

PARK CITY MUNICIPAL CORPORATION
HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD
MINUTES OF JANUARY 16, 2018

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

EX OFFICIO: Bruce Erickson, Anya Grahn, Polly Samuels McLean, Liz Jackson

ROLL CALL

Vice-Chair Beatlebrox called the meeting to order at 5:00 p.m. and noted that all Board Members were present except Jack Hodgkins, who arrived late.

ADOPTION OF MINUTES

December 5, 2017

MOTION: Board Member Scott moved to APPROVE the minutes of December 5, 2017 as written. Board Member Holmgren seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously. Douglas Stephens abstained since he was absent on December 5th. Board Member Hodgkins was not present for the vote.

PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS

There were no comments.

STAFF/BOARD COMMUNICATIONS AND DISCLOSURES

Director Erickson thanked the HPB for their willingness to meet in a different room this evening. The Council Chamber was unavailable because The City Council was holding a special meeting in the Council Chamber from 3:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m.

Director Erickson announced that he had validations for anyone who parked in China Bridge to attend this meeting.

Planner Grahn reported that the next HPB meeting would be February 7th, which is their normal day and time.

CONTINUATIONS (Public hearing and continue to date specified.)

173 Daly Avenue —Disassembly/Reassembly and Material Deconstruction—
Significant House. The applicant is proposing to disassemble and reassemble

the Historic single-car garage. The house will be re-framed from the interior and the non-historic siding will be removed. The applicant will be removing the existing Historic windows, an existing stack rubble wall on the east side of the building, the existing roofs and roof framing, the non-historic porches on the front façade, the existing historic doors, and a portion of the historic shed structure to accommodate a connection to the single-family dwelling.
Public hearing and possible action. (Application PL-17-03468)

MOTION: Board Member Beatlebrox moved to CONTINUE 173 Daly Avenue to February 7, 2018. Board Member Scott seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously. Board Member Hodgkins was not present for the vote.

Jack Hodgkins arrived.

REGULAR AGENDA – Discussion, Public Hearing and Possible Action

1. 269 Daly Avenue – HDDR Material Deconstruction and Reconstruction – The applicant is proposing to reconstruct the historic house and historic garage designated as “Significant” on the City’s Historic Sites Inventory. In addition the applicant will be removing existing non-historic fences, a non-historic addition on the southwest corner of the house, the roof structure, one deteriorated chimney, exterior walls and layers of non-historic siding, non-historic front porch, non-original front door, and non-historic windows on the historic house. The applicant is only proposing to modify the garage doors as part of the reconstruction of the historic garage.
(Application PL-17-03554)

Planner Grahn introduced Russ Henry, the contractor and part-owner of the project.

Planner Grahn commented on the development history. The house has changed significantly as evidenced from the Sanborn maps. It was originally built as a hall parlor, and during the late 19th Century a stem-wing was added. At some point the house became more of a rectangular shape with a front porch, and it remained that way from 1900 onward. Planner Grahn stated that it was difficult to determine whether the cross-wing was filled in to create the rectangle hall-parlor or whether it was demolished and re-built.

Planner Grahn noted changes to the garage. In the 1900 and 1907 Sanborn it is very rectangular and similar to the footprint that exists today. However, in 1929 and 1941 the shape was more square. There was no evidence in the research to indicated an addition to the garage. She explained that in the past, accessory

building have been misrepresented on the Sanborn map, and that could possibly be the case with this structure.

Planner Grahn reported that a number of applications were recently made starting in 2010. In 2013 the Staff met with the Historic Preservation Board. The site was originally Landmark, but it was discovered at a later time that the gabled L on the front was actually built between 1965 and 1970 and it was not historic. They also recognized under the previous owners that the house needed to be reconstructed due to its poor condition. At that time the designation was changed from Landmark to Significant.

Planner Grahn noted that the property now has a different owner. There is also a Notice and Order on the property due to the significant amount of deterioration and the failing condition of the building. She assumed the Board had read the Chief Building Official's letter and looked through the Notice and Order and were aware of some of the issues. The roof is about to collapse, the walls are buckling both on the house and the garage. There is a lot of wood rot and mildew in the house. The porch is not historic but it is starting to pull away from the house.

Planner Grahn stated that the first part of this item is to look at the criteria to determine whether or not the historic house and the garage should be reconstructed. The first is whether or not the historic building has been found hazardous by the Chief Building Official. She pointed out that the Chief Building Official has found it hazardous and issued a Notice and Order on the building. Planner Grahn noted that the Staff report outlined the issues related to deterioration.

Planner Grahn remarked that the second criteria is whether the historic buildings can be made safe and serviceable through repair. She stated that the Staff went to the site when the Notice and Order was issued, but they also went out with the owners and looked at it closer with the Chief Building Official. Based on the lack of structure and the amount of deterioration, the Chief Building Official did not believe it could be repaired in place. Due to the amount of accumulated damage, reconstruction is the best method with salvaging materials where possible. Planner Grahn thought the amount of salvageable materials was very little, primarily because of the different remodels that occurred over the years, and because of the overall poor condition of the building.

Planner Grahn stated that the third criteria is whether or not the form, features, detailing, placement, orientation and location can be reconstructed based on accurate measured drawings. She noted that the architect, Rick Otto, had provided documented evidence that the house could be reconstructed as the historic hall-parlor. The Planning Department would make sure it is an accurate reconstruction.

Planner Grahn explained that the procedure for the reconstruction is to have a vote by the HPB. She asked if the Board wanted to take action on the reconstruction first and then discuss material deconstruction, or whether they wanted to have that discussion first.

Chair Stephens suggested that they talk about the garage and the house at the same time. He thought moving the house should be a separate discussion.

Planner Grahn commented on the site improvements. The survey notes an old rock wall lining the property. She has not been able to get up there to see it because a portion of the hillside has fallen into the back of the house, as well as a significant amount of overgrowth. She had added a condition of approval to salvage the rocks and use them to rebuild a new retaining wall to help maintain the character of the site. Planner Grahn noted that there is also an old picket fence, but she did not believe it has any historical significance. She indicated a concrete pad and sidewalks, which are not historic. However, the applicant proposes to build a walkway back to the house.

Planner Grahn pointed out that the main addition to the house has only been the gabled L that was added on to the front between 1965 and 1970. They know that based on documentation in the Sanborn maps, the tax cards, and the method of construction. The applicant was proposing to remove the gabled L, which would leave the hall-parlor with a salt box shape and the shed in the back.

Chair Stephens thought the addition from the 1960s was apparent when he visited the site. Planner Grahn agreed. It is a non-historic addition and the Staff finds that the material deconstruction is necessary to restore the original hall-parlor. Planner Grahn stated that the structure is single-wall construction. The floor structure is settled and slumped and shifting in different directions. The floor has rotted, which caused the wall to buckle in different directions. It also caused the roof to give way. When the applicant reconstructs the house, the new structural system will meet Code and support the weight of the house.

Chair Stephens asked if there was different siding between the historic house in the back and the new addition from the 1960s. Planner Grahn recalled that there were three or four different sidings. Chair Stephens clarified that he was only asking about that one side. Planner Grahn answered yes.

Planner Grahn noted that the roof is in very poor condition. The asphalt shingles have worn away. The roof is deteriorated and water seeping in has caused much of the mildew and rot on the interior of the house. The roof would be reconstructed as part of the restoration of the building. Planner Grahn pointed to an existing chimney on the center of the house. They would like to keep the chimney; however, it is unclear whether it could be salvaged given the poor roof condition. For that reason, she added a condition of approval to salvage and use

the bricks to the best ability and reconstruct the faux chimney. She believed that would help with the restoration of the original house form. There are several different siding profiles on the house due to the number of times it was remodeled and the need to make repairs. Planner Grahn had added conditions of approval that talk about how the applicants can identify and analyze the different siding materials as they pull the house apart. If any of the original materials can be salvaged, they would make the best effort to save it. Planner Grahn thought it was questionable whether much could be saved.

Planner Grahn stated that because of the Notice and Order, it is important to address the health and safety concerns of the structure as soon as possible. If there had been more snow this winter, there was concern that the roof might have collapsed. She noted that the applicant had broken things into two different design reviews. The first is to address the historic house and reconstruct it. A second review would take place in the future when the applicant decides what the addition would look like. Planner Grahn remarked that an HDDR for an addition was approved in 2013, and the applicant would like to have a similar plan. She had added a condition of approval indicating how much of that rear wall could be removed, to avoid having to come back to the HPB for the addition.

Planner Grahn noted that currently there is no foundation, which is typical. A foundation would be added when the house is reconstructed. The porch, which she believed was probably built during a 1980s remodel, was pulling away from the building and had deteriorated significantly. When the house is reconstructed they would add a new porch that is more typical of hall-parlors.

Planner Grahn pointed out that the house only has one door, which does not meet the Fire Code for exits. The door is from the 1980s. It is craftsman inspired, but warped because of how the house has settled. The applicant intends to replace the door with a period appropriate front door. Planner Grahn stated that there are a number of different windows on the house; but none are historic windows typically seen during the Mining Era. She had added a condition of approval to verify the actual window openings once they start tearing off the siding. Any new windows on the historic house will be wood and double-hung to match what existed historically.

Planner Grahn reiterated the plan to reconstruct the garage. She pointed to two additions on the garage. One was a lean-to on the south side of the garage. The second addition was across the back of the garage. The additions were constructed of scrap metal and plywood, and the Staff did not believe they were historic. The additions were failing and adding to the unsafe condition of the garage. The applicant was proposing to remove the additions but maintain the original garage shape and structure in the reconstruction. Planner Grahn noted that the roof of the garage was also failing. It was settled and buckled, and things were pulling apart and shifting in different directions. The exterior walls

are board and batt. However, because they have been buried by about three feet of soil and materials, the walls are rotted about three feet around the perimeter of the building. Planner Grahn indicated a service door on one side of the garage, as well as the front garage doors. The applicant was proposing to keep a period door, and also rebuild the garage doors during the reconstruction, but keep the same chevron wood panel pattern. She had added a condition of approval to address that as well since it is a character defining feature of the garage. Planner Grahn noted that the garage has one window that is plexiglass in a wood frame. It is likely a historic window opening, and it would be replaced with wood as part of the restoration of the garage.

Planner Grahn asked for questions or comments regarding the materials deconstruction before moving on to the relocation.

Board Member Hutchings asked if there was a timeframe for when the applicant has to submit the second HDDR application. Planner Grahn answered no. However, a financial guarantee will be in place before the house is demolished or deconstructed. The financial guarantee gives the applicant 24 months from the date the permit is pulled to the date that a certificate of occupancy is issued. That is the incentive to reconstruct the historic house. Whenever the applicant comes in for the addition, there would be the tie to get the historic house reconstructed.

Board Member Hutchings wanted to know the process if the applicant did not rebuild the structure. Planner Grahn stated that nothing requires the applicant to add the addition. In terms of the reconstruction, if the applicant walks away from the project the City has the ability to complete it. Typically, the applicant works with the City and an extension can be granted if needed. Very rarely does the City have to step in.

Russ Henry clarified that it was their intention to move forward with the reconstruction. He has lived on the street for 25 years. He had done a historical reconstruction below this house and lived in that house. He currently lives in a historic home above that that was reconstructed. Mr. Henry stated that this is his neighborhood and he has a vested interest in improving the street.

Board Member Hutchings noted that a house on Park Avenue sat for years, which is why he asked the question.

Chair Stephens understood that this project was not approved under the 2013 HDDR and it would be starting the process over again. Planner Grahn replied that he was correct. Chair Stephens remarked that the Staff has a sense of the massing, but it would be finely tuned specific to this application.

Board Member Scott thanked the applicant for taking an interest in this home. Based on its condition, it would not have many years left and it is important to preserve these structures.

Chair Stephens commented on the siding. It was clear that the siding on the addition that was done in the 1980s was not the original siding. From what he could see from the street, it appeared that the siding on the south end was most likely the original siding. He asked if they had a sense of what siding might be historic. Mr. Henry thought the north side and the south side had some of the original siding.

Planner Grahn suggested that some the siding might have been salvaged from other houses. There are no ghost lines from the previous windows, which makes her think it was added on once the window changes were made. Chair Stephens stated that speaking from experience, when the addition was done on the front it was possible that the siding was taken from that portion and pieced in.

Chair Stephens was uncomfortable with a blanket assumption that the siding is going to be bad. In reality, if someone is told that, it is easy to ruin the siding taking it off. Chair Stephens believed it was possible to salvage a lot of the siding and reuse it. Mr. Henry stated that if the siding was added later it would come off easier. If it was in the original construction the siding was actually shear wall and it has the bigger square nails through it. The nails were bent over on the inside so they did not stick into the room. In his experience it is harder to salvage and the end result is a percentage of the material. Chair Stephens assumed the Planning Department would be working with the applicant on that phase of the project.

Planner Grahn stated that for 632 Deer Valley Loop, the HPB required that she and the Chief Building Official watch them take down the siding to make sure that it was not being damaged and that it was stored properly. She noted that they could add a similar condition of approval to this project. Chair Stephen favored adding that condition.

Chair Stephens commented on the siding on the garage and he thought it made sense that the structure would be rotting at the bottom sitting in snow. He wanted to know an acceptable way to address that siding. Planner Grahn thought they should salvage whatever they could; however, she was not confident that it would be very much given the amount of rot.

Rick Otto, the project architect, stated that an issue on Daly Avenue over the years of reconstruction is that there is more dirt than snow laying up against the structure, and that causes the rot. Chair Stephens agreed, but if the bottom three feet is rotted out, they should still try to salvage the upper part of the boards

in the design. Chair Stephens thought the garage was a dominant feature of the home because it is right on Daly. If they put new material on it, it would look like a new garage sitting in front. Mr. Henry noted that in looking at the garage you can see where there have been repairs and it is not the original. There are different kinds of board and batt and it is easy to tell the old boards from the new boards. Chair Stephens reiterated that they should remove and save what they can, and put it back in a consistent manner rather than in a repaired state.

Chair Stephens opened the public hearing.

Harriet Henry stated that she could vouch for the work and that Russ Henry would do his very best and make the house look just like it should.

Chair Stephens closed the public hearing.

Chair Stephens stated that he is very familiar with Mr. Henry's work and he does good work. He explained that the intent is to codify because whatever the HPB approves through this process is not only Mr. Henry's responsibility, but it carries over to the next owner if they ever decide to sell it.

Board Member Beatlebrox thought it looked like a great plan. Mr. Russ was obviously a brave heart for taking on this project and she was excited for this house. Board Member Holmgren stated that she was also excited for the neighborhood.

Planner Grahn asked if the Board wanted to add conditions of approval based on their comments this evening. Chair Stephens asked if the conditions as drafted included the condition for the Planner and the Building Official to be on site when the siding is removed. Planner Grahn answered no, but she had drafted a condition to read, "The Historic Preservation Planner and Chief Building Official will conduct a site visit during removal of the siding on the house and garage to ensure the siding is being removed carefully and will be stored properly to prevent further deterioration." Chair Stephens asked if that would occur before the architectural plans are submitted. Planner Grahn added another condition of approval to read, "The applicant shall make an effort to remove only the bottom portion of the garage siding where the rot has occurred to preserve the remainder of the historic board." Chair Stephens wanted to make sure that the material could be relocated in a fashion that could be used most efficiently.

Board Member Hodgkins commented on the condition of determining where the original windows were. He asked if Planner Grahn takes the conclusion or goes back to the site to see inspect it herself. Planner Grahn offered to add a line to the condition stating that it needs to be approved again by the Planning Department.

Chair Stephens stated that the HPB would be giving the go ahead to do demolition, which would include exploratory demolition. In that process they should be able to tell from the inside where it is board on board with lap siding going around where the original windows were located. Mr. Henry agreed, but stated that it depends on where the windows were cut out. Chair Stephens thought that would be part of the as-is plans that come in. Planner Grahn remarked that given the structural instability of the house, she was unsure how much could actually be done from the interior without it collapsing. She noted that the condition of approval did have language stating that the window configuration would be approved by the Planning Department to make sure it is done correctly. The Staff would do their best considering the site conditions and the instability of the building.

Board Member Scott stated that from walking around the site he agreed that removing the siding would be difficult; however, he thought some sections could probably be save. In looking at the front elevation from Daly that uses the least amount of siding, he assumed it would be prioritized to go in the front. Planner Grahn stated that in a case like this house where what they can salvage may be limited, they would prioritize the front. On a different house they might be more apt to number the siding and make sure it gets returned to the side of the building. For this structure, she believed they would salvage what they could and figure out what to do with it.

Planner Grahn stated that a motion would be to Approve the Reconstruction and Material Deconstruction of the Significant structure at 269 Daly Avenue, according to the Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Conditions of Approval as amended.

MOTION: Alex Weiner moved to APPROVE the Reconstruction and Material Deconstruction at 269 Daly as stated by Planner Grahn. Board Member Holmgren seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

Finding of Fact – 269 Daly Avenue

1. The site is located at 269 Daly Avenue in the Historic Residential (HR-1) zoning District.
2. The site has been designated as “Significant” on the City’s Historic Sites Inventory (HSI) and includes a historic house and historic garage.
3. The house first appears on the 1889 Sanborn Fire Insurance map to the west of the Union Concentrator Mill. The Ontario Mining Company and its subsidiaries continued to own many of the parcels on Daly Avenue and rented out houses constructed on their mining claims, such as 269 Daly, well into the late-twentieth century.

4. The house was likely built prior to 1889 as a two-room hall-parlor; however, it was expanded by adding a stem-wing to the south end of the hall-parlor form before 1889. T-shaped cottages became a predominant house form in the 1880s and 1890s.
5. By the 1900 Sanborn Fire Insurance map, the house was expanded once again or replaced by a house that is more rectangular in form with a full-width front porch.
6. In April 2011, a Historic District Design Review (HDDR) application was submitted for the purpose of relocating the house towards Daly Avenue, rehabbing the historic house, and constructing a new rear addition.
7. In June 2013, Chief Building Official Chad Root and Planning Director Thomas Eddington approved the relocation of the historic house to accommodate the rear addition, finding that the relocation would avoid excavation on the wall of the canyon and solve drainage issues that had caused the back wall of the historic house to deteriorate. The HDDR application was issued on May 17, 2013, with the Condition of Approval that the HDDR would expire by May 17, 2014, if a building permit had not been issued. The HDDR expired in May 2014 as no application for building permit was ever filed.
8. In April 2012, the Park City Council approved Ordinance 12-10 for the 269 Daly Avenue Plat Amendment. It included a "Maximum Building Line" on the east (rear) side of the house that would prevent development from creeping up the steep slope of the canyon wall.
9. In September 2013, the Historic Preservation Board approved a Determination of Significance (DOS) application to modify the designation from "Landmark" to "Significant."
10. In December 2015, the Land Management Code (LMC) was amended to require that the Historic Preservation Board (HPB) review and approve
11. On January 12, 2017, the Building Department issued a Notice and Order for the site due to the overall dilapidated conditions and structural instability of the house and garage.
12. The house was then sold to the current owners, David and Harriet Henry, in April 2017.
13. On September 8, 2017, the Planning Department received a Historic District Design Review (HDDR) application for the property at 269 Daly Avenue. The application became vested under the current Land Management Code (LMC) and Design Guidelines when the application was deemed complete on October 17, 2017.
14. On November 27, 2017, the Chief Building Official issued a letter in support of reconstructing the historic house and garage due to the deficiencies outlined in the Notice and Order.
15. The proposal to reconstruct the historic house and garage complies with LMC 15-11-15(A) in that:
 - a) The Historic house and garage has been found by the Chief Building Official to be hazardous and dangerous, pursuant to Section 116.1 of the International Building Code. In addition to the January 12, 2017, Notice

and Order on the property, Chief Building Official Dave Thacker wrote a letter in support of reconstruction due to the hazardous conditions on November 27, 2017.

b) The Historic Buildings cannot be made safe and/or serviceable through repair. The structural system and materials of the historic house have deteriorated to such an extent due to uneven settling, wood rot, and water damage that they are no longer salvageable and cannot be reused.

Similarly, the structural system and materials of the historic garage have buckled and cause significant deterioration of the historic materials.

c) The form, features, detailing, placement, orientation, and location of the Historic Buildings will be accurately depicted by means of new construction, based on as-built measured drawings, historical records, and/or current photographs. The applicant has proposed to reconstruct both the historic house based on the hall-parlor form that existed prior to 1965. The historic garage will be reconstructed as it exists today, without the non-historic additions to the east and south of the garage; measured drawings will aid in the accurate reconstruction.

16. The material deconstruction of the existing non-historic wood picket fence, sidewalk, and asphalt parking strip is appropriate as they do not contribute to the historic integrity or historical significance of the structures or site. There is an existing historic retaining wall that contributes to the historic character of the site that will be rebuilt following construction of an addition to the rear of the house at a future time; the proposed scope of work regarding the rock wall will mitigate any impacts that will occur to the visual character of the neighborhood as conditioned.

17. The applicant is proposing to remove the non-historic gable stem-wing on the west façade that was constructed between 1965 and 1970. The material deconstruction is necessary for the restoration of the hall-parlor's original façade.

18. The historic roof structure has visible deterioration and a "wavy" appearance to structural failure. The asphalt shingles roofing has failed due to age and deferred maintenance. Inside the attic, the structural supports of the roof have bowed, detached, and created an unstable roof structure that has broken through the ceiling inside. Any material deconstruction of the roof is necessary as part of the restoration of the building.

19. The existing brick chimney is in the center of the house. It suffers from mortar deterioration, loose bricks, and instability due to the failing roof structure. The applicant will reconstruct the chimney. Any material deconstruction is necessary in order to restore the original appearance of the chimney.

20. The single-wall construction of the house has contributed to its lack of structural integrity. The walls have settled, buckled, and pulled apart. There are several styles of siding profiles on the exterior of the house, including shiplap and dro-novelty siding. The applicant will analyze and determine the original siding material as the house is deconstructed. The material deconstruction is necessary for the restoration of the original hall-parlor house's appearance.

21. The applicant will submit a second Historic District Design Review (HDDR) application after the house has been deconstructed to satisfy the active Notice and Order. An addition will be constructed on the back of the house and remove approximately 27 feet linear feet of the back of the house.

22. There is no existing foundation and the floor structure rests largely in the dirt. The material deconstruction of the existing wood floor structure is needed in order to restore and reconstruct the hall-parlor house.

23. The existing porch is not original and likely constructed during the 1980 remodel to the façade. The porch's floor structure has slumped and settled in different directions, causing the porch to pull away from the house. The material deconstruction of the non-historic porch is necessary to restore the original porch to the reconstructed hall-parlor form.

24. There is only one existing, non-historic, Craftsman-style door on the west façade of the historic house. It has a non-historic screen door attached to its frame. The front door will be replaced as part of the reconstruction of the hall-parlor form. The material deconstruction is appropriate as the door does not contribute to the historic integrity of the structure.

25. The original window openings of this house have been lost, likely in one of the renovations that occurred after 1965. The existing non-historic windows consist of wood, aluminum, and vinyl windows that are in fair to poor condition. The applicant has proposed to reconstruct the original window openings of the house. The material deconstruction is necessary as these additions to the building do not contribute to its historic integrity or historical significance. The material deconstruction is necessary in order to restore the original window configuration of the hall-parlor form.

26. The historic garage has two additions constructed on its east and south elevations sometime after the Mature Mining Era (1894-1930). The east addition consists of an exposed wood plank roof with board and batten siding. The addition to the south is sided with plywood and sheet metal. The applicant is proposing to remove these non-historic additions. These additions do not contribute to the historic integrity or historical significance of the garage.

27. The existing garage roof consists of panels of corrugated steel over a failing roof structure. The applicant is proposing to reconstruct the historic garage roof. The material deconstruction of the roof is necessary for the restoration of the historic garage.

28. The exterior walls of the original garage consist of board-and-batten siding. The walls on the north and east sides of the building have become buried by changes in the grade and overgrown landscaping, causing the walls to rot. Around the periphery of the structure, approximately three feet (3') of the lower half of the walls have deteriorated. The walls have settled, buckled, and pulled apart due to the lack of foundation. The existing wood siding is in poor condition and has been covered with sheet metal in some places. The applicant is proposing to reconstruct the garage in its entirety. The proposed material deconstruction to reconstruct the garage and replicate the historic board-and-batten wood siding is necessary to restore the garage.

29. There are a pair of swinging carriage doors that measure approximately five feet by seven feet on the west façade. The doors consist of a wood frame securing a chevron pattern of wood slats. A historic four-panel wood service door on the north side of the garage has largely rotted out due to moisture and the lack of foundation. Both of the doors are in poor conditions and cannot be made safe and serviceable through repair, thus they will need to be reconstructed. The material deconstruction is necessary for the restoration of the historic garage.

30. There is only one window in the historic garage and it is located on the south side of the east façade. The window is an undivided light, single-pane square-shaped window. The material deconstruction is necessary in order to restore the original window configuration and restore the historic garage.

Conclusions of Law – 269 Daly Avenue

1. The proposal complies with the Land Management Code requirements pursuant to the HR-1 District and regarding material deconstruction.
2. The proposal complies with Land Management Code 15-11-15 Reconstruction of an Existing Historic Building or Historic Structure.

Conditions of Approval – 269 Daly Avenue

1. Final building plans and construction details shall reflect substantial compliance with the HDDR proposal stamped in on September 8, 2017 and December 19, 2017. Any changes, modifications, or deviations from the approved design that have not been approved by the Planning and Building Departments may result in a stop work order.
2. The applicant shall salvage rocks from the existing rock wall. These rocks shall then be reused on the site to construct any new retaining walls. If constructing an engineered retaining wall is necessary, the rocks can be used as a faux veneer over the concrete retaining wall.
3. The applicant shall make an effort to salvage and reuse the bricks from the existing historic brick chimney for its reconstruction. If this is not possible, the new bricks used to construct the historic chimney shall match the originals in all respects: design, dimension, texture, material, and finish.
4. As the house is deconstructed, the applicant shall identify and analyze different siding profiles to determine the original siding profile. The applicant shall salvage and reuse any original siding materials that can be made safe and/or serviceable through repair.
5. Where the severity of deterioration or existence of material defects requires replacement, the new wood siding materials shall match the original in design, dimension, texture, material, and finish. The applicant shall demonstrate the severity of deterioration or existence of defects by showing the Planning Department that the historic materials are no longer safe and/or serviceable and cannot be repaired to a safe and/or serviceable condition.

6. Any future addition made to the east (rear) wall of the historic house shall not exceed 27 feet in length.
 7. Following removal of the non-historic wood siding materials, the applicant shall update his Historic Preservation Plan with a conditions report detailing the locations of original window and door openings. The applicant shall base any window and door modifications on the façade (west elevation) or secondary facades (north and south elevations) that will be visible from the Daly Avenue right-of-way on physical, measured evidence uncovered during the demolition process. Planning staff shall review and approve the updated window configuration based on this new physical evidence.
 8. The new windows on the historic house shall be wood, double-hung windows consistent with what existed historically.
 9. The chevron-pattern panel garage door is a character-defining feature of this historic garage. As part of its reconstruction, the new garage door shall match the original in all respects: scale, dimension, texture, profile, material, and finish.
 10. The new window on the historic garage shall be wood and match the existing in all respects: scale, dimension, texture, profile, material, and finish.
 11. The Historic Preservation Planner and Chief Building Official will conduct a site visit during the removal of the siding on the house and garage to ensure that the siding is being removed carefully and will be stored properly to prevent further deterioration.
 12. The applicant shall make an effort to remove the bottom portion of the garage siding where rot has occurred to preserve the remainder of the historic boards.
2. 269 Daly Avenue (historic location) – HDDR – Relocation of the historic house four feet (4') west towards Daly Avenue. (Application PL-17-03554)

Planner Grahn reported that she and the applicant had differing opinions on this application. She would give the Staff's position and the applicant would have the opportunity to give their position.

Planner Grahn recalled that in 2013 the house had either a Notice and Order or it was determined to be in poor condition. At that time the previous owner went through the plat amendment process, and as part of that process the Planning Commission had expressed concern that they did not want the new addition or any development creeping up the hillside. Therefore, they put in a maximum development line, which she indicated on the plat amendment. Planner Grahn pointed to the approximate location of the historic house, and noted that the applicant was proposing to move it 4 feet forward. The garage would stay in its original location. The dash line represented the footprint of what was proposed and approved in 2013.

Planner Grahn noted that in 2013 the Code was different than it is today. At that time the Chief Building Official and the Planning Director only had to find unique conditions, per the Code. They found that the concern and reason for allowing it

to be moved forward 4 feet was because the wall of the canyon had fallen on the back of the house and had eroded the back of the house. The Planning Director and Chief Building Official believed that drainage and other issues would not get resolved if the house was not moved forward; and that was the basis for their approval. Planner Grahn stated that in 2015 and 2016 the Staff and the Historic Preservation Board talked a lot about changing the Code, and the change was made to have the HPB make the decisions on relocation, reconstruction and panelization rather than the Staff. She noted that at the same time they defined unique conditions to make it less broad and generic. The result was the criteria that is in place today.

Planner Grahn stated that even though the house was approved to be reconstructed with the addition in 2013, it was vested at that time but the approval expired after one year because a building permit was never pulled. The approval expired, the owners are new, and project must comply with the current Code that was in place when this new application was submitted in October.

Planner Grahn reiterated that this application was being reviewed under the current Code that exists today. The first criteria is whether or not the building can be moved. It assumes that the building is structural sound, but they already know it is not structurally sound. The City did not require this applicant to have a licensed structural engineer assess the house because they know it needs to be reconstructed. Relocating the house would not hurt its structural stability because its stability is gone. For that reason, the application complies. This is not a Landmark structure so it is able to be moved.

Board Member Hodgkins asked if this house was originally designated Landmark and was later changed to Significant. Planner Grahn explained that prior to 2013 the house had been listed as Landmark because it was not uncommon for Ls to be added to hall-parlors. The Reconnaissance Level Survey that was done in 2009 was a general survey and they thought the L was historic. In 2013 the owner found evidence that the L was actually built between 1965-1970 and it was not historic. The L had changed the historic form of the house and that, combined with the need to reconstruct the house, changed the designation from Landmark to Significant. Planner Grahn noted that Landmark structures are National Registry eligible and cannot be reconstructed. Often times structures are designated as Significant so they can be reconstructed. Board Member Hodgkins clarified that the house still meets the criteria for Significant under the new Code. Planner Grahn answered yes.

Planner Grahn pointed out that they were only talking about moving the house 4 feet west towards Daly Avenue. The LMC has been modified, and it has been demonstrated that the house is in poor condition. The house needed to be deconstructed not because of its location but because of other conditions on the site.

Planner Grahn stated that the second criteria is whether or not the Planning Director and Chief Building Official determines that the house is a threat in its present setting because of its hazardous conditions. In 2013 the argument was that there were hazardous conditions because of the drainage issues. However, under the current Code the Planning Director and the Chief Building Official found that the drainage issues could be addressed in other ways without relocating the building.

Planner Grahn stated that Item c) under Criteria 3 is that the HPB, with input from the Planning Director, finds that there are unique conditions; and they have to include all of the items, which is 1) whether or not the historic context of the historic buildings have been so radically altered that the proposed relocation will enhance the ability to interpret the character of the historic buildings or sites or the District. Planner Grahn noted that she was asking the HPB to discuss this issue. She had looked through the 1909 Sanborn Fire Insurance Map of the 200 and 300 blocks of Daly Avenue. She found that 9 historic structures designated on the HSI still remain; and three of the nine have been relocated. Planner Grahn stated that in looking at all of Daly Avenue, there are 33 historic structures and six have been relocated.

Planner Grahn stated that another thing discussed in the Staff report is that location is part of the integrity of the structure. There are seven aspects of integrity and they have previously talked about the importance of location and how it contributes to the character of the site and contributes to its significance. She noted that relocating the structure 4 feet changes the context and setting of the building. Planner Grahn remarked that they were not just talking about the setting of this particularly house on this lot, but how it relates to all of Daly as a whole. She presented the Sanborn Map and noted that the green buildings were the ones that were relocated. The red building was the current historic house and the garage in its current location. Planner Grahn stated that the green buildings are Significant, the blue buildings are Landmark, and the ones circled were the buildings that were relocated within this mini-neighborhood.

Planner Grahn stated that the next criteria is whether the proposed relocation diminishes the overall physical integrity of the Historic District. She noted that this building is not on the National Register and it is not eligible for the National Register, however, the LMC and the Design Guidelines are written such that it is tied to the National Register standard. Significant Buildings are treated as National Register eligible, even though most are not.

Planner Grahn stated that the next criteria is that the historic integrity and significance will not be diminished by the relocation and reorientation. She pointed out that location is a big part of the integrity of the site.

Planner Grahn stated that the last criteria is whether the potential to preserve this building is enhanced by its relocation. She noted that there were only talking 4 feet and there was still room to put the addition proposed. If the house is not moved, the addition will be closer to the canyon wall.

Chair Stephens referred to the plat map and the development line that was drawn. He asked if the line was just past the rock walls. Planner Grahn stated that it was the maximum development line. They could build on it but not past it. The rear yard setback will be determined from the back of the lot. Chair Stephens understood that the addition proposed in 2013 did not taking full advantage. Rick Otto stated that it was more a function of getting retaining and drainage around the back. Setting the maximum development line was based on what was planned so they could get rock retaining and drainage around the house.

Board Member Beatlebrox read from the criteria, "The proposed relocation and reorientation will abate demolition of the historic buildings and structures on the site". She noted that Planner Grahn had indicated that it did not comply with the criteria because the building was already falling down. Ms. Beatlebrox believed that the building would fall down if it is moved, and she questioned when it would be moved. Planner Grahn stated that in this particular case, it was not being demolished because of its location on the site, but rather due to years of deferred maintenance and the hillside settling and falling into the back of the building. She did not believe the location alone was contributing to its poor condition.

Ms. Beatlebrox understood that in order to move a building, it could not collapse while it was being moved. In this case the house is in such poor condition it will collapse when moving. She asked if the idea was to reconstruct the house and then move it. Mr. Otto replied that the idea is to salvage whatever materials possible, and then demolish the house. The house would not be moved. Chair Stephens explained that they were not talking about the home 4 feet, but rather relocating the footprint and rebuilding the house in its new location 4 feet closer to Daly Avenue.

Mr. Otto provided a brief history of the property. When the original architect retired he took over the project and they went through the process and designed the project. Mr. Otto stated that they were allowed the 4' move; and in his mind with the 30" addition on the back of the garage, they were moving the house 18" closer to the garage. He pointed out that it was not a significant move and kept the historic integrity of the house. Mr. Otto remarked that Daly Avenue has a lot of variation and locations, and at the time that was part of the logic for allowing it to be moved 4' closer. Another reason was to move the house off the hillside. It was a technical issue of trying to create some space. Mr. Otto noted that the Henry's bought the house based on those approvals. Mr. Otto stated that very

little has changed from what was approved in 2013, and allowing them to move the house 4 feet would help with technical issues.

Mr. Henry stated that the house is located on the old Washington Mill Site. He noted that the homes on Daly Avenue were squatters' shacks and they were built as temporary structures for the mine workers. Mr. Henry remarked that because it was a mill site and a large cable ran through there, some of those houses are staggered based on the Millsite and not on civil engineering. Mr. Henry believed that the house at 269 Daly would get lost when a house is built on the adjacent lot. Pulling the house forward would give the street more historical integrity. He noted that the two houses he reconstructed on that street were moved. One house was moved 24 feet. The other house was moved 16' forward and 18' sideways. This request for 4 feet was minimal in comparison.

Mr. Henry stated that another reason for wanting move the house 4' is that Daly Avenue is challenged for sunlight, and moving the house forward 4' makes a difference in the number of hours it gets sunlight.

Chair Stephens appreciated Mr. Otto's comments regarding the prior approval; however, the HPB is obligated to review this application under the current Code.

Board Member Wiener asked if the current Code allowed the house to be moved. Chair Stephens stated that the HPB needed to review the criteria to see if it is allowed within the current Code. Planner Grahn stated that Exhibit A in the Staff report was the criteria they should use to make their findings.

Mr. Henry did not believe anyone would know the difference if the house is reconstructed 4 feet closer to the road. He pointed out that 4 feet is not a lot, and the relationship between the house and the garage remains the same. Allowing the house to move results in a nicer project and keeps it off the hillside, which is advantageous for the neighborhood.

Mr. Otto stated that without the 4-foot move, the addition would creep further up the hillside and appear to overpower the historic house. He asked if the LMC allows the HPB the flexibility to make variations to the Code. Chair Stephens stated that the addition is not within the purview of the HPB. Their role is to look at the historic house. It would be up to the Planning Department and the HDDR to address the addition and how it impacts the neighborhood.

Chair Stephens appreciated that Mr. Henry pointed out that taking the addition off the rear of the garage keeps the relation with the garage and the house the same. His primarily concern is the relationship between the front of the current house and the historic houses on each side, and how that fits if the house is moved. He also noted that the front façade of the house would be moved back towards the hillside because they would be removing the addition.

Mr. Otto stated that logically they would be creating air with the deck versus the addition, which is a solid façade. Chair Stephens pointed out that they did not know whether the front porch would go all the way across. Planner Grahn stated that the porch is designed to go all the way across.

Board Member Weiner understood that “unique condition” would still apply if there is a unique condition that warrants moving the structure. She wanted to know more about what changed from the previous approval, when the Planning Director and the Building Official found unique condition by virtue of the land in the back. Ms. Weiner wanted to know why that was no longer relevant. Planner Grahn explained that at that time the Code only said that the Chief Building Official and the Planning Director could approve the relocation of a house if there were unique conditions. It did not identify unique conditions or specify the impacts. The previous Building Official and Planning Director found unique conditions based on the drainage; however, in looking further, it was later determined that the drainage could be addressed without relocation.

Board Member Weiner asked Mr. Otto if he believed the drainage could be addressed by other means. Mr. Otto replied that drainage would have to be addressed regardless, but getting the retaining walls around the back of the house is an expensive solution to try to deal with the hillside. Not being allowed the additional 4 feet would exacerbate the situation. Ms. Weiner asked if the erosion would become worse over time and the rock wall would begin to move forward over time. Mr. Otto stated that rock walls tend to move, but they would have to be structural rock walls. Chair Stephens pointed out that the rock walls would be an issue for the Building and Engineering Departments. Mr. Otto agreed, and commented on the need to be very careful about how the walls are built.

Board Member Scott referred to page 110 of the Staff report, which showed the front porch is the distance of the L coming out. Mr. Otto believed it was approximately 6 feet. He noted that the deck would continue all the way across the front with a replicated door centered in the deck.

Board Member Beatlebrox referred to Exhibit A and noted that the guidelines say that unique conditions shall include the following. The first one is the historic context of the historic buildings and structures have been so radically altered that the proposed relocation will enhance the ability to interpret the historic character. Ms. Beatlebrox thought that was very important. She was having a difficult time finding that the historic context had changed at all on the street, and certainly not radically. Ms. Beatlebrox did not believe there was a unique condition regarding that particular issue. Chair Stephens did not disagree. However, in his opinion, it is the context of the surrounding buildings rather than the entire street. He would like to see how the historic house would be located if it was built in place

with the addition gone, in relationship to the other two buildings. He also wanted to know if it was moved 4 feet and the addition removed in the front, what the relationship would be to those two buildings.

Mr. Henry referred to the house to the south that was redone and built into the hillside. He noted that a stone wall was built on the property line with planter boxes on top of the wall. Coming down the hill, the house is lost behind all the planters and the stone wall. Board Member Beatlebrox stated that she had noticed that it was obscured and it was difficult to tell that it was a Landmark house. Mr. Henry stated that if the house at 269 Daly moves forward, it would enhance the historical context of the street.

Chair Stephens opened the public hearing.

There were no comments.

Chair Stephens closed the public hearing.

Board Member Hodgkins understood that it was already determined that the house would be demolished. He questioned why it should go back into the same spot because it will be a reconstructed house rather than the original house. Mr. Hodgkins clarified that he has never voted in favor of moving an original house, and he always has issues with demolishing a house and reconstructing it. However, since demolition was not part of this discussion, he did not understand why the historic location was such an issue. Mr. Hodgkins stated that if the historic location was so important, why were they allowing the house to come down. Chair Stephens stated that they were allowing demolition because the house was in a deteriorated condition. He explained that the intent with reconstruction is to reconstruct the home in place so as not to deceive the public and people viewing the home in the future.

Ms. Hodgkins pointed out that the same conditions do not apply to the house next door, and that house will be built 10' off the street. Part of the argument is how this house relates to the houses on either side, but in reality they do not have control over the streetscape. Chair Stephens clarified that his point was how this house related to the historic homes on the street; not the new homes that would be built.

Director Erickson noted that the Code says to protect the historic character of the neighborhood. If the definition of neighborhood character was on the screen, they would see random placement of homes for trams towers, the Millsite, and overhead cables. He stated that two houses to the south were relocated because of the proximity to the creek. Director Erickson thought the policy decision was relative to how to protect the character of the neighborhood; not how to protect the character of the street. He pointed out that if the Board was

trying to interpret the character of the street, moving the house may diminish the historic character of the street and not necessarily the proximity to the two historic homes. That was the reason why the City Council gave direction to change the Land Management Code. Director Erickson believed that was a good position to be discussing in order for the HPB to understand the difference in the different neighborhoods and why the houses are in their current location. He remarked that if there was a unique condition relative to the site, they would direct the applicant to apply for a variance with the Board of Adjustment because that body has the power to change the rules. The other alternative would be to amend the plat and allow that limited development behind the move. That does not necessarily help because the large redevelopment behind Landmark houses caused the City to write a more rigorous regulation.

Director Erickson stated that the strategy is to protect the historic house and to protect the neighborhood. The alignment of houses on the street is not necessarily historic character; but the positioning of the houses on this street create the character on Daly Avenue. He thought the HPB needed to worry less about the house and more about the impact to the neighborhood. He pointed out that Planner Grahn's conditions talk about how the National Register views relocated structures.

Chair Stephens stated that ultimately the HPB needed to find a reason within the criteria to justify moving the house. Planner Grahn noted that it needed to meet Criteria A, B or C. If it is C, then it has to meet 1-4.

Board Member Hutchings did not think it met Criteria A or B. He was struggling with C because he could not see where the structure had been so dramatically altered to meet the requirement.

Director Erickson noted that normally the Code requires a transitional element. He asked if it was possible to do a different kind of transitional element if the house did not move. Planner Grahn stated that the addition being proposed is far smaller than most additions they look at for material deconstruction. This is only a 1 story addition off the back. Between that and the fact that the footprint of the addition is only half of the historic structure, she thought they could treat it differently. One of the things they did was skew the addition so it reads separately. Normally, when they look at these they make the house an I or H shape with the traditional element because it helps push the bulky mass of the addition behind the house so it reads separately. In this case, the addition will be shorter than the ridgeline of this building. Some of the things that can be done to differentiate it is to choose materials that break up the mass. The roof pitch will be different. Those types of things could be done to help with this project.

Board Member Hutchings wanted to know how that would help meet the requirements in this case. Planner Grahn replied that they could talk about this

addition being a transition in itself instead of an element. It is a Design Guideline and once they see the addition they would sit down with the Design Review Team to look at it closer. However, what they typically do with transitional elements may not be 100% applicable here because of the mass and scale.

Chair Stephens thought the question is what impact it would have if the house is not relocated. It may help mitigate some of the issues with regards to square footage that might be lost, as well as the ability to design the addition.

Mr. Otto noted that the addition was by the previous owner. It is relevant but it will change.

Board Member Beatlebrox read Criteria C3, "The historical integrity and significance of the Historic Building and/or Structure will not be diminished by relocation and/or reorientation". In her opinion, when an addition is huge and overpowers the original building, the historic structure is diminished. She thought the idea of having a 1 story addition in the back was a unique situation, and that the applicant should be commended. Mr. Beatlebrox suggested that this could possibly be a condition of approval for moving it. If they get more square footage for a 1 story, smaller is better.

Director Erickson stated that the criteria is fairly clear in the LMC, but it was open to a policy discussion. There also needs to be consistency in what they do for this application and how they approve projects in the future. In five years they need to be able to explain how they made their decision. Director Erickson stated that if they could implement this consistently with the code they could move it forward. The purpose is to restore the house and allow an appropriate addition, but in a way that is consistent with the LMC.

Board Member Hodgkins asked Planner Grahn if she was willing to consider no transitional element or whether she was saying that it looks different but it does meet the transitional element. Planner Grahn thought they should avoid talking about the addition because the design was not the purview of the HPB. She pointed to Mr. Otto's comment that the addition that was approved in 2013 would not be the same addition this applicant will propose when they come back for Design Review. Planner Grahn clarified that there is room for an addition regardless of whether or not the house is moved 4 feet.

Chair Stephens agreed that they should not be talking about the addition, which is why they clarified that the line in the back is the maximum development line.

Board Member Hodgkins stated that based on the current Land Management Code, he did not think the 2013 approval could be done today. Planner Grahn pointed out that when it was approved in 2013 it was under the 2009 guidelines. They need to look at it carefully and consider why it was allowed at that time.

She assumed that it was approved without the transition due to the size and scale. Chair Stephens noted that it was only one story and there are architectural ways to make a transition easier.

Board Member Scott understood that there were neighboring Landmark structures, the 2013 approval was done under the previous code, and that it does not meet certain requirements of the current code. He also understood that trees were an issue and he did not think a 4' movement was significant enough to change that issue. They were also within the maximum development line. Mr. Scott stated that the primary points for moving the house were sunlight and the cost of retaining the back. He stated that in looking at the street five years into the future, the front mass and scale will have changed from an L-shape with a decent mass and a small front porch. The front mass would be gone and the front porch would go all the way across. In his opinion, 4 feet makes up for that. With the house closer to the street it brings the scale back into interest. He pointed out that the entire front of house would be changed anyway.

Board Member Weiner stated that if the purpose of the change is to bring the house into alignment with how it was historically built, she thought that was significant.

Board Member Scott stated that his concern was being consistent and protecting the neighborhood.

Director Erickson stated that the HPB could argue the policy that moving the house 4 feet forward and removing the non-historic front increases the historical integrity of the home. They would need to make a finding on how this would not decrease the historical integrity of the neighborhood. They would weigh the two and say it is better to preserve the house rather than worry about the 4 feet; or be able to interpret the 4 feet in the Staff recommendation. If they decide this is the direction to take in order to preserve the house, they may have to weaken the integrity of the neighborhood. It would have to be a consistent thought that they could argue in the future.

Board Member Beatlebrox thought the intent of the Guidelines is to make sure that owners do not move their house to accommodate large additions or other non-historic elements. Board Member Holmgren pointed out that they should not be talking about additions and elements that were not within their purview. Chair Stephens agreed that their decision needed to be made within the Guidelines. He believed there was consensus that a motion to move forward needed to be within the language of the Code.

Planner Grahn stated that if there was consensus for Criteria C, they needed to find compliance with all the requirements of items 1 through 4.

Board Member Holmgren stated that she has lived in her house for 30 years and she watched many Landmark homes get moved prior to the LMC. She has always strongly objected, and she believed minutes from meetings in years past would reflect her comments and objection. Ms. Holmgren understood the importance of light in the house and how it affects everything, and she was conflicted on this decision.

Board Member Hutchings understood this project was practical, but he was still having a hard finding compliance with C1. Board Member Hodgkins stated that the house would be torn down so it would not be the same historic house. Board Member Holmgren remarked that it was still part of the neighborhood.

Mr. Henry stated that as new homes are built, historic homes get lost in shadows. His point for #1 is that moving the house forward would be an enhancement. It would enhance the historic character of the neighborhood because it would give the house more prominence. The house that was built last year left this house in a big shadow, and another house will be built next door.

Board Member Hutchings did not dispute that it might enhance the neighborhood. In order to comply with 3C1, he asked if they needed to find that the historical context has been altered; or if they could just say moving the house would enhance the historical context.

Planner Grahn believed they needed to show that the historic context has been altered. However, they could argue that the context has been altered because so many buildings on Daly have been relocated and new developments changed the look and feel of the street.

Board Member Weiner liked the fact that the front of the house would be returned to its original form. If the house is not moved 4' forward they would not have the luxury of having the original façade. Planner Grahn pointed out that the original façade would return even if the house is not moved forward.

Board Member Beatlebrox did not believe the historic context had changed. It was the one street that still has the old mining feel. Even if the homes were moved, they still look similar.

Mr. Henry noted that they were proposing to save the garage and return the house to its original look. Moving the house would not change the historical nature of the street. Board Member Beatlebrox agreed that it would not change the historical nature of the street. She believed this application complied with Items 2 and 3.

Director Erickson stated that he still supported Planner Grahn's recommendation; however, if the applicant's testimony was correct and things such as the barns and shops are gone, how could the street be historically correct. Planner Grahn thought they could make that argument. Director Erickson pointed out that there was no evidence in the Findings of Fact to do that and to have that conversation with the HPB. There were two contexts that they could not explain; the location of the home and the setback against the hillside. He wanted to know how they could interpret it for the public to explain why the house is in its current location. It would be helpful if they could find additional information or photos that would respond to the historical context of Daly Avenue to see if it has radically changed. However, if they do that, it opens up the threat to other historic homes on Daly that may be in the same situation, and it will test C1 every time. That is something they would want to avoid.

Chair Stephens stated that in some instances it would not meet the test on 3 or 4. Even if people claim the street has been changed, there is some justification not to allow it based on the criteria. Chair Stephens pointed out that if they decide to allow this house to move 4 feet they need to make sure that it does not create future problems. He echoed the importance of being consistent.

Director Erickson stated that the consistency with the previous code was changed by policy. They were being consistent with the current code not to relocate houses unless evidence makes a compelling case. If the Board felt like a piece of evidence was missing, he would rely on the historic preservation team to respond.

Chair Stephens thought the Board was primarily having issues with C1. With the information presented this evening, there was nothing that helped him justify C1. He suggested that there may be additional evidence or materials related to historical context that might help the HPB come to consensus for a motion.

Planner Grahn stated that if the other Board Members felt the same way, they could continue to February 7th, and give direction on what additional information they would like to see. Board Member Holmgren stated that she was very torn on this issue and she would feel more comfortable if they could wait for additional information.

Mr. Otto asked if it would be appropriate to consult Dina Blaes. Planner Grahn replied that if the applicant wanted additional time to work with a consultant or do their own research, the Board could continue to a date uncertain.

Chair Stephens clarified that he was not looking at the entire street. Daly is a long street and different things occur depending on where it is on the street. He wanted to confine this to the surrounding properties in the area to see the historic context and whether it has changed.

Director Erickson pointed out that given the steepness of the lot in the back, it is possible that the front yard was used for the outhouse, which is why the house was set back further. Chair Stephens suggested that there may have been flooding issues as well because the stream was changing direction. He believed this was the type of information they needed to have to get better understanding. At this point the Board was struggling with it, and with the current information he could see no way around C1.

Chair Stephens asked if the applicant was willing to accept a continuation or if they preferred to have a decision this evening.

Mr. Henry was not opposed to a continuation if the Board needed additional information. Chair Stephens suggested that they continue this item to February 7th. If the Staff or the applicant needed additional time to do the requested research, the item could be continued again to a later date. The applicant agreed.

MOTION: Board Member Holmgren moved to CONTINUE 269 Daly Avenue to February 7, 2018. Board Member Scott seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

3. Annual Preservation Award - Staff recommends the Historic Preservation Board choose one (1) awardee for the annual Preservation Award, choose up to four (4) nominees for a historic award plaque.
(Application GI-15-02972)

Due to the late hour, the majority of the Board recommended a continuance to the next meeting.

MOTION: Board Member Holmgren moved to CONTINUE the Annual Preservation Award discussion to February 7, 2018. Board Member Hodgkins seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed. Board Member Beatlebrox voted to hold the awards discussion this evening.

Board Member Hutchings asked if they could talk to the Staff off the record about the artists. Planner Grahn stated that any Board member could stop by the office to speak with her, or if they had artists to recommend they could submit the names in writing.

Historic Preservation Board Meeting
January 16, 2018

The Meeting adjourned at 6:59 p.m.

Approved by _____
Stephen Douglas, Chair
Historic Preservation Board

APPROVED