

PARK CITY MUNICIPAL CORPORATION
HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD
MINUTES OF JUNE 15, 2011

BOARD MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE: Roger Durst, Ken Martz, David White, David McFawn, Sara Werbelow, Judy McKie

EX OFFICIO: Thomas Eddington, Kayla Sintz, Polly Samuels McLean Patricia Abdullah

Chair Durst called the work session to order at 5:07 p.m.

Chair Durst announced that terms had expired for him and Ken Martz as Board members. He opened the floor for nominations for a replacement Chair. Board Member McFawn preferred to wait until new Board members were appointed and present. Chair Durst noted that his term would expire July 1st and someone would need to Chair the next meeting. Typically it would be done by the Vice-Chair, however, that would be Ken Martz and his term would also expire July 1st.

Assistant City Attorney Polly Samuels McLean advised that the HPB could choose a Chair Pro Tem to conduct the next meeting until a vote was taken, at which time the new Chair would assume the position. Board Member Werbelow volunteered to act as Chair Pro Tem.

WORK SESSION

Property noticing for reconstructions of historic structures.

Planner Kayla Sintz stated that part of the visioning process and continued discussions with the Board and Staff was to devise better public noticing signs for reconstructions to better inform the public about the project. The Staff has been working on putting together some mock-ups. In addition, the Planning Department has been revising the regular noticing signs system and proposed to use a standard real estate type sign. The intent is for the noticing signs to remain on the property during the project construction.

Planner Sintz presented a possible garage reconstruction to show the general layout of the proposed signs. It would show the site plan and there would be the ability to place photographs across the top showing existing conditions and what is proposed. Each sign would be tailored for individual projects and placed next to the building permit posted on site.

Director Eddington referred to the mock-up presented and noted that the bluish-purple area would be a permanent aluminum frame. The center portion is an 11 x 17 paper insert that could be easily printed specific to each project and enclosed in Plexiglass.

Historic Preservation Board
Minutes of June 15, 2011

Chair Durst asked if the proposed sign was for reconstruction only or if it would be used for any project in town. Director Eddington replied that it would be used for any HDDR project.

Planner Sintz pointed out that based on the scale, the signs are primarily for pedestrians.

Board Member White liked the more substantial sign. Board Members McFawn and Werbelow concurred. Board Member McFawn liked how the sign could be changed and evolve over time. Board Member Werbelow remarked that there were infinite variations on how the material could be presented, and asked if there would be a template.

Director Eddington asked if the Board thought the sign should be for all HDDR applications. He noted that some applications are more significant than others and felt the proposed sign may not be necessary for smaller maintenance projects. He suggested that the sign would be appropriate for reconstruction and new construction.

Planner Sintz noted that the Staff receives the highest volume of public comment when historic sites are noticed. For that reason she recommended the new sign for any historic site.

Chair Durst asked if the sign would divulge the name of the builder or the applicant. Planner Sintz answered no. The sign would only provide a physical description of the project as a way to inform people when they see a disturbed site or something occurring on a historic structure. If people have questions that were not answered by the sign, they could then contact the Planning Department for further information. The sign would only provide a physical description of the project.

City Council Member, Liza Simpson, stated that both the City Council and the Planning Commission have expressed an interest in providing better and more stable noticing. If the signs are successful they could be expanded beyond reconstruction or HDDR projects.

Chair Durst suggested adding the City logo to the sign. Board Member White thought the sign should be used for any project that goes through the HDDR. Planner Sintz asked about smaller projects such as window replacements or trim painting. Board Member Werbelow thought it would be difficult for the Staff to arbitrarily determine which projects would or would not require the sign. She favored consistency and agreed that it should be any project that goes through the HDDR.

Director Eddington stated that reconstructions, panelizations and additions are the biggest impact items that generate public input. He suggested starting with those three that physically impact the footprint, scale and mass of the building. If they later find it necessary, they could move into porch renovations, windows, roofs, etc. Director Eddington was concerned about the possibility of having too many signs on one street.

Board Member McFawn pointed out that all three of the major categories mentioned require bonds. He suggested posting the signage for any project requiring a surety bond.

Historic Preservation Board
Minutes of June 15, 2011

Assistant City Attorney McLean stated that because the signs were an internal policy, she was less concerned with the criteria for posting the sign. The objective this evening was to hear input from the HPB as to whether there should be explicit projects or whether the Staff could have the discretion to determine which projects would create public interest. Ms. McLean suggested that the Board discuss whether or not construction on vacant lots should be included.

Board Member Werbelow thought new construction should be included. Chair Durst felt they should follow Board Member White's suggestion to include any HDDR project. The Board concurred.

City Attorney McLean pointed out that a small project such as windows would fall under the HDDR criteria. If they are overly broad in what is posted, people may not pay as much attention. In addition, it would require a significant amount of Staff time. Director Eddington suggested new construction, additions, reconstruction and panelizations, since they were the four major project types.

Board Member McFawn clarified that because it is an internal policy the City is not required by law to adhere to specifics. Director Eddington agreed that it was simply a goodwill gesture.

Director Eddington summarized that they would post signage on new construction, additions, reconstruction and panelizations as a starting point, and assess or adjust as they move forward.

Board Member McFawn liked an earlier suggestion for placing an estimated time frame for construction on the signage. Planner Sintz noted that timing was under the control of the Building Department and not the Planning Department. She was not comfortable estimating construction time, but they could give the date when the HDDR was approved. She liked the idea of letting people know what to expect in terms of timing, but she suggested that they give the matter more thought. Board Member McKie felt it was important to be clear that it was only an estimate and not a concrete date.

REGULAR MEETING

ROLL CALL

Board Member Durst called the Regular Meeting of the HPB to order at 6:20 and noted that all Board Members were present except Brian Guyer.

ADOPTION OF MINUTES – May 4, 2011

MOTION: Board Member McFawn moved to APPROVE the minutes of May 4, 2011. Board Member White seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS

Historic Preservation Board
Minutes of June 15, 2011

There were no comments.

STAFF/BOARD COMMUNICATION & DISCLOSURES

City Council Member Liza Simpson noted that Council Member Dick Peek was on his way, but was running late. Council Member Peek would be the new City Council liaison to the HPB.

Council Member Simpson thanked Roger Durst and Ken Martz for their invaluable service to the Historic Preservation Board and to the community. Their insight and hard work on all the issues, whether as a member of the Board or as a member of the public, were valuable and contributed towards keeping the historic portion of the community healthy. Council Member Simpson expressed her appreciation as both an Old Town resident and as a Council member on behalf of the City Council.

Council Member Simpson announced that Roger Durst would assume a new role as the "Minister of Delight". Mr. Durst has insight specifically to the idea that all architecture should bring something to the community and he calls it "delight". It is a very important component of the community and Director Eddington and others were trying to find the best way to harness Mr. Durst's skills and insight and his support of the HPB .

Council Member Simpson stated that she and Board Member Werbelow had a brief conversation about having an HPB member at the Design Review Team. With two new Board members coming on and with Council Member Peek being the new liaison, Council Member Simpson suggested that Board Member Werbelow prepare a report to the HPB regarding her experience on the DRT. Council Member Simpson recalled that when the idea was first discussed, the intent was to share the knowledge on what the DRT does among the HPB members, particularly for those members who were not architects and had not personally experienced the process. After hearing a report from Board Member Werbelow, the HPB could discuss whether it would be helpful to give another non-architect member the opportunity to participate for three months to understand how the process works.

Director Eddington echoed the sentiment that the Staff would miss both Ken Martz and Roger Durst. However, with Mr. Durst carrying on "delight" and Mr. Martz's role with the Historic Society, both would remain a part of the HPB in some capacity.

Director Eddington suggested September for a visioning session. It was scheduled on the agenda for discussion this evening; however, he recommended postponing that discussion until the next meeting when the new Board members were in attendance. Board Member Martz offered to attend if they wanted him to be there.

Planner Sintz announced that Shauna Stokes, who was with the Building Department for fourteen years, had joined the Planning Department. Ms. Stokes fits in well with the Planning Department and the Staff appreciates her hard work and enthusiasm.

Council Member Dick Peek arrived.

Council Member Simpson introduced Dick Peek as the new City Council liaison to the HPB. She would remain as the backup liaison if he is unable to attend. Council Member

Historic Preservation Board
Minutes of June 15, 2011

Simpson noted that Mr. Peek was a member of the former Historic District Commission and he is well versed in Historic District issues.

Council Member Peek stated that his introduction to public involvement began with construction of historic homes and he was eventually recruited to the Historic District Commission.

REGULAR AGENDA – Discussion, Public Hearing and Possible Action.

1. Historic Preservation Awards Program – Resolution for Adoption
(Application #GI-11-00124)

Chair Durst stated that the Board met several times and eventually selected the High West Distillery building as the recipient of the first award. Since the last meeting the subcommittee interviewed and commissioned an illustrator to do a painting of the building that would be suitable for hanging. The intent is to continue with an award each year and to create a gallery of historic buildings and preservation in the City. Chair Durst noted that the award presentation would occur on August 18th at a Historical Society event. He noted that several categories were created for the award.

Planner Sintz noted that page 67 of the Staff report lists the themes that were previously discussed. The categories were infill development, new construction, excellence in preservation, sustainable preservation, embodiment of historical context, connectivity and site, adaptive use. She noted that the 2011 award was selected for adaptive use.

Chair Durst requested a motion to forward a resolution to the City Council for adoption.

Board Member Werbelow could not recall a discussion among the Board that one theme would not be repeated within a two year period. Planner Sintz noted that she had taken that comment from the minutes where Chair Durst had suggested mixing up the themes to avoid repeating the same one. The Board could change that if they wished. It was noted that the two-year reference was not stated in the resolution. Board Member Werbelow liked the idea of different themes, but she was not comfortable with being bound to a specific time period. Since the time period was not included in the resolution, Board Member Werbelow did not believe it would be an issue.

MOTION: Board Member Werbelow moved to forward a POSTIVE recommendation to the City Council to adopt the Annual Historic Preservation Award Program. Board Member White seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

Planner Sintz asked about process. Assistant City Attorney McLean replied that once the resolution is adopted the program would be in place and the Historic Preservation Board could present the award. The HPB would have the option of asking the City Council to present the award the night the resolution is adopted, they could present it at the next HPB meeting, or it could be presented as discussed at the Historical Society event in August. At a minimum, once the program is in place the Staff could help with a press release to let people know about the award and the results for this year.

Historic Preservation Board
Minutes of June 15, 2011

Chair Durst noted that in addition to a plaque on the illustration, a plaque would be mounted at the recipient's location. Chair Durst stated that the subcommittee met with the illustrator and he is revising the sketches based on their comments. The illustrator would send Chair Durst a copy that would be distributed to the HPB. He welcomed comments prior to the final illustration.

Chair Durst provided a brief summary of the artist selection process. The subcommittee asked the Park City Arts Board for recommendations. They were given the names of five local artists, but only two applicants responded. Both presented very good work and the subcommittee made their selection. Chair Durst emphasized that the intent is to solicit a different artist each year from four local applicants.

Planner Sintz would inform the Board members when the resolution is scheduled to be heard by the City Council.

Board Member Martz asked if the subcommittee had made a decision on the plaque. He noted that plaques are expensive, particularly if they have to be changed each year. He noted that the Historical Society and the City have done plaques in the past and he suggested that they look at how the HPB could fit in with their approach. Chair Durst stated that the award would be from the City and given by the Historic Preservation Board. The plaque would not change except for the date.

Board Member Werbelow remarked that timing was an issue and the Board could not wait another month to discuss the details for the plaque. Director Eddington understood that there would be a plaque on the actual piece of art and the City would provide the frame. In addition, the recipient would be given a plaque to hang inside their building. The Board concurred that the subcommittee could work out the details.

2. 919 Woodside Avenue – Appeal of Staff's Determination to deny the movement of a historic structure. Application #PL-11-01253)

Chair Durst recused himself from this item and turned the chair over to Vice-Chair Ken Martz. Board Member Werbelow recused herself from this item.

Ken Martz assumed the Chair.

Assistant City Attorney McLean noted that the HPB would lack a quorum of members who attended this meeting to approve the minutes at the next meeting. Craig Elliott, representing the applicant, asked if there was a legal reason why the three remaining members could not vote on the minutes. Ms. McLean explained that typically a quorum is required to move forward. If the applicant stipulates that three voting members would be acceptable, it should not be a problem. Ms. McLean remarked that the Board could also offer the applicant the option to request a continuation to the next meeting. Mr. Elliott stated that if it was not illegal for three members to confirm the meeting, he was comfortable moving forward this evening.

Planner Sintz reported that the Historic Preservation Board was being asked to conduct a quasi-judicial hearing on an appeal of Planning Staff's determination of non-compliance with the Design Guidelines for Historic Districts and Historic Sites for the proposed relocation of the historic structure located at 919 Woodside Avenue. The

Historic Preservation Board
Minutes of June 15, 2011

Planning Staff determined that the proposed movement of the significant structure does not comply with the design guidelines or the Land Management Code.

Planner Sintz noted that the review in the Staff report was limited to the request to move the structure and not the proposed addition to the structure. Planner Sintz reviewed the LMC guidelines as provided in the Staff report.

Craig Elliott provided a history of the building. The applicants have owned the building for a long time. They also own the building behind and members of their family lived in the structure for many years. He provided photos of what the house looked like when it was purchased, noting that the additions were already there. There was very little fabric left and the structure was condemned by the Building Department. Reconstructing was not a fair option because there was not enough fabric left in the building structure itself to reconstruct. The decision was made to demolish the structure and reconstruct the building as a form of preservation.

Mr. Elliott pointed out that this was not a unique request because other historic buildings in Park City have been moved. He presented photos of structures that have been moved, including the Miner's Hospital, a boarding house, a distillery and several historic homes. Mr. Elliott stated that the buildings were moved for different reasons and they were all done under different rules and regulations.

Mr. Elliott remarked that unique conditions are something they have to deal with and he assumed it was the reason why they were denied the opportunity to move the building forward. One condition is that the vegetation in front of the property is part of the existing fabric of the street. In the original application they talked about the site conditions and how the existing trees shelter the building from view. He presented a photo showing the two trees on the side, the depth of the building, where it was on the site, and the two buildings next to it. Mr. Elliott noted that unique is not a definition in the Code. Therefore, he went to the dictionary and found unique defined as "being the only one".

Mr. Elliott presented the Sanborn maps showing the house and where it sits on the property in comparison to everything else on the block. He noted that the adjacent houses were always closer to the street and remains that way today. He connected dots to show that the proposed location is still significantly back from the existing natural condition of the property. Mr. Elliott stated that from a planning perspective on this property, the situation is unique. He did not believe that moving the building would take away from the character because it is still significantly removed from the existing street front.

Mr. Elliott presented graphics to support his comments regarding unique conditions and the proposed movement of the building.

Board Member McFawn noted that the HPB could not consider additions. He asked if Mr. Elliott had a rendering showing the building in its proposed state without additions. Planner Sintz stated that page 31 of the Staff report showed the approved reconstruction, but without the garage or the basement. Mr. Elliott did not have the requested rendering.

Historic Preservation Board
Minutes of June 15, 2011

Board Member McKie asked if anything was salvaged from the original structure. Mr. Elliott replied that there was nothing to salvage. She asked if there were photos of the interior. Mr. Elliott stated that he had a number of exterior photos but he was unsure if he had interior photos on file. He pointed out that the building was condemned. Board Member McFawn noted that page 25 of the Staff report contained exterior photos which showed the deteriorated condition of the building. He believed the building was condemned with good reason.

Vice-Chair Martz stated that before the structure was torn down, he had visited the building with the Planning Department, Ron Ivie and others and it was evident that the structure was a safety hazard.

Board Member McKie asked if the HPB could not consider the addition because the addition had not been approved. Planner Sintz explained that the application would probably change if the building could not be moved forward. Board Member McKie understood that the HPB would not revisit the application with the addition regardless of whether the appeal is approved or denied. Planner Sintz replied that the HPB would only see the addition if it results in an appeal by a neighbor or the applicant.

Mr. Elliott believed they were dealing with facts. From a planning perspective, the pattern and texture of the street is a very unique condition, which is why the Planning Director is part of the process. He pointed out that the process is new to the guidelines in terms of this particular aspect of unique conditions.

Mr. Elliott and Board Member White discussed the amount of space on the property and the proximity to the adjacent homes. Board Member White thought the adjacent house on the right looked closer than what is allowed by Code. He clarified that Mr. Elliott's proposal would comply with the front yard setback. Mr. Elliott replied that the proposed setback is 18 feet, which is significantly deeper than the required setback of 10 feet. The setback prior to demolition was 24 feet.

Vice-Chair Martz opened the public hearing.

It was noted that Margaret Hilyard had submitted a letter with her comments.

Cindy Swan, a resident on the south side of the subject property, understood that the structure as proposed would be the same as the other houses on the street. However, if the Historic District Guidelines and the LMC have specific requirements, it should follow the current guidelines. Ms. Swan noted that the buildings referenced in the photos were actually moved. The difference is that the building at 919 Woodside was torn down and is not actually being moved. She pointed out that the building was demolished due to negligence. The owner did nothing to that house for many, many years and left it to deteriorate. Ms. Swan questioned the uniqueness of the trees in front because there are trees in front of every house in Old Town. She asked if moving the house would kill the fir tree. Ms. Swan could not understand why the house should be moved.

Ruth Meintsma did not begrudge anyone the right to make things work on their property. However, in looking at the streetscape and all the houses lined up, the fact that this house was set back makes you question why this house was so unique that it was set back from the rest. Ms. Meintsma believed there was some significance to the original

Historic Preservation Board
Minutes of June 15, 2011

location. She stated that the guidelines make it difficult to move houses unless it is absolutely necessary, because the location itself can be unique and historic.

Vice-Chair Martz closed the public hearing.

Board Member McKie remarked that unique conditions are unique attributes that lend something to the historic character of the house. The location made the house unique which is more of a positive than a negative. Board Member McKie pointed out that the Land Management Code talks about the criteria for relocation or reorientation of historic buildings and/or structures; however, this application involves a replica because the historic structure was torn down. She understood that reconstruction is a legitimate preservation technique, but in her opinion, the replica with the addition is not a historic building. All the historic energy was lost when the original structure was demolished.

Vice-Chair Martz remarked that the historic building was bonded and measurements were taken prior to the demolition in order to preserve its historic essence.

Assistant City Attorney McLean noted that LMC Section 15-11-15 talks about reconstruction. The first part of the section addresses when reconstruction is allowed. The Code also states, "If an application involving a reconstruction of historic building and/or structures on a Landmark site or a Significant site also includes relocation and/or reorientation of the reconstructed historic buildings and/or structures on the original site or another site, the application must also comply with Section 15-11-13 of this Code", which is the Staff analysis regarding reconstruction. Ms. McLean pointed out that the application goes through the same analysis whether it is a reconstruction or an existing structure.

Board Member McKie asked if agreements were made for reconstruction prior to demolishing the structure. Mr. Elliott explained that the applicant went through an extensive process to document the building. Some pieces were completely missing, but from historic photos they were able to find other buildings in town that were built by the same group, and they measured the dimensions. When the building was condemned it was no longer safe and the owner needed to make a decision. He asked Mr. Elliott to prepare a preservation plan for reconstruction and the building was taken down to avoid a safety hazard. The owner later submitted a Historic Design Review application. Mr. Elliott believed the owner acted in good faith and in the best interest of the public.

Board Member McFawn thought it was helpful when Mr. Elliott pointed out the property lines for the buildings and the fact that they were not trying to push the structure all the way forward. While the position of the house is unique to the block, he enjoys the fact that some of the houses are askew in Old Town. However, the position of the house is not unique on Woodside because other houses on other blocks of Woodside are set back substantially. Regarding the reconstruction, Board Member McFawn noted that this structure was torn down for safety reasons and nothing was salvageable. It is a historic home of nature and that historic piece needs to be preserved. Therefore, reconstruction was the only way that could be accomplished.

Board Member McKie understood that other options were given but the applicant chose reconstruction. Director Eddington explained that the structure was condemned by the Chief Building Official due to the condition and neglect. Board Member McKie wanted to

Historic Preservation Board
Minutes of June 15, 2011

know how long the building sat vacant. Director Eddington was unsure. Board Member McKie asked if the owner who neglected the property is the same owner who wants to reconstruct it. Mr. Elliott assumed that was correct. A family member had lived in the house, but he did not know the history beyond that.

Board Member McFawn questioned whether owner neglect could be a factor in their decision. Assistant City Attorney McLean advised that owner neglect should not be part of their decision. The HPB should focus their discussion on LMC Section 15-11-15 in terms of reorientation. Existing or reconstruction is not part of this appeal process and does not fit within the criteria of owner neglect.

Board Member McFawn felt another question was whether they wanted to promote row houses in Park City by allowing everyone to reorient houses closer to the street, or if they wanted to preserve some of the Old Miner Heritage.

Assistant City Attorney McLean commented on precedent. She noted that the City has the obligation to be consistent; however, if mistakes were made in the past they do not need to be repeated. The HPB should focus their analysis on the criteria and whether there were unique conditions that the Planning Director or Chief Building Official should have found in order to allow movement of the house. If they find that there were not unique conditions, the HPB should vote to uphold the Staff decision. If there are unique conditions, they should find in favor of the appellant. The Board should rely on the Code. If the Code no longer works, then it should be changed through the proper process.

Board Member White felt the unique condition is where the house was located. Many of the examples shown were structures that were moved from one site to another. In this situation where the structure will be reconstructed on its own site, the issue is what dimension is appropriate to move. The applicant has suggested six feet, but that dimension could be different on another site. Board Member White was struggling with the word "unique". It appeared that the Chief Building Official and the Planning Director could not find a unique reason for moving the building. Not wanting to set a precedent, Board Member White questioned why the house would need to be moved.

Mr. Elliott agreed that most of his examples had been moved off the property. However, he had photos of other structures that were relocated on the site. One in particular was High West, which he believed was a good example of moving a building without losing its context.

Vice-Chair Martz recalled that the Board previously had a similar discussion. It is a good discussion and the issues should be constantly raised. He did not believe the Code should be changed. The Planning Staff and others involved make good decisions and those decisions are an important part of historic preservation. Vice-Chair Martz noted that the City has a history of 30 or 40 years of remodeling historic homes and they should have this discussion with every application. At the same time, he was pleased to see something proposed on this vacant lot because it was an eyesore. He recalled that the same owner intentionally neglected the house. It was a rental and they did nothing with it. Consequently, the structure was demolished.

Historic Preservation Board
Minutes of June 15, 2011

Vice-Chair Martz believes in the current guidelines and in the process. Each project is unique and should have its own individual review. He was happy that the owner was willing to make the investment to bring back the building. Vice-Chair Martz felt the 5 foot movement as proposed was still within the practicality of what can be done with the property. Another benefit is that the property would be improved. Vice-Chair Martz was in favor of allowing the reconstruction to be moved forward on the site.

Board Member McFawn could not see any conditions that would warrant moving the structure. In his opinion, a unique condition would be something that creates an issue for the historic structure. He believed the house could be reconstructed in the same location without issue. He was pleased that the owner was making the investment to bring back the building and clean up the vacant lot, but he could not find any condition that would support moving the house on the property.

Board Member McKie concurred with Board Member McFawn. A unique condition would create a negative for the structure and provide a reason for moving it. She understood the reason why the applicant wanted to move the building, but that was not an issue the HPB could address. Since they could only consider the original structure, there was no apparent site condition to allow moving the building.

MOTION: Board Member McFawn moved to DENY the appellant and to UPHOLD the Staff's finding for denial for relocation of 919 Woodside Avenue, based on the Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law outlined in the Staff report. Board Member White seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed 3-1. Board Members Martz, McKie and McFawn voted in favor of the motion. Board Member Martz voted against the motion. Board Members Werbelow and Durst were recused.

Findings of Fact – 919 Woodside Avenue

1. The site is 919 Woodside Avenue. 919 Woodside Avenue is listed as a Significant Site on the Park City Historic Sites Inventory.
2. 919 Woodside Avenue has a Financial Guarantee associated with the property, recorded as a lien, which requires the historic structure to be reconstructed as part of the approved Preservation Plan.
3. The Pre-Application Historic District Design Review was submitted to the Planning Department on February 16, 2011. The Design Review Team (DRT) met with the applicant's representatives on February 23, 2011. The applicant indicated a basement and garage addition were being proposed, as well as a rear addition. The rear addition as proposed would require the historic structure to be moved forward on the site. The DRT directed the applicant to submit additional information, per the Historic District Guidelines and Land Management Code as to the unique conditions present on site warranting the movement of the historic structure.

Historic Preservation Board
Minutes of June 15, 2011

4. On March 17, 2011 the applicant submitted a full Historic District Design Review for 919 Woodside, including a memo to the Planning Director and Building Official describing unique conditions associated with the property.
5. The applicant supplemented the application request with additional information of perspective drawings on April 20 and April 27, 2011.
6. The application proposed to relocate the existing Significant Structure from the original historic location. The application proposes to move the home six (6) feet towards Woodside Avenue and keep the orientation to the street as it has historically been oriented.
7. LMC Section 15-11-12 requires that an application shall be denied if the Planning Department determines that the application does not comply with the Historic District Guidelines.
8. The application does not comply with Historic District Design Guideline (HDDG) E.1.1 as follows:

“Relocation and/or reorientation of historic buildings should be considered only after it has been determined by the design review team that the integrity and significance of the historic building will not be diminished by such action and the application meets one of the criterion listed in the side bar to the left (as follows). In the HRL, HR1, HRM and HRC zones, existing historic sites that do not comply with building setbacks are considered valid complying structures. Therefore, proposals to relocate and/or reorient homes may be considered only:

 1. If a portion of the historic building encroaches on an adjacent property and an easement cannot be secured; or
 2. If relocating the building onto a different site is the only alternative to demolition; or
 3. If the Planning Director and Chief Building Official determine that unique conditions warrant the relocation or reorientation on the existing site.”
9. The design review team determined the proposed relocation of the historic building six feet toward Woodside Avenue would not affect the integrity and historical significance per outlined criteria in the Historic Guidelines.
10. LMC 15-11-13states the criteria for the relocation of historic buildings. It states, “It is the intent of this section to preserve the Historic and architectural resources of Park City through limitations on the relocation and/or reorientation of Historic Buildings, Structures, and Sites” and lists the same criteria for consideration of movement of homes as listed in HDDG E.1.1with one additional criterion which states “The Planning Director and the Chief Building Official determine that unique conditions warrant the proposed relocation and/or reorientation to a different Site.”
11. The Planning Director and Chief Building Official determined that a non-typical deep front yard setback not matching the other historic homes in this area was not a unique condition. Reconstruction is an identified method of preservation and, therefore, should follow exactly the historic conditions and period of which the structure was built, to include location on site.

Historic Preservation Board
Minutes of June 15, 2011

12. The Chief Building Official did not determine that unique conditions exist to warrant the proposed relocation and/or reorientation on the existing site. There are no unique building code conditions on the site.
13. The Planning Director did not determine that unique conditions exist to warrant the proposed relocation and/or reorientation on the existing site.
14. The HPB has determined that no unique conditions exist to warrant the proposed relocation on the existing site. There are no unique planning site conditions or building code conditions on the site.
15. The findings within the analysis section are incorporate within.

Conclusions of Law – 919 Woodside Avenue

1. Pursuant to LMC Section 15-11-12 the application must be denied because the proposed project does not comply with the Historic District Guidelines or LMC 15-11-13.

Order:

1. The Design Review application request for movement of the historic structure is denied.

Director Eddington introduced Katherine Matsumoto Gray, who was appointed by the City Council as an HPB member starting in July, along with Puggy Holmgren, who was also appointed. He noted that Judy McKie was re-appointed for another term.

Director Eddington reported that Brian Guyer had submitted his resignation from the Board since he would be doing a work study program in Austria. The City Council would begin the selection process to appoint someone to fill Mr. Guyer's seat.

The meeting adjourned at 6:38 p.m.

Approved by: _____
Roger Durst
Historic Preservation Board