

PARK CITY MUNICIPAL CORPORATION
HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD
MINUTES OF MARCH 4, 2015

BOARD MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE: John Kenworthy, Lola Beatlebrox,
Marian Crosby, Puggy Holmgren, Hope Melville, David White

EX OFFICIO: Thomas Eddington, Kirsten Whetstone, Anya Grahn, Hannah
Turpen, Polly Samuels McLean, Makena Hawley

ROLL CALL

Chair Kenworthy called the meeting to order at 5:00 p.m. and noted that all Board Members were present except Cheryl Hewett who was excused.

ADOPTION OF MINUTES – January 7, 2015

MOTION: Board Member Holmgren moved to ADOPT the minutes of January 7, 2015 as written. Board Member Crosby seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS

Jennifer Gardner had read about this meeting in the Park Record but she did not see the topic of anti-idling on the agenda. Director Eddington informed Ms. Gardner that the City Council would be discussing that topic the following afternoon. Assistant City Attorney McLean suggested that Ms. Gardner look online to find the approximate time that item would be discussed.

STAFF/BOARD COMMUNICATIONS AND DISCLOSURES

Planner Grahn thanked everyone who attended the open house. The attendance surpassed their expectations. She believed the actual attendance was higher than the 75 people signed in.

Planner Grahn reported that the Utah Heritage foundation was doing the Annual Preservation Conference next Friday in Salt Lake. The Planning Staff would be attending. She would be giving a presentation regarding mine structures.

Board Member Crosby asked for an update on the status of selecting the artist for the HPB award. Planner Grahn stated that the Planning Department put out a Request for Proposal in February and only one applicant applied. The Staff had concerns that the requirements were too stringent. Therefore, instead of asking that the artist submit a sketch of their actual proposal, they changed it to request a portfolio of some of their best work. The deadline for that submittal was Friday,

March 6th. The Staff hoped to get at least one more applicant and then schedule a meet with the subcommittee to choose an artist. The plan is to move forward in time to present the award in May during Preservation Month. Planner Grahn stated that the RFP could be found online. It was also advertised in terms of sending it out to a list of artists that might be interested or ones they have worked with in the past.

Board Member Crosby could not recall who had volunteered to be on the selection committee. She thought she had but could not remember. Director Eddington recalled that it Marian Crosby, Lola Beatlebrox and John Kenworthy.

Board Member White disclosed that he would be recusing himself from the Historic Grant for 264 Ontario Avenue since he is the project architect.

Board Member Melville asked if Mr. White had to be recused from the discussion because she and others may have questions regarding the project. Assistant City Attorney McLean assumed that someone else would be representing the applicant and could answer their questions. Mr. White pointed out that both applicants were in attendance and they were very knowledgeable and capable of answering questions. Ms. McLean explained that as a Board member it would be a conflict for him to present or to answer questions. The only exception would be if it was Mr. White's personal house.

Board Member Crosby disclosed that she would be recusing herself from the work session discussion regarding temporary winter balcony enclosures based on a working relationship with The Riverhorse. Chair Kenworthy asked if it was necessary for Ms. Crosby to be recused since it was only a work session item. Assistant City Attorney McLean replied that was Ms. Crosby's, but because the Code is tied to The Riverhorse application she recommended that recusal. Chair Kenworthy noted that he has a balcony on Main Street and he did not feel the need to be recused. Ms. McLean pointed out that it would primarily be a policy discussion, but it was also tied to a specific application. There was no reason for Chair Kenworthy to recuse himself but she suggested that he make a disclosure.

Chair Kenworthy disclosed that his building at 438 Main Street has a balcony. He did not have any type of relationship with The Riverhorse and believed he could keep an open mind during the discussion.

Board Member Holmgren disclosed that she was on the Executive Committee for the HPCA. Chair Kenworthy stated for the record that his balcony was a visual element and could not be occupied.

REGULAR MEETING – Discussion, Public Hearing and Possible Action

1. 264 Ontario Avenue – Historic District Grant (Application PL-14-02418)

David White recused himself and left the room

Planner Whetstone reported that the applicants, Patricia and David Constable, were the owners of the house at 264 Ontario Avenue. The home was built in 1890. It is a one-story frame T/L shaped cottage with a gable roof. According to the HSI it is T/L shaped because a cross wing was added to an existing hall-parlor structure. It is one of the earliest styles and one of three of the most common styles built in Park City during the Mining Era. The structure maintains its integrity of a T/L style because the additions have been minor. Planner Whetstone noted that the structure was nominated to the National Register in 1984 as part of the Park City Mining Boom area residence thematic district. However, it was never listed due to objections by the owners.

Planner Whetstone stated that minor additions included extra porch posts, a small lean to addition on the south side that was more of a greenhouse material, and a more recent shed addition on the east side of the rear. The additions are proposed to be removed as part of the restoration.

Planner Whetstone reported that in August of 2014 a Historic District Design Review was approved for the restoration of the historic cottage and an addition to the rear. There was plat amendment prior to the HDDR. The house originally sat on several Old Town lots and portions of other lots. The plat amendment created a large lot in the HRL District, which exceeds the required 3,750 square feet for a single family home.

Planner Whetstone stated that the grant application was submitted on June 25th, 2014. However, it was delayed because the City Council was considering a different policy for funding grants. The owners needed to get the historic house lifted and placed on a new foundation before winter. She clarified that there is no basement. The owners made an agreement with the Planning Director and they were allowed to continue with that work because the City had delayed the grant. Planner Whetstone noted that the policy issue had been resolved and the grant application was before the HPB for review.

Planner Whetstone reported that in addition to the foundation, the applicants had also done some stabilization to the walls, roof and porch. They were proposing siding and trim repair. The roof would be asphalt shingles. The applicants were also proposing to reconstruct the porch and bring back some of the historic elements.

Planner Whetstone reviewed a plan of the proposed addition. She indicated the two garages on the upper level on the McHenry side. Access to the garages and a front entrance to the house would be on McHenry. The historic structure was

the lower portion with a connector element that goes back three stories with two single car garages at the top floor.

Planner Whetstone referred to the table on page 57 of the Staff report showing the scope of work, which included the new foundation, structural work, siding repair, the historic porch, window and door replacement and roofing and exterior paint.

The Staff recommended that the Historic Preservation Board review this request and consider awarding the applicant a portion of the total cost up to a maximum of \$43,744. The applicants are the primary owners and they intend to make it their primary residence once the restoration is completed.

Planner Whetstone noted that the largest grant ever awarded by the program was \$50,000 for 1280 Park Avenue in 2003. The second largest grant was \$42,000 plus. If awarded, this would become the second largest grant received from the Matching Grant Program. She pointed out that any grant awarded over \$25,000 must go to the City Council for review.

Planner Whetstone requested that the HPB discuss the grant application and either consider awarding the amount of \$43,744, award a portion of that amount, deny the grant request entirely, or continue the item for additional information.

David Constable introduced himself and his wife Patricia. They have lived in Park City for 43 and they have owned the property at 264 Ontario for 14 years. Mr. Constable clarified that it was a previous owner in 1984 who objected to the National Register nomination. He remarked that they were anxious to use the house as their primary residence.

Mr. Constable stated that the structure is basically a shell currently, but it has been stabilized from the inside to support it. When they gutted the inside they discovered that at some point in the past there was a major fire in the home. They were unaware of the fire until then because it had been concealed with sheet rock and the roof. Mr. Constable noted that they also discovered that the roof has been compromised and would probably need to be replaced.

Assistant City Attorney McLean clarified the alternatives. If the amount is over \$25,000 they HPB would not award the grant but instead would forward a recommendation to the City Council to award that amount. She noted that the revised grant policy was attached to the Staff report as Exhibit F. Item 2 was a list of what the HPB had previously decided were eligible improvements during the grant update process. She suggested that the Board review that list. Ms. McLean noted that the list of eligible improvements talks about exterior work such as siding; however, in her report Planner Whetstone had not recommended including the siding.

Planner Whetstone clarified that they included siding but not roofing because at the time the roof was going to be new shingles. The Staff later decided to make it consistent and added roofing to the list. Ms. McLean pointed out that the Staff report showed an asterisk next to siding and roofing in the Scope of Work. Planner Whetstone replied that it was an error and the asterisks should be removed.

Board Member Melville stated that the HPB had said that additional eligible improvements were the physical conditions report and the preservation plan because both were expensive but required. Those items were not listed in the scope of work that was being requested. Planner Whetstone replied that the physical conditions report and the preservation plan were completed before the applicants submitted for the grant. Therefore, it was not requested as part of their application. Ms. Melville asked if it could still be added to help the applicants recoup the cost. Planner Whetstone answered yes.

Chair Kenworthy clarified that \$43,744.50 was 50% of the total and did not include the cost of siding, roofing and painting. Planner Whetstone replied that the siding was included in the \$43,744 amount, but roofing and exterior painting were not included in the total amount of \$87,489.

Board Member Melville noted that the applicants have since discovered that the roofing needed to be replaced; and she asked whether the roof would have been included if the application was submitted today. Planner Whetstone stated that they could have requested the structural part of the roof in the grant application. Typically new shingles are not an eligible expense because it is considered a maintenance item. Ms. Melville asked if the expense shown for the roofing was what the applicants initially thought they needed to do or what they have to do now in replacing it.

Mr. Constable stated that due to evidence of a fire, at least one half of the roof on the historic structure would have to be replaced. It was an open question as to whether or not to replace the entire roof. Ms. Melville thought the roofing should be included in the grant since there is evidence that it needs to be replaced. The preservation plan and the physical conditions report should also be included.

Board Member Beatlebrox noted that the HPA had agreed to cover up to \$3,000 for the preservation plan and the physical conditions report. Board Member Holmgren pointed out that paying for those reports was a reimbursement and not part of the grant.

Board Member Melville asked about the procedure for approving the reimbursement since the report and the preservation plan was already done. Planner Whetstone stated that they could include it their motion to the City

Council as part of their recommendation. Director Eddington suggested that they specify up to a certain amount to make it clear to the City Council.

Board Member Crosby understood that only half of the roof was destroyed in a fire. Mr. Constable replied that it was the southerly T-portion. Ms. Crosby asked if the \$4,700 for the roof shown in the Scope of Work reflected the replacing the entire roof or just a portion. Ms. Melville clarified that the \$4,700 was the cost for minor repairs and replacing the shingles. Ms. Constable remarked that they would most likely replace the entire roof.

Board Member Holmgren was uncomfortable just saying “up to” a certain amount. If they intend to include roofing or other items in the grant, she thought they needed to see it again with concrete numbers.

Chair Kenworthy asked for the size of the roof that needed to be repaired. Mr. Constable stated that that portion of the building is 12' x 24', but it would be on an angle. Planner Whetstone calculated 188 square feet. Chair Kenworthy thought \$4,700 was a high cost for 300 square feet. Board Member Crosby stated that they would still need documentation to support structural roof repair and a cost estimate from the contractor. Mr. Constable stated that Gardner Boswell was his contractor and they could provide that information.

Planner Whetstone suggested that the HPB should discuss the full grant amount before they ask the applicants to come back with further information. She pointed out that the grant request was already a significant amount before adding additional items.

Board Member Holmgren referred to the Scope of Work table on page 57 of the Staff report and the reference to “labor”. She assumed they were not paying for labor because it is not an eligible expense. Planner Whetstone replied that labor was included in both the structural work and siding repair because it is part of the cost to do the work.

Chair Kenworthy asked the Board to provide input on the grant and the three items in question.

Board Member Beatlebrox stated that the entire application was well-done and straightforward and detailed. She was familiar with the property and it will enhance the town if it can be renovated and preserved. Ms. Beatlebrox was in favor of granting the original amount requested. In terms of the roof, because it is a new item she agreed that the Board needed to see actual numbers if they intend to include it in the grant. Regarding the exterior painting, Ms. Beatlebrox asked if the siding was original. Mr. Constable stated that it is original; however, where the non-historic addition was removed, that portion clearly needs to be painted. He remarked that at least one-third of the building is raw wood. It is the

original siding but it will need to be painted in order to preserve it. Ms. Beatlebrox stated that siding will deteriorate if it is not painted regularly. As part of the preservation she thought they should support exterior painting.

Board Member Crosby concurred with Ms. Beatlebrox. She would also like clarification on the roof repair and she was not opposed to giving grant money to help with the roof expense. Ms. Crosby complimented the applicants on the level of detail in their application. She asked for clarification on the preservation plan and whether the cost is reimbursable up to \$3,000.

Board Member Holmgren recalled the discussion but she could not remember the exact amount. Planner Grahn recalled that they were willing to reimburse up to \$1,500 per report for a total of \$3,000.

Assistant City Attorney McLean noted that the policy comes from the HPB and they can be living documents. As they define the policy it should be updated to so the expectations are clear to everyone. It should be outlined in the policy and not just based on memory or minutes. Board Member Holmgren clarified that Ms. McLean was suggesting that Exhibit F should be updated if they include additional improvements. Director Eddington agreed that the HPB should update the policy as the grant program evolves.

Director Eddington commented on the \$3,000 amount for the physical conditions report and the preservation plan. He noted that \$3,000 is the typical cost for each one and the HPB had decided to reimburse 50% of the cost up to \$1500 for each. However, it would not be part of the grant. Chair Kenworthy asked how it would be paid. Board Member Holmgren stated that the applicant would apply for a reimbursement separate from the grant. Board Member Melville stated that the HPB needs to authorize the funding before any work could be started; except for the physical conditions report and the preservation plan because those need to be done first.

Board Member Holmgren reiterated her understanding that the reimbursement was not part of the grant. Director Eddington understood that the reimbursement was part of the grant because it is the only funding source available. He recalled that timing was the issue because the physical conditions report and the preservation plan need to be done first to understand the proposal for the grant.

Assistant City Attorney McLean thought it was unfortunate that this item was scheduled first because this was a broader policy discussion that was taking place without Board Member White. She suggested that the HPB could briefly continue this item until later in the meeting and bring back Mr. White to participate in the discussion so they have a clear policy with his input.

Board Member Holmgren suggested that the HPB continue this item to the next meeting to allow the applicants to obtain information and a cost estimate for the roof. Assistant City Attorney McLean commented on the important of being consistent with the grant program. If the HPB decides that every historic house being renovated deserves to have roofing, the policy should be updated to include roofing. Their original intent was not to include roofing, but that can change because it is a living document. However, if they were only considering awarding the roofing amount for this application because they assume that the roofing amount will be less than the cost of the structural, and the amount can go towards the structural, the Board can make that decision but it has to be made with distinction to avoid setting a precedent.

Chair Kenworthy agreed that consistency was important. He also agreed that it was important to have David White's opinion on the physical conditions report and the preservation plan; and for that reason he favored a continuance until later in the evening.

Ruth Meintsma asked if the HPB could take public input before they continue because there were more questions regarding the policy that refer to the next application. Assistant City Attorney McLean stated that the Board could decide whether or not to take public input at this time. She thought the better question was whether or not public input would relate specifically to this application. If public comment was more about the policy in general, it might be better to hear those comments when David White was in the room.

Chair Kenworthy preferred to continue and asked for a motion to continue until later in the evening. Board Member Holmgren stated that she still had questions regarding the labor situation, windows, siding and repair materials. Planner Whetstone thought the HPB needed to address those issues now so the Staff and the applicant would know what to bring back in terms of addressing the issues raised by the Board and the public. Chair Kenworthy pointed out that if they still have unanswered questions they could continue it again to the next meeting.

MOTION: Board Member Beatlebrox made a motion to temporarily CONTINUE this discussion until after the 943 Park Avenue item on the agenda. Board Member Holmgren seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

David White returned to the meeting.

Chair Kenworthy called for a policy discussion regarding the physical conditions report and the preservation plan. He briefly updated David White on why the Board temporarily continued the grant request for 264 Ontario Avenue.

Planner Grahn explained that the way the City was funding the grant program had become illegal per State law. Therefore, they looked at other ways to create a policy to guide the grant program. The Staff initially met with the City Council, and came before the HPB. At that time the HPB discussed possibly putting a cap on the total amount of a grant; but that was not supported. The HPB talked about allowing people to apply grant funds to be reimbursed for the physical conditions report and preservation plan. Planner Grahn pulled up the minutes from that meeting to recall their discussion. The minutes reflect that Chair Kenworthy had asked about the cost of a physical conditions report and preservation plan. The Staff estimated approximately \$2,000. According to the minutes, the HPB decided on reimbursing a maximum of \$1500 for the physical conditions report and \$1500 for the preservation plan. The applicant could be reimbursed for each report up to that amount for a total reimbursement of \$3,000.

Board Member White stated that he was not aware of that discussion or the decision to reimburse for those reports.

Planner Grahn stated that the Staff understood that if someone came in with a physical conditions report that cost \$3,000, the HPB and the City Council could reimburse them for up to \$1500, which is the half. Board Member White understood that both the report and the preservation plan were part of the HDDR. Planner Grahn replied that they are; however, the HPB had expressed interest in helping applicants pay for those reports because it was an additional burden of owning and restoring a historic home.

Board Member Melville believed the Staff correctly understood the Board's intent. Board Member Crosby clarified that the reimbursement request would be submitted with the grant application. Planner Grahn replied that the physical conditions report and the preservation plan are required as part of the Historic District Design Review process, and they are approved as part of the HDDR. She understood that timing was a concern and it was agreed that reimbursement for the report and the preservation plan would be reimbursed at the time of the grant and it would be combined into one application.

Board Member Beatlebrox stated that when they were reviewing the application for 264 Ontario and there was no mention of the preservation or physical conditions report, it seemed unfair not to bring it up because it was being requested in the next application for 943 Park Avenue.

Board Member White stated that for 264 Ontario Avenue, the grant money requested was completely for construction and reconstruction, but nothing prior. Planner Grahn explained that Mr. and Mrs. Constable set up their grant application that way because the grant program had been on hold since they applied last July. They were unique in that they were allowed to move forward

with construction because the grant program was not available and they needed to start construction. However, the application for 943 Park Avenue came in after the grant program was approved by City Council and the policy was in place.

2. 943 Park Avenue – Historic District Grant (Application PL-15-02682)

Planner Grahm reviewed the grant application for a Landmark structure at 943 Park Avenue. The house was originally built around 1900 as T-shaped cottage. It was modernized sometime between 1900 and the Second World War. After the 1940's the house was covered in asbestos siding according to the tax cards. In the 1960's aluminum siding was added, the structure lost its chimney and the picture window was altered. In 2000 Dick Peek owned the house. He renovated it and restored many of the original details. The home is currently owned by John Hutchings and his wife Cara and they would like to renovate the house to make it a home for their family as their primary residence.

Planner Grahm stated that a new basement needs to be constructed. The structural stabilization that was done in 2000 is still in fairly good condition; however it needs to be upgraded and replaced as necessary. The roof structure also needs to be upgraded. Mr. Peek informed her that the siding and trim was the historic siding that he uncovered and repaired in 2000. New siding was mixed in which is to be expected. This applicant plans to repair and paint the siding.

Due to the amount of work necessary to restructure the roof and the fact that the plywood sheathing and the decking need to be replaced, Planner Grahm recommended that the grant also help them fund the asphalt shingles. She explained that typically new shingles is considered maintenance. However, this situation was different because with this amount of structural work something has to go on top of the roof sheathing. Planner Grahm stated that the porch would be reconstructed and brought back to more of the mining era and less reminiscent of the 1920 details.

Planner Grahm presented the approved plans which were attached to the Staff report. She reviewed that the cost breakdown and noted that repair to the trim and siding was included in the grant, but not painting the siding. The physical conditions report and the preservation plan were included as a reimbursable expense. They did not have a breakdown cost for each report but the total cost of both reports was more than \$3,000.

Planner Grahm stated that if approved, this would be the largest grant ever awarded by the City.

Assistant City Attorney McLean pointed out that this house would have a new basement. She recalled past discussions where the Board had allowed for a new foundation, but she wanted to know if there was any distinction between the types of work for the foundation itself versus work that is done in order to have a basement, such as excavation.

Planner Grahn stated that previously before the grant program came back, the Staff always said that if someone put in a basement they would deduct the excavation, house lifting and other associated costs to keep the amount awarded similar to those who only put in a slab foundation. When the City Council discussed the new grant program, the Staff explained why they have always tried to separate a basement from a slab foundation. The City Council did not share their view and they did not see a difference between the two.

John Hutchings, the applicant, stated that they purchased the house in 2011 and they were excited about this project. They have a family and need more square footage and they worked hard to do the addition in a way that is separated from the historic house and is not visible from the street. Mr. Hutchings noted that they had the house tested for Radon and the levels were high. After consulting with a number of radon mitigation companies the only way to mitigate the radon is to lift the house, build a foundation and create a seal to keep the radon gas outside of the house. That was another reason for doing this project. Mr. Hutchings and his wife like living in Old Town and they are happy to be raising their family in Old Town. They are vested in the community and plan to stay in Park City for the foreseeable future.

Mr. Hutchings noted that the costs were higher because of the amount of square footage being restored. The historic home itself is approximately 900 square feet, which is larger than most historic homes.

Chair Kenworthy opened the public hearing.

Ruth Meintsma, a resident at 305 Woodside, stated that she had gone in depth on both of these projects. She believes that if the grant money is going to be productive in accomplishing what the City wants to accomplish they need to get down to the nitty-gritty. Ms. Meintsma had made some comparatives and she thought they were both great projects to come up at the same time. Ms. Meintsma stated that she was in the process of doing a physical conditions report and a preservation plan for a neighbor. She was doing it herself but she did have volunteers for some of the certification. She assumed that the City's offer to help pay for the report and the preservation plan was not a matching grant but actually a gesture to help offset the costs because they are expensive but required. She explained why she thought that was attractive and helped the owner.

Ms. Meintsma stated that she also went into in-depth detail because she felt like she was speaking to the HPB and the City Council because of the size of the grants. Ms. Meintsma commented on the scope of work costs for 943 Park Avenue and presented her analysis. In terms of structural work, she could find nothing on the physical conditions report or the preservation plan about structural failure. There were no photos or descriptions about where the structure needed work. Ms. Meintsma believed that needed to be verified and documented before any grant money can be awarded for structural work. She found the same lack of evidence for siding repair in both reports. In terms of the roof, the only mention she could find was on the historic preservation plan, which talks about main building B.1, roof, where it says no change to roof over historic portion. It makes no mention of anything failing. Regarding the issues of basement vs. foundation, Ms. Meintsma had compared the two projects. One was a 900 square foot footprint and the other was approximately 740 square feet. Both structures were the same T/L cottage type. She handed out an exhibit she had prepared comparing the two applications. In looking at the comparison and the numbers for excavation and house lifting and foundation, the excavation was \$26,000 more than just the foundation. In her opinion, the \$26,000 appears to represent the basement portion. She pointed out that the Ontario project lot is not flat and it is very difficult to access. She has watched the crews do a lot of carrying and moving because it is not directly off the street, which increases the cost of the foundation. The project on Park Avenue is available and easy to access which should lower the cost. Ms. Meintsma understood that the excavation was not only for the original historic house but also for non-contributing additions being lifted for the foundation. She commented on the disparity in numbers between the two projects. She thought the Ontario project should definitely receive 50% of the total cost for excavation, house lifting and foundation. However, she thought the grant for Park Avenue should be a lower percentage based on the disparity between the two projects.

In looking at the brace for lifting, Ms. Meintsma noted that the Ontario project was more expensive, but the structure of the house has been compromised in many ways. The floor needs to be corrected. The back needs to be taken care of and, most recently, the roof needs to be replaced. It will require significant shoring before it can be lifted. On that issue she believed it was appropriate for the Ontario project to be requesting more than what was being requested for the Park Avenue project. Ms. Meintsma clarified that she was not suggesting that the items mentioned should not be funded, but she was suggesting that they look at a more proportional percentage between the two projects.

Ms. Meintsma commented on the porch restoration. In her opinion it was more of a reconstruction than a restoration, which is the fourth and least desirable method of saving history. She noted that removing the non-historic porch would make it easier to lift the house, and that should also reduce the expense. Regarding the Ontario project, Ms. Meintsma thought there was conflicting information as to

whether or not the porch would stay. If the Ontario house is raised with the porch, that would increase the expense. She was unsure whether re-building the front porch on the Park Avenue house justified the amount proposed in the scope of work. She agreed that it needed to be done because it saves historic form and historic character, but there is no historic material. Ms. Meintsma thought the front porch rebuild should be lower than 50%. She found it strange that the new porch stairs were part of the grant request because the stairs were only added because of the new basement. If it was only a foundation the stairs would not be necessary. She believed the owner should be 100% responsible for building the steps. Ms. Meintsma reiterated that neither the physical conditions report nor the historic preservation plan identifies any siding that is in bad condition and needs to be replaced. She questioned how they could justify giving money for something that is not documented. In terms of cornice repair, she pointed out that there were no pictures or descriptions to give any indication of needing repair. She questioned why they would award \$5,500 to do that work when it did not appear to be necessary.

Ms. Meintsma believed the request for painting on the Park Avenue project was different than the Ontario project. The Park Avenue house has been painted many times and that affords protection. In her opinion, painting the siding would only be for a new color. If there are places where the paint is failing, it should be described, recorded and justified; but she found nothing to indicate that condition. Ms. Meintsma found the same lack of justification for the roof. She noted that the preservation plan states that there is no change to the roof. If conditions need to be improved to protect the house, it should be listed, photographed, and described in detail.

In terms of reimbursing the physical conditions report and the preservation plan, Ms. Meintsma thought 50% of the cost was extreme and recommended a gesture of \$1,000.

Chair Kenworthy closed the public hearing.

Board Member Crosby understood from Ms. Minima's comment that the preservation report and the physical conditions report did not support what the applicant for 943 Park Avenue was requesting for the grant. She thought Ms. Meintsma had raised some good points and she was interested in hearing from her fellow Board members on the issue.

Chair Kenworthy remarked that Ms. Meintsma has more experience than most of the applicants who come before them. However, he believed these applicants would be leaning on their hired professionals. In past discussions the Board considered a fair price for the physical conditions report and the historic preservation plan.

Board Member White stated that the reports cost much more than what the HPB allows for reimbursement. He remarked that when he does a project he includes the cost of the physical conditions report and the historic preservation plan in his fee. Chair Kenworthy asked Mr. White to estimate an average cost for the reports based on his experience. Mr. White replied that Ms. Meintsma was being extremely thorough in the how doing the reports for her neighbor, and he would not belittle her thoroughness in any way. He suggested that the HPB should discuss this further.

Chair Kenworthy asked if Mr. White was comfortable with the current policy of reimbursing up to \$1,500 for each report. Board Member White thought it was a reasonable amount. The work he does preparing the reports is worth more, but he believed the reimbursed amount was fair.

Board Member Melville understood that Ms. Meintsma was saying that when she read the conditions report she did not find documentation of things that needed to be repaired. Therefore, the request for money for that repair was not justified.

Board Member White asked the Board to keep in mind that the costs submitted for the two projects were not from the same contractor. In addition, the two sites are different and one site is more difficult than another site. One project restores the footing and foundation and the other project is excavating for a basement, which results in a cost difference.

Board Member Melville stated that she definitely favors these types of projects and awarding as much as possible for historic preservation grants. When a foundation needs to be put in to stabilize the house and the house has to be lifted, that is one cost. However, digging out a basement is different and requires additional excavation and foundation costs; and she did not believe that falls under the venue of historic preservation. Ms. Melville recognized that basements are allowed, but it cannot be justified as part of the grant program. In the past the grants have been based on the cost to raise a house and put in a foundation. That would be the reimbursable cost, but not the additional cost to finish the basement.

Planner Grahn asked what the Board would consider a good policy for the Staff to have when assessing grant applications. She asked if they wanted to fund specific items or whether they should put a cap on the reimbursable amount regardless of whether it is a slab foundation or a new basement.

Board Member Holmgren felt strongly that the grant portion should be for the foundation. A basement is completely different and the owner should have to pay that additional cost.

Board Member White stated that they would have to either get a price from a contractor or say that any footing and foundation that has a basement would only be funded for half of the cost. He recalled that the Board has done that in the past.

Board Member Holmgren stated that knowing that the grant is based only on a slab foundation, if the owner wants to dig for a basement the contractor would know to bid the two separately.

Planner Grahn stated that this application was typical for people putting in a basement. She wanted to know which parts should be eliminated to keep a level playing field. Mr. White pointed out that a basement required more excavation so that percentage should be reduced as well. He suggested reducing the amount to half of the 50% paid by the City for foundation and excavation work.

Chair Kenworthy noted that they were looking at variables in terms of contractors and sites, but also variables with timing and construction costs. Board Member Beatlebrox remarked that they were also looking at livable space in the basement at 943 Park Avenue compared to the livable space at 264 Ontario being behind the house. She believed it was comparing apples to oranges.

Board Member Melville asked what they had done in the past when basements were put in to determine the appropriate grant amount. Chair Kenworthy recalled basing it on the contractor's bid. Director Eddington stated that they tried to separate the basement from the foundation via a percentage, but there was never a specific formulate to do it. He remarked that another alternative would be to look at these from a percent perspective. One alternative would be to get very specific in the grant request and require a proposal for just a foundation, even if a basement was proposed. Board Member Melville was concerned about putting additional burdens on people. Director Eddington agreed, which left them with the other alternative of determining a percentage. Board Member White stated that they did it by percentage in the past. He noted that regardless of whether it is a slab foundation or a basement the house has to be lifted. Ms. Melville pointed out that the foundation cost would be different in terms of a slab foundation versus a foundation for a basement; and the excavation would also be different.

Planner Grahn reviewed a grant application from two years ago for 1049 Park Avenue. At that time the HPB could award funds without sending it to the City Council. She pointed out that the only covered cost was the foundation work. The excavation, house lifting and bracing the house was done at the full expense of the applicant. That project put in a full livable basement under the house. Planner Grahn recalled that the justification for only paying for the foundation was that the additional excavation, the bracing of the house and lifting the house was more substantial because of the basement.

Board Member Holmgren assumed the porch restoration in the grant request would return the porch to what was shown in the photo on page 154 of the Staff report but with new porch stairs. Ms. Holmgren stated that she questioned the porch before Ms. Meintsma made her comments. In terms of siding and trim repair, she also had looked for details and found nothing. Ms. Holmgren clarified that her position has always been that paint is maintenance.

Planner Grahn commented on the porch from the standpoint of the HDDR. She stated that when the Staff met with the preservation consultant they looked at the historic photograph from the 1940's. They visited the site several times and tried to figure out which parts were built when. They concluded that the T-shape cottage was built originally with a simple miners' era porch. Sometime in the 1920's or 1930's the porch was changed to look more like a craftsman. Planner Grahn stated that the Staff asked the applicants which era they wanted to take the porch back to and they chose the mining era. She noted that the porch stairs are needed because of the basement. Planner Grahn remarked that the railings and the stairs are required because of Building Code, but the HPB has the purview to decide whether or not those elements should be included in the grant.

Chair Kenworthy stated that since they have new guidelines and new procedures with City Council approval above \$25,000; having two grant requests with record amounts at the same time, he was concerned about forwarding these grant requests to the City Council for these significant amounts. He remarked that the City Council wholeheartedly supports the HPB and the Mayor and the Council are passionate about preservation. However, he was still uncomfortable forwarding these first two projects with record amounts. Chair Kenworthy clarified that the HPB wants to do whatever they can to promote preservation and it is an economic driver in so many ways. They want to reach out to the homeowners who have historic homes, but the question is what direction they want to take with this new process. He believed the City Council had limited the HPB approval to \$25,000 for a reason.

Board Member Beatlebrox had attended the City Council meeting when they discussed the guidelines. One Council Member was in favor of the HPB promoting the grants and awarding the money, and letting the Council decide whether or not to pay that amount. The message she heard from the City Council was that the HPB should not hold back. Ms. Beatlebrox was excited when she saw these grants with record amounts because awarding money is part of their role as the HPB.

Board Member White commented on roofs and porches. He stated that a lot of roofs are just 2 x 4's at 2 feet on center, which does not come close to the structural requirements. Porch floors are 2 x 4's laid on the dirt with a wood porch material laid over that. He was unsure how those could be saved or

replaced without restructuring it entirely. If they put a footing and foundation underneath it will raise the porch slightly and the floor structure will be new. Mr. White agreed that the porch would be new, but if they keep the posts the same with the same spacing and the porch roof has the same slope, it would still look historic even though the material is new. The existing material is mostly rotten and there was no other way to restore the porch.

Board Member Melville asked if the house would retain its current Landmark status when the project is complete. Planner Grahn answered yes. The applicants had done a good job incorporating the non-historic but contributing addition that was added in the 1930's or 1940's and using it as a transition element. The new addition will be set back from the house and it will not be visible from the street.

Board Member Melville asked Mr. Hutchings if the house would still look historic when the project is completed. She commented on a previous grant that was awarded for a house, but when the work was completed the house has a number of modern elements and it no longer looks historic. She wanted to make sure that would not happen again.

Mr. Hutchings stated that the intention is to keep the house looking exactly as it looks today. They would pull off the doors and windows during construction but they will be put back. They were considering changing the paint color to a darker green. The driveway and walkway will remain in their current locations and the shrubs in between the walkway and driveway will remain. Ms. Melville asked about the colorful trim elements. Mr. Hutchings stated that the trim would be the same. He noted that the yellow trim shown on the picture would be painted white. He believed the reconstructed porch will look more historic than the existing porch. The grass will be replanted and there are no plans to take out the tree shown on the right side of the photo. Mr. Hutchings clarified that this project was a necessity to accommodate their family. They love the historic house and want to keep it exactly as it looks today except for a different color.

Board Member Melville understood that the City does not regulate color, but she asked if the applicant intended to paint the new part a different color than old part. When that has been done on other structures it makes the historic house stand out. She acknowledged that it may not make a difference in this project because the addition will not be seen from the street. Mr. Hutchings stated that he and his wife had not had that discussion; however, it probably would not make a difference in this circumstance. Mr. Hutchings stated that in an effort to distinguish the addition from the historic house is to reverse the siding by keeping the horizontal siding on the historic house and putting vertical siding on the addition. He remarked that he and his wife believe it is important to distinguish the historic home from the addition. He was not opposed to different paint colors if it was preferred by the Board.

Mr. Hutchings commented on items in the requested grant that they felt were not supported in the reports. He stated that the work needs to be done and he was willing to provide as much information as necessary to support that. A structural engineer did a full structural assessment of the home and determined that it needs work on the roof, the ceiling, the floor, and the walls. He was happy to provide that assessment. In terms of the basement, Mr. Hutchings thought a better calculation for the percentage would be to seek a bid from a builder. In his research, the cost difference between a slab foundation and a basement is not a 50/50 split. They chose to do a full basement because the incremental costs were not that much different. He agreed that a basement costs more but it does not cost twice as much.

Chair Kenworthy asked if the Board was prepared to make a final decision on a grant amount for 943 Park Avenue; or whether they needed more documentation. A raise of hands showed that four Board members wanted additional documentation. Chair Kenworthy asked what specific documentation they would need before making a final decision.

Board Member Holmgren wanted to see the difference between a slab foundation and a basement. She also would like more details about the roof expense.

Board Member Beatlebrox noted that the siding and the cornice were mentioned and whether or not painting is required in order to maintain and protect what already exists. Board Member Holmgren stated that she has been in the home and it is well painted. For that reason, she also questioned the need for painting. Ms. Beatlebrox thought Ms. Meintsma had raised valid issues that require documentation.

Board Member Melville understood that the HPB awards the grant up to a maximum amount, but the applicant would have to submit actual receipts to the Planning Department before any money is paid. Planner Grahn replied that this was correct. She stated that the HPB could continue this item and ask the applicant to bring back everything and they can look at all the totals; or they can take out the parts the Board was not comfortable with this evening and have the applicant come back with a request for a second grant on those items.

MOTION: Board Member Holmgren moved to CONTINUE the Historic District Grant for 943 Park Avenue to the next meeting. Board Member White seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

Planner Grahn summarized the items that the applicant should provide: 1) the cost difference between the slab foundation and the basement; 2) more detail regarding the roofing expenses; 3) more detail about the siding and cornice repair; 4) whether or not paint is required to maintain the siding.

The Board concurred. Chair Kenworthy recommended that Mr. Hutchings also provide the backup showing what he paid for all the reports.

Board Member Melville thought it was right to request the documentation, but she wanted to make sure that they did not put additional requirements and burdens on the applicant because they intent is to encourage people to do preservation and to seek grant funds. She asked Mr. Hutchings if the documentation requested was something he could easily provide or whether it would be a burden. Mr. Hutchings stated that he has all the information and could easily provide whatever they needed.

Board Member Crosby noted that their request added another level of detail to the physical conditions report and the preservation plan. Planner Grahn stated that it could be addressed through an amended report or by adding exhibits to the existing report. She would work with the applicant to determine the best way to handle it.

3. 264 Ontario Avenue (Continued Discussion)

Board Member White recused himself and left the room.

Director Eddington informed Planner Whetstone that the HPB clarified that their previous decision was to reimburse up to \$1500 for the physical conditions report and \$1500 for the preservation plan, for a total not to exceed \$3,000. The reimbursement is included as part of the grant and the reports can be done prior to awarding the grant.

Chair Kenworthy opened the public hearing.

Ruth Meintsma stated that comments on this project were more optimistic. However, she suggested conditions instead of a straight 50% of cost. She understands roofing enough to know what it takes to keep the roof and reinforce it. She thought the proposed expense for the roofing was a small amount and believed that it should be included in the grant. Ms. Meintsma reviewed the scope of work listed and thought the excavation should be 100%. For backfill, drain and gravel, she thought the drain was definitely necessary to keep water off the house. In terms of backfill and gravel, Ms. Meintsma noted that the equipment would already be on-site for the addition and she asked if that was considered in the amounts or if the cost was representative of a segment of the entire operation.

Mr. Constable explained that the house lifting and the excavation under the house, as well as the backfill, drainage and gravel would occur independent of the excavation for the addition.

Based on that explanation Ms. Meintsma thought it should be funded the full 50%. Regarding the porch, Ms. Meintsma quoted language from the preservation plan that she believed was conflicting information. One quote stated that the existing porch will remain the same. The second quote stated that the porch would be rebuilt, posts would be reused. A third quote was note on the architectural drawing stating that the porch roof will be braced back to the house during construction.

Mr. Constable explained that they had braced the roof and removed the non-historic porch floor. The posts were saved and will be re-used. The actual roof of the porch will also be reused.

Ms. Meintsma stated that if the owner intended to reuse the porch roof, she believed they should be awarded all the funding. Ms. Meintsma reiterated her earlier comment that restoration of the porch was the wrong term. Ms. Meintsma commented on the asterisks next to siding materials and labor with the question of whether or not it should be included. She stated that with this structure most of the siding is in good condition and according to the physical conditions report only a small amount at the base need to be replaced. Based on the work and labor required to scrape, fill and replace to save the siding, as well as the small amount of new material, she thought the \$32,000 looked like a small figure and suggested funding 100%. Ms. Meintsma commented on the restoration of windows and doors. She pointed out that the window shown in the drawings was different from the actual window in the house.

Mr. Constable stated that in looking at historic photos, the window was changed at some point. Ms. Meintsma agreed, but noted that the changed window became historic in its own right. That window was changed again on the plans. He remarked that the preservation plan states that all the doors and windows would stay the same.

Mr. Constable replied that she was correct. Ms. Meintsma believed that the window she mentioned was different on the plans. Mr. Constable disagreed. All the windows and doors in the historic house will remain exactly the same in style and size. He pointed out that they will be new windows and the doors will be refinished.

Ms. Meintsma believed the measurements on the drawings for the front porch casement window was different from the size identified on the existing conditions report.

Ms. Constable informed Ms. Meintsma that the windows contractor came and measured every window to make sure the new windows would be the same size. Planner Whetstone confirmed that the windows would be the same. Ms. Meintsma conceded that the discrepancy was with the drawings.

Ms. Meintsma noted that the windows would be replaced with new energy efficient windows, which is a factor for replacement, but it is not supposed to dominate. She read from the guidelines, a historic window with a storm window could actually be better. In her opinion, replacing the existing windows with new windows was not the first best option. She thought the people who take the extra effort to renovate everything they possibly can and take the least evasive approach by adding the storm window should receive 50% of the cost. Replacing the windows with new windows is easy and fast, and most people do even though it is not the best for historic preservation. Her recommendation would be to award 40% for those who completely replace the windows.

Ms. Meintsma found conflicting information regarding the trim. She asked if all the trim around the window would be saved.

Mr. Constable stated that the trim around the double-hung window would be saved. Ms. Meintsma asked about the other windows. Planner Whetstone recalled that after they went back and looked at the windows they went inside and determined that they were not historic. Ms. Meintsma clarified that she was talking about the trim. The preservation plan indicated that all the trim would be saved but the windows would be replaced.

Mrs. Constable stated that their intent is to use whatever trim they can, and any damaged trim would be reconstructed to look exactly the same.

Ms. Meintsma commented on the asterisk for exterior painting. Since priming is the part of the major protection, she suggested approving the amount for work up to and including the priming at 50%, but not awarding money for the paint color. Ms. Meintsma questioned whether the walls should be awarded a 50% grant. The structure in the house is described many times in both the physical conditions report and the preservation plan indicating that and the structure from the ground up is in good condition, except for the issue with the roof. She noted that for the walls the applicants want to put 2 x 6's for environmental reasons. She thought that made sense, but it comes under a different purview and moves into a different category. Ms. Meintsma thought those with structural unsound walls should be eligible for 50%. In her opinion that did not apply in this case.

Ms. Meintsma commented on the roof. She has been evaluating different structures around town, but in particular the garage on Woodside that was renovated and no longer has the feeling of a historic garage. Ms. Meintsma

stated that when a roof is unsound and needs to be replaced, the first place the contractors go to is TJI, which is a brand name for I-beams. They are fast, easy and cheap and they make a good strong roof to Code, but they alter the historic look. She consulted a structural engineer who said a lower mass profile roof can be done, but it takes a different level of designing and engineering. Ms. Meintsma believed the Constable's would have to replace the entire roof rather than just a portion. If they have their contractor build a low profile roof, she thought the City should award 100% of the amount for the grant because that type of roof is expensive.

Chair Kenworthy closed the public hearing.

Mr. Constable commented on the 2 x 6 walls and the \$24,000 budget and the City paying for half of that amount. He agreed that maybe the house could remain standing in its current condition since it has for 130 years, but at some point it will not. He believed that if they expend the time, money and effort to go through this process, they should do what they can to make sure the structure lasts another 100 years. Mr. Constable stated that their plan for the walls has the energy efficient component, but the primary intent is to make the house safe and sound and able to withstand snow loads and other elements. He did not believe that awarding \$12,000 to shore up the house was an inordinate amount of money for the City to pay.

Mrs. Constable commented on raising the house. She was unable to watch it because it was so intense to see the house lifted seven feet in the air and coming back down square on to the foundation. She noted that one of the walls Ms. Meintsma mentioned as being structurally sound was a shaped wall and they are all different levels of the interior of the house. She felt strongly that the house needed a lot of support. Mrs. Constable appreciated the fact that the Board takes the time to contemplate everything and to even consider awarding money to help maintain the structure. She assured them that they would do the best job possible to make this home a beautiful place. She also thought it would be unique in terms of historic preservation because of the circumstances of entering the house from McHenry due to the Ontario right-of-way which is not their property. Mrs. Constable complimented David White on doing an incredible job of co-joining the new part with the historic. She was very proud of it.

Board Member Holmgren was happy with everything on this project. She would like the amount of the historical forms officially put into the grant request. If they are looking at roofing she also wanted that officially in the request. She was pleased with the work that was already done and thought the rest of the project would be very cool.

Chair Kenworthy clarified that Ms. Holmgren was asking that the physical conditions report and the preservation plan be included in the grant up to \$3,000,

providing that Mr. White submits his invoice, and that the amount for those reports would be added to the amount of \$43,744.

Board Member Holmgren clarified that she was also asking the applicant to find out the exact cost of the roof so the amount would not be based on guessing. She suggested that they obtain that cost prior to the next meeting so they could move this forward. Ms. Holmgren recommended a continuance to allow the Applicant the time needed to provide the necessary information.

Board Member Melville preferred to make a decision this evening. She asked if it was possible to award an amount this evening and to review a separate request for the roof. Planner Whetstone noted that some roof work was already included in the structural work. She understood that the remaining cost of the roof was for new shingles.

Director Eddington recommended that the Board keep it as one grant. It would be easier for the City Council to review and for the Staff to follow the grant and make the payouts. He concurred with Ms. Holmgren's recommendation to continue the item until they have an exact cost for the roof repairs as well as the preservation plan and the physical conditions report.

Board Member Beatlebrox asked if those costs would be added to the matrix or whether they would be separate. Director Eddington replied that it would be added to keep it one grant.

Mr. and Mrs. Constable were comfortable with a continuation.

Board Member Beatlebrox stated that in addition to knowing the cost, she would like to know exactly what they intend to do with the roof, given the concern that was raised earlier about making sure a new roof still looks old. Ms. Beatlebrox also requested that they identify the materials they propose to use on the roof.

Board Member Melville agreed with the comment to update the grant with preservation plan and the physical conditions report request. She personally favored including the exterior painting in this case because of the old wood that is being maintained.

MOTION: Board Member Melville moved to CONTINUE the grant request for 264 Ontario Avenue to the next meeting to consider the applicant's resubmission of the Scope of Work Summary, which will now include the preservation plan and physical conditions report, as well as the proposed repairs to the roof and the associated costs. Board Member Crosby seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

4. Memo to HPB

Planner Grahn stated that in 2009 Preservation Solutions conducted a Reconnaissance Level Survey. The purpose was to identify which buildings in Park City. It was a very preliminary review but it resulted in the Historic Sites Inventory. In 2013 the City asked CRSA to do an Intensive Level Survey of the two National Register Districts to make sure they had as much history and knowledge about the historic structures as was possible. Planner Grahn stated that one of the goals in working with CRSA was to make sure they had a comprehensive list of historic sites and that they were not missing any. The list was compared with the Museum's list of historic sites to identify any discrepancies. Planner Grahn was unsure why Preservation Solutions had overlooked some of the buildings, but she attributed it to the fact that the Reconnaissance Level Survey was preliminary and quick.

Planner Grahn presented the list of houses that the City asked CRSA to look into. She noted that 569 Park Avenue and 921 Norfolk Avenue had originally been nominated to the Historic Sites Inventory, but they were removed by the HPB in 2010. Planner Grahn explained that legally those sites could not be reviewed again unless CRSA discovered new information, which they did not.

Board Member Melville wanted everyone to look which house they were talking about at 569 Park Avenue that was removed from the HSI in 2010. Ms. Melville had read the HPB hearing on that structure and she found a number of errors. It states that Sandra Morrison requested that it be taken off of the HSI because of a roof change. Ms. Melville noted that Ms. Morrison said that she never made that request and she never received notice of that HPB hearing. Ms. Melville stated that she walks that street every day and she never saw a notice on the house, and the neighbors have said that they never received a notice. She believed there was a noticing failure on the hearing. Ms. Melville remarked that Sandra Morrison has said that if she had known about the hearing she would have attended and given additional information to show why this is a historic house. Mr. Melville stated that somehow this house needed to come back to the HPB for further review based on previous errors. She would work with Planner Grahn on how that could be accomplished.

Ms. Melville pointed out that the house has a 1998 Historic Preservation Award plaque on it and it was on the Historic Home Tour in 2012. Planner Grahn asked Ms. Melville to send her the additional information from Sandra Morrison and she would definitely review it. Ms. Melville reiterated that besides the additional information, there was an error with the noticing and errors in the report; specifically that Sandra Morrison had requested that the house be removed. Planner Grahn would look into it.

Planner Grahn stated that they found that the structure at 84 Daly was possibly destroyed by a rock slide. It was rebuilt in 1989 on the same footprint but it was not a true reconstruction. Planner Turpen had outlined that in the memo so the Board could see why they decided not to include that structure on the HSI.

Planner Grahn stated that 1258 Norfolk and 332 Woodside would be discussed at the next meeting due to time constraints.

Planner Grahn explained that if the HPB did not take the Staff's recommended action on any of the Determination of Significance items, no change would occur to the designation of the structures. They will remain not listed on the Historic Sites Inventory, which means they are not protected by the HSI. If the owner submitted for a demolition permit it could be granted.

Planner Grahn suggested a change in the agenda to discuss 135 Sampson Avenue first to accommodate the owner.

5. 135 Sampson Avenue – Determination of Significance
(Application PL-14-02551)

Planner Grahn reported that a significant site is any building; main, attached, detached or public. It can be an accessory building and/or structure, and it can be designated to the Historic Sites Inventory if it meets certain criteria.

Planner Grahn reviewed the criteria for significance. The site has to be at least 50 years old or has achieved significance within the last 50 years or if it is of exceptional importance to the community. She stated that the building at 135 Sampson was constructed around 1900. However, at that time that area was not part of the town and so it does not show up until the 1907 Fire Insurance Map. At that time it was associated with a house that was listed as 79 Utah Avenue. It was a one-story wood frame stable and it was larger than it is today. By 1929 the larger portions of the building were demolished, leaving just the smaller shed, which is the structure that exists today. Planner Grahn noted that all the changes were made within the historic period.

The second criteria is that the structure has to retain its essential form, meaning there were no major alterations. Planner Grahn stated that how the building looked like at the end of the historic period in 1929 is how it looks today. The demolition of the other portions of the stable occurred between 1907 and 1929. Since 1929 there have been no additions or removal of upper stories, relocation of the building or any new additions that obscured the essential historic from the public right-of-way.

The third criteria is to make sure it is important to local and regional history. Planner Grahn stated that the construction method is indicative of the vernacular

structures build during the Mature Mining Era. The haphazard design was typical because Park City did not have builders and craftsman. People did backyard projects. The materials on the structure would have been readily available during the historic period. The structure conveys a sense of Park City's history because of these materials and its simplicity.

Planner Grahn remarked that the structure meets the criteria for Significance, but is does not meet the criteria for Landmark designation. The building was originally in a much more rural location that it is today. The historic integrity of the site with the new houses surrounding it and the changes in the road has largely been lost. She was unsure whether the National Register of Historic Places would want to honor this one building. Planner Grahn believed the structure was significant to local and regional history for the reasons outlined.

The Staff recommended that the Board review the application, conduct a public hearing, and designate the garage as significant on the HSI.

Chair Kenworthy opened the public hearing.

Carol Sletta, the owner, stated that she was unaware of this process until the notice sign was posted in her yard. She asked if the structure was found to be Significant on the Historic Sites Inventory, whether she would be able to turn it into a garage at some point in the future as long as she retained the integrity of the exterior. She had no plans to do that but wanted to know if she had that ability just in case. The Board members replied that she would have that ability.

Board Member White asked if the metal siding on the shed was original or whether it used to be wood siding that was covered with metal. Ms. Sletta stated that a neighbor had told her that she helped put metal siding on that building. Ms. Sletta noted that she had put the wood siding on the back side just to cover the metal to make it look nicer for the neighbor who built next door. Ms. Sletta was unsure whether or not there was wood siding underneath the metal.

Chair Kenworthy closed the public hearing.

Board Member Melville stated that the Board would encourage using it a garage or storage, because having a use helps keep the historic structures vital.

MOTION: Board Member White moved to designate the garage at 135 Sampson Avenue as a Significant Site on the Park City Historic Sites Inventory. Board Member Holmgren seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

Findings of Fact – 135 Sampson Avenue

1. The Park City Historic Sites Inventory (HSI), adopted February 4, 2009, includes 405 sites of which 192 sites meet the criteria for designation as Landmark Sites and 213 sites meet the criteria for designation as Significant Sites. This site was not included on the 2009 HSI.
2. The garage and house at 135 Sampson Avenue are within the Residential-Low Density (HR-L) zoning district.
3. The house at 135 Sampson Avenue is not historic; it was constructed in 1979, per Summit County records, and extensively renovated in 1996.
4. There is wood-frame shed-roof garage structure at 135 Sampson Avenue.
5. The existing garage structure has been in existence at 135 Sampson Avenue since circa 1900. The structure appears in the 1907, 1929, and 1941 Sanborn Fire Insurance maps. A 1904-1904 tax photo of Park City also demonstrates that the overall form of the structure has not been altered.
6. The garage was built c. 1900 during the Mature Mining Era (1894-1930). Between 1907 and 1929, a portion of the garage was demolished to create a square-shaped structure. Staff finds that these changes have gained historical significance in their own right, and that the garage is historic. The existing structure is in disrepair and is not habitable in its current dangerous condition.
7. The garage is constructed of dimensional lumber and sheet metal. The two (2) hinged garage doors on the south façade are corrugated metal. These materials would have been readily available during the Mature Mining Era.
8. The structure is a single-cell plan and typical of the accessory structures built during the Mature Mining Era.
9. The site meets the criteria as Significant on the City's Historic Sites Inventory.
10. Built circa 1900, the structure is over fifty (50) years old and has achieved Significance in the past fifty (50) years.
11. Though the structure has lost its historic integrity due to extensive changes to its setting, it has retained its Essential Historical Form.
12. The structure is important in local or regional history because it is associated with an era of historic importance to the community, the Mature Mining Era (1894-190).

Conclusions of Law – 135 Sampson Avenue

1. The existing accessory structure located at 135 Sampson Avenue meets all of the criteria for a Significant Site as set forth in LMC Section 15-11-10(A)(2) which includes: (a) It is at least fifty (50) years old or has achieved Significance in the past fifty (50) years if the Site is of exceptional importance to the community; and (b) It retains its Essential Historical Form, meaning there are no major alterations that have destroyed the Essential Historical Form. Major alterations that destroy the Essential Historical Form include:
 - (i) Changes in pitch of the main roof of the primary façade if 1) the change was made after the Period of Historic Significance; 2) the change is not due to any structural failure; or 3) the change is not due to collapse as a result of

inadequate maintenance on the part of the Applicant or a previous Owner,
or

(ii) Addition of upper stories or the removal of original upper stories occurred
after the Period of Historic Significance, or

(iii) Moving it from its original location to a Dissimilar Location, or

(iv) Addition(s) that significantly obscures the Essential Historical Form when
viewed from the primary public Right-of-Way.

(c) It is important in local or regional history, architecture, engineering, or culture
associated with at least one (1) of the following:

(i) An era of Historic importance to the community, or

(ii) Lives of Persons who were of Historic importance to the community, or

(iii) Noteworthy methods of construction, materials, or craftsmanship
used during the Historic period.

2. The garage house structure located at 135 Sampson Avenue does not comply
with

all of the criteria for a Landmark Site as set forth in Land Management Code
(LMC)

Section 15-11-10(A)(1). The structure does not meet the criteria for landmark
designation as it is not eligible for the National Register of Historic Places
because much of the historic integrity of the garage's setting and location has
been lost.

6. 581 Park Avenue – Determination of Significance
(Application PL-14-02551)

Planner Turpen reported that the Staff finds that the house at 581 Park Avenue is
significant based on the following criteria: It is at least 50 years old. It was
constructed in 1889. It is a modified pyramid house. Based on the Sanborn
maps the front porch was expanded between 1889 and 1900; and it was reduced
from 1907 to 1928 and that reduction is there today with the portico entry on the
south side. Planner Turpen stated that after the historic period a rear addition
was removed. It was a historic addition but the Staff did not find the removal to
be a detriment to the historic integrity. Around 1991 the garage and roof deck
addition was added on the front. In 2002 two dormers were added to the north
and south roof planes. In 2014 a few modifications were made to upgrade the
garage and roof deck.

The Staff finds that the structure retains its essential historic form. Planner
Turpen remarked that historic additions were made in the settlement and mining
boom era, as well as in the mature mining era as reflected on the Sanborn map.
The alterations that were made represent the need for the Parkites to expand
their homes. The alterations and additions have gained historical significance in
their own right. Planner Turpen stated that the 1941 additions altered the
historical form with the two dormers, but the Staff did not believe it altered the
pitch of the main roof from the primary façade. Even though the 1991 garage

and roof addition changed the front façade, the additions did not destroy the historic house like most front additions would do. She pointed out that if the garage addition was taken away, much of the historic front façade would still remain.

Planner Turpen stated that the historic house is important to local and regional history because it is indicative of construction methods during that period. The property is also associated with two different people who owned it. The first, Lucien Simon, owned a number of mining claims and he purchased the property in 1887. He eventually sold the home to Sara and Jacob Richardson. Jacob Richardson was an early Park City undertaking who had his business on Main Street.

The Staff did not find that the house meets the criteria for Landmark designation. Even it is at least 50 years old and is significant to local and regional history, it is not eligible for the National Register based on some of the additions. However, the Staff finds it significant to Park City preservation.

The Staff recommended that the HPB review the application, conduct a public hearing and designate the house at 581 Park Avenue as Significant to the Park City Historic Sites Inventory.

Chair Kenworthy opened the public hearing.

There were no comments.

Chair Kenworthy closed the public hearing.

Board Member Beatlebrox stated that if this house was designated as Significant, she questioned how they would keep other from thinking they could stick a garage on their pyramid house or ski chalet and still call it Significant. She understood that the guidelines would prevent that from happening, but she was concerned about the perception.

Planner Turpen stated that one Guideline does say that if an alteration made to the façade of a historic and it is taken off, it cannot affect the historic structure. That was the criteria the Staff used to make their finding. If the front addition was taken off on 581 Park Avenue, the front façade would still be retained. Ms. Turpen agreed that because of the Guidelines the front addition would not be allowed to happen today.

Board Member Melville was comfortable designating this site as a significant property. She agreed that if the garage was removed the historic house would still be there. Board Member Holmgren agreed that it should stay Significant.

MOTION: Board Member Holmgren moved to designate the house at 581 Park Avenue as a Significant Site on the Park City Historic Sites Inventory. Board Member White seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

Findings of Fact – 581 Park Avenue

1. The Park City Historic Sites Inventory (HSI), adopted February 4, 2009, includes 405 sites of which 192 sites meet the criteria for designation as Landmark Sites and 213 sites meet the criteria for designation as Significant Sites. This site was not included on the 2009 HSI.
2. The house at 581 Park Avenue is within the Historic Residential (HR-1) zoning district.
3. The structure has been in existence at 581 Park Avenue since circa 1889. The structure appears in the 1889, 1900, 1907, 1929, and 1941 Sanborn Fire Insurance maps. The structure appears in a 1941 tax photograph.
4. The structure is not currently designated as a Significant or Landmark site on the 2009 Historic Sites Inventory.
5. The original pyramid house was constructed within the Settlement and Mining Boom Era (1868 – 1893) and is historic. The two (2) later additions were made after the Period of Historic Significance and are non-historic.
6. Though out of period, the garage/roof deck addition added prior to 1991 and the two (2) dormers added in 2001 do not detract from the historic significance of the structure and its Essential Historic Form.
7. The original exterior siding and ornamental detailing above the front entranceway are remaining on the exterior of the house. The roofing materials, concrete foundation, and modern garage door are indicative of alterations outside of the historic period.
8. The front (east) façade retains its original windows with the exception of one (1) non-historic door which replaced a historic window opening.
9. The structure is a pyramid house typical of the Settlement and Mining Boom Era (1868 – 1893).
10. The site meets the criteria as Significant on the City's Historic Sites Inventory.
11. Built circa 1889, the structure is over fifty (50) years old and has achieved Significance in the past fifty (50) years.
12. Though the structure's historic integrity has been diminished due to the out-of-period additions and alterations to its historic materials, it has retained its Essential Historical Form. The out-of-period addition to the east elevation of the structure and the dormers on the north and south roof planes of the structure do not detract from its historic significance.
13. The structure is important in local or regional history because it is associated with an era of historic importance to the community, the Settlement and Mining

Boom Era (1868 – 1893) and it is associated with the lives of Lucien Simon and Sarah and Jacob Richardson who are significant in the history of the community.
14. The site does not meet the criteria as Landmark on the City's Historic Sites Inventory.

Conclusions of Law – 581 Park Avenue

1. The existing structure located at 581 Park Avenue meets all of the criteria for a Significant Site as set forth in LMC Section 15-11-10(A)(2) which includes:

(a) It is at least fifty (50) years old or has achieved Significance in the past fifty (50) years if the Site is of exceptional importance to the community; and
(b) It retains its Essential Historical Form, meaning there are no major alterations that have destroyed the Essential Historical Form. Major alterations that destroy the Essential Historical Form include:

(i) Changes in pitch of the main roof of the primary façade if 1) the change was made after the Period of Historic Significance; 2) the change is not due to any structural failure; or 3) the change is not due to collapse as a result of inadequate maintenance on the part of the Applicant or a previous Owner, or

(ii) Addition of upper stories or the removal of original upper stories occurred after the Period of Historic Significance, or

(iii) Moving it from its original location to a Dissimilar Location, or

iv) Addition(s) that significantly obscures the Essential Historical Form when viewed from the primary public Right-of-Way.

(c) It is important in local or regional history, architecture, engineering, or culture associated with at least one (1) of the following:

(i) An era of Historic importance to the community, or

(ii) Lives of Persons who were of Historic importance to the community, or

(iii) Noteworthy methods of construction, materials, or craftsmanship used during the Historic period.

2. The existing house structure located at 581 Park Avenue does not comply with all of the criteria for a Landmark Site as set forth in Land Management Code (LMC) Section 15-11-10(A)(1). The structure does not meet the criteria for landmark designation as it is not eligible for the National Register of Historic Places due to post 1941 alterations that have damaged and obliterated significant character-defining features of the historic structure.

7. 1108 Park Avenue – Determination of Significance (Application PL-14-02553)

Planner Turpen reported that the Staff finds that the garage located at 1108 Park Avenue is Significant based on the following criteria: The garage was constructed sometime between 1929 and 1941. It is a simple wood frame gabled roof garage and there have been minimal alterations since its construction. The garage was not visible in the 1907 or 1929 Sanborn map, but it does show up in

the 1941 Sanborn map. The garage retains its essential historic form, due to minimal alterations since its construction. It is important to local and regional history because of its association with Robert and Melissa Kimball. They owned the property during construction of the garage. The construction is indicative of Park City at the time in terms of the Mining Decline and the emergence of the recreation industry. The Staff believes it was most likely constructed by the owners based on the construction type, the haphazard design, as well as the lumber and sheet metal materials.

The Staff did not find that the garage meets the criteria for Landmark designation. It is associated with a Significant structure because the house is already on the historic sites inventory. The Staff finds that if the garage were to stand alone it would not necessarily meet the criteria for the National Register of Historic Places.

The Staff recommended that the HPB review the application, conduct a public hearing and designate the garage at 1108 as a Significant Site on the Park City Historic Sites Inventory.

Chair Kenworthy opened the public hearing.

There were no comments.

Chair Kenworthy closed the public hearing.

Board Member Crosby asked if these were the same Kimball's with the Kimball garage. Planner Turpen answered yes.

Board Member Holmgren pointed out that even though the garage itself was not specifically called out on the Historic Sites Inventory for the house at 1108 Park Avenue, the box was checked for an accessory building, so it was referenced on the current historic site form for the property.

MOTION: Board Member White moved to designate the garage at 1108 Park Avenue as a Significant Site on the Park City Historic Sites Inventory. Board Member Crosby seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

Findings of Fact – 1108 Park Avenue

1. The Park City Historic Sites Inventory (HSI), adopted February 4, 2009, includes 405 sites of which 192 sites meet the criteria for designation as

Landmark Sites and 213 sites meet the criteria for designation as Significant Sites. This site was not included on the 2009 HSI.

2. The garage at 1108 Park Avenue is within the Residential-Medium Density (HRM) zoning district.
3. There is a historic modified bungalow house and a wood-frame gabled-roof garage located at 1108 Park Avenue.
4. The existing house located at 1108 Park Avenue is designated as "Significant" on the 2009 Historic Sites Inventory. The garage was not included in the 2009 Historic Sites Inventory.
5. The existing structure has been in existence at 1108 Park Avenue since between 1929 and 1941. The structure appears in the 1941 Sanborn Fire Insurance maps. A 1941 tax photograph of the house at 1108 Park Avenue demonstrates that the overall form of the structure has not been altered.
6. The garage was built between 1929 and 1941 during the Mining Decline and Emergence of Recreation Industry Era (1931-1962).
7. The garage is constructed of dimensional lumber and sheet metal. The two (2) hinged garage doors and one (1) standard door on the west façade are wood with glazed panels. These materials would have been readily available during the Mining Decline and Emergence of Recreation Industry Era.
8. The structure is a single-cell plan and typical of the accessory structures built during the Mining Decline and Emergence of Recreation Industry Era.
9. The site meets the criteria as Significant on the City's Historic Sites Inventory.
10. Built sometime between 1929 and 1941, the structure is over fifty (50) years old and has achieved Significance in the past fifty (50) years.
11. The structure has retained its Essential Historical Form.
12. The structure is important in local or regional history because it is associated with an era of historic importance to the community, the Mining Decline and Emergence of Recreation Industry Era (1931-1962). The structure is also associated with the lives of Persons significant in the history of the community, Robert T. Kimball and Robert W. Kimball.
13. The site does not meet the criteria as Landmark on the City's Historic Sites Inventory.

Conclusions of Law – 1108 Park Avenue

1. The existing structure located at 1108 Park Avenue meets all of the criteria for a Significant Site as set forth in LMC Section 15-11-10(A)(2) which includes:
 - (a) It is at least fifty (50) years old or has achieved Significance in the past fifty (50) years if the Site is of exceptional importance to the community; and
 - (b) It retains its Essential Historical Form, meaning there are no major alterations that have destroyed the Essential Historical Form. Major alterations that destroy the Essential Historical Form include:
 - (i) Changes in pitch of the main roof of the primary façade if 1) the change was made after the Period of Historic Significance; 2) the change is not due to any structural failure; or 3) the change is not due to collapse as a result

of inadequate maintenance on the part of the Applicant or a previous Owner, or

(ii) Addition of upper stories or the removal of original upper stories occurred after the Period of Historic Significance, or

(iii) Moving it from its original location to a Dissimilar Location, or

(iv) Addition(s) that significantly obscures the Essential Historical Form when viewed from the primary public Right-of-Way.

(c) It is important in local or regional history, architecture, engineering, or culture associated with at least one (1) of the following:

(i) An era of Historic importance to the community, or

(ii) Lives of Persons who were of Historic importance to the community, or

(iii) Noteworthy methods of construction, materials, or craftsmanship used during the Historic period.

2. The existing garage structure located at 1108 Park Avenue does not comply with all of the criteria for a Landmark Site as set forth in Land Management Code (LMC) Section 15-11-10(A)(1). The structure does not meet the criteria for landmark designation as it is not eligible for the National Register of Historic Places due to post 1941 alterations that have damaged and obliterated significant character-defining features of the historic structure.

8. 316 Woodside Avenue – Determination of Significance
(Application PL-14-02555)

The Staff recommended that the house at 316 Woodside Avenue should be a Significant site. It was constructed around 1889 by Martin Prisk, an employee of the Marsac Company. It was built as a T-shaped wood frame cottage. Sometime between 1900 and 1907 the front porch was screened in, and by 1929 a rear addition was constructed.

Planner Grahn commented on interesting facts that occurred after the historic period of significance. In 1941 the house was remodeled to restore the front porch. Between 2001 and 2002 the owners did a new foundation and basement renovation. Planner Grahn noted that the City awarded grants for this property in 1989, 1997 and 2001. All of those were prior to the 2009 Historic Sites Inventory. Planner Grahn presented an analysis showing the development of the house during those years.

Planner Grahn noted that the additions were made within the period of historic significance of the Mature Mining Era. The additions are representative of families coming to Park City to live in these miners shacks and having to expand the house to meet their own needs. Planner Grahn stated that the post 1941 addition might have altered the historic roof form, but it did not change the pitch and it maintained the roof of the primary façade. The 1940's addition was more at the back.

Planner Grahn reported that the structure is associated with Parkite Martin Prisk and its expansion is related to the boom before the panic of 1893. The structure also survived the great fire of 1898. The materials used were commonly found in Park City during this era. She pointed out that the Third Street Frontage is unique and speaks to how Park City was developing during this era.

Planner Grahn did not believe the structure meets the criteria for Landmark designation because it is not eligible for the National Register of Historic places. The post-1941 addition changes the rear roof form and has obliterated the significant character defining features of the historic house. However, the structure is significant to local history.

Chair Kenworthy opened the public hearing.

There were no comments.

Chair Kenworthy closed the public hearing.

Board Member Beatlebrox thought the HPB should support the Significant designation because it was supported before in all of its iterations.

MOTION: Board Member Beatlebrox moved to designate the house at 316 Woodside Avenue as a Significant Site on the Park City Historic Sites Inventory. Board Member White seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

Findings of Fact 316 Woodside Avenue

1. The Park City Historic Sites Inventory (HSI), adopted February 4, 2009, includes 405 sites of which 192 sites meet the criteria for designation as Landmark Sites and 213 sites meet the criteria for designation as Significant Sites. This site was not included on the 2009 HSI.
2. The house at 316 Woodside Avenue is within the Historic Residential-1 (HR-1) zoning district.
3. There is wood-frame T-shaped cottage at 316 Woodside Avenue.
4. The existing house structure has been in existence at 316 Woodside Avenue since circa 1889. The structure appears in the 1889, 1907, 1929, and 1941 Sanborn Fire Insurance maps. A 1904-1904 tax photo of Park City also demonstrates that the overall form of the structure has not been altered.
5. The house was built c. 1889 during the Settlement and Mining Boom Era (1868-1893) by Martin Prisk, an employee of the Marsac Company. Between 1907 and 1929, a rear addition was constructed to fill-in the wing of the T-shape cottage. Staff finds that these changes have gained historical significance in their own right, and that the house is historic. A later, post-1941 addition was also

constructed across the rear of the house.

6. The house is clad in drop novelty siding, simple wood trim, and Victorian-inspired details reminiscent of the Settlement and Mining Boom Era.

7. The structure is T-shape plan and typical of the types of residential structures built during the Settlement and Mining Boom Era. Further, T-shape cottages were part of a national Romantic movement towards the picturesque and dynamic plans in Victorian art and architecture.

8. The site meets the criteria as Significant on the City's Historic Sites Inventory.

9. Built circa 1889, the structure is over fifty (50) years old and has achieved Significance in the past fifty (50) years.

10. Though the post-1941 addition to the house has altered the rear roof form, the structure has retained its Essential Historical Form. The Land Management Code defines the Essential Historical Form as the physical characteristics of a Structure that make it identifiable as existing in or relating to an important era in the past.

11. The house structure is important in local or regional history because it is associated with an era of historic importance to the community, the Settlement and Mining Boom Era (1868-1893)

Conclusions of Law – 316 Woodside Avenue

1. The existing house structure located at 316 Woodside Avenue meets all of the criteria for a Significant Site as set forth in LMC Section 15-11-10(A)(2) which includes:

- (a) It is at least fifty (50) years old or has achieved Significance in the past fifty (50) years if the Site is of exceptional importance to the community; and
- (b) It retains its Essential Historical Form, meaning there are no major alterations that have destroyed the Essential Historical Form. Major alterations that destroy the Essential Historical Form include:
 - (i) Changes in pitch of the main roof of the primary façade if 1) the change was made after the Period of Historic Significance; 2) the change is not due to any structural failure; or 3) the change is not due to collapse as a result of inadequate maintenance on the part of the Applicant or a previous Owner, or
 - (ii) Addition of upper stories or the removal of original upper stories occurred after the Period of Historic Significance, or
 - (iii) Moving it from its original location to a Dissimilar Location, or
 - (iv) Addition(s) that significantly obscures the Essential Historical Form when viewed from the primary public Right-of-Way.
- (c) It is important in local or regional history, architecture, engineering, or culture associated with at least one (1) of the following:
 - (i) An era of Historic importance to the community, or
 - (ii) Lives of Persons who were of Historic importance to the community, or
 - (iii) Noteworthy methods of construction, materials, or craftsmanship used during the Historic period.

2. The existing house structure located at 316 Woodside Avenue does not comply with all of the criteria for a Landmark Site as set forth in Land Management Code (LMC) Section 15-11-10(A)(1). The structure does not meet the criteria for landmark designation as it is not eligible for the National Register of Historic Places due to post 1941 alterations that have damaged and obliterated significant character-defining features of the historic structure.

WORK SESSION

Temporary Winter Balcony Enclosures

Board Member Crosby recused herself and left the room.

Planner Grahn reported that the Riverhorse had approached the City Council about the possibility of creating a seasonal balcony enclosure program. In November the City Council requested feedback from the Historic Preservation Board. The HPB had a brief discussion but tabled further discussion due to the late hour.

Planner Grahn stated that currently there were a few conflicts with balcony enclosures in the Design Guidelines. The Guidelines are strict about new additions being visually subordinate to historic buildings when viewed from the public right-of-way. The Staff is concerned that annual construction and removal could be detrimental to historic building materials and intensify wear and tear. They also believe that the proposed balcony enclosures visualize and alter the original building design. Additional concerns include energy-efficiency, snow shedding of shed roofs on to Main Street, the seasonal assembly and disassembly, increased water and sewer impact fees to name a few.

Planner Grahn asked whether the Board was comfortable with having seasonal balcony enclosures on both historic and non-historic buildings, or whether it should be limited to non-historic buildings given the amount of wear and tear of attaching and removing temporary structures.

Chair Kenworth asked Planner Grahn to define the current tent situation that the City allows for these balconies. Planner Grahn stated that currently if someone wants to put up a tent on their balcony during the winter months it goes through Administrative Conditional Use Permit process. The applicant is allowed to up a tent for a two-week period. She recalled that one applicant can have five Administrative CUPs for a total of 70 days combined. The tent should be taken down between each CUP or the owner will be fined.

Board Member Holmgren recalled that the temporary structures have to be built as though they were permanent. Planner Grahn answered yes. Ms. Melville asked about the balcony itself. Planner Grahn remarked that in some cases the

balcony itself may need to be upgraded for structural supports. She believed it would have to be reviewed on a case by case basis because each building is unique and different.

Board Member Melville stated that in her personal opinion it putting up and taking down a permanent enclosure on a historic façade would be very detrimental. She was opposed to allowing enclosures on historic structures. Ms. Melville stated that she was also generally opposed to balcony enclosures on newer buildings because the enclosures visually modify and alter the original building design. She also thought the enclosures would have an impact on the historic district. Planner Grahn stated that it would not impact the historic district because the enclosures would be seasonal. If they were to permanently enclose balconies there would be an issue with the National Register. She noted that the State Historic Preservation Office was adamant that temporary structures do not get considered for the National Register. Ms. Melville stated that at least visually it would alter the Historic District. Planner Grahn agreed.

Chair Kenworthy pointed out that the tents that are currently allowed also alter the visual. He asked the representatives from Riverhorse to offer their opinion.

Seth Adams with Riverhorse thought the tents were much more of a detriment to the visual appearance. He did not put up a tent this year and he was lucky the weather was nice. However, they would like to have the ability to use the balcony all the time, which was why they were making this request. Mr. Adams did not believe the enclosure impacted the visual integrity of what people on the street see walking on Main Street. Mr. Adams remarked that one of the objectives for the enclosure is to get people out on the deck to look up and down Main Street.

Chair Kenworthy asked Mr. Adams if the building was historic. Mr. Adams stated that where the balcony is was not historic. The entrance of the Riverhorse on the Main Street level is historic. Chair Kenworthy asked what percentage the business would increase with the enclosure. Mr. Adams estimated 10%. He clarified that it allows them to take the waiting space in the restaurant and convert it into seats. The balcony would be used to corral people in order to create more dining space inside the restaurant, but there would not be tables on the balcony. Chair Kenworthy asked if the enclosure was needed for six months. Mr. Adams answered no. He thought December 15th through April 15th would be sufficient.

Board Member Melville referred to page 295 of the Staff report and noted that the balcony was currently curved and the building façade is further back. She understood that Mr. Adams was proposing to rebuild the balcony to square it up. He replied that this was correct. Squaring up the corners would add a few square feet to the size. The reason was to make the temporary structure fit

better. Ms. Melville understood that they were also proposing to bring the façade out further than where it currently sits. Mr. Adams replied that it would only be the corners beneath the archway.

Board Member Melville clarified that the building shown on page 296 with the enclosure would not be allowed to be constructed as a permanent structure. Planner Grahn answered yes. If the Riverhorse was to propose this permanently it would not be supported by the Guidelines. Planner Grahn pointed out that Mr. Adams is the only one who has proposed the enclosure, but they need to look at it holistically in terms of how it could be managed up and down Main Street.

Board Member White noted from the table on page 277 of the Staff report that only three properties wanted this type of structure. Planner Grahn explained that the Staff looked at who on Main Street has an Administrative CUP, which is required for outdoor dining in the summer. Of all the businesses on Main Street only three do, and one was under review last year. Mr. White asked if the businesses that said no could change their mind. Director Eddington answered yes. He pointed out that the three identified were the ones who have applied for an Administrative Conditional Use Permit. The rest would have that ability. Director Eddington stated that there were 15 non-historic structures out of 21 shown on the table.

Board Member Melville assumed other buildings could build a balcony as well. Director Eddington stated that they could but they would need permission from the City Engineer to encroach over the public right-of-way. Planner Grahn noted that balconies need City Council approval because they do extend over the City right-of-way. Director Eddington agreed that with City approval more balconies could be built on Main Street if they apply for an Administrative CUP for outdoor dining.

Board Member White how many properties would have to do structural work in order to enclose their balconies. Director Eddington stated that the Staff had not done that analysis, but he assumed that most would require some type of structural work for both historic and non-historic structures. Mr. White asked if the same applied for tents. Director Eddington believed the tents still needed to meet load capacity for the number of people. However, that situation was different than connecting a new structure to a building. The temporary structure would have more connections and structural challenges to the existing façade, but the requirements for load capacity would be about the same.

Chair Kenworthy asked how this would affect Grappa. They were not on the list but they put up tents all the time on their patio. Director Eddington replied that this was only for balconies. Chair Kenworthy noted that TMI was not listed but they have outdoor dining. He names others that were not listed.

Board Member White clarified that the only visual example they have is for Riverhorse. Director Eddington stated that Riverhorse was the only application they had received. Board Member Holmgren thought it needed to be determined on a case by case basis. Mr. White thought the temporary structure looked better than a white tent. However, he was apprehensive about putting glass and steel temporary structures on historic buildings. Planner Grahn stated that the Staff had drafted guidelines to address the issues and to be consistent when applicants come in with an application for a balcony enclosure. The guidelines would also ensure that they protect the look and feel of Main Street.

Board Member White thought it was obvious that whether it was a tent or an enclosure these structures would not go away. Planner Grahn explained that if someone has a balcony on Main Street and they wanted something more permanent than a tent for the winter months, they could apply for that type of enclosure. She stated that the Staff would treat the process similar to the dining deck program except that it would be a winter balcony enclosure program. Mr. White clarified that each structure would be reviewed on a case by case basis. Planner Grahn answered yes, but guidelines need to be in place for consistency.

Board Member Beatlebrox asked if the guidelines on page 280 of the Staff report were enforceable. Planner Grahn replied that it was an issue they needed to discuss.

Planner Grahn reiterated her earlier question about limiting enclosures to new buildings versus historic buildings, or whether it should be allowed on all structures.

Board Member Holmgren did not believe they should delineate between old and new. Board Member Melville disagreed. She thought it would be even worse if they were allowed on historic buildings. Board Member Beatlebrox agreed. Board Member White concurred with Ms. Melville and Ms. Beatlebrox. He was not comfortable putting that type of temporary structure on a historic building.

Planner Grahn summarized that the answer was No on historic structures but Yes on non-historic buildings. Board Member Melville stated that she was generally opposed to the structures on any building on Main Street at this point.

Planner Grahn read proposed language to the LMC to say that, "Balconies may not be enclosed permanently. Temporary seasonal balcony enclosures may be appropriate on some structures." She thought that gave some leeway for structures where the Staff did not believe it would be appropriate. Chair Kenworthy understood that this would only pertain to the ones on public pedestrian right-of-ways. Planner Grahn answered yes. Board Member Holmgren asked how the language ensures that the enclosures would not be

allowed on historic buildings. Planner Grahn stated that additional language could be added to exclude historic structures. Ms. Melville suggested specifying non-historic buildings.

Chair Kenworthy stated that the Flanagan's Building is a Landmark historic building and he would never want to see a temporary structure on it for any reason. He noted that the balcony is probably 99% over a public right-of-way which would eliminate the opportunity. Since it was his building he was very comfortable not having the enclosure.

Planner Grahn reviewed the proposed revisions to the Design Guidelines for the Main Street District as outlined on page 180 of the Staff report. She noted that new construction is everything that was not designated as historic on the HSI.

The first guideline addressed historic sites in Park City. She added, "Temporary structures are not subject to review of the National Register of Historic Places" which is true by the national Park Service.

She added a new Guidelines, "Temporary winter balcony enclosures are reviewed by the programs criteria and are not addressed by these specific Design Guidelines."

Board Member Melville questioned why they would say it was not addressed by the Design Guideline. Planner Grahn stated that the Staff thought it was better to have a separate set of guidelines for review because it is less confusing than having them incorporated into the Design Guidelines. Director Eddington clarified that there were so many conflicting guidelines relative to a new temporary structure that it would not work well and could cause confusion. Planner Grahn noted that summer dining decks have a separate set of guidelines. This would fall under that category.

Chair Kenworthy stated that Flanagan's has a dining deck and they have to go through the requirements and permitting process. From his point of view and a business standpoint, they are providing a customer service. He understands that there is opposition to dining decks and he respects those opinions. However, in a situation like the Riverhorse it allows the owner to provide customer service in a resort town and people enjoy the dining decks on the street. Contrary to popular belief they do not make a lot of money from dining decks, but the reward is happy customers. Chair Kenworthy remarked that in granting his request, Mr. Adams would be able to provide an operational solution in a historic building to improve customer service. Chair Kenworthy thought six months was too long and would prefer a four-month time frame. He thought it was important to balance historic preservation with the ability to provide better customer service.

Board Member Holmgren understood from previous conversations that Mr. Adams was addressing the issues of snow shedding and removal and other safety factors. She thought this was positive for Main Street. It is a piece of magic and people who experience it will never forget it. Ms. Holmgren felt strongly that they should allow this to happen. However, she agreed that the time limit should be less than six months. She felt positive that this was brilliant, new and innovative for Historic Main Street and she would like to see it approved.

Mr. Adams favored a shorter time period as well. He would be comfortable if the winter was 180 days.

Planner Grahn reviewed the proposed guidelines for balcony enclosures and requested feedback from the Board on each one.

1) The enclosure must be constructed on a balcony on Main Street. There would be no balconies on Swede Alley or any side streets.

The Board pointed out balconies that already exist on Swede Alley. They noted that the Caledonia is on a side street and they have a balcony. Chair Kenworthy thought it would be difficult to limit it to Main Street. Planner Grahn suggested that they eliminate the guideline.

2) There may be times when it is not appropriate to enclose a balcony due to the unique historic character and architectural detailing of the historic building. Planner Grahn noted that the guideline no longer applied based on their discussion and the decision not to allow it on historic buildings.

The Board discussed whether or not the guideline could apply to non-historic structures. Planner Grahn suggested changing the language to say, "...due to unique conditions or circumstances" to address an unforeseen situations where enclosing a balcony may cause life/safety issues. The Board concurred.

Planner Grahn read the language as revised, "There may be times when it is not appropriate to enclose a balcony on a non-historic building due to the unique conditions or circumstances".

Board Member Beatlebrox asked if they needed to define unique circumstances. Planner Grahn stated that currently the Planning Director and Chief Building Official are the ones who determine a unique circumstance and she thought they should make that determination for the enclosures as well. The Board agreed.

3) The applicant must demonstrate that the temporary enclosure will not damage the existing façade and/or side walls with repeated attachment and detachment.

Planner Grahn stated that this guideline was no longer necessary based on their earlier decision.

4) The enclosure and balcony shall respect the architectural style of the building. Planner Grahn clarified that even on new buildings they would not want something that did not match what exists or keep with the theme. The Board agreed.

Chair Kenworthy suggested that they prohibit signage. Planner Grahn asked if they wanted to prohibit signs completely or whether they should include language stating that any new signage will require a sign permit application. The Board unanimously wanted signage prohibited for the temporary enclosures.

5) The enclosure shall retain existing railings in order to achieve a design consistent with open balconies and maintain the character of the original building. She asked if the Board agreed that the railings should not be removed.

Director Eddington suggested that they keep the railings on the balconies to keep it looking like a balcony. The Board agreed.

6) The existing exterior wall may not be removed seasonally in order to accommodate the balcony enclosure. The Board agreed.

7) The enclosure must not block existing door and window openings on neighboring buildings. The Board agreed.

8) Enclosures should consist of clear glazing set in window frames that generally match the mass, scale and material as those used for the glazing frames of the building itself. The Board agreed.

9) Draperies, blinds and/or screens must be located in a traditional manner above doors and windows. Draperies, blinds and/or screens should not be used within the balcony enclosure if they increase the bulk appearance of the enclosure. The use of these must blend with the architecture of the building and should not detract from it. Materials should be high quality, color-fast and sun fade resistant.

Planner Grahn stated that she had borrowed the guideline from Vancouver, where they have balcony enclosures on condo buildings. The concern is that when people drape the interior of the glass, it appears to be bulky and heavier, and less open. She was unsure whether that would occur on Main Street, but the language could protect it from occurring.

Board Member Beatlebrox suggested saying that draperies, blinds or screens are not required. Board Member Holmgren preferred not to allow them at all. They would still want people to be able to look in or look out.

Mr. Adams stated that the only reason he would consider a blind would be the hour or two as protection from the blinding sun. Other than that he could see no reason to have them.

Board Member Holmgren did not favor the concept at all. The Board discussed potential language to address the issue of blocking the sun like Mr. Adams had suggested, but not using them as a barrier.

Board Member Beatlebrox suggested language to say, "Sun screens permitted and should be used only during times of extreme sun and should not be obstructive." The Board was comfortable with that language.

10) The balcony must be situated so as not to interfere with pedestrian movement on the sidewalk. The Board agreed.

11) The closure must have direct access to the restaurant's dining area. The Board agreed.

12) The design must address snow shedding.

Board Member Melville asked where in the language it says that a building permit is required and it must comply with Building Department requirements.

Planner Grahn stated that if they add language indicating that a building permit is required, the Building Department would make sure it complies with the International Building Code. The Board favored adding language regarding the building permit.

13. Any changes to the exterior façade of the building, proposed changes to the existing balcony, or construction of a new balcony shall be reviewed by Staff as part of the Historic District Design Review. New balconies extending over the City right-of-way will require approval of the City Council. The Board agreed.

14. The construction of any temporary tents should be approved through an Administrative Conditional Use Permit for up to fourteen (14) days. Free-standing tents will not be considered the same as balcony enclosures.

Planner Grahn clarified that tents would still be treated as tents and balcony enclosures would be a separate program.

15. Any new signage will require a Sign Permit application.

Planner Grahn noted that this guideline was no longer necessary because signage was addressed in a previous guideline where the Board agreed to prohibit signage.

In terms of the time frame for having the enclosure, The Board agreed on four months. Director Eddington preferred to have specific dates and suggested December 15th to April 15th.

Mr. Adams noted that the time frame for summer dining decks was 180 days. Board Member Beatlebrox thought 120 days was sufficient. Director Eddington pointed out that dining decks have specific dates so everyone knows when they are allowed to go up and when they have to come down.

Chair Kenworthy suggested a maximum four month window between December 1st through April 30th. Director Eddington asked if they wanted to limit it to four months. Mr. Adams stated that personally he would like to put it up right after Thanksgiving and take it down when PCMR closes.

Board Member White suggested November 15th to April 15th. Director Eddington recommended specifying dates and not talk about a four month limit. It would be consistent for everyone and it would make it easier for Building and Code Enforcement to monitor.

The Board was comfortable with a November 15th to April 15th time frame.

Chair Kenworthy thanked Mr. Adams for his input.

The meeting adjourned at 8:47 p.m.

Approved by _____
John Kenworthy, Chair
Historic Preservation Board