

PARK CITY MUNICIPAL CORPORATION
HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD
MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 6, 2019

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

EX OFFICIO: Bruce Erickson, Hannah Tyler, Mark Harrington, Liz Jackson

ROLL CALL

Chair Doug Stephens called the meeting to order at 5:00 p.m. and noted that all Board Members were present except Lola Beatlebrox and Jordan Brody, who were excused.

ADOPTION OF MINUTES

January 16, 2019

Board Member Hodgkins referred to page 3, fourth paragraph, regarding the discussion about the two historic tax credit programs in Utah. He referred to the sentence in which Amber Anderson stated "it is not a deduction but rather an actual dollar for dollar reduction in taxable income". He changed taxable income to correctly read **tax liability**.

MOTION: Board Member Holmgren moved to APPROVE the minutes of January 16, 2019 as amended. Board Member Hodgkins seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS

There were no comments.

STAFF/BOARD COMMUNICATIONS AND DISCLOSURES

Planning Director Erickson stated that Planner Hannah Tyler was going back to the City Council with the Historic District Guidelines. The Architectural Section was being scrubbed by the sustainability Department and the City Council had questions as to whether some things were more restrictive and reduced the opportunities to be sustainable. The Staff would inform the Board members when it is scheduled before the City Council. Director Erickson noted that Chair Stephens was at the last City Council meeting and they appreciated his input.

Director Erickson reported that Planner Laura Newberry was adjusting the agendas inside of the Granicus system to make sure the meeting times are

correct. The error was raised by a member of the public and it was being corrected.

REGULAR AGENDA

1. 424 Woodside Avenue – Material Deconstruction – The applicant is proposing to remove the existing non-Historic windows, non-historic doors, a non-historic east facing addition, and a portion of the historic roof framing to accommodate an addition/connection to the existing non-historic south addition. Application PL-1603379

Planner Tyler introduced Jonathan DeGray, the project architect, who was representing the application this evening.

Planner Tyler provide a brief history of the project. She believed it was consistent with most of the other projects occurring in town. She recalled that this item came back to the Historic Preservation Board in 2017 and 2018 as a reorientation and relocation. Several public meetings were held and the HPB ultimately denied the application. That decision was appealed to the City Council and the Council heard it twice. The City Council upheld the HPB denial of the reorientation; however, they granted the appeal for relocation.

Planner Tyler reported that the structure would be relocated 10 feet and it would meet the setbacks. She pointed out that because the City council is the governing body of the LMC, the relocation was not a consideration for the HPB this evening. Planner Tyler explained that the Board was only looking at a normal material deconstruction.

Planner Tyler reviewed a slide showing the original 1993 addition and the historic house. She pointed to where the house would be moved back slightly to accommodate an addition between the 1993 addition and the historic house.

Planner Tyler stated that 424 Woodside was back to a simple material deconstruction, which is where the Staff wanted it to be in the beginning. She remarked that the Staff and the applicant were in agreement in recommending approval of the material deconstruction.

Planner Tyler reviewed each elevation to help the Board members understand what they were looking at. She noted that the west elevation faces town. She pointed to the non-historic piece that was proposed to be removed and noted that it was part of the 1993 addition. The applicant was proposing to remove that piece and restore the original porch. She indicated a set of non-historic windows that the applicant intended to restore to the original window opening. Planner Tyler reviewed to additional elevations showing the porch removal all the non-historic windows that would be removed. If any of the windows are historic they

were beyond repair. She pointed to a non-historic door and stated that the applicant proposed to put in a door that matches the door that was there historically.

Planner Tyler reviewed the east elevation facing Woodside. That piece of the historic roof and the historic wall would be removed to accommodate a transitional element between the 1993 addition and the historic house, which adds circulation to the historic house. Planner Tyler reported that the Staff had worked extensively with the applicant to lower the height of the transitional element. She believed those were the only two historic pieces that would be removed.

Board Member Hodgkins asked how that was seen as a transitional element. He realized it was allowing the occupants to transition between the historic and the addition, but he questioned how that met the Land Management Code for a transitional element. Planner Tyler apologized for using a poor choice of words. She pointed out that it was actually adding a stepping effect between the 1993 addition and the historic structure. She thought it was a modest addition compared to what was done in 1993. Mr. Hodgkins asked if they were looking at what was actually being proposed or whether it had been revised. Planner Tyler replied that it was the material that would be removed to accommodate an addition.

Mr. Hodgkins asked if what was shown on page 94 was the reduced volume or the volume that was original proposed. Planner Tyler replied that it was the reduced volume that was achieved after the Staff worked with the applicant.

Board Member Hodgkins reiterated his question as to how the transitional element was allowed per the LMC. The LMC requires transitional element to be attached to the rear. Planner Tyler stated that it was the rear elevation. Mr. Hodgkins remarked that it was not actually attached. Planner Tyler thought she had erred in calling it a transition element. She emphasized that the Staff supported the element; however, the HPB had the purview to exclude it from the material deconstruction.

Chair Stephens thought Board Member Hodgkins made a good point. In the past, transitional elements or additions have been on the back of the home, which is typically not visible from the public right-of-way. In this case, it is still on the back of the home but it is also visible from the public right-of-way. Chair Stephens understood the architectural benefit of making the transition between the 1993 addition and the newly proposed addition, but the argument was the perspective of whether they were looking at it from the front or the rear. He commented on the importance of being consistent to avoid setting a precedent on future projects. They also need to be consistent in applying the Guidelines.

Board Member Hodgkins stated in the past the connection between the addition and the historic home allows the volume of the historic home to be read. He acknowledged that it did not apply in this case because the house was turned around, but he was unsure whether it allowed the volume of the original house to be read as it was.

Board Member Hutchings thought it appeared that the applicant was removing a chunk of the historic home to add new construction. He did not believe that was allowed under the LMC.

Board Member Scott asked if by definition that was considered the back of the house or the public right-of-way. Planner Tyler stated that the crux of the previous request was that it was one of the last remaining properties facing town and it was unique. Planner Tyler believed that very few properties that face town would request this type of addition. She was not as concerned about precedent. Each site is unique, but she believed this property was especially unique.

Board Member Hutchings asked Planner Tyler to clarify why the Staff supported this request. Planner Tyler replied that the Staff did not find the addition to be invasive because people could still view the hall-parlor form of the structure. Mr. Hutchings remarked that they would be removing a portion of the hall-parlor form.

Jonathan DeGray, the project architect, understood that material deconstruction was the scope of the review this evening; however, the questions from the Board related to design review. Mr. DeGray stated that if the Staff supported the HDDR in terms of design review, he wanted clarification on the scope of review for this HPB meeting.

Board Member Hodgkins believed Chair Stephens had already addressed the question. The Board is accustomed to siding removal in order to attach an addition to the historic structure. In this case they were being asked to remove a chunk of the roof and walls from the back side of the house. Mr. Hodgkins thought the Board was struggling with the fact that they were being asked to approve the demolition of a sizeable percentage of the volume of the historic building.

Planner Tyler presented the criteria from which the HPB would make their decision. Chair Stephens asked if this was part of the Historic District Guidelines or part the Land Management Code. Planner Tyler replied that the Board was looking at this through the lens of the LMC and the six criteria.

Board Member Hutchings did not believe the proposal met any of the six criteria. Planner Tyler realized that it was on the public right-of-way. However, given the unique characteristics of the structure facing town and the great lengths that

were taken to restore the structure in its current form, she did not believe that it distracted from the historical significance of the historic structure, which was one of the criteria.

Mr. DeGray stated that it was proposed to the owner as a benefit in terms of developing more interior space at the entry and adding an element that created a step down between the tall 1993 addition and the shed roof of the historic form. He noted that this has always been an issue for the owner.

Board Member Hodgkins felt that moving the house back exacerbated the issue they were trying to mitigate. He noted that the new and the old structure already abut aggressively, and he asked why they could not align the floors to avoid having a connector piece. Mr. DeGray replied that the floors were already aligned as best as possible. The historic form was down lower and they were aligning the floor of the addition to meet it. However, there is no floor of the historic element at the entryway, which is why they were proposing the addition.

Planner Tyler reminded the Board that this was on a downhill lot and the original front façade faces town. The more the structure is raised, the front east facing façade will be farther off the ground and appear like a second story. Planner Tyler noted that it goes back to the conservation of which façade would be restored. Raising the structure less and adding the element on the public right-of-way brings back the original façade that is seen from the cross-canyon view.

Board Member Hodgkins did not believe they were talking about the deconstruction of the façade. In his opinion, being viewed from the public right-of-way was not the issue. In most proposals that come before them there is the ability for the addition to abut the historic house. With this current proposal, the addition does not abut the historic house and they were not talking about a façade. They were talking about a chunk of the house itself.

Chair Stephens recalled that currently the rear of the house sits on the property line. Mr. DeGray replied that the house was being moved to comply with the setback because it is on the property line. Planner Tyler clarified that the setback is measured from the property line, and the property line is slightly east of the edge of curb.

Director Erickson understood from the comments that the issue was with the size of the addition between the existing 1993 structure and removal of the roof on the historic house. Board Member Scott stated that removing the non-historic addition on the back was not a problem. The issue was removing approximately 20% of the historic home. Board Member Hodgkins clarified that it was 20% of the volume of the home itself. He pointed out that the size of the transition piece was not an issue. He did not think the Board would object if the piece was added directly to the back side of the house. Director Erickson clarified that the

objection was replacing a chunk of the historic house with a contemporary design. The Board concurred.

Board Member Hodgkins noted that the LMC talks about compatibility with the historic nature of the various streetscapes. Since this was not a design review, he was unsure whether that could be addressed. Director Erickson stated that if there was consensus among the Board to direct the Staff to make findings for denial, the Staff would need to make findings based on the six criteria presented, and the Board would need to give guidance to help the Staff prepare those findings.

Board Member asked if the findings needed to meet all six of the criteria. Planner Tyler replied that some of the criteria would not be applicable. For example, 99% of material deconstructions are not routine maintenance. However, it would have to meet all the criteria that does apply.

Mr. DeGray stated that if the Board was objecting to the form of the addition and the fact that it removes historic material, it was possible to build the addition and leave the roof in place. If the roof is left in place, he could then meet with the Staff in terms of meeting the HDDR.

Chair Stephens clarified that the Board was not doing design review; however, it is always difficult when they are asked about material deconstruction and removal because they want to know the reason for it and what would go in its place.

Mr. DeGray understood that the Board did not like the design, which is why they were considering a denial. Board Member Hutchings disagreed. Board Member Hodgkins stated that his issue was that the design did not leave the volume of the historic home visible.

Director Erickson asked Mr. DeGray if any part of the addition part of the stairway connection between the two buildings. Mr. DeGray replied that it was only the mudroom and support facilities. Director Erickson clarified that the existing connection would remain. Mr. DeGray answered yes.

Board Member Hutchings asked if the City Council had given a reason for approving the relocation. Planner Tyler stated that the City Council found that it would still meet the criteria for the streetscape and it was compatible. The City Council tied it to the LMC and found that it met the criteria for relocation.

Planner Tyler stated that the Staff could adjust the findings of fact to omit all the language regarding the roof structure.

Chair Stephens believed part of the problem was the 1993 addition to the historic house, which in his opinion, makes the historic house less significant because the addition was approved in the 1990s when design review was less stringent. Even though it would be removing a portion of the volume of the original historic house, he thought the connecting element made the historic house become more significant because it mitigated the 1993 addition. Chair Stephens thought the question was whether the historic house would retain its importance in relationship to the huge addition to the south side. Looking at the transition element from the actual front of the house he believed it was an acceptable addition. He found it to be more problematic from Woodside. Chair Stephen thought the issue was how to protect this Significant house. It was not necessarily the best approach and he did not want to set a precedent for the future, but he was trying to look at it on a larger scale.

Director Erickson stated that the Board could take three actions: 1) approve it with Conditions as written; 2) continue and direct the Staff to come back with Findings for Denial; 3) continue and give the architect the opportunity to respond to their comments before taking action. Director Erickson noted that Planner Tyler had provided an extensive analysis of the materials that would be removed and caused the decision for the relocation but not the reorientation. He thought that was another factor of what the Board was trying to review because it was consistent with previous actions. Director Erickson thought it would be difficult to debate the roofline without seeing graphics from the architect.

Mr. DeGray was unclear on exactly what Director Erickson was proposing in terms of the design. He understood that the Board would not have an issue if he could build the connecting element without removing any historic material. Chair Stephens replied that he was correct. Mr. DeGray stated that if that was the case, the applicant would ask that the discussion regarding the removal be removed from the Staff report and for the Board to approve the material deconstruction. Mr. DeGray pointed out that the roof that the Board objected to removing was rebuilt by Dick Peek in 1993. The original roof form was retained but there was no historic material left.

Chair Stephens opened the public hearing.

Ruth Meintsma, a resident at 305 Woodside, remarked that there were three different parts. The first was the non-historic porch on the east side. She referred to the picture on page 27 of the Staff report and pointed to a "bite" taken out of the historic roof. Ms. Meintsma remarked that the porch was not the exact porch shown in historical photos. The original porch was simpler and came out from the vertical wall. On the proposed porch the rafters are sistered into the roof rafters. She noted that in the Guidelines it states that if a porch needs to be removed because it is derelict or if there is no porch but there is recorded evidence that a porch once existed, the historic porch does not need to be

replicated. A generic porch can be built that fits the era and the hall and parlor style. Ms. Meintsma remarked that the porch was very attractive and more complicated than a simple porch. She thought the small bite that comes out of the roof is a small give for a beautiful take. Ms. Meintsma believed the porch would be seen from the across-canyon view. She believed that what the community was getting from this project was amazing in terms of the history of the project. They would get a beautiful porch on the back in exchange for removing a small bit of historic roof. The other portion is non-historic and irrelevant.

Ms. Meintsma commented on the faux door on the north side. It is no longer a door; however, she thought it looked like the grade had been replaced so it looks like a usable door. One graphic showed that the original walkway and stairs would be maintained. Therefore, the feeling of the side yard and the side entry would be repeated even though the door would not be used. She thought that was a great effort.

Ms. Meintsma referred to the picture on page 28 of the Staff report and the red on the shed roof. She thought it looked like the graphic showed more material being removed than what would actually be removed. In the 3-D graphic showing the added flat roof section, it does not go into the slope change. Ms. Meintsma stated that an issue previously talked about was that the expansive roof did not have a street appeal. However, in the end it was determined to have appeal because it is unique and has character. Ms. Meintsma stated that the small amount of material being removed would not invade the change in slope or the ridge. The two windows being removed would be repeated again.

Ms. Meintsma acknowledge that the Guidelines state that the façade on the street seen from the right-of-way is hyper-sensitive and that area is not supposed to be touched. She noted that a garage is allowed and a garage completely changes the feeling of historic in terms of grade and a street wall. She believed that if another project added a garage, it would change the character of the structure much more than the small amount of historic material being removed. Ms. Meintsma believed that if the original owner or builder came back, that person would be able to see the original historic house even with the historic material removed on the street right-of-way.

Chair Stephens closed the public hearing.

Chair Stephens referred to the northwest birdseye view showing on the screen. He thought from that viewpoint that only the shed roof would be impacted and not the original gable roof on the house. Mr. DeGray replied that he was correct. Chair Stephens asked how far they would go into the shed roof. Mr. DeGray stated that it would be approximately 15 feet.

Board Member Holmgren stated that she liked the design. She knows the building and the location and she was not opposed to what was being proposed.

Board Member Scott stated that this was a challenging home and he thought it was a good way to connect the two pieces. He remarked that the most sacred view is the public right-of-way façade and that needs to be protected. If someone raises their house to add a garage the façade is still protected.

City Attorney Mark Harrington thought the Board was properly assessing the criteria that gives them flexibility to assess pragmatics with the mission to protect. Mr. Harrington explained that criteria are not black and white because they are essentially drafted to give discretion within the intent of the chapter to reach a reasonable result. Mr. Harrington stated that it was not an ultimatum to protect at all extremes; it is to protect with reasonably balancing property rights to functionally use imperfect property with imperfect materials. The City Council struggled with that on the appeal and they allowed in part and denied in part.

City Attorney Harrington remarked that emphasizing and prioritizing Criteria 2 and 3 is where the Board started. He was prepared to say that was not appropriate; however, at the same time, the purpose of Criteria 5 in terms of mitigation brings back pragmatic components. For example, the design criteria might allow things that could be done in a way that would be worse. City Attorney Harrington asked if there was a mitigation level the Board would be comfortable with in looking at the rear façade analysis. From the perspective of a rear addition, he believed the question was whether it mitigates to the extent necessary to protect the front, but still allow reasonable use in the rear. It was a difficult call, but as long as their decision reasonably relates to the evidence in the record he could defend it either way.

City Attorney Harrington stated that the Board needed to stay away from design review, but there is a pragmatic in Criteria 5 that states if something can be designed under the Code that is more impactful, they might be holding the line for no good reason. This was what the HPB needed to evaluate.

Board Member Hodgkins stated that as the Historic Preservation Board, their mission is to preserve the historic. He thought it was difficult to anticipate whether a design that looks good today for a historic structure would not be looked at negatively in the future. For the longevity and perpetuity of the historic structures, he preferred to leave them alone as much as possible for the sake of preservation. In terms of being on the backside of the building, if the next person wanted to insert a large addition into the historic piece, he did not think they would want to allow it. Mr. Hodgkins felt this case was different because the addition was already on the side of the house and a new addition was not being added.

Board Member Hutchings echoed Mr. Hodgkins. He thought the design was great, but the removal of the historic piece in isolation was not supported by the criteria.

Chair Stephens stated that when the Board previously discussed this proposal they were opposed to the reorientation of the building because that was the historically significant aspect. He thought the City Council reconfirmed their opinion through the appeal process. Chair Stephens did not believe they could have everything they wanted, and it would be an easier discussion if there was not an existing addition to the south. To avoid setting a precedent, he would be looking at this structure based on what the Board previously decided and what the City Council determined in the appeal process, which was that the most important part of the historic house was the location and its orientation. Chair Stephen found that the addition in the back, which requires removal of the historic material, to be acceptable. He thought it helped mitigate a faux pau when the addition was approved in the 1990s. Chair Stephens stated that his concern was being able to craft the approval in a way that avoids this surfacing again as an issue. Chair Stephen clarified that if there was not an addition to the south he would be in total agreement with Board Members Hutchings and Hodgkins. However, since the south addition is there and already makes a travesty of the house, he wanted to improve the house from the front.

Board Member Hodgkins remarked that by moving the house back, it accentuates the difference in levels and the difference between the old and the new, and it allows them to become their own structures. He thought the transitional element pulls both pieces together in a way that looks like they should not be together. Mr. Hodgkins appreciated that the house was not being reoriented, but he thought it was important to understand that allowing it to move back 10 feet increases the façade that is seen from across the canyon and the house will not read as it does today. Regarding the relocation, on one side it mitigates the connector between the south addition and the historic house looking from the right-of-way; but from the other side it results in more façade. In his opinion, that was the win and the loss.

Chair Stephens referred to the north side of the house and asked Mr. DeGray about its relation to the side yard setback with the property line. Mr. DeGray stated that based on the lot width the setback would be 5 feet on the south and 13 feet on the north. The setbacks were in compliance. Chair Stephens clarified that the house would be moved back directly to the east without decreasing the side yard setback. Mr. DeGray replied that he was correct.

Mr. DeGray requested a straw vote from the Board on the other issues in the proposal before making a final motion.

Board Member Hutchings supported everything except the removal of the roof material. Board Member Hodgkins and Scott concurred with Mr. Hutchings. Chair Stephens was comfortable with the request presented by Staff. Board Member Holmgren agreed with Board Members Hutchings, Hodgkins, and Scott.

Planner Tyler stated that based on the straw poll they would strike Finding #40, which states, "The applicant will remove a portion of the west facing roof structure and façade to accommodate a new addition." The Board would approve the request but deny Finding of Fact #40.

Planner Tyler pointed out that the photos in the Staff report were labeled incorrectly and the east and west facades were flipped. She believed that was a carryover from the original Staff report when they were talking about rotating the structure. Planner Tyler clarified that even though the picture labels were incorrect, the Findings of Fact was correct.

MOTION: Board Member Hutchings moved to APPROVE the Material Deconstruction and associated repairs to the Significant duplex dwelling at 424 Woodside Avenue, pursuant to the Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Conditions of Approval in the Staff report, with the amendment to strike Finding of Fact #40 per the discussion this evening. Commissioner Holmgren seconded the motion.

Director Erickson recommended that the motion clarify in the Findings of Fact that the façade facing Woodside is in fact the west façade, and the façade facing Park Avenue is in fact the east façade.

VOTE: The motion passed. Douglas Stephens voted against the motion.

Findings of Fact – 424 Woodside Avenue

1. The Duplex Dwelling located at 424 Woodside Avenue is listed as "Significant" on the Park City Historic Sites Inventory (HSI).
2. The property is located in the Historic Residential (HR-1) zone.
3. The Historic Structure faces towards Main Street in that the original primary entrance faces east. In 1993, a 700 square foot (SF) addition was constructed to the south of the Historic Structure to create the Duplex Dwelling Use.
4. In 2005 a Plat Amendment was approved creating a 75-foot-wide lot by combining three (3) existing lots into one legal lot of record. The Historic Structure straddles two (2) of the three (3) lots that were combined.
5. On November 16, 2016, the applicant submitted a HDDR Application for the subject property. At the time, the project scope of the HDDR included: Reorient (rotate) the Historic Structure so that the primary entrance faces Woodside Avenue (west) and Relocate the Historic Structure ten feet (10') to the east in order to comply with the minimum Front Yard Setback.

6. After working with the applicant on the required materials for their submittal, the current HDDR application was deemed complete on March 2, 2017. Between March 2, 2017 and the first HPB meeting on July 19, 2017, staff provided the applicant with redline comments and re-reviewed new plans addressing those comments once submitted by the applicant.
7. The Historic Preservation Board held a public hearing and continued this item on July 19th, 2017.
8. The Historic Preservation Board held a public hearing and continued this item on October 4th, 2017.
9. The Historic Preservation Board held a public hearing, discussed the item, and continued this item on December 5th, 2017.
10. The Historic Preservation Board held a public hearing and continued this item on February 7th, 2018.
11. The Historic Preservation Board held a public hearing, discussed the item, and continued this item on March 7th, 2018 in order to facilitate a site visit at the request of the applicant.
12. The Historic Preservation Board conducted a site visit, held a public hearing, discussed the item, and continued this item on April 4th, 2018.
13. The Historic Preservation Board held a public hearing, discussed the item, and denied the Relocation and Reorientation of the Historic Structure at 424 Woodside Avenue with a 5 to 1 vote on May 2, 2018.
14. On May 22, 2018, staff issued a Denial Letter for the HDDR application.
15. On June 4, 2018, the City received an application for an appeal of the Historic Preservation Board's decision for the Relocation and Reorientation of the Historic Structure at 424 Woodside Avenue. On June 15, 2018, the Appellant provided supplemental information. This application was accepted within 30 days of the Final Action of the HPB.
16. On July 12, 2018 the City Council reviewed the appeal, held a public hearing, and directed staff to return with findings of fact granting the Appeal in part to approve the Relocation and deny the Appeal in part to uphold the HPB's decision regarding the Reorientation.
17. On August 2, 2018, City Council continued the discussion to August 16, 2018 regarding the ratification of the Findings of Fact for the Appeal.
18. On August 16, 2018, City Council granted the Appeal in part to approve the Relocation and denied the Appeal in part to uphold the HPB's decision regarding the Reorientation.
19. On December 7, 2018, the applicant submitted drawings that complied with the City Council's August 16, 2018 action and the Land Management Code. The new proposal is to relocate the structure ten feet (10') to the east, lift the structure one foot eleven inches (1'11"), renovate the historic portion of the structure, and construct an addition between the existing south addition and historic portion of the structure.
20. The Historic Structure was constructed ca. 1886. The Park City HSI identifies the Historic Structure as significant to the Mature Mining Era (1894-1930).

21. Originally, the Historic Structure was a hall-parlor type single-family dwelling with a side-gabled roof; it was built on a relatively steep slope that was terraced toward the rear of the house (the Woodside Avenue side) to provide a more level building lot.

22. Historically, the Historic Structure was associated with a network of pedestrian paths on the east side of the structure that connected the residence to Main Street.

23. The Historic Structure first appears on the 1889 Sanborn Fire Insurance Map as a wood-framed and wood-sided house originally faced east, providing a view over Main Street. Physical evidence and the 1889 Sanborn map indicate that it had a small shed-roofed wing on the south end of the rear (west) side but no front porch.

24. By 1900, the original shed-roofed wing had been extended across the rear (west) side.

25. In 1907, the Sanborn Map indicates that a formal front porch was added to the east side, further defining it as the primary façade, at the same time that a secondary entry porch was added to the west side. The house retained this configuration through 1930.

26. The principal façade was composed of a central doorway flanked by a window on each side. Woodside Avenue was present to the west, but access to the house was via a footpath leading north from Fourth Street behind the Park Avenue houses, and then a short staircase leading up to the east façade. The orientation of houses along the uphill (west) side of Woodside was uniformly east-facing, while orientations along the downhill (east) side was mixed, with some facing the street and others the canyon.

27. By 1941, a second shed-roofed addition had been built across the west side, incorporating the 1907 rear screened porch and essentially filling the terrace between the rear wall of the house and the retaining wall so that the eave was nearly at grade. The front porch had been removed and asbestos shingles had been applied over the original wood siding by this time.

28. Asbestos shingle siding was noted on the 1957 tax appraisal card, which also documents the absence of an east porch.

29. The 1968 tax appraisal card indicates that a porch had been rebuilt across the east façade.

30. Between 1978 and 1993, the east façade was modified by the addition of a sunroom across the north two-thirds, covering the original doorway and north window.

31. The east façade of the Historic Structure is the “front”. This is supported by the traditional design of a central entrance door flanked by two (2) windows. This is a common style of architecture seen throughout Park City. The “rear” of the Historic structure is the west façade. This is represented by its traditional form created through additions throughout the Historic period.

32. The front façade has a front door entrance; however, a utility entrance is also located on the northwest corner of the structure in the rear enclosed porch addition. This was also a common occurrence in houses throughout Park City.

(Examples include the side-enclosed porches at 1057 Woodside Avenue and 811 Norfolk Avenue). This utility entrance was often the entrance used by members of the household as a “mud room” so that the front entrance (on the front façade) remained clean.

33. Both entrances typically would have been used throughout the Historic Period; it would have simply depended on what the occasion was.

34. The applicant intends to replace non-historic materials with historically compatible materials. The removal of the proposed non-historic materials will assist in restoring the duplex dwelling to its Historic Form because the existing non-historic materials are incompatible and/or beyond repair.

35. The applicant will remove the non-historic windows. Replacement windows will not change the dimensions of the existing windows and will be compatible with the historic structure.

36. The applicant will remove the non-historic east entrance railing.

37. The applicant will remove the foundation to accommodate a new basement foundation.

38. The applicant will remove the non-historic door on the north façade. Replacement door will not change the dimensions of the existing door and will be compatible with the historic structure.

39. The applicant will remove the non-historic rear porch enclosure. The applicant will reconstruct the historic porch. The reconstructed porch will require the removal of a portion of the roof; however, this will restore an architectural feature that was previously removed.

41. Staff finds that the removal of the proposed non-historic materials will assist in the renovation of the duplex dwelling to its Historic Form because the existing non-historic materials are incompatible and/or beyond repair. In addition, the applicant will be restoring Historic features that have been lost.

Conclusions of Law – 424 Woodside Avenue

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

Conditions of Approval – 424 Woodside Avenue

1. Final building plans and construction details shall reflect substantial compliance with the HDDR proposal stamped in on December 7, 2018. Any changes, modifications, or deviations from the approved design that have not been approved by the Planning and Building Departments may result in a stop work order.

2. Where the historic exterior materials cannot be repaired, they shall be replaced with materials that match the original in all respects: scale, dimension, texture, profile, material and finish. Prior to removing and replacing historic materials, the applicant shall demonstrate to the Planning Director and Project

Planner that the materials are no longer safe and/or serviceable and cannot be repaired to a safe and/or serviceable condition. No historic materials may be disposed of prior to advance approval by the Planning Director and Project Planner.

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

4. A structural engineer shall be responsible for creating a cribbing plan prior to the house being supported from the interior for the installation of the new concrete foundation. Within five (5) days of installation, the structural engineer will inspect and approve the cribbing as constructed. If the cribbing is to be relocated or altered at any time during the construction of the foundation, the structural engineer shall create and approve a new cribbing plan. The structural engineer shall re-inspect and re-approve the cribbing within five (5) days of any relocation or alteration to the cribbing.

5. Historic buildings which are lifted must be returned to the completed foundation within 45 days of lifting the building. Failure to do so will be a violation of the Preservation Plan and enforcement action through the financial guarantee for historic preservation could take place. The Planning Director may make a written determination to extend this period up to 30 additional days if, after consultation with the Historic Preservation Planner, Chief Building Official, and City Engineer, he determines that it is necessary based upon the need to immediately stabilize an existing Historic property, or specific site conditions such as access, or lack thereof, exist, or in an effort to reduce impacts on adjacent properties.

6. The Preservation Plan must include a review and stamp by a licensed and registered structural engineer on the proposed cribbing or shoring methods. If the contractor makes a revision to the cribbing or shoring plan, the structural engineer must approve the change in writing. Cribbing or shoring must be of engineered materials. Screw-type jacks for raising and lowering the building are not allowed. The owner (or through its agent or the contractor) is responsible for notifying the Planning Department if changes are made.

The Meeting adjourned at 5:55 p.m.

Approved by _____
Douglas Stephens, Chair
Historic Preservation Board