

PARK CITY MUNICIPAL CORPORATION
HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD
MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 3, 2016

BOARD MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE: David White, Lola Beatlebrox, Cheryl Hewett, Hope Melville, Douglas Stephens, Jack Hodgkins

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

ROLL CALL

Chair White called the meeting to order at 5:04 p.m. and noted that all Board Members were present except Puggy Holmgren, who was excused.

PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS

There were no comments.

ADOPTION OF MINUTES

January 3, 2016

Board Member Melville referred to page 3 of the Staff report where corrections were made to the December minutes. She corrected the "Silver Queen and 65 Main Street" to correctly read "...and **625** Main Street.

MOTION: Board Member Beatlebrox moved to APPROVE the minutes of January 3, 2016 as amended. Board Member Hewett seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

STAFF/BOARD COMMUNICATIONS AND DISCLOSURES

Planner Hannah Turpen handed out a brochure which was the Staff version of the article for this month. She recommended that the Board read through it and consider how it will impact the discussion when looking at the design guidelines. Planner Turpen informed the public where they could obtain a copy of the brochure online from the Utah Heritage Foundation.

Planner Turpen stated that the brochure talks about compatible design and it outlines a lot of what is being done in the Avenues in Salt Lake. She noted that some buildings from Park City were also featured in the brochure.

Director Erickson introduced Ashley Scarff as the newest member of the Planning and Historic Preservation team. Ms. Scarff will be helping with historic preservation and larger scale planning projects.

Board Member Melville asked for an update on the Rio Grande Building on Park Avenue. She did not think any of the siding looked original. It was the same modern siding that was being put on the condo project.

Planner Grahn replied that it was not the same siding used on the condo project. The siding for the Rio Grande Building is siding that was milled to match what was on the building historically. Planner Grahn explained that when they removed the corrugated metal yellow siding two years ago, they found that most of the siding was cut down to create a skirt around the base of the building. Much of that wood was rotted and chipped beyond repair. She stated that the Staff considered having them reuse the existing siding, but the boards varied in length and width due to deterioration. Therefore, they decided the better option was to mill new siding that matches the profile, which is mostly barn board. Planner Grahn remarked that when it was first put up the Staff was concerned that the new siding on the Rio Grande structure looked similar to the siding on the condo project. The developer has assured the Planning Department that the siding would be painted. Planner Grahn believed the painting would make the siding look different than the condo project and it should make the Rio Grande stand out more.

Director Erickson clarified that the developer had provided samples and Planner Grahn was able to compare it to the historic board and see the paint color.

Board Member Melville thought it was board and batten. Planner Grahn replied that the Staff had that same thought from looking at the initial photographs, but when they visited the site they found that it was the same board you would find on a barn. It was just vertical boards next to each other. Ms. Melville stated that it currently did not look historic at all. Planner Grahn pointed out that it is new wood and they do not want it to look that historic because it is a new material. She assured Ms. Melville that once the wood is painted it would look very different from the condo project.

Planner Turpen stated that the historic board and a sample of the new board was available in the Planning Department if any of the Board members were interested.

Board Member Melville asked about the original historic plan for the Rio Grande building. Planner Grahn believed they originally intended to use the historic material. However, the exploratory demo was done in selective places and at that time they did not realize the extent to which the historic siding had been removed and lost. When the Staff visited the site during the winter they found

that the original siding was only around the base of the building and not all the way up as everyone had anticipated. Ms. Melville thought the historic photos showed either corrugated metal or board and batten. Planner Grahn explained that the corrugated metal was historic only in the sense that it was from the 1960s and 1970s, or possibly the 1940s; but it was not original to the actual building. She thought the photo was unclear as to whether it was actually showing board and batten. It could be showing the groove between the vertical boards. Ms. Melville requested that the Staff relook at the historic photos.

CONTINUATIONS (Public Hearing and Continue to Date Specified.)

Planner Grahn reported that the list of continuations were Determination of Significance applications and the Staff requested that they be continued to the meeting on March 2nd. The items will be noticed in accordance with recent LMC changes, and will include a property notice, a mailing, and a letter to the property owner. Planner Grahn stated that a sign would be posted on the property and neighbors within 100 feet will be noticed by mail.

1. 569 Park Avenue – Determination of Significance

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

MOTION: Board Member Beatlebrox moved to CONTINUE 569 Park Avenue – Determination of Significance to March 2, 2016. Board Member Stephens seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

2. 210 Grant Avenue – Determination of Significance

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

MOTION: Board Member Beatlebrox moved to CONTINUE 210 Grant Avenue - Determination of Significant to March 2, 2016. Board Member Stephens seconded the motion.

VOTE: The Motion passed unanimously.

3. 921 Norfolk Avenue – Determination of Significance

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

MOTION: Board Member Beatlebrox moved to CONTINUE 921 Norfolk Avenue – Determination of Significance to March 2, 2016. Board Member Stephens seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

4. 1406 Park Avenue – Determination of Significance

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

MOTION: Board Member Beatlebrox moved to CONTINUE 1406 Park Avenue – Determination of Significance to March 2, 2016. Board Member Stephens seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

5. 1259 Norfolk Avenue – Determination of Significance.

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

MOTION: Board Member Beatlebrox moved to CONTINUE 1259 Norfolk Avenue – Determination of Significance to March 2, 2016. Board Member Stephens seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

WORK SESSION – Discussion of recent LMC Amendments to Chapter 15-11.

Planner Grahn stated that the Staff thought it would be helpful for the HPB and the Staff to quickly review the LMC changes that the City Council adopted in December.

Planner Grahn referred to page 39 of the Staff report which outlined the changes to the noticing requirements. The change would allow the Staff to do further community outreach as far as noticing for HPB review of material deconstruction, the determination of significance, and other items reviewed by the Board.

Planner Turpen noted that page 40 outlined the expansion of the purpose of the Historic Preservation Board to include review of material deconstruction applications.

Planner Grahn stated that pages 42-43 outlined the expanded criteria that the Staff and HPB worked to create in terms of the Historic Sites Inventory and the different designations. She noted that the criteria had been modified because the City Council had excluded the buildings that were not historic to Park City but had been moved. Those buildings would not be on the historic sites inventory. Planner Grahn noted that retained language included that it retains its historical form and the historical scale and mass as the Board previously discussed.

Planner Grahn commented on the new designation of “Contributory Site” and the criteria for contributory. She pointed out that the designation does not protect the structure from demolition.

Planner Grahn referred to page 44 and noted that criteria was adding stating that after any panelization or reconstruction project, the HPB would review the project to determine whether or not it retained its Landmark or Significant status.

Planner Turpen noted that page 44 also outlined the process for material deconstruction, which includes the HPB review. The process also includes that relocation and reorientation of any building would be reviewed by the HPB.

Planner Grahn referred to pages 46-47 and noted that the criteria for reorientation and relocation of historic buildings had been modified. Previously it was up to the Chief Building Official and the Planning Director to find unique conditions that warranted the relocation or reorientation. The modification leaves it up to the HPB. Planner Grahn reviewed examples of unique conditions as provided in the Staff report. Planner Turpen noted that the same process applied for reconstruction, which would be reviewed by the HPB.

Planner Grahn commented on a change to the appeal process to make it consistent. Since the HPB will be doing the material deconstruction reviews, their decision could be appealed to the Board of Adjustment. To make it consistent, any Staff determination on a design guideline would also be appealed to the Board of Adjustment on an HDDR application.

Planner Turpen noted that the definitions were updated beginning on page 51 of the Staff report.

Director Erickson remarked that the purpose of this review was to update the HPB on the changes made by the City Council with respect to historic homes that were moved into Park City. The Staff was assessing the impacts. Director Erickson believed the new noticing requirement was important for the entire Historic District and responds to the Board’s request for additional notification.

Planner Grahn explained that the noticing requirement for material deconstruction is to notice neighbors within 100 feet, which is the same

requirement for HDDR applications. Director Erickson stated that prior to this change public noticing did not occur for material deconstruction. In addition to the mailed notice, a sign will be posted on the property so the adjacent property owners are aware of what is occurring. There will be two notices; one of the HDDR action and a second one for the actual material deconstruction.

Board Member Stephen asked if the HPB would be using what was passed by the City Council in reviewing the relocations on the agenda this evening. Planner Grahn answered yes.

REGULAR AGENDA – Discussion, Public Hearing and Possible Action

Planner Grahn reviewed the next two items simultaneously. Two separate actions were required.

1. 1450 Park Avenue – Relocation and Material Deconstruction – Significant House. The applicant is proposing to relocate the existing historic house on its lot. In addition, the applicant will be removing non-historic vegetation, non-historic rear additions, removing the roof for structural upgrades, temporarily removing a historic chimney for restoration, removing non-historic cladding on exterior walls, removing the non-historic porch, removing a historic door and non-historic doors, removing existing non-historic windows. (Application PL-15-03029)
2. 1460 Park Avenue – Relocation and Material Deconstruction – Significant House. The applicant is proposing to relocate the existing historic house on its lot. In addition, the applicant will be removing non-historic vegetation, non-historic rear additions, removing the roof for structural upgrades, removing non-historic cladding on exterior walls, removing the non-historic porch, removing a historic door and non-historic doors, removing existing non-historic windows. (Application PL-15-03030)

Planner Grahn stated that because these projects are similar and the work being done is consistent on both, she had broken the discussion into two sections. One was to talk about the difference between the two properties and the second was to discuss the similarities. She thought the Planning Commission would find that the findings and reasoning for these changes were the same for both projects.

Rhoda Stauffer, the City's Housing Specialist, and Hans Cerny, the project architect, were present to answer questions.

Planner Grahn stated that she was disoriented when they visited the historic houses and the places where they entered the historic houses were actually the kitchen additions that would be removed. She had mistakenly identified the wrong portion of the house but it was correct in the Staff report. Rhoda Stauffer clarified that they walked into the kitchen addition at 1460 Park Avenue, but they actually walked into the living room at 1450.

Planner Grahn referred to the site plan on page 185 of the Staff report. The applicant was proposing to relocate each of the houses. She noted that 1450 Park Avenue would be moved 8'6" to the west, and 1460 Park Avenue would be moved 5'5" to the west. It would be closer to Park Avenue but within the setback.

Planner Grahn remarked that these historic houses used to be in a neighborhood full of other historic houses. It was a neighborhood similar to Upper Park Avenue where there was a clear rhythm and scale and pattern going on in the streetscape due to smaller surrounding houses. However, much of the historic context of the neighborhood has been lost with the addition and construction of new condo buildings and multi-family dwellings. The Staff had conducted an analysis and found no significant impact on the historic integrity of the structures by moving forward to the west.

Planner Grahn stated that even if these houses get renovated and become more historic looking in appearance they would still not be eligible for the National Register because of the setting and the surrounding condo units.

Planner Grahn asked for comments or questions regarding the relocation.

Board Member Beatlebrox wanted to know the exact setback once the houses are moved. Planner Grahn replied that it would be approximately 15 feet from Park Avenue. Board Member Hodgkins asked how it compared to the other historic buildings at 1410 and 1406 Park Avenue. Planner Grahn did not know the setback on those structures.

Board Member Melville understood that the proposal was to move the structures forward towards the street but it did not involve panelization. Planner Grahn replied that she was correct. The structures would be moved intact. Ms. Melville asked if the renovations being proposed could be done in the current location without moving the homes. Planner Grahn answered yes. She stated that one of the concerns, especially when they had looked at the Greenpark Co-housing project, was that getting enough units to make the project feasible required adding additional units on-site. If the houses are not pushed forward to the street, the separation between the new construction behind it and the historic house becomes more limited. Planner Grahn felt that would be more detracting than pushing the houses forward and create additional separation between this and new cottage housing that will be constructed behind it. Ms. Melville clarified

that the houses were being moved forward in order to accommodate more units on the property. Planner Grahn replied that she was correct.

Ms. Melville recalled that when Greenpark Co-Housing requested to move those building the request was denied. Planner Grahn could not recall the specifics of why it was denied. However, she reminded the Board that new Code amendments were adopted that defines unique conditions. Prior to that it was up to the Chief Building Official and the Planning Director to find the unique conditions. Ms. Melville stated that it had not come before the HPB, but she remember reading in the newspaper that Greenpark Co-Housing wanted to move the structures so they could fit ten units on the property. She reiterated that their request was denied. Now that it was a City project, they were proposing to move the buildings for the same reason. Ms. Melville understood that they could still put in cottage units without moving the houses, but it would be a lesser number than what was being proposed. Planner Grahn stated that the number of units proposed would still fit and meet the building requirements for the separation. However, the concern about the separation is more about its impact on the historic structure. A greater separation isolates the historic structures and makes them stand out more clearly. Ms. Melville believed they could reduce the number of cottages and achieve the same separation without moving the historic homes. Planner Grahn agreed, but noted that the discussion was not to dictate the number of cottage units.

Board Member Melville was concerned that when the public asked to move the historic moves they were denied; but now that the City is the applicant they have found a way to allow it. She questioned the fairness.

Assistant City Attorney McLean remarked that the Code has changed since Greenpark Co-Housing made their request. Ms. Melville wanted to know what new Code criteria they were using to justify a change in thinking. Ms. McLean did not believe a prior application was submitted to move the structures.

Council Member Cindy Matsumoto commented on her recollection of the discussion with the City Council regarding the project that was proposed as Greenpark Co-Housing. She stated that an RFP went out and the Council asked to have the buildings remain in their existing location and to have the greatest degree of rehabilitation of the buildings. The Council did not want panelization. Ms. Matsumoto stated that the City Council worked hard with Greenpark to try to come up with a workable solution. She recalled that there were a number of reasons besides moving the structures that kept the project from moving forward; and financing was the primary reason. Ms. Matsumoto remarked that the City Council granted extensions and made changes to the Code to allow access off Sullivan Road in an effort to make the project work. Ms. Matsumoto stated that when the Greenpark Co-Housing project ended because it was not feasible to move forward, there were two questions. One was whether something different

could be done. They were advised that since they had gone out for a public RFP they could not change the rules in midstream and allow Greenpark to move the buildings. When that project became moot the City decided that the fastest way to get affordable housing was for the City to take on the project themselves. The City Council once again specified that the goals were to preserve the buildings and to have attainable housing. They knew it would be controversial and that the City would be scrutinized because they were asking to have the buildings moved. Ms. Matsumoto clarified that it was really about separation and a better project. She remarked that the City was proposing to build fewer homes than what was proposed in the Greenpark project and the amount of parking was reduced. They were trying to achieve the best project possible.

Director Erickson referred to page 46 of the Staff report and noted that Criteria #3 was the criteria used for recommending that the houses be moved. Criteria #3 gives the power to the HPB and not the Planning Director and Chief Building Official. Director Erickson read, "The historic context of the buildings have been so radically altered that the present setting does not appropriately convey its history". He explained that the Staff determined that because the structures are locked between 1970 condos and there are no historic homes immediately adjacent, moving the buildings a couple of feet allows greater separation from the new development, and would not affect the historic character of the buildings after the proposed renovation.

Board Member Beatlebrox asked for the setback requirement in that neighborhood. Planner Grahn replied that it was 15 feet. Ms. Beatlebrox assumed there were no other non-conforming buildings and that they were all set back 15 feet or more. Planner Grahn stated that there might be some legal non-conforming buildings. She was not sure what the setbacks were for the 1970s condos. It appeared that there were a variety of issues and the Staff would review each unit individually as they came in to determine whether or not it was legally non-conforming.

Board Member Beatlebrox stated that when she visited the site she looked at the setbacks and some seemed closer than 15 feet. She did not believe this request was non-conforming.

Board Member Stephens asked if the proposed location would be 15 feet back from the property line. Planner Grahn answered yes. He asked how far back the property line was from Park Avenue. He thought the curb cut was different than the property line. Mr. Cerny replied that the property line was behind the sidewalk. Mr. Stephens pointed out that these homes would be sitting back further than some of the other homes on Park Avenue. Mr. Stephens suggested that it might be better to move the homes closer to Park Avenue to greater separation from the buildings in the back. He understood that moving them closer to the street would require a Board of Adjustment hearing.

Board Member Hodgkins had concerns with the relocation. From the standpoint of a Historic Preservation Board, moving a historic building should not be preferable. If the role of the HPB is to protect the historic integrity of the City, he thought they needed to spend more time making this decision. He understood where in the Code it might be allowable, but he thought that argument could be debated. Mr. Hodgkins questioned whether the research that was presented fit the definition of continuity, rhythm and pattern that they previously discussed; particularly if they do not understand the other setbacks on adjacent structures. Mr. Hodgkins stated that as he stood on this site and across the street from this site other historic buildings could easily be seen. Without understanding where those are, he was not sure he could approve moving the two structures as close to the street as proposed. In addition, being able to get behind the buildings and allowing them to breathe was not historically as important as the streetscape.

Board Member Beatlebrox wanted to know the actual footage between the historic buildings and the proposed affordable housing unit immediately behind. Mr. Cerny stated that it was approximately 10 to 12 feet. Ms. Beatlebrox asked for the footage between the adjacent buildings if these homes were not moved. Mr. Cerny stated that if the homes are not moved they would have to reorganize the entire site. Ms. Beatlebrox asked if it would be ten feet between the two buildings immediately behind if the buildings are moved, but only five feet if they remain in their current location. Mr. Cerny explained that several things would need to be considered. One is the Building Code that requires a minimum separation between buildings that would need to be addressed. He pointed out that it was more than an aesthetic issue or finding a comfortable distance between units.

Board Member Beatlebrox stated that she was sensitive to the fact that the City needs affordable housing. These two buildings were affordable housing and it would be wonderful to keep them as affordable housing. She thought it would be a shame to lose a number of affordable housing units by not moving these structures. Ms. Beatlebrox asked if the structures were stable enough to be moved. Mr. Cerny stated that the structures would have to be stabilized in order to be moved. At this point he was unsure which method would be used but it would likely be some type of constructed frame around the house. Ms. Stauffer explained that the houses would be raised regardless because they need to put footings and foundations underneath them.

Chair White stated that if the historic houses are not moved forward and the same number of affordable units are built as shown, there would be less than five feet between the structures.

Chair White opened the public hearing on the relocation portion of the applications.

Clark Baron, the owner of the Struggler Unit adjacent to this property, appreciated the hard work of the Planning Department in trying to save these two historic dwellings because he shares that interest. He knew the owner of the home closest to his unit and the history of that house and would like to see it preserved. Mr. Baron approved the idea of reworking the homes and making them stable and up to Code and still retain their historic locations and shape. He supported the current proposal. Mr. Baron stated that in looking at other homes around Park City he recognizes that quite a few were built very close to the road and have no front yard. Mr. Baron noted that unlike many of the other historic homes in the area these homes were built away from the city center and actually have moderate front yards historically. He would like to see the front yard maintained because it is a unique feature of historic homes. Mr. Baron believed that moving the homes closer to the road would decrease the value of the home for future homeowners.

Mr. Baron clarified that he would not address any issues with the housing behind at this point because he was told that it was not part of this hearing. However, he was supportive of the concept of the cottages because it was a good use for the back of the property. Mr. Baron stated that if possible he would like to see the historic setbacks maintained, but he was willing to accept whatever the City chooses to do. Mr. Baron was pleased with the concept of this project.

Ruth Meintsma, a resident at 305 Woodside, asked about the root cellar.

Planner Grahn stated that the root cellar would be addressed during the material deconstruction portion of the discussion.

Ms. Meintsma noted that the root cellar is part of one particular house and it appeared to be attached now but in history it was not attached. Planner Grahn replied that she was correct. Ms. Meintsma stated that root cellars can be used today in the same way they were used historically or in other ways. She hoped that relationship and association would not be lost in the move.

Marianne Cone stated that she was part of the Greenpark Co-Housing. She had the pre-application conference notes for the HDDR process. She understood that that LMC had changed since the time of the Greenpark project and asked if it was changed specifically for these two homes or if they would see the changes applied to other structures. Planner Grahn replied that it would be applied in other places. Ms. Cone reiterated that Greenpark Co-Housing was not allowed to move anything at all. She pointed out that the buildings are not parallel and one is kind of askew. They asked if they could at least make them parallel to make them look better and the answer was no. Ms. Cone noted that Dina Blaes was the Preservation Consultant at the time and she was adamant that the building would not be moved. She pointed out that the argument of unique

conditions did not work for that project. Ms. Cone stated that one reason the Greenpark Co-Housing project failed because it went on for so long with the Planning Commission. If it had not been such a long process she believed they would have been able to obtain the financing. With more cooperation from the City she believes the project would have moved forward and people would have been living there for a year. They had proposed seven affordable housing units, paid for the architect and had worked out a system for co-housing. She encouraged the Board members to research co-housing if they were unfamiliar with the concept.

Ethel Preston appreciated Board Member Melville's concern about fairness. Ms. Preston thought it was a good idea to move the houses forward; but she thought it was a good idea when they proposed it for the Greenpark project. There was an issue about separation of one unit from the main house and their architect redesigned the unit to make the separation more distinctive to set off the historic house. Ms. Preston stated that as a citizen she was not opposed to moving the houses forward. She understood that as a Historic Preservation Board they may see it differently based on the guidelines. Ms. Preston wanted it on the record that Greenpark Co-Housing was denied this ability and the City, who now owns it, has changed the Code to make it work for them.

Chair White closed the public hearing on the relocation.

Planner Grahn stated that the next part was the material deconstruction. She explained that the major difference between the two historic houses were the additions that would be removed.

Planner Grahn referred to page 90 of the Staff report and noted that the orange outline showed what would be remaining after the additions have been removed on 1450 Park Avenue. She pointed out that it included the root cellar. Page 86 of the Staff report contained the Sanborn maps from 1907 and 1927. She did not believe the root cellar had been constructed at that point. Planner Grahn stated that the footprint in 1907 and 1927 consisted of the T-shaped cottage with an awkward L addition off the rear. Over time a root cellar and additional additions were constructed off the back. She stated that the additions were causing significant strain and weight on the house because of how they were built over the existing roof. The applicant was proposing to remove everything except what was shown in the orange outline on 1450 Park Avenue.

Board Member Melville referred to page 92 which showed the side view of an existing side elevation. She understood that everything would be removed starting with the middle chimney back. Planner Gran answered yes. Ms. Melville referred to page 92 and asked if she was reading it correctly that there was an original root cellar in 1904. Planner Grahn stated that it was part of a report Sandy Hatch did for the City in 2010 or 2011. She had used her drawings;

however, as they compared it to the Sanborn maps they found inaccuracies, such as when different portions of the building were constructed. Planner Grahn stated that the Sanborn maps are more consistent with what was there in 1904. She thought it was important to understand that the additions were tacked on to the house, and while they tell the history of development of the site, they do not necessarily contribute to the 1904 house itself. Planner Grahn commented on the importance of looking at the whole project and what they were trying to accomplish. In this case, the applicant was requesting to restore the structure to the 1904 form.

Mr. Cerny stated that part of what helped them determine what was historic was going up into the attic and seeing the original structure. Planner Grahn agreed that Sandy Hatch's exploratory demolition was much more limited than what was done recently.

Board Member Melville asked for the age of the additions. Planner Grahn believed the additions were post 1927 based on the Sanborn maps. That would put them outside of the historic period, but they could be over 50 years old. In response to the question asked by Ms. Meintsma, Ms. Melville understood that they would be removing the root cellar. Planner Grahn replied that the applicant was proposing to remove the root cellar. Ms. Stauffer stated that the stairway from the house goes down into the root cellar and it has been used as debris for years.

Planner Grahn referred to page 198 which showed the proposal for 1460 Park Avenue outlined in orange. The applicant was proposing to restore the house to the 1901 original, which was the T-shape cottage. They were proposing to remove the rear additions, which were not outlined in orange. Planner Grahn stated that based on the Sanborn maps a number of additions were made early on to the back of the house; however, the Staff did not believe those were the same additions that exist today. They were likely removed and replaced based on the forms of construction; specifically in the attic.

Board Member Beatlebrox wanted to know the square footage now and what it would be once the additions are removed. Mr. Cerny stated that the new square footage proposed for 1460 was 825 square foot footprint, including porches. The gross was 710 square feet of occupied space. For 1450 the square footage proposed was 858 square foot footprint and 800 gross square feet occupied space. Mr. Cerny believed the existing square footage could be found in the existing conditions report.

Board Member Beatlebrox clarified that the structures would remain small cottages and they would retain the porches in front for the entrance. Planner Grahn stated that they would talk about the porches later in the discussion. At this point she wanted the Board to focus on the additions.

Chair White understood that only the T-shape portion would be built. Planner Grahn explained that the T-shape portion would be preserved. The rest would be removed. Chair White stated that the site plan shows that area as part of the finished footprint. Planner Grahn stated that the applicant was proposing to remove the additions. An existing shed addition sits on that side of the house and the applicant was proposing to construct a new addition in that location that from the street would look similar to the projections seen today. It would help with the structural supports in the back and actually make the height of those areas walkable. Currently the ceilings are very low. Chair White clarified that what was proposed on the site plan was actually a new addition to the T-shape. Planner Grahn answered yes, and noted that it was true for both 1450 and 1460. She had included the site plan to give the Board an idea of where they were being relocated.

Planner Grahn reviewed the proposal to remove the roofs and noted that the roofs were different on each house. On 1450 Park Avenue the sheathing of the roof and the asphalt singles would be removed. The existing structure would have new beams to support a new roof, new sheathing and new asphalt shingles. The entire roof needed to be replaced.

Planner Grahn stated that on 1460 Park Avenue, the attic has suffered severely from fire damage. Rather than try to sister the beams in the existing structure with new members to bring the roof up to Code, the applicant was proposing to remove the roof structure and reconstruct it. Planner Grahn noted that in both cases the gables would be structured and preserved in order to maintain the pitch as opposed to trying to reconstruct the pitch. Chair White clarified that the pitch and massing would remain the same. Planner Grahn replied that this was correct.

Planner Grahn pointed out that there were three chimneys on 1450 Park Avenue; however, there were no chimneys on 1460 Park Avenue. The Staff suggested that the applicant maintain the original chimney, which is visible from the right-of-way. The chimney will be decorative as a character defining feature, but it will not be functional. Planner Grahn stated that Park City is losing a lot of the chimneys around town and chimneys were an important part of the Park City vernacular in how terms of how these houses looked. The two chimneys on the back of the house were added as part of the later additions and the Staff did not believe they were historic. They do not serve a purpose and they are not structurally sound. The Staff requested that the applicant be allowed to remove the two back chimneys as part of this rehab project.

Planner Grahn stated that the rest of the items being proposed for both houses were fairly similar and she requested that they be discussed together rather than individually.

The first item is that the applicant was proposing to remove much of the landscaping as part of the grading on site. The Staff was concerned about the loss of mature vegetation on the site and added a condition of approval stating that if the applicant removes mature vegetation it needs to be replaced. In addition, the applicant will be required to revegetate the site with lilacs and fruit trees consistent with what would have historically been there.

Planner Grahm stated that the applicant was also proposing to remove the Masonite and asbestos shingle siding to uncover the original wood siding. Since the extent of how much wood siding is still in existence or the condition of the siding, a condition of approval was added requiring a review by the Preservation Planner to make sure that any discarded material is severely damaged.

Planner Grahm reported that the applicant was also proposing to put in new foundations which would mean removing any rubble under the historic houses. The aluminum porches would be removed and reconstructed to be more in keeping with the historic photograph for 1450 Park Avenue. The windows would also be removed and the original window openings restored. The windows would be replaced with wood double-hung windows.

Planner Grahm noted that the last item were the doors. The applicant would like to keep the historic doors but relocate them to the rear elevation so they could widen the front door for ADA access. Planner Grahm stated that the Staff and the Building Department finds that ADA access could be created off the back of the structure to meet the ADA requirement, and that would allow the front door to remain in place and to be maintained and preserved to keep the original look of the house. The Staff requested input from the Planning Commission regarding the doors.

Board Member Beatlebrox stated that she had noticed the doors right away. The decoration on them is elaborate. Planner Grahm noted that it was not clear exactly what year the doors were put on, but one house dates from 1901 and the other house from 1904. Ms. Beatlebrox did not want the door to be moved.

Board Member Hodgkins asked for the difference in width of the new door. Mr. Cerny was unsure of the exact width. The current width is less than 3 feet. Mr. Cerny stated that if they were allowed to make the door ADA accessible, they would reuse the historic door in another part of the house. Ms. Stauffer remarked that the intent is to create a door to look exactly like the historic door only wider. It would have the same historic detailing.

Board Member Stephens thought the size of the door was more important than the detailing. Putting a door wide enough for ADA access changes the proportions. Mr. Stephen preferred having the ADA access off the back. He

asked if all the buildings on the site would be ADA Accessible or just these two. Ms. Stauffer stated that only these two structures would be ADA accessible because they are single story homes.

Board Member Melville agreed that the historic size and look of the door is important to the house. If they start changing the proportions it impacts the house and the streetscape. She thought it was important to keep the historic door in the front and comply with the ADA requirements in a different portion of the house.

Board Member Beatlebrox asked for the difference in feet between front access and back access in terms of how far a handicapped person would have to travel. Mr. Cerny replied that there would be 10-12 feet of travel from the driveway to the front door. It could be as much as 25 feet to the back of the house. In looking at the site plan, Ms. Beatlebrox thought there was room for a car to pull further back in the driveway.

Board Member Hewett asked if Unit E was a two-story structure. Ms. Stauffer stated that all of the new units on the property would be two-story. Ms. Hewett thought it made more sense to make one of the new units ADA accessible.

Mr. Cerny verified that per Code the clear width for ADA access is 32 inches. Mr. Hodgkins believed that was the clear width with the door open. Mr. Cerny agreed.

Board Member Stephens stated that the HPB was trying to make a decision on the historic significance of the front door and its importance in keeping the integrity of the home. He did not believe the HPB should be focused on design issues in terms of where to put the ADA access. That issue should be left to the design community. Mr. Stephens thought the Board should focus their discussion on whether or not the historic door is important to how the house looks from the street, and whether or not it is important to keep the historic door on the front of the house. In his opinion, ADA and affordable housing were not issues for the HPB.

Planner Grahn pointed out that if ADA access is put in the front, the door becomes wider and the HPB would have to approve the demolition of additional materials to make it wider. Mr. Stephens clarified that his point was that the HPB should be deciding whether the historic door could be removed and replaced with a wider door. Whether or not it is for ADA access should not be the issue. Planner Grahn agreed with his point.

Board Member Beatlebrox asked if the decorative pieces on the door were milled with wood. Planner Grahn believed that it was wood. She noted that the physical conditions report shows the front door for each property in detail.

Planner Grahn remarked Sandy Hatch had stated in her report that it was unclear whether or not the doors were original, but they were certainly historic doors. Mr. Hodgkins asked if anyone knew the width of the historic door. Mr. Stephens was almost certain that it was a 2'4" door, because that was what was consistently built at that time. Chair White thought the door shown in the photograph looked wider than 2'4".

Planner Turpen noted that the report identifies it as 32" wide. That would mean that the applicant could use one of the new type of hinges that clears the door, in which case they could use the existing door. She suggested that it might be something the applicant should research and come back with a new proposal for the door.

Board Member Beatlebrox asked for an explanation of the windows. Planner Grahn replied that all the windows in both houses have either been replaced or were beyond repair. She recalled that there was only one historic double-hung window on the back gable at 1460, but there is no glass and the wood is rotted. The applicant was proposing to remove all of the windows, restore the window openings on the historic portion of the house, and replace it with wood-double hung windows, which is consistent with what was there historically. Planner Grahn stated that on the back of 1460 the window will be shifted slightly to the north to accommodate a door and window on that gable.

Board Member Hodgkins noted that the proposal includes a number of items and he asked if it would be an all or nothing vote at the end. Director Erickson replied that it did not have to be an all or nothing vote. The Board could take action on the relocation of the building, a separate action on the material deconstruction, and take a separate action on the doors and request that the applicant return to the HPB if there is the need for additional material deconstruction for the doors on the front. Director Erickson noted that these actions should be taken separately for each house. Planner Grahn pointed out that the Staff recommendation is for approval of all items except the relocation of the historic doors.

Ms. Stauffer stated that if the Board felt strongly about the front door, they would rather have an approval to keep the front doors as they exist rather than request that the applicant come back with a new proposal.

Board Member Stephens clarified his earlier comment. He had mixed up the houses and referred to the wrong house when he said the door was 2'4". He stated that 1450 Park Avenue actually has the 2'4" door. 1460 Park Avenue has a wider door now, but it would have been a 2'4" door originally. If the applicant was restoring the window openings to the original size he thought they should also restore the front door opening to the original size. Board Member Beatlebrox concurred.

Director Erickson suggested that the Board discuss the doors and provide clear direction.

Chair White thought it was the opinion of the Board to maintain the historic openings and proportions for both houses. The Board concurred.

Chair White opened the public hearing on the deconstruction of materials.

Ruth Meintsma, 305 Woodside Avenue, noted that in her report Sandy Hatch states that the root cellar was probably original to the property. That would mean 1904, as indicated in the drawing. Ms. Meintsma understood that the root cellar was not included in the Sanborn map, but those were particularly fire maps. If there was a structure or element that would not be involved in fire insurance, it was not always included on the map. She pointed out that a concrete structure with a tin roof would not be a fire issue. Ms. Meintsma stated that in looking at the picture she thought Ms. Hatch would have been able to tell if the materials and/or the construction were historic. She remarked that accessory structures are now protected because they are important to the context of the historic houses. She did not think they should be allowed to remove the root cellar without first proving that it was not historic, as opposed to proving that it was historic. If it has historic significance she thought it should be kept and incorporated if they find that it is associated with the original structure. Ms. Meintsma pointed out that there was no tax appraisal card for 1450 Park Avenue, and she asked why it was missing from the Staff report.

Planner Grahn remarked that it was not included in the Historic Sites Inventory form. She pointed out that the HSI form also does not note historic accessory buildings. Ms. Meintsma asked if the tax appraisal card was accessible. Planner Grahn stated that Dina Blaes was very thorough about including the documentation when she created the HSI forms and it was possible that the Museum did not have a copy of the tax card. Board Member Melville suggested that Ms. Meintsma check with the Museum.

Ms. Meintsma referred to page 101 of the Staff report, Findings of Fact #16, which states that the window on the north of the 1904 structure are not original to the building because they are horizontal as opposed to vertical, and they likely date from the 1920s and 1930s. She thought anything within the Mining Era was relevant, which would include the 1920s and 1930s. They may not be contributory to the original building form but they were contributory to the way people lived in the house.

Planner Grahn thought it was clear that the craftsman windows which were more of the 1920s, 1930s were added after the house was constructed in the 1904 era. She explained that historically the windows would have been vertical double-

hung windows. She believed the additions were added later on. If the applicant was choosing to restore the structure to its 1904 appearance, they would not want to keep 1920 features if the goal is to look like a 1904 house.

Chair White closed the public hearing.

Board Member Hodgkins referred to the house that was built in 1904. He noted that the original portion was the T-shape and he asked if putting on the newly proposed addition would actually take it back to 1904, or whether they should require a transitional element for any additions. Planner Grahm replied that they could require a transition element if the Board preferred. She pointed out that the Staff had not completed the HDDR. Planner Grahm noted that the footprint of those additions were so small and the applicant was replacing an existing addition with an addition that is shorter than the house. Mr. Hodgkins understood the explanation; however, the additions did not date back to 1904. He asked if the structure was actually being restored to a later date in which case it might capture the 1930s windows. Mr. Hodgkins stated that he was looking for clarification. Planner Grahm felt there were a number of things going on. The applicant was requesting to restore the home to 1904 with the new addition. The footprint is so small the Staff did not think a transitional element would do it justice. However, they could look at adding one.

Board Member Stephens stated that the object this evening was to look at removing non-historic additions, but when the design review takes place it would have to comply with the current guidelines. Board Member Hodgkins clarified that the additions being removed are over 50 years old so they are not non-historic. The HPB is being asked to approve the demolition of the additions because the applicant would like to restore it back to the 1904 house. At that point he believed they would be required to have a transitional element to the addition. Board Member Melville agreed.

Director Erickson thought the current Design Guidelines would require the transitional element. He explained that the applicant was proposing to restore all portions of the current historic home to the 1904 home. If a new addition is added there would need to be a transition in accordance with the Guidelines and the addition could not detract from the historic home.

Board Member Hewett referred to public comment that having a front yard was part of the original house. She asked if it was beyond the purview of the HPB to know whether or not the front yard could be maintained. Planner Grahm stated that the Design Guidelines talk about the amount of paved green space allowed in the front yard. Someone could not make it into a gravel parking lot.

Board Member Stephens asked if this was a PUD or condominium project. Ms. Stauffer replied that it was a condominium project. Mr. Stephens assumed that a

portion of the condo fees would go towards maintaining the property. Chair White pointed out that part of the HDDR includes landscaping.

Board Member Melville had concerns with the relocation. She thought the materials deconstruction and eventual reconstruction of these homes could be accomplished and done well with the buildings remaining in their historic location. The setback is the historic setback and it has always been that way. Ms. Melville did not agree that the historic context of the building has been so radically altered that the present setting does not appropriately convey its history. Ms. Melville did not believe that relocating the building was required.

Board Member Melville thought there was an unfairness issue or at least the appearance of unfairness by denying relocation for a similar project but allowing it for a City project. She had concerns regarding that issue from both a public perspective and the appearance of unfairness. Ms. Melville understood that the Code had changed, but she did not believe it met the new criteria because the historic context was not changed.

Board Member Melville emphasized that their decision was not about ADA compliance or affordable housing. The HPB was only making a decision on whether the house should be moved, and she felt they set a precedent when they allow those types of things. Ms. Melville remarked that there needs to be significant justification to allow moving a building from its historic location. In this case, the home can be renovated and reconstructed without moving it.

Board Member Melville supported the deconstruction as proposed, but she was opposed to moving the house. She also wanted to maintain the historic door in its original proportions.

Board Member Stephens did not believe moving the homes forward 5 to 8 feet would alter the effect of how these homes relate to the street. It would leave a 15' setback and an additional five to ten feet to the curb. Mr. Stephens stated that if it were 15' he would be more inclined to agree with Ms. Melville. However, if these homes would still have a large front yard and the perception of the historic front yard from the street would not be altered.

Board Member Stephen supported relocation. He thought it would be more cumbersome to have the historic homes sit closer to the new homes behind. Mr. Stephens also supported taking the home back to 1904 as long as they were restoring the original openings for the windows and maintaining the front doors.

Board Member Hodgkins agreed with Board Member Melville. He thought the argument being made that allows the homes to be relocated based on the LMC was relatively weak. Mr. Hodgkins was unsure whether moving the homes met the definition of continuity when it would be moved in front of the neighboring

building. He pointed out that they were not even sure how close the other historic buildings are that are relatively close to the arch of the street. Mr. Hodgkins found the arguments for moving the building very weak and he could not support it.

Board Member Beatlebrox had no concerns with moving the buildings. There is significant land and the setback is legal. They would also be setback further than the most of the other structures she noticed on the street during the site visit.

Board Member Beatlebrox like the cottage idea and the idea of having two historic homes and the cottages behind. She understood that they were not supposed to consider the cottages behind, but the massive condos on each side as being one long façade versus the smaller homes consistent with the historic homes makes more sense.

Board Member Beatlebrox supported moving the buildings 5 to 8 feet. She also thought the façade should be restored to 1904 in the same proportions.

Board Member Hewett thought this was a good example of how they start getting into the constraints in trying to make the decision. If she just looks at the facts she would agree with Ms. Melville that these are historic homes and they should not be moved. However, there are other considerations and it is hard not to bring that part into it. Ms. Hewett stated that it is difficult to make a decision in a box.

Assistant City Attorney McLean understood her position, but they need to live by the Code without taking into effect any extraneous items. She counseled the Board members to look closely at the criteria in Chapter 15-11-13, items 1, 2, 3 and sub (i) through (iii) and use those to make their determination. Ms. McLean clarified that the appeal process was basically adhering to the Code as well.

Board Member White agreed with Board Members Melville and Hodgkins. He could not find a strong reason for moving the historic homes.

Assistant City Attorney advised the Board to frame their decision on the criteria she had mentioned. Director Erickson referred the Board to pages 46 and 47 of the Staff report, 15-11-13, Relocation Criteria. If the Board chooses not to allow relocation they would deny it on the basis that it did not meet the tests of a substantial change because the site has not been radically altered, as well as reasons not met in criteria 4 (i) through (iv). Assistant City Attorney McLean explained that it is helpful for the record to have the reasoning behind why it does or does not meet the criteria.

Chair White stated that he could not support relocation because it did not meet the criteria.

Board Member Beatlebrox read from page 84 of the Staff report, Criteria 3(i) "The historic context of the building has been so radically altered that the present setting does not appropriate convey its history and the proposed relocation may be considered to enhance the ability to interpret the historic character of the building in the District. She noted that was one reason they choose but she did not think it applied. She then read 3(ii) "The new site shall convey a character similar to that of the historic site in terms of scale and neighboring buildings, materials, site relationships, geography and age". She believed this criteria applied because the new site, which was only 5 feet away, would convey that character. Ms. Beatlebrox felt that having other buildings of the same kind of character around it would help convey the character.

Board Member Stephens stated that he was trying to make his decision based on the LMC as it exists from what was passed in December. Like it or not, there was specific wording "radically altered the present setting" and he could not see where moving the building 5' or 8' and still having a yard in front would radically alter the present setting. Secondly, it does not change the character of the historic site, especially in relationship to the neighboring building because the historic neighboring buildings are now gone. Mr. Stephens did not believe the integrity and the significance of the historic building would not be diminished by relocation. Based on how the LMC was written, he could not see how this would be a radical difference.

Chair White understood the logic, but the HPB was not supposed to be considering the buildings behind it or what happened before.

Assistant City Attorney McLean requested that the Board make individual motions for relocating the homes at 1450 and 1460 Park Avenue.

MOTION: Board Member Melville moved to DENY the request of the applicant to relocate and move the structure at 1450 Park Avenue based on failure to meet the criteria in Land Management Code 15-11-13, and because the historic context of the building has not been so radically altered that the present setting does not appropriately convey its history, and that the building currently is on its historic setback. Board Member Hodgkins seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion failed on a 3 to 3 vote. Board Members White, Melville and Hodgkins voted in favor of the motion. Board Members Stephen, Beatlebrox and Hewett voted against the motion

Assistant City Attorney McLean explained that in order to take an action there needed to be a majority. Another alternative would be to continue the item until there was a full Board to vote.

MOTION: Board Member Melville moved to DENY the request of the applicant to relocate and move the structure at 1460 Park Avenue based on failure to meet the criteria in Land Management Code 15-11-13, and because the historic context of the building has not been so radically altered that the present setting does not appropriately convey its history, and that the building currently is on its historic setback. Board Member Hodgkins seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion failed on a 3-3 vote. Board Members White, Melville and Hodgkins voted in favor of the motion. Board Members Stephens, Beatlebrox and Hewett voted against the motion.

MOTION: Board Member Melville moved to APPROVE the proposal for the materials deconstruction at 1450 Park Avenue with the exception of the front door, which would remain in its current location and proportion as recommended by Staff and based on the Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Conditions of Approval found in the Staff report. Board Member Hodgkins seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

MOTION: Board Member Melville moved to APPROVE the proposal for the materials deconstruction at 1460 Park Avenue as recommended by Staff and based on the Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Conditions of Approval found in the Staff report.

Board Member Stephens asked how they should address the front door on 1460 Park Avenue. Planner Grahn stated that the Staff thought the door on 1460 was historic; however, Mr. Stephens thought the original door would have been narrower than the existing door.

Chair white recalled that the Board wanted to maintain the historic proportion and size. Planner Grahn stated that the HPB would be approving the removal of the front door and bringing back a smaller door. Board Member Hodgkins asked if that fit in with the demolition issue. Planner Grahn replied that in this case they would only be approving the removal of the door. Board Member Stephens pointed out that the new door would have to comply with the Guidelines.

Chair White called for a second on the motion. Board Member Stephens seconded the motion with the amendment to remove the front door and have it restored through a review by the Planning Department to be restored back to their perception of the original size in relationship to the patterns of windows and doors.

Board Member Melville noted that the amendment would be a change to Condition of Approval #4. Planner Grahn suggested language for the amendment to say, "Restore the original door opening and door."

Board Member Stephens accepted the language recommended by Planner Grahn.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

Findings of Fact – 1450 Park Avenue

1. The property is located at 1450 Park Avenue, Lot 2 of the Retreat at the Park Subdivision.
2. The historic house is listed as Significant on the Historic Sites Inventory.
3. The house was originally constructed c. 1904, per the Historic Site Inventory (HSI) Form, as a cross-wing. Following its initial construction, several additions were constructed on the rear elevation of the original cross-wing form. Material alterations, such as the asbestos siding, aluminum windows, and metal porch, were added starting in the 1940s.
4. On December 8, 2015, the Planning Department received a Historic District Design Review (HDDR) application for the renovation of the historic house at 1450 Park Avenue; the application was deemed complete on December 17, 2015. The HDDR application is still under review by the Planning Department.
5. The applicant intends to remove all of the landscaping as part of the relocation of the historic houses at 1450 and 1460 Park Avenue as well as a non-historic retaining wall, wood fence, and chain-link fence. These landscaping additions to the historic site are non-contributory to the historic integrity or the historical significance of the site, and, thus, can be removed.
6. Following the initial construction of the cross-wing c. 1904, several additions were made to the original form. These additions are non-contributory as they largely obscure the original historic form and make the developmental history of the site nearly indiscernible. The removal of these additions is required for the rehabilitation of the historic structure; these proposed exterior changes do not destroy the exterior architectural features which are compatible with the character of the historic site; the proposed work mitigates any impact that will occur to the visual character of the neighborhood; and the removal of these non-contributory additions will not impact the historical significance of the structures nor impact their architectural integrity.
7. The applicant is proposing to improve the structural integrity of the existing roof form by removing the existing asphalt shingles, wood shingles, and roof sheathing. New plywood and OSB sheathing will be applied and the existing roof rafters will be sistered with new members to improve its

- structural strength. The proposed scope of work is necessary for the rehabilitation of the historic building; the proposed exterior changes will not damage or destroy the exterior architectural features of the subject property; and the proposed scope of work mitigates any impacts that will occur to the architectural integrity of the building and will improve the structural stability of the historic building.
8. The applicant will temporarily dismantle the original chimney, located on the north-south stem of the c.1904 cross-wing for restoration purposes. This is a necessary as part of the rehabilitation of the building and the proposed scope of work for this chimney's restoration will mitigate any impacts that will occur to the architectural integrity of the object.
 9. The applicant will remove the two (2) remaining chimneys on the rear additions that are not visible from the primary public right-of-way (Park Avenue). These later additions to the Historic Building are non-contributory to the historic integrity or historical significance of the structure or site and may be removed.
 10. On the exterior, the original wood lap siding has been covered by Masonite and asbestos shingle siding. This material will be removed in order to restore the original wood lap siding. The Masonite and asbestos shingle siding does not contribute to the historic integrity or the historical significance of the structure and may be removed.
 11. The applicant proposes to replace the existing, limited stone rubble and concrete foundation with a new code-compliant concrete foundation. The work is necessary in order to rehabilitate the building, improve its structural stability, and preserve the floor structure into the future. The proposed exterior change will not damage the exterior architectural features of the subject property which are compatible with the character of the historic site as the new foundation will have limited visibility from the primary public right-of-way.
 12. The historic wood porch was likely replaced by the existing porch—consisting of the metal awning, metal posts, and concrete slab—in the 1940s or 1950s. The existing porch is non-contributory to the historic integrity or historical significance of the structure or site and may be removed.
 13. The applicant proposes to remove the existing kitchen door, as part of the larger demolition of the non-contributory rear additions. This is acceptable as any addition to a Historic Building, Site, or Structure has been found to be non-contributory to the historic integrity or historical significance of the structure or site may be removed.
 14. The applicant will remove the existing 1970s-1980s aluminum windows on the front (west) façade in order to restore the original window openings and window configuration. The existing windows are non-contributory and may be removed.
 15. The wood windows on the north and south elevations of the historic c.1904 structure are not original to the building as they are horizontal-

oriented rather than vertically-oriented. They likely date from the 1920s or 1930s and are not contributory to the original building form. The removal of these windows shall not damage or destroy the exterior architectural features of the subject property which are compatible with the character of the historic site and these windows may be removed.

Conclusions of Law – 1450 Park Avenue

1. The proposal complies with the Land Management Code requirements pursuant to the HR-M District and regarding historic structure deconstruction and reconstruction.
2. The proposal meets the criteria for relocation pursuant to LMC 15-11-13. Relocation and/or Reorientation of a Historic Building or Historic Structure

Conditions of Approval – 1450 Park Avenue

1. Final building plans and construction details shall reflect substantial compliance with the HDDR proposal stamped in on November 23, 2015. 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 is responsible for providing an updated landscape plan as part of the building permit application. Any significant vegetation that needs to be removed shall be replaced in-kind or a multiple of trees of the same caliper shall be provided to match the diameter of the existing tree. The updated landscape plan shall incorporate fruit trees and lilac bushes, consistent with the current vegetation that exists on site. If possible, the applicant will preserve the lilac bushes.
3. Where the historic exterior materials cannot be repaired, they will be replaced with materials that match the original in all respects: scale, dimension, texture, profile, material and finish. Prior to replacement, the applicant shall demonstrate to the Historic Preservation Planner that the materials are no longer safe and/or serviceable and cannot be repaired to a safe and/or serviceable condition.
4. The applicant shall maintain the historic front door opening, front door, and door surround in its existing location on the front (west) façade.

Findings of Fact – 1460 Park Avenue

1. The property is located at 1460 Park Avenue, Lot 2 of the Retreat at the Park Subdivision.
2. The historic house is listed as Significant on the Historic Sites Inventory.

3. The house was originally constructed c. 1901, per the Historic Site Inventory (HSI) Form, as a cross-wing. Following its initial construction, several additions were constructed on the rear elevation of the original cross-wing form. Material alterations, such as the asbestos siding, aluminum windows, and metal porch, were added starting in the 1940s.
4. On December 8, 2015, the Planning Department received a Historic District Design Review (HDDR) application for the renovation of the historic house at 1460 Park Avenue; the application was deemed complete on December 17, 2015. The HDDR application is still under review by the Planning Department.
5. The applicant intends to remove all of the landscaping as part of the relocation of the historic houses at 1450 and 1460 Park Avenue as well as a non-historic retaining wall, wood fence, and chain-link fence. These landscaping additions to the historic site are non-contributory to the historic integrity or the historical significance of the site, and, thus, can be removed.
6. Following the initial construction of the cross-wing c. 1901, several additions were made to the original form along the rear (east) elevation. These additions appear in 1927 Sanborn Fire Insurance map; however, were altered after 1927 to create the unbroken wall of the rear addition that exists today. The applicant is proposing to remove these additions in order to restore the c.1901 form and construct an addition that will largely mimic the c.1927 kitchen addition that exists today. The removal of these additions is required for the rehabilitation of the historic structure; these proposed exterior changes do not destroy the exterior architectural features which are compatible with the character of the historic site; the proposed work mitigates any impact that will occur to the visual character of the neighborhood; and the removal of these non-contributory additions will not impact the historical significance of the structures nor impact their architectural integrity.
7. The applicant is proposing to improve the structural integrity of the existing roof form by removing the existing asphalt shingles, wood shingles, and roof sheathing. New plywood and OSB sheathing will be applied and the existing roof rafters be replaced due to fire damage. The gable ends will be structured from the interior to prevent their removal. The proposed scope of work is necessary for the rehabilitation of the historic building; the proposed exterior changes will not damage or destroy the exterior architectural features of the subject property; and the proposed scope of work mitigates any impacts that will occur to the architectural integrity of the building and will improve the structural stability of the historic building.
8. On the exterior, the original wood lap siding has been covered by Masonite and asbestos shingle siding. This material will be removed in order to restore the original wood lap siding. The Masonite and asbestos shingle siding does not contribute to the historic integrity or the historical significance of the structure and may be removed.

9. The applicant proposes to replace the existing, limited stone rubble and concrete foundation with a new code-compliant concrete foundation. The work is necessary in order to rehabilitate the building, improve its structural stability, and preserve the floor structure into the future. The proposed exterior change will not damage the exterior architectural features of the subject property which are compatible with the character of the historic site as the new foundation will have limited visibility from the primary public right-of-way.
10. The historic wood porch was likely replaced by the existing porch—consisting of the metal awning, metal posts, and concrete slab on or after 1958. The existing porch is non-contributory to the historic integrity or historical significance of the structure or site and may be removed.
11. The applicant proposes to remove the existing kitchen door, as part of the larger demolition of the non-contributory rear additions. This is acceptable as any addition to a Historic Building, Site, or Structure that has been found to be non-contributory to the historic integrity or historical significance of the structure or site may be removed.
12. The applicant will remove the existing pre-2006 aluminum window and the fixed pane window on the front (west) façade in order to restore the original window openings and window configuration. Further, the applicant will be restoring the original historic window on the south elevation as well as the original window opening on the east elevation. A new door opening will be cut into the east elevation, where it will not be visible from the primary right-of-way. The existing windows are non-contributory and may be removed.

Conclusions of Law – 1460 Park Avenue

1. The proposal complies with the Land Management Code requirements pursuant to the HR-M District and the pending ordinance.

Conditions of Approval – 1460 Park Avenue

1. Final building plans and construction details shall reflect substantial compliance with the HDDR proposal stamped in on November 23, 2015. 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 is responsible for providing an updated landscape plan as part of the building permit application. In regards to the mature tree in the front yard, the applicant will need to specifically show that the construction activity is detrimental to the tree prior to its removal. Any significant vegetation that needs to be removed shall be replaced in-kind or a multiple of trees of the same caliper shall be provided to match the diameter of the existing tree. The updated landscape plan shall

- incorporate fruit trees and lilac bushes, consistent with the current vegetation that exists on site. If possible, the applicant will preserve the mature tree.
3. Where the historic exterior materials cannot be repaired, they will be replaced with materials that match the original in all respects: scale, dimension, texture, profile, material and finish. Prior to replacement, the applicant shall demonstrate to the Historic Preservation Planner that the materials are no longer safe and/or serviceable and cannot be repaired to a safe and/or serviceable condition.
 4. The applicant shall maintain the historic door opening, door, and door surround in its existing location on the front (west) façade.

Assistant City Attorney McLean referred to the two motions on the relocation and noted that the motions were made based on the findings, conclusions and conditions found in the Staff report; however, those were drafted for approval. If the Board votes to deny then new findings for denial would have to be prepared. Ms. McLean stepped out to contact the City Attorney on the procedure of a tie.

Assistant City Attorney McLean returned. She had consulted with the City Attorney regarding procedure. The motions on the relocation failed because there was not a majority; however, the Board had several options. They could continue until the all seven Board member were present, they could request more information and/or have more discussion to see if someone could be persuaded to change their vote, or those who voted to deny could state reasons with findings reflecting the basis for denial.

Chair White preferred to continue the relocation item until they have a full Board. Board Member Stephen stated what during the site visit he did not realize the relocation would be such an issue. The Staff report was complete but he did not believe it fully described the surrounding situations with regards to setbacks in the neighborhood and how this might radically alter the setting. He requested a continuance so he and others would have the opportunity to revisit the site and/or to have the missing information included in the packet for the next meeting. Board Member Beatlebrox preferred to continue because this was the first test of the new criteria and she thought they needed to understand it better.

Board Member Stephen stated that setbacks are measured from the property line and he would like to know where the property line is in relationship to the curb. Board Member Beatlebrox wanted to know what the setbacks are opposite the property and on the sides both contiguous and further down. Planner Grahn offered to provide that information for the next meeting.

MOTION: Board Member Stephens moved to CONTINUE the relocation of the homes at 1450 and 1460 Park Avenue to March 2, 2016. Board Member Beatlebrox seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed 5-1. Board Member Melville voted against the motion.

3. Administrative – Staff recommends the Historic Preservation Board choose one (1) Awardee for the Annual Preservation Award.
(Application GI-15-02972)

Board Member Melville noted that the minutes of November 18th and December 2nd reflected her recollection that a number of the Board member had suggested awarding multiple plaques rather than limiting the award to one project. She asked why the Staff was recommending that they only choose one awardee.

Planner Grahn clarified that it was not limited to one. The Staff was suggesting that they give plaques to the previous award winners. The Board could discuss whether to award to multiple properties each year or just one. Planner Grahn stated that her concern with awarding to multiple properties is that the Preservation Award would become a participation award. She thought they needed to honor projects that were exceptional work in the community rather than just give an award to every rehab project.

Board Member Melville understood the concern, but she did not believe that was the case in this year because there were a number of exceptional projects. She specifically mentioned 562 Main, 651 Park Avenue, 343 Park Avenue, 1049 Park Avenue, and the Alaska House at 125 Main Street. She recognized that other projects were done that were good but they were not exceptional enough to qualify. Ms. Melville thought it was difficult to choose just one of the ones she had mentioned.

Planner Grahn stated that the intent this evening was not to pick one or multiple awards. The Board had requested that the Staff discuss the history of the program, whether or not they wanted to continue with the paintings, whether they wanted to award a plaque. She reported that a City Resolution allows for the Historic Preservation Award, which was included in the Staff report, and they need to discuss whether or not to amend the resolution.

Planner Grahn stated that the recent Staff in the Planning Department did not realize that a Resolution was adopted in 2011 that allowed for this award. She noted that the awards are usually given out in May to help promote National Historic Preservation Month and bring attention to the cause. She asked if the HPB wanted to recommend that the City Council amend the Resolution to ensure that the awards are given in May in conjunction with National Historic

Preservation Month. Planner Grahn stated that a second issue is to talk about the goals of the Historic Preservation Award. She noted that when the award was first created the goal was that a painting would not only decorate the halls of City Hall, it would also showcase and promote the local artists. Planner Grahn remarked that when plaques are handed out, over time it is easy to forget who was awarded a plaque. A painting is a lasting remembrance because everyone can see it. She had outlined the goals based on previous meeting Minutes and Staff reports that were done in 2011 when this program was started. Planner Grahn stated that a third issue for discussion was the success of the program moving forward. Her research found that High West, who had received the first award, had also received a plaque. It was not a plaque to hang on a building but something smaller that would go on a desk. She commented on different types of plaques and requested input from the HPB on what they would prefer. Planner Grahn noted that there were pros and cons to each type and it was something the Board needed to discuss. Planner Grahn remarked that budget was another issue for discussion as outlined on page 308 of the Staff report. She thought they could increase the budget for a painting if it was limited to one painting. They also included the cost for bronze plaques, depending on size.

Planner Grahn recommended that the Board discuss the issues before they look at award recipients. It is important that the program is consistent year to year.

Board Member Hodgkins announced that he needed leave the meeting. However, he supported the changes recommended by Staff. Mr. Hodgkins stated that based on the changes to the LMC, some of the Board's concern with preservation in Park City was new construction. If he was to vote on nominees, he would support the new construction only because it makes a statement.

Board Member Hodgkins left the meeting.

Board Member Beatlebrox stated that she is a big fan of art. When she read the background of the program and that they wanted to put art in City Hall to patronize local artists as part of this program, she strongly favored continuing with the art piece and having the plaque be ancillary. Ms. Beatlebrox stated that she is a former education curator at the Park City Museum and she favored putting historic information on plaques.

Chair White asked if they change the program to have multiple winners, whether it would have to go back to the City Council to amend the resolution. Planner Grahn replied that she would have to double check the language in the ordinance. She read from the ordinance, "That you wish to identify and award exemplary historic preservation projects in compliance with the Historic Guidelines." She did not believe the ordinance limited the number of recipients in one year. The ordinance was primarily the goal of the program.

Chair White stated that he was a proponent of the artwork and he would like that to continue. However, he did not believe they could do more than one art piece each year.

Board Member Melville was not opposed to the art. She pointed out that the \$800 to \$1000 payment was actually asking the artist to make a donation to the City, and she wondered how many artists would be interested. Ms. Melville also questioned whether the City wanted to clutter City Hall with artwork.

Planner Grahn stated that it was created as a legacy gallery. She suggested that the best project could be awarded a painting and a plaque, and the rest get plaques. Ms. Melville thought the plaques were important because if they were trying to encourage preservation and public outreach, very few people see the paintings in the Marsac Building. However, many people see the plaques on the buildings or other structures as they walk by. Ms. Melville suggested something similar to the historic plaques from the National Register that are seen on houses and buildings. It provides historic information that people walking by can read, and the information is more useful than just identifying it as a Historic Preservation Award recipient. She believed it would encourage people to research the history of their house a little more when they plan to do these projects. Ms. Melville agreed with the idea of choosing one piece of art, but she felt strongly that multiple plaques should be awarded on very good projects.

Board Member Stephens concurred with Ms. Melville. If the purpose is to help the residents and the visitors interact with the historic fabric, they need something on the building to indicate its history. It may be less efficient in the winter, but during the summer people walk around and when they see the ribbons they find it unique, and a plaque would say more. As a homeowner on Main Street he would not want more on his plaque than maybe the year the house was built, because he would not want people standing on his front porch reading a lot of history. Mr. Stephens stated that from his own experience, when he is outside people will ask him when the house was built. Mr. Stephens suggested that the year it was built and the year it received the award would be sufficient information, and it would also lower the cost of the plaque.

Board Member Stephens is a proponent of art and he has his own art collection, but he did not think they should spend the money on art. If the City wants art in its building, they should contract with artists to put art in the building. He agreed with Ms. Melville that few people coming to town see the art and how it relates to historic preservation. Until it was mentioned in a previous meeting, he was unaware that the paintings were from historic preservation awards. Mr. Stephens stated that as a homeowner he personally would rather have a plaque than a print of a piece of art.

Board Member Stephens wanted the opportunity to give out more than one award when there is good restoration, but when there is no restoration the Board should not be obligated to give an award.

Planner Grahn went through the items discussion. She asked if the Board supported giving the award in May during Historic Preservation Month, or whether they wanted to keep with the current resolution which states June. Ms. Melville noted that the Board has been giving the award in May. Planner Grahn replied that they have been doing it in May, but that is not what the resolution states. The question was whether they wanted to recommend that the City Council amend the resolution. Ms. Melville asked if the resolution needed to be amended.

Assistant City Attorney McLean noted that the resolution states specifically that the recipient is to be selected during the month of June. Planner Grahn pointed out that the resolution does not specify when the award is presented. Ms. McLean agreed. However, if the Board changes when the award is presented, it should be formalized in a recommendation to the City Council to amend the ordinance. It would also apply if they choose to change any of the criteria of the program.

Chair White questioned why the Board could not select the recipient in June. Planner Grahn replied that they could. The issue is that waiting until June to select means the award is not given until the Fall, and that misses Historic Preservation Month in May. Chair White asked if the intent was to give the award in May during Historic Preservation Month. Planner Grahn answered yes. Chair White clarified that in order to give the award in May the resolution would need to be changed. Planner Grahn answered yes. However, this year may be an exception to the rule considering that it was already February and they still needed to choose a recipient.

Director Erickson did not believe that changing the resolution would be a problem. Chair White thought it should occur in May. Board Member Stephens agreed. Chair White asked if it required a motion. Director Erickson replied that they were only giving direction to Staff to prepare the final report. No action was required this evening.

Board Member Stephens asked the Staff to see if there was any interest in leveraging this further to see if the Park City Historical Society has any desire to partner with the HPB on this. He thought it might be a way to honor these preservationists. Planner Grahn understood that the first year the HPB did partner with the Historical Society to present the award to High West. From what she was told it did not get a good turnout, but she would reach out Sandra Morrison to see if there is a way to partner on this again and find a different way to publicize it.

Planner Grahn asked if the HPB wanted to move forward with a painting and a plaque, or just a plaque. Chair White personally wanted to do a painting for the top recipient and then recognize other recipients with a plaque for good work that was done in that year time frame. Director Erickson asked if the Board was thinking of a total of three recipients with the top recipient getting the artwork, or a total of five. Board Member Melville thought it should be based on the projects that were done because the number may change each year.

Board Member Beatlebrox liked the idea of a painting for the top recipient and plaques for other projects. Board Member Hewett concurred.

Planner Grahn asked if the Board wanted a standardized plaque or something more like a historical marker, and keeping the historic information brief. She suggested adding the year the house was built, the year it received the Historic Preservation Award, and possibly the first owner or the person who built it. She asked if that was enough information on the plaque.

Board Member Beatlebrox thought they should add more history on something like a restaurant where people could get close to the building to read it. If it is a plaque on someone's house, they would not want to encourage people to come up on the porch. Ms. Melville agreed that people should not be driven to private porches, but she thought the plaque could be placed on a retaining wall or some other place associated with the house where it could be read and more history could be provided. Board Member Beatlebrox liked the idea of adding a name of who lived there, such as a miner working at the Daly mine. Ms. Melville noted that they usually refer to the historic houses by the name of the person who built it. Planner Grahn stated that the house is usually identified by either the person who built it or the person who lived there the longest.

Chair White thought the plaques on a couple of Mr. Stephen's homes give the original owner and the year built. He was comfortable with that amount of history. Ms. Melville pointed out that Mr. Stephens personally had the plaques done by an artist. They were very nice but different from what the City would award.

Planner Grahn referred to page 308 which listed a few options that were quoted for size and cost of the bronze plaques. It could either be 6" x 6" x 3" thick, or 10" x 10" x 3" inches thick. If the Board wanted a different size she would have to get another quote. Board Member Stephens thought 3" was too thick. The Board agreed. Planner Grahn offered to double-check on the thickness.

Planner Director reported that the money spent on the plaques and the artwork comes out of the Planning Department budget each year. He has to submit a budget request each year to be approved by the City Council. That was why

Planner Grahn had put together a budget for Historic Preservation Award that was included in the Staff report. Director Erickson asked the Board which plaque size was appropriate on a residential structure or whether they wanted to make a distinction between commercial structures and residential structures. He noted plaques should probably be smaller for buildings with porches and beams so it would not overpower. A larger façade may need a larger plaque.

Chair White thought rectangular was more proportional than square. Board Member Melville thought there were examples around the City because there has been a variety of plaques over the years. Planner Grahn offered to contact a bronze company and obtain a proposal for how the plaque would look. It would give the Board a starting point to discuss what type of plaque they would like.

Board Member Melville asked Director Erickson if he could increase his budget for this program; and if the money is not used it could roll into the next year. Director Erickson stated that he fully intends to support this program. The program is important to the Planning Department and he will be making a budget request to make it all happen. Before he requests an increase he wanted to make the Staff understand what the HPB wants.

Board Member Melville thought the first criteria should be a plaque in a size that the public could see. In addition, when projects move forward she would suggest that the Staff work with the applicant to do the historic research because that would get the applicant more involved in the historic aspect. Planner Grahn did not disagree, but she thought it was important to look at the cost. The more standardized they make it the more affordable it will be and more plaques could be awarded. She suggested that they continue to look into the design.

Director Erickson stated that if the Board was going to give direction this evening, the Staff would like to know how many awards they were thinking to give out. If they want one painting and the rest plaques, he would also like to know that so he could consider that in his budget.

Board Member Stephens thought the Board should have the option to do four awards. He has noticed a number of nice restorations in progress and he believed that might continue for a while. At some point it will slow down. Mr. Stephens clarified that he would like the option for four but they should not give out four just because they can. He believed the projects should definitely merit the award. Mr. Stephens reiterated his earlier comment that the information on the plaque should be minimal. He pointed out that adding a name could change the type set on each plaque. Mr. Stephens thought they should err on the side of a smaller plaque. He thought 10" x 10" was a good size.

Board Member Melville reiterated her suggestions to be added to the list of potential recipients; 562 Main, 651 Park Avenue, 343 Park Avenue, 1049 Park

Avenue and 125 Main Street. Planner Grahn asked if there was agreement among the Board with those being the five award recipients. The Board concurred. She asked which one should be the top recipient for a painting. Chair White stated that 562 Main was the only one he could visualize at this point.

Board Member Stephens thought they were talking about the maximum number of recipients this year. He was not ready to make a decision on the top choice. Planner Grahn suggested that they continue this discussion until the March or April meeting. Board Member Beatlebrox noted that they need to give the artist time to do the painting. If they want to award in May they would need to make a decision on March 2nd.

MOTION: Board Member Beatlebrox moved to CONTINUE the discussion of the Historic Preservation Awards and the selection of the awards to March 2, 2016. Board Member Stephens seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

4. Design Guideline Revisions- Staff recommends that the Historic Preservation Board take public comment on the proposed changes to the Design Guidelines for Park City's Historic Districts and Historically Significant Buildings; provide specific amendments to be made to the document if necessary; and make a recommendation to City Council (Council review will be after the entire Guidelines are reviewed by the HPB) Application GI-13-00222

Director Erickson stated that the HPB needed to open the public hearing and take public comment on this matter. If there were few changes or corrections to the Design Guidelines the Staff would request that the HPB take action this evening. However, if there are a number of comments from the public that the Board would like the Staff to address or if the Board has questions, they could continue this item for further clarification by Staff.

Chair White opened the public hearing.

There were no comments.

Chair White closed the public hearing.

Board Member Stephens recommended that the HPB continue this meeting. He was not questioning what they were trying to accomplish, but when he read through it he wanted to make sure he was aware of the intended consequences of these Guidelines. Because this would be going to the City Council, he thought

it was important to make sure they understood it fully. Mr. Stephens preferred to continue to give the Board the time to have a healthy discussion on the issues.

Assistant City Attorney McLean pointed out that these revisions were the ones that the Board discussed at the last meeting. The only changes were the ones Staff had made based on Board input at the last meeting. Ms. McLean clarified that there was nothing new in this section. Mr. Stephens understood there was nothing new, but he also understood when they discussed these at the last meeting that there would be an opportunity to review them again. He wanted the chance to look at them as a whole rather than piecemeal, and since this meeting was long already, he thought it was better to wait and have that discussion.

Board Member Melville understood that the Board was asked for input at the last meeting in terms of what they would like to see, but they would have the opportunity to see the changes in writing. She thought that was what they were given in the Staff report and she was satisfied with what was presented. However, if some of the Board members wanted additional time for discussion she was not opposed. Ms. Melville pointed out that some definitions were not included that the Board had asked to see. One was "complimentary" that Ms. Beatlebrox had asked for a definition. Ms. Melville requested that the Staff include that for the next meeting. She had no further comments because she believed the changes were what they had discussed at the last meeting.

Chair White was comfortable with the proposed changes. Board Member Beatlebrox preferred additional time for discussion.

MOTION: Board Member Stephens moved to CONTINUE this item to March 2, 2016. Board Member Beatlebrox seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

The meeting adjourned at 7:40 p.m.

Approved by _____
David White, Chair
Historic Preservation Board