



HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD  
DECEMBER 17, 2007  
MARSAC MUNICIPAL BUILDING  
10:00 AM

WORK SESSION – 10:00 AM

PAGE #

5 Historic District Guidelines Discussion

REGULAR MEETING – 10:30 AM

ROLL CALL

PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS

STAFF/BOARD MEMBER'S COMMUNICATIONS AND DISCLOSURES

APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF DECEMBER 3, 2007

CONSENT AGENDA

PUBLIC HEARINGS/DISCUSSION/ACTION ITEMS

- No Items

ADJOURN

Pursuant to the Americans with Disabilities Act, individuals needing special accommodations during the meeting should notify the Park City Planning Department, 615-5060, prior to the meeting.

Published: December 15, 2007  
Posted: December 14, 2007



## **WORK SESSION**



## Historic Preservation Board Staff Report



**Author:** Patrick Putt  
**Subject:** Historic District Guidelines  
Update  
**Date:** December 17, 2007  
**Type of Item:** Legislative

Planning Department

Dina Blaes and I will be presenting a working draft of the Historic District Guidelines update at the Monday's meeting. The elements to be discussed include the introduction, commercial rehabilitation, and residential rehabilitation. Copies of these elements are attached under separate cover. In addition to explaining the draft elements, we will look to establish a review schedule and process for getting draft elements out to the Board and comments back to Dina.

A couple of things to note:

1. Land Management Code, Section 15-11-5(A) states that it is a purpose of the Historic Preservation Board to:

*Preserve the diverse and harmonious architectural styles and design preferences reflecting the phases of the City's history and to encourage complimentary, contemporary design and construction through the creation of comprehensive Historic District Design Guidelines and update as necessary.*

Once the HPB has completed the Historic District Guidelines update, it will forward it recommendation to Planning Commission for a subsequent review and recommendation to City Council. City Council will take Final Action on the guidelines.

2. Initially, this will be a content review only--layout, illustrations, photographs and captions are being tracked separately and will be inserted when we have agreement on the final formatting.

3. "New Construction" is not included in this round of review. It will be ready for review the second week of January.

4. Every rehabilitation-related topic listed in the existing guidelines and the 1995 Design Standards (never adopted) is incorporated into these pages, either in concept or in direct quote. It may not seem as though they are included because the preliminary drafts are short and require discussion and input.

4. Remember that the materials we will be handing out on Monday represent a starting point, not an end product seeking final approval. Get ready to roll up your sleeves.



**MINUTES OF DECEMBER 3, 2007**



PARK CITY MUNICIPAL CORPORATION  
HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD  
MINUTES OF DECEMBER 3, 2007

BOARD MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE: Ken Martz, David White, Puggy Holmgren,  
Gary Kimball

EX OFFICIO: Patrick Putt, Brooks Robinson, Katie Cattan, Kirsten Whetstone, Polly  
Samuels McLean, Patricia Abdullah

---

REGULAR MEETING  
ROLL CALL

Chair Martz called the meeting to order at 10:30 a.m. and noted that all Board Members were present except for Mark Huber and Todd Ford who were excused.

PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS  
There was no comment.

STAFF/BOARD MEMBERS COMMUNICATION

Planner Brooks Robinson remarked that at the last meeting the Staff committed to bring information to the HPB regarding any design review that was approved by Staff between meetings. He noted that the Staff report contained information on 411 Park Avenue. Also included were RDA maps for both the Main Street RDA and the Lower Park Avenue RDA. Planner Robinson pointed out that 9<sup>th</sup> Street is the dividing line between the two. Main Street does not include going up on Deer Valley Drive.

Planner Robinson stated that after discussions with Gary Hill, Budget Manager, and in looking at the funding sources, they are no longer funding Main Street. However, there is still CIP or General Fund money that was allocated to the HPB and that money can be used for historic structures outside of those two RDAs.

Chair Martz asked if access to that funding should be communicated in a general way. Planner Robinson suggested that it might be helpful to supply that information as a Historic Grant program to let the owners of historic structures know that grant money is available.

Puggy Holmgren asked if it was possible to get better copies of the RDA maps. Planner Robinson replied that it was the best copy he had but he would try to find better copies. Chair Martz thought it would be helpful to have a larger map available for when the HPB discusses a grant issue. Planner Robinson remarked that with each application, the Staff would identify through the Staff report which RDA or funding source the money would be allocated from, as well as the amount remaining in that particular funding source.

Chair Martz referred to the rendering provided in the Staff report for the 411 Park Avenue design review approval. He expressed concerns with the building height and questioned whether it met all the historic guidelines in terms of the street façade. Chair Martz was unsure if this was the proper forum for questions and offered to communicate his concerns to the Staff outside of this meeting.

Planning Director Patrick Putt updated the Board members on a number of upcoming events. He and Dina Blaes will attend the HPB meeting on December 17<sup>th</sup>, to provide progress updates and other items on the historic guidelines.

Director Putt stated that he is also working on LMC Amendments that will be presented to the Planning Commission during their December 12<sup>th</sup> work session. He plans to provide the HPB with copies of those amendments. Director Putt stated that one of the ideas put forth in the amendments involve how and when noticing occurs. Besides noticing when there is a preliminary Staff determination for design review compliance for a project, he will propose an amendment that would also require them to post the property when they receive a completed application. This would give the neighborhood, the property owners, and the affected stakeholders an earlier opportunity to know that plans have been submitted and a project is being contemplated.

Chair Martz disclosed that he personally knows Steve Swenson, the applicant's representative for 64 Chambers Street. Board Member Huber disclosed that she has known Steve Swenson casually for a few years. Chair Martz did not believe their acquaintance with Mr. Swenson presented a conflict. Mr. Swenson stated that he has not discussed this project with either of the Board Members.

#### APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF NOVEMBER 5, 2007.

Board Member Holmgren noted that she was listed as absent but then making a comment later in the meeting. Planner Robinson noted that the fourth paragraph indicates that she joined the meeting at that time.

MOTION: Board Member Holmgren moved to APPROVE the minutes of November 5, 2007 as written. Board Member White seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

#### CONSENT AGENDA

There were no items.

#### REGULAR AGENDA

##### PUBLIC HEARING/DISCUSSION/ACTION ITEMS

##### 1. 64 Chambers Street – Appeal of Staff Determination of a Design Review

Planner Katie Cattan provided a brief history of the project, as outlined in the Staff report. She noted that on May 21, 2007, the Historic Preservation Board found the rear addition to the single family home at 64 Chambers Street significant and the side addition to the home to be insignificant. The applicant originally submitted plans for a Steep Slope CUP for an accessory apartment and a historic district design review; however, those plans were dependent on the rear addition not being significant. Following the HPB determination, the application was put on hold until revisions could be submitted.

Planner Cattan reported that the applicant had submitted revised plans on October 30, 2007 and those plans were reviewed at the November 7, 2007 Historic District Design Review meeting. During that meeting the Staff found that the plans did not comply with Historic District Design Guideline #49. She read from Guideline #49, "Locate additions

to original houses so they do not alter the front façade. Additions should be designed so that they do not obscure the size and shape of the original house. One option is to set the addition on the lot so it does not affect the building's front." Planner Cattan distributed copies of the revised plans and noted that page 2 showed the historic and non-historic additions. The third page showed what was proposed for the new addition.

Planner Cattan remarked that in their review, the Staff found that the character defining element was that the structure is a one-story low profile home with a front porch. Adding a garage underneath changes it to a two-story home with a higher profile. The addition off the rear actually adds a third story. The Staff determined that Guideline #49 was not complied with because the front façade was being altered and the addition did not meet the conditions of the guideline.

In reviewing this application, the historic footprint of 64 Chambers Street is 851 square feet. The lot is 55' x 75' deep. A lot of this size allows a footprint of 1,635 square feet. Planner Cattan noted that there is room to put an addition off to the side or to find a different solution from what was being proposed. The Staff was also concerned that the portion of the addition on the rear of the home would be directly over the portion that was found to be historically significant.

Chair Martz referred to the top of the first page of the south elevation and clarified that it was the part of the addition that was found to be significant. Planner Cattan replied that this was correct.

Board Member White asked if the grade line shown on the south elevation was the actual grade line along that historic addition. Steve Swanson, representing the applicant, replied that it is the grade line at the setback. Board Member White clarified that the grade is out in front at the building line on the south elevation.

Board Member Holmgren thought the project was very well done.

Mr. Swanson thanked the Board for taking another look at the project. He distributed copies of a third iteration of the design and explained the differences between this one and the other two. Mr. Swanson agreed with the Staff determination regarding non-compliance with Guideline #49. He commented on the intent to maintain three sides of the historic structure. He noted that the roofline on the south elevation comes down to a 6' height above the floor. In order to make that space usable, they would like to step back from there by a foot and create a raised portion, which would be contiguous with the main floor of the house. Mr. Swanson remarked that the second scheme in the packet was generated to save just the wall. The new scheme depicts that if it cannot be saved in total, it would be removed and rebuilt with the original exterior façade and the same roof pitch. Mr. Swanson stated that by virtue of the building and the site they need to create a one-and-a-half story to two-story intersection between the two volumes, which occurs at the southwest quadrant of the existing historic structure.

Mr. Swanson noted that most of the south façade and south facing roof form, and part of the northwest corner of the existing roof form of the historic shed addition would remain or be rebuilt to the size, volume, and character of the original structure. He proposed that they be allowed to encroach over a portion of that, based on the fact that they are running out of space on the site. He believed this proposal reveals the historic portions

of the home by obscuring as little as possible, while allowing them to create something workable for the owner.

Chair Martz was unsure if the Board could comment on the new proposal presented this evening since it was not part of the agenda. Planner Robinson replied that this was correct. He explained that the HPB was acting as an appellate Board in a quasi-judicial setting and the decision should relate to whether or not the Planning Director and the Planning Staff erred in making the decision on whether Guideline #49 was being correctly applied. Planner Robinson noted that the appellant has stated agreement with the Staff determination, which was the reason for submitting an alternate design this evening. Planner Robinson stated that the Staff would review that alternative design through the design review process.

Board Member White agreed with the Staff determination on the first proposal presented and they did not err on their assessment of compliance with Guideline #49. Board Member White remarked that the sketch they received this evening goes a long way towards solving the problem and he encouraged Mr. Swenson to submit a completed set of drawings for the Staff to review.

Board Member Holmgren agreed with Board Member White. She felt the Staff did a great job in making their determination and she supported their decision.

Board Member Kimball concurred with the Staff determination.

Chair Martz agreed that the Staff determination was appropriate. He believes the south elevation exterior is very important and significant. On the north elevation, Chair Martz understood that the HPB found that addition to be insignificant and he believes it opens up the house on that side and leaves room for another addition. Chair Martz stated the original south elevation needs to be maintained as much as possible, all the way back to the original roofline of the main part of the house. In terms of the garage issue as it relates to Guideline #49, Chair Martz commented on other structures with garages underneath and felt the precedent has been set for allowing that. He believed the architect was heading in the right direction with the secondary proposal and encouraged Mr. Swanson to follow up with Staff.

MOTION: Board Member Holmgren moved to uphold the Staff determination of non-compliance with the Historic District Guidelines, based on the Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law outlined in the Staff report. Board Member White seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

Planner Cattan stated that the applicant is required to provide a preservation plan showing how they plan to keep the integrity of the home during construction. If the preservation plan includes panelization, it will come back to the Historic Preservation Board.

#### Findings of Fact – 64 Chambers Street

1. The home at 64 Chambers Street is located in the Historic Residential (HR-1) Zone.
2. The historic home was built in 1885.

3. The rear addition to the home was built between 1900 and 1907.
4. The rear addition to the home is representative of the most common method of expansion of a small Park City house during the early 1900's.
5. The historic home is a one-story hall and parlor design.
6. Hall and parlor homes are one of the most three common house types built during the mine boom era.
7. The home at 64 Chambers Street is a Historically Significant property according to the recent Park City Property Inventory.
8. The application for Historic District Design Review was submitted on October 30, 2007. Staff found that the proposed plans did not comply with the HDDR guidelines, specifically guideline #49.
9. The proposed addition to 64 Chambers Street alters the front façade of the home. This is not in compliance with guideline #49.
10. The Planning Director supported Staff's decision in the denial of the Historic District Design application.
11. The applicant appealed the Planning Director's determination to the Historic Preservation Board on November 12, 2007.

Conclusions of Law – 64 Chambers Street

1. The Planning Director did not err in his decision finding that the Historic District Design Review for 64 Chambers Street to not comply with the Historic District Design Guidelines.
2. Appellant's request for a reversal of the Planning Director's decision to deny the application is not approved.

The meeting adjourned at 11:05 p.m.

Approved by \_\_\_\_\_  
Ken Martz, Chair  
Historic Preservation Board