well. As an example, there are many old stately homes that were built, especially the mansions in the Dupont Circle area, and there was always a carriage house in the back of the mansion. Nowadays, with automobiles instead of horses, there is no longer the need for a carriage house. Ms. Wiener stated like in this situation, the carriage house faced the house in front of it. Very creative and wonderful projects have reoriented the carriage houses so they face the side street. Ms.

Weiner believed the project was done in a way that maintained the character of the home, and making it into a separate home because those mansions no longer exist. She thought it was possible to rotate a building without losing its character. Ms. Weiner reiterated that the street is literally on top of this roof, and every other structure around it faces the street. There is no other shed type roof like this one. Adding to that is the fact that there is no access or footpath, which isolates the house at its front. She found that to be a concern and a compelling reason to consider reorientation.

Board Member Scott stated that the question was whether or not to rotate. He was unsure if it was putting one before the other, because he also thinks about the option of whether 2' in elevation or an increase in grade would create a different situation. That was difficult for him because it was not a decision for the HPB. Mr. Scott struggled with the question of whether historical context trumps the perception of historical reconstruction along the street. He enjoys walking along streets like Norfolk and Park Avenue and appreciating some consistency of rhythm, size, scale and mass. It is a historic preservation question and he struggles with it because outside of going from the facts it is only an opinion. It is hard to take opinion away from what looks good.

Board Member Scott was interested in Ms. Meintsma's account of when the garage was built. It sounds like there was heated discussion about it, and he would personally like to read the minutes from those Historic Commission meetings. They talk about Code clarity and consistency, and he would like to understand what was going on at that time because the town was different. Mr. Scott stated that if he had to make a decision this evening, he would agree with Mr. Hodgkins that rotation would not solve the problems. It is an elevation question about whether or not it would be livable.

Board Member Scott referred to the comment Mr. Tesch made that deciding against the applicant's request would essentially be condemning the building. He understood that position; however, to allow it to rotate and change would also be condemning the historical significance of the building.

Board Member Holmgren stated that he goes by this property a lot and she is very familiar with the house. She has been unhappy the last few years watching it deteriorate. It was similar to a demolition by neglect situation. Ms. Holmgren likes those homes and when she was looking to purchase a home she was trying to find one of the lower set houses because she likes the yards. Finding out that the view from the house was of the town was another reason not to consider reorientation. Ms. Holmgren stated that she was not in favor of rotation.

Vice-Chair Beatlebrox stated that when she first looked at this application a few months ago, she was not in favor of rotating a historic home. However, she saw the logic of the context of the building changing, that there was no longer a path

to access the front, and the problems associated with being on the road. She believes people know the house because the roof is so ridiculous. Ms. Beatlebrox remarked that she was struggling as well. After hearing Ms. Meintsma's presentation and hearing the story of the house looking towards town is very important. She does not want to lose that historic aspect, but at the same time there is a façade that no one sees. Rotating the house would allow people to enjoy the hall-parlor form. Ms. Beatlebrox thought this was a difficult decision because the history of the structure is very important.

Director Erickson suggested that the Staff could do additional research and craft additional findings that might help the Board in terms of how these determinations work. It is important to get enough information to help the Board determine which way the house was facing. That goes to historical context and they need to know that. Secondly, the Staff needs to determine the front of the house and where the house is accessed. If there was a path in the past and the house was below Woodside, that makes historical context and historical storytelling different than if the access was off of Woodside. Director Erickson believed the Staff could try and find the Minutes from the meetings related to the garage, as requested by Board Member Scott. That would help them see the context of the garage versus the low house. Director Erickson stated that if the Staff provides clarity and additional findings, it would help the Board in their deliberation.

Director Erickson stated that he usually dislikes recommending a continuance, but he did not believe the HPB had enough facts to make a finding on which way the house faces. The Staff made the determination that the house was facing east; but not whether it was the front of the house. Other presentations determined something different, and he would like additional research to provide the Board with more accurate information to make their decision. Director Erickson remarked that if the Board was prepared to make the Findings this evening, that could be done and a continuance would not be necessary.

Mr. DeGray clarified that based on the Staff report, the applicant understood that the Board would be making a decision on reorientation and on the lifting as part of that. Assistant City Attorney McLean explained that the Historic Preservation Board does not have jurisdiction to make a judgement on lifting. It is outside of their purview. Mr. DeGray asked if it would be a Staff level determination. Ms. McLean answered yes. Director Erickson pointed out that the applicant would have the right to appeal if they disagreed the Staff's determination. Ms. McLean stated that the appeal would go to the Board of Adjustment because it would be under the Historic District Design Review.

Ms. Blaes asked for clarification on Director Erickson's question about the front of the house. She thought it was important to understand that based on the building form and the essential historic form, the front of this house is east facing.

It is a single-cell home, hall-parlor style and they know the front. She asked if Director Erickson was referring to accessibility.

Director Erickson stated that he needed to build all three sets of facts. He understood that the original Staff report had the front of the house facing east. Planner Tyler answered yes, noting that the Staff was consistent with the applicant. Mr. DeGray stated that the historic form facing east is the issue. Planner Tyler noted that Ms. Meintsma had mentioned that the west facing porch in the back was always called the front porch because there was stair access. Director Erickson agreed, but he thought that needed to be clarified. He understood that some of the Board members were working on findings about where the primary access was to the house, and whether or not the path was there and in what form. Given the nature of this issue and the process going forward with the HDDR, he wanted to make sure there was a solid basis for decision-making.

Ms. Blaes clarified that her reason for raising the concerns was because Board Member Hodgkins was not persuaded that the orientation made sense. She assumed that in large part he was basing his decision on the assumption that the east facing façade was the primary façade. Ms. Blaes stated that if they follow Director Erickson's logic that may that is not the primary façade with regard to access, then as a preservationist she would also say that he was suggesting that substantial additions could go onto that east elevation. However, that made her nervous as a preservationist because that is the primary façade. Secondary facades can handle additions and the Guidelines talk about additions beyond the mid-point of a secondary façade. She noted that facing Woodside is a tertiary façade, which is the façade to build additions to minimize the negative impact to the historic resource. Ms. Blaes was concerned with the line of inquiry with regard to the access, because in essence the rear of the house is the historic front façade.

Director Erickson stated that he was not trying to reopen the discussion. His intent was to get enough facts on the table so when the applicant comes back the HPB has findings on these matters, and the findings can be used as the underpinnings of the design work and the preservation work that the applicant will try to accomplish. Director Erickson clarified that he was only making a suggestion. The HPB could decide how to proceed.

Board Member Scott asked if raising the home was a primary decision-making process, followed by rotation. If the home could not be raised, then the rotation could not occur. Board Member Hodgkins thought that was a fundamental question because the applicant would not want to reorient the house if it could not be raised.

Ms. Blaes stated that without looking at the LMC with that scenario in mind, she could not imagine that rotating the home without lifting would solve any of the problems. Board Member Hodgkins agreed. Ms. Blaes noted that at the beginning of the July Staff report the Staff made the comment that if the HPB makes a decision about rotation, the proposed design meets the LMC and would be able to go through a Staff approval process. If the design proposed by the applicant raised significant red flags about lifting, it would pertain to maintaining historic significance and not the ability to actually solve some of the other livability and adaptability problems.

Planner Tyler clarified the process. She and Jonathan DeGray, the architect, determined that it was best to come to the HPB to determine rotation prior to going any further in the design process. She explained that for her to provide any comments on this design would be a disadvantage to the owner to pay the architect to continue with the design if the HPB would not approve it. Planner Tyler noted that additional design work needs to occur after the HPB makes the decision on rotation because the Staff has comments regarding the design. She remarked that this came about as a logical process to keep the applicant from doing a design that may never get approved. Planner Tyler remarked that the Staff needs to review the lifting and design guideline work still needed to be addressed in terms of windows and transitional elements.

Mr. DeGray understood that if the HPB approves the rotation, that a caveat to that approval would be for the applicant to work with the Staff to meet the Design Guidelines. Planner Tyler agreed. In addition, the HPB would have to later approve the removal of the two historic walls, and any other historic material that would be removed. Mr. Berkley stated that the intent is to salvage and reuse as much historic material as possible.

Board Member Hodgkins asked if the applicant had ever considered moving the structure further back from the road. Mr. Berkley replied that the proposed plan takes it back to a new setback. Planner Tyler explained that upon reorientation it would comply with the setbacks. Mr. Hodgkins asked if in addition to reorientation, the house would be pushed back off the road. Mr. DeGray replied that the approach is to keep it as close to its original location as possible, which means it is as far forward as it can go on the site. One of the variances corrected the side yard setback, and the front yard has been placed so the structure is currently on the front yard setback. Mr. DeGray pointed out that the reorientation would be right on the front yard setback as well. Mr. Hodgkins clarified that the proposal would not move the structure further back. Mr. DeGray replied that this was correct.

Board Member Hodgkins stated that in looking at the different Sanborn maps, the additions were never on the east side; they were on the west side. He suggested

that there might be other solutions if it is determined that the east side is important historically and the structure needs to face east.

Director Erickson stated that regardless of what is considered the front of the house and the access, he believed the historic concept of the neighborhood is the north-south orientation of the longitudinal access of the house. In his opinion, that was the important contextual portion for looking at this. Mr. Hodgkins noted that a number of the photos presented this evening were taken from a distance looking across the hill, and they were looking at that façade facing east. Therefore, one could also argue that that façade is one of the most important historical pieces of the house, and that the view from Woodside Avenue was always secondary.

Ms. Blaes remarked that in looking at the development pattern of the structure itself on the Sanborn maps, a typical process was to have a hall-parlor with a shed addition off the rear because that is how the house was used. Mr. Hodgkins believed that most of the houses were used from the rear for daily use.

Assistant City Attorney McLean commented on process and the material deconstruction. She clarified that if the HPB approves reorientation they would not be automatically approving the material deconstruction, because that is not before them this evening. Ms. McLean thought this was difficult because on one hand the rotation will move some of the walls on to the existing addition, which is not being proposed to be removed, and would hide some of the materials. There is also a suggestion that a new addition might be put on which would hide other historic materials. The material deconstruction would come back to the HPB, but she wanted the Board and the applicant to be aware that the application for reorientation was only one part of the overall project.

Vice-Chair Beatlebrox pointed out that they were also not approving an addition on either the east or the west side of the structure. It was not a foregone conclusion that if the building is rotated they would be able to put an addition on the downhill side. Assistant City Attorney McLean agreed. That would be determined by the Staff in the HDDR review.

Board Member Hodgkins remarked that with additions the house would be so large and unrecognizable from the historic structure. If the City allows that to happen, he questioned whether it would be better to tear down the structure. Ms. Blaes did not see the solution as tearing it down. She cited many examples on the Historic Sites Inventory that do not have a single piece of historic material, but they are respectful of the forms that were there. Many buildings have been reconstructed based on historic photographs, and it follows National Register reconstruction. Ms. Blaes stated that since 2006 Park City has made the effort to maintain the opportunities to bring projects back into preservation. Mr. Hodgkins

stated that he was making the point that the house would look like a Park City house but it would not be recognizable as a historic structure.

Director Erickson stated that if all the Board members agree, the Staff would recommend a motion to continue to January 17, 2018, with direction to the Staff to find additional Findings for the face of the house, the front of the house, and the access to the house.

MOTION: Board Member Holmgren moved to CONTINUE 424 Woodside Avenue to January 17, 2018 with direction to Staff as stated by Director Erickson. Board Member Hodgkins seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed. Board Member Hodgkins voted against the motion.

Planner Tyler stated that she would issue a formal Staff report for the next meeting. She would be making a determination for the direction that the house faces, which side would be considered the front, and access to the house. Everything else would remain the same.

It was noted that the applicant and his representatives had conflicts with the January 17<sup>th</sup> date. Planner Tyler asked to change the date to February 7, 2018.

Board Member Beatlebrox requested a motion to change the date of continuance.

MOTION: Board Member Holmgren moved to change the date of Continuance for 424 Woodside to February 7, 2018. Board Member Hodgkins seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

Annual Preservation Award - Item now heard on the rescheduled December 5, 2017 meeting. Staff recommends the Historic Preservation Board choose one (1) awardee for the annual Preservation Award and choose up to four (4) nominees for a historic award plaque. (Application GI-15-02972)

Due to the late hour this item was continued.

MOTION: Board Member Holmgren moved to CONTINUE the Annual Preservation Award discussion to January 17, 2018.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.



Historic Preservation Board Meeting  
December 5, 2017

The Meeting adjourned at 8:07 p.m.

Approved by \_\_\_\_\_  
Stephen Douglas, Chair  
Historic Preservation Board

APPROVED











