

PARK CITY MUNICIPAL CORPORATION
HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD
MINUTES OF APRIL 5, 2017

BOARD MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE: Chair Douglas Stephens, Lola Beatlebrox, Cheryl Hewett, Puggy Holmgren, Randy Scott, David White

EX OFFICIO: Bruce Erickson, Anya Grahn, Hannah Tyler, Polly Samuels McLean, Louis Rodriguez

ROLL CALL

Chair White called the meeting to order at 5:00 p.m. and noted that all Board Members were present except Jack Hodgkins, who was excused.

PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS

There were no comments.

ADOPTION OF MINUTES

March 1, 2017

Board Member Holmgren moved to APPROVE the minutes of March 1, 2017 as written. Board Member White seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

STAFF/BOARD COMMUNICATIONS AND DISCLOSURES

Planner Anya Grahn announced that the following evening the City would be receiving two Heritage Awards from Preservation Utah, formerly called the Utah Heritage Foundation. The Awards are for the stewardship of the McPolin Farm, and for their partnership with Vail Resorts to help stabilize the California Comstock and the mine structures.

Planner Grahn noted that the Planning Department was seeing an increase in the number of applications. She and Planner Tyler were trying to gauge the HPB agendas and whether or not a second meeting might be necessary. She asked the Board members to think about their availability and whether they would be available on the third Wednesday of every month if a second meeting is necessary due to work flow. The Staff would give the Board as much notice as possible if a second meeting would be scheduled for that month.

Chair Stephens asked for the location and format for receiving the awards from Preservation Utah. Planner Grahn stated that Preservation Utah hosts the event.

It is a ticketed fundraising event that will be held at Trolley Square in Salt Lake. She would send the Board members photos of the plaques. She believed photos would also be posted on Facebook.

Chair Stephens reported that at 4:30 p.m. today the Board did a site visit to 732 Crescent Tram. They had a chance to walk through the home with the architect and property owner for an in-depth tour of the construction of the home to help in their review of the project this evening.

CONTINUATIONS (Public Hearing and Continue to date specified.)

1302 Norfolk Avenue – Determination of Significance

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

MOTION: Board Member Holmgren moved to CONTINUE the Determination of Significance on 1302 Norfolk Avenue to a date uncertain. Board Member Beatlebrox seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

REGULAR AGENDA – Discussion, Public Hearing and Possible Action

1. 732 Crescent Tram – Determination of Significance on Additions to the historic house (Application PL-16-03370)

Planner Grahn reported that this item was continued from the last meeting to give the Board the opportunity to visit the site. She thought Chair Stephens had accurately summarized the site visit and what they observed.

Planner Grahn emphasized that the HPB was only looking to make a determination as to whether or not the additions on this house are historically significant. If they are not found to be significant, the applicant could submit an application to remove those additions through the material deconstruction process. Planner Grahn noted that the criteria for Landmark and Significant designations were outlined in the Staff report.

Chair Stephens asked Planner Grahn to identify the additions that would be removed. Planner Grahn believed it was Addition A, the stairwell; Addition B, a bathroom and addition; Addition D, the root cellar; and Addition E, a portion of the roof. She reviewed the elevations and stated that the portions identified in green was the original single cell. The red color was the kitchen area that Carl Winters had either completely rebuilt or only renovated. The orange color represented the area that Carl Winters had built onto the side of the house.

Chair Stephens suggested that they address each addition individually. He asked if anyone had a specific issue on either A, B, D and E.

Board Member Hewett recalled that the Board had already discussed D, the root cellar, and everyone was comfortable removing it. She had no issues with the other additions.

Board Member White understood that the high gambrel shaped roof was over Additions C and B. Jonathan DeGray, the project architect, believed it was only over C. Mr. DeGray remarked that it was over C and a portion of the original building form identified in green. He thought the plan on page 25 of the Staff report was correct. Mr. White referred to the west elevation and noted that A extends the farthest out to the right. Mr. White asked Mr. DeGray to identify B in that elevation. Mr. DeGray acknowledged that Mr. White was correct, and that the roof was modified to capture B as well.

Board Member White stated that from the site visit he believed it was all historic construction, with the exception of the upper part. It was just a matter of what year each addition took place. Board Member Scott agreed, because by definition historic is over 50 years. Mr. White stated that he has looked at a lot of old structures and this was one of them.

Board Member Scott believed people have a visual image of a historic home in Park City. In this case, he thought the historic additions on this home detract from that image. For that reason, he was conflicted on where to start and where to stop. He was looking for guidance from the other Board members.

Board Member White felt strongly that the green and the blue portions, minus the stairway, should be kept. He was willing to discuss the remaining portions.

Board Member Holmgren remarked that at the last meeting she thought the Staff report was well done. After being on-site, she thought it was very evident where each piece had been added. She asked again for the portions they were being asked to determine. Chair Stephens stated that it was A, B, D, E, and the front porch. He reiterated that the Board decided at the last meeting that the roof cellar was not significant. He thought there was little question about the front porch after seeing the newer construction on the site visit. The question is whether to retain the additions identified in blue, green and red.

Chair Stephens understood that the applicant wanted to remove the stairs, but it appeared to him that the stairs were put into what was a historic larger box. Mr. DeGray thought the blue color should include the stairs.

Mr. DeGray referred to a 1912 photograph on page 49 of the Staff report that depicts the building in its mining era form. He thought the additions should relate to the mining era because it was placed on the HIS for its mining era construction. Mr. DeGray believed the portions in green, blue and red reflect that period.

Board Member Beatlebrox noted that page 48 of the April Staff report included seven aspects of integrity to aid in determining whether or not the additions being reviewed contribute to the historic integrity of the house. As she walked through and looked at the houses on the site visit, she was struck by the poor workmanship; especially the roof line. Ms. Beatlebrox stated that if anything were to be removed, she would suggest Addition E at the top because it detracts from the original form and integrity of the house.

Chair Stephens echoed Ms. Beatlebrox. He recalled that the Board wrestled with Addition E in terms of when it was built and how it affected the original house. He agreed that it was helpful to have the seven aspects of integrity outlined in the Staff report. Addition E, the roof portion, detracts from the original single cell house and from the house they saw in the across canyon photograph that Mr. DeGray referred to earlier. Chair Stephens believed that E would be a distraction from the historic house and not an addition to it. After talking about extending the blue over to B, he was left with Additions A and B, which were behind the building and typical additions. He thought they were less significant because they were not visible from the public right-of-way. Chair Stephens thought it was necessary to remove Addition E in order to restore the character of the original house as it was built in the time period that the applicant was trying to restore.

Board Member White agreed that A, B and E were the three portions that detract from the original house. He was not opposed to removing the root cellar.

Board Member Hewett did not find A, B, and E to be historically significant.

Board Member Scott stated that still struggled with A, but he thought it was evident that the addition was done in a different period using different methods of construction. His decision was driven by the across the canyon photograph, which was the historic home.

Board Members Beatlebrox and Holmgren agreed.

Planner Grahn recommended that the Board review the criteria to affirm their discussion prior to making a motion. She recalled from the last meeting that the Board decided that the association with Carl Winters was not relevant to this house. For that reason, the findings of fact should be amended to remove Finding of Fact #18.

Planner Grahn reviewed the criteria. a) Are the additions at least 50 years old; have achieved Significance, or if the site is of exceptional important to the community. Based on their discussion, she thought the Board agreed that a) the additions may be 50 years old or older. b) Do they retain their historic integrity in terms of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, and association. She understood that the Board did not believe the additions contributed to retaining the historic integrity.

Board Member Beatlebrox stated that the workmanship of the rooftop addition detracts from the historic integrity. She personally would not be opposed to keeping A, B, and C because they do not detract as much as the roof portion.

Board Member Hewett referred to the last sentence, which states that the form was modified at the end of the Mature Mining Era or a short time thereafter. She believed the Board did not want that piece to detract from the more historic piece that fits better with the Park City Mining Era. She believed that was the reason for their agreement to remove the additions. The Board concurred.

Planner Grahn read c) whether or not significant local, regional, or national history. She understood that the Board was saying that the significant part of the house was the original portion from the Mining Era, and not necessarily the additions, because they do not meet those criteria.

Director Erickson commented on the process. He and Assistant City Attorney McLean would like the Board to make Findings for Significance. The additions they believe contribute to the Significance were the stairway of B, and C. He noted that the Staff report contained two sets of findings. One was for finding the sites Significant, and the second for finding the sites Non-Significant. The motion should say that the Historic Preservation Board finds the area designated in green and blue as Significant, per the findings of fact, conclusions of law, and conditions of approval, with the removal of Finding #18. Secondly, a motion to remove the historic designation from the additions designated as A, C, E and F, per the findings of fact, conclusions of law and conditions of approval. Director Erickson stated that when they make the motion, they should add the diagrams of the Staff report into their motion so the diagrams refer to the action taken.

Chair Stephens opened the public hearing.

There were no comments.

Chair Stephens closed the public hearing.

Planner Grahn drafted a motion for the Board to consider. The HPB should move that the addition designated in orange on the diagram on page 54 of the Staff report and identified as B on the diagram on page 58 meets the criteria for

Landmark designation based on the Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Conditions of Approval with the removal of Finding of Fact #18, which references Carl Winters.

Director Erickson asked if that incorporates the blue area and the stairway. Planner Grahn answered yes. She had called it out as the orange area and explained that it was shown as B on page 58. Chair Stephens referred to page 58 and noted that the addition to the rear that would not be removed was shown in gray. Only the stairs were identified in orange. He pointed out that they were identifying the staircase as Landmark, Addition D as Landmark, and the original house as Landmark, and the addition identified in gray as Landmark. Planner Grahn remarked that the request was only to remove the additions.

Assistant City Attorney McLean believed that a finding of fact says that the original structure has been deemed Landmark. Director Erickson noted that B was the stairway. Chair Stephens clarified that the motion would determine that B and D are significant as shown on page 58 of the Staff report. Planner Grahn replied that he was correct.

MOTION: Board Member Scott move to Accept the proposed motion as stated by Planner Grahn and modified by the Planning Director, in accordance with the Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Conditions of Approval as amended to remove Finding of Fact #18, renumber the Findings, and incorporate the diagrams referenced in the Staff report. Board Member Hewett seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

Planner Grahn drafted a second motion for the Board to consider. The HPB moves that the additions identified as A, C, E and F in the diagram referenced on page 58 of the Staff report, do not meet the criteria for Landmark designation, based on the Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law.

MOTION: Board Member White moved to Accept the motion as stated by Planner Grahn. Board Member Scott seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

Findings of Fact Supporting the Historic Designation of Additions B & D

1. The Park City Historic Sites Inventory (HSI), adopted February 4, 2009, includes 414 sites of which 192 sites meet the criteria for designation as Landmark Sites and 222 sites meet the criteria for designation as Significant Sites.

2. The house at 732 Crescent Tram is within the Historic Residential (HR-1) zoning district.
3. The historic house at 732 Crescent Tram is identified as —Landmarkll on the Historic Sites Inventory (HSI). It is eligible for the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP), but is not currently listed.
4. In December 2015, City Council amended the Land Management Code to expand the criteria for what structures qualify to be landmark and significant sites.
5. A single-cell house was initially built on this site c.1904.
6. Analysis of the 1900, 1907, and 1929 Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps demonstrates that a second room was added to the west of the single-cell to create a hall-parlor form by 1907. A third in-line addition was also added to the south of the single-cell to create an L-shape. This is further supported by physical evidence found inside the house.
7. Carl Winters purchased the house in 1926. His daughter Marie remembers the house only consisting of —a kitchen, bathroom, dining room, front room, and one bedroom. This is supported by the 1941 Sanborn Fire Insurance Map that shows the L-shaped cottage.
8. During Winters ownership of the house (1926-1938) several additions were made that are documented by the c.1941 tax photograph. An in-line addition was constructed to expand the c.1907 rear addition; a staircase addition was constructed along the west wall of the c.1907 rear addition; a bathroom addition was built to the south of the original kitchen, or c.1907 west addition to the single cell; a root cellar was built west of the original kitchen, and a second story was added to the house.
9. Carl Winters' daughter also remembers that her father —tore off the kitchen and bathroom and made them new. It's unclear if he demolished and rebuilt the kitchen and bathroom or simply renovated them. New construction materials are found in the kitchen wing; however, it maintained the footprint of the original c.1907 addition that was made to the west side of the single-cell and that created the original hall-parlor form.
10. The house has remained largely unchanged since Winters' improvements were constructed between 1926 and 1938.
11. G. Leo and Margaret Rodgers purchased the house in 1985; in 1988, they received \$3,770 in grant funds for painting, a new roof, and fixing a wall.

12. The applicant has documented the developmental history of this building and finds that the additions made by Carl Winters are not historic.

13. The additions constructed by Carl Winters are between 79 and 91 years old.

14. The building is eligible for the NRHP because it retains its historic integrity in terms of design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association as defined by the National Park Service for the National Register of Historic Places. The additions under review do not detract from the historic building. Park City's Historic Site Form finds that —much of the original integrity and composition is intact in formll which includes these additions.

15. The building as it exists today contributes to the broad patterns of Park City's history because it possesses sufficient integrity to reflect the time period of the Mature Mining Era.

16. The hall-parlor form was one of the three most popular building forms seen during the Mature Mining Era and the house at 732 Crescent Tram reflects the folk Victorian architecture seen during that era.

17. The overall development of this property reflects the changing needs of Park City's mining boom era. As Park City became an established community, permanent residents expanded the early miners' cabins in order to accommodate growing families.

18. The additions reflect the distinctive characteristics of the period and methods of construction typical to the Mature Mining Era. The additions were constructed of simple materials and single-wall construction. The staircase was haphazardly constructed to the west side of the c.1907 addition and a bathroom was built into the hillside. The expansion was typical of Park City during this period as it made use of any available space on this hillside lot.

19. The house, with its additions, was designated as a Landmark Structure in 2009 by the Historic Sites Inventory.

20. In 1982, the house was identified as historic on a reconnaissance level survey of Old Town.

21. The house was rated —BII in a 2007 NRHP eligibility survey; B sites were found to be potentially eligible for the NRHP or slightly less significant and/or intact.

22. The house retains its historic scale, context, and material which allow the original c.1907 hall-parlor and rear addition to be restored, despite the later

additions made by Carl Winters. The house reflects the historical and architectural character of the district due to its mass, scale, composition, materials, treatment, and other architectural features that are visually compatible with the Mining Era Residences National Register District.

Conclusions of law Supporting the Historic Designation of Additions B & D

1. The existing house located at 732 Crescent Tram meets all of the criteria for designating sites to the Park City Historic Sites Inventory as a Landmark Site including:

- a. It is at least fifty (50) years old or has achieved Significance or if the Site is of exceptional importance to the community; and Complies.
- b. It retains its Historic Integrity in terms of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling and association as defined by the National Park Service for the National Register of Historic Places; and Complies.
- c. It is significant in local, regional or national history, architecture, engineering or culture associated with at least one (1) of the following:
 - i. An era that has made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history;
 - ii. The lives of Persons significant in the history of the community, state, region, or nation; or
 - iii. The distinctive characteristics of type, period, or method of construction or the work of a notable architect or master craftsman. Complies.

2. The existing house located at 732 Crescent Tram 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 the Site is of exceptional importance to the community; and Complies.
- (b) It retains its Historical Form as may be demonstrated but not limited by any of the following:
 - (i) It previously received a historic grant from the City; or
 - (ii) It was previously listed on the Historic Sites Inventory; or
 - (iii) It was listed as Significant or on any reconnaissance or intensive level survey of historic resources; or Complies.
- (c) It has one (1) or more of the following:
 - (i) It retains its historic scale, context, materials in a manner and degree which can be restored to Historical Form even if it has non-historic additions; and
 - (ii) It reflects the Historical or Architectural character of the site or district through design characteristics such as mass, scale, composition, materials, treatment, cornice, and/or other architectural features as are Visually Compatible to the Mining Era

Residences National Register District even if it has non-historic additions; or Complies

(d) 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.

Findings of Fact for Removing the Historic Designation of Additions A, C, E and F

1. The Park City Historic Sites Inventory (HSI), adopted February 4, 2009, includes 414 sites of which 192 sites meet the criteria for designation as Landmark Sites and 222 sites meet the criteria for designation as Significant Sites.
2. The house at 732 Crescent Tram is within the Historic Residential (HR-1) zoning district.
3. The historic house at 732 Crescent Tram is identified as —Landmarkll on the Historic Sites Inventory (HSI). It is eligible for the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP), but is not currently listed.
4. In December 2015, City Council amended the Land Management Code to expand the criteria for what structures qualify to be landmark and significant sites.
5. A single-cell house was initially built on this site c.1904.
6. Analysis of the 1900, 1907, and 1929 Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps demonstrates that a second room was added to the west of the single-cell to create a hall-parlor form by 1907. A third in-line addition was also added to the south of the single-cell to create an L-shape. This is further supported by physical evidence found inside the house.
7. Carl Winters purchased the house in 1926. His daughter Marie remembers the house only consisting of —a kitchen, bathroom, dining room, front room, and one bedroom. This is supported by the 1941 Sanborn Fire Insurance Map that shows the L-shaped cottage.
8. During Winters ownership of the house (1926-1938) several additions were made that are documented by the c.1941 tax photograph. An in-line addition was constructed to expand the c.1907 rear addition; a staircase addition was

constructed along the west wall of the c.1907 rear addition; a bathroom addition was built to the south of the original kitchen, or c.1907 west addition to the single cell; a root cellar was built west of the original kitchen, and a second story was added to the house.

9. Carl Winters' daughter also remembers that her father —tore off the kitchen and bathroom and made them new. It's unclear if he demolished and rebuilt the kitchen and bathroom or simply renovated them. New construction materials are found in the kitchen wing; however, it maintained the footprint of the original c.1907 addition that was made to the west side of the single-cell and that created the original hall-parlor form.

10. The house has remained largely unchanged since Winters' improvements were constructed between 1926 and 1938.

11. G. Leo and Margaret Rodgers purchased the house in 1985; in 1988, they received \$3,770 in grant funds for painting, a new roof, and fixing a wall.

12. The applicant has documented the developmental history of this building and finds that the additions made by Carl Winters are not historic.

13. The additions constructed by Carl Winters are between 79 and 91 years old.

14. The building is eligible for the NRHP because it retains its historic integrity in terms of design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association as defined by the National Park Service for the National Register of Historic Places. The additions under review do not detract from the historic building. Park City's Historic Site Form finds that —"much of the original integrity and composition is intact in form" which includes these additions.

15. The building as it exists today contributes to the broad patterns of Park City's history because it possesses sufficient integrity to reflect the time period of the Mature Mining Era.

16. The hall-parlor form was one of the three most popular building forms seen during the Mature Mining Era and the house at 732 Crescent Tram reflects the folk Victorian architecture seen during that era.

17. The additions constructed to the house between 1926 and 1938 do not reflect the Mature Mining Era and do not contribute to our understanding of the broad patterns of our history.

18. Carl Winters is a person of historical significance in the community; however, the additions he made to the house at 732 Crescent Tram between 1926 and

1938 are not significant because of their association with Carl Winters as there are better properties that represent Carl Winters' contributions to the community, including the historic Park City High School at 1255 Park Avenue.

19. The additions do not reflect the Mature Mining Era's characteristic building types or methods of construction.

20. The house, with its additions, was designated as a Landmark Structure in 2009 by the Historic Sites Inventory.

21. In 1982, the house was identified as historic on a reconnaissance level survey of Old Town.

22. The house was rated —BII in a 2007 NRHP eligibility survey; B sites were found to be potentially eligible for the NRHP or slightly less significant and/or intact.

23. The house retains its historic scale, context, and material which allow the original c.1907 hall-parlor and rear addition to be restored, despite the later additions made by Carl Winters. The house reflects the historical and architectural character of the district due to its mass, scale, composition, materials, treatment, and other architectural features that are visually compatible with the Mining Era Residences National Register District.

24. The additions do not contribute to the historical significance of this house.

Conclusions of Law for Removing the Historic Designation of Additions A, C, E and F

1. The additions to the existing house located at 732 Crescent Tram does not meet all of the criteria for designating sites to the Park City Historic Sites Inventory as a Landmark Site including:

d. It is at least fifty (50) years old or has achieved Significance or if the Site is of exceptional importance to the community; and Complies.

e. It retains its Historic Integrity in terms of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling and association as defined by the National Park Service for the National Register of Historic Places; and Complies.

f. It is significant in local, regional or national history, architecture, engineering or culture associated with at least one (1) of the following:

iv. An era that has made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history;

v. The lives of Persons significant in the history of the community, state, region, or nation; or

vi. The distinctive characteristics of type, period, or method of

construction or the work of a notable architect or master craftsman. Does not comply.

2. The additions to the existing house located at 732 Crescent Tram 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 the Site is of exceptional importance to the community; and Complies.
- (b) It retains its Historical Form as may be demonstrated but not limited by any of the following:
 - (i) It previously received a historic grant from the City; or
 - (ii) It was previously listed on the Historic Sites Inventory; or
 - (iii) It was listed as Significant or on any reconnaissance or intensive level survey of historic resources; or Complies.
- (c) It has one (1) or more of the following:
 - (i) It retains its historic scale, context, materials in a manner and degree which can be restored to Historical Form even if it has non-historic additions; and
 - (ii) It reflects the Historical or Architectural character of the site or district through design characteristics such as mass, scale, composition, materials, treatment, cornice, and/or other architectural features as are Visually Compatible to the Mining Era Residences National Register District even if it has non-historic additions; or Complies.
- (d) 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. Does not comply.

2. 1141 Park Avenue – Historic District Design Review – Material Deconstruction on Landmark Site. The applicant is proposing to impact the following: non-historic concrete patios and courtyards; non-historic wood fences; remove non-historic c.2000 rear addition, non-historic wood doors, and non-historic windows on the historic house; and remove non-historic doors and non-historic windows on the historic shed.
(Application PL-16-03214)

Brad Davidson with Black Dog Builders, Jim and Samantha Ossalaer, the owners, and Jordan Smith, representing the project architect, were present to answer questions.

Planner Grahn reported that based on the Sanborn Map analysis, it appears that the house was A T-shape or L-shape with a box bay on the front. For some reason the house was cut off on the 1889 Sanborn Map, but was shown clearly in 1900. Moving forward in history, in 1907 the Sanborn map was drawn showing the T-shape, the box bay, the front porch and the addition on the back. By 1929 the house was more of a bungalow style. It retained its shape but the box bay was gone. There was still a partial width front porch. The rear addition was removed in 1941. Planner Grahn presented the 1941 photograph overlaid what it might have looked like originally as a cross-wing. She stated that the gable roof was removed and replaced with a hip roof that covered the entire house. As seen in other houses in Old Town, as additions are added, the roof forms begin to fail and cause snow build-up. It was not uncommon for these houses to become bungalows since it was the prevalent style in the 1920s and 1930s.

Planner Grahn stated that the existing features related to the bungalow were the hip roof that extends over the entire house, exposed rafter tails beneath the eaves of the hip roof, the tapered porch columns, and the Chicago style windows, which is solid glass with two narrow double hung windows on either side. Planner Grahn commented on changes that occurred in 1949, and by the 1960s the wrap around porch was introduced, and that porch currently exists on the house.

Planner Grahn stated that in the 1990s the house had fallen into fair condition. She presented photos showing what the house looked like before it was renovated the first time. The hip roof is taller than a porch roof, which might explain why there is a gap between the top of the windows and doors and the top of the roof. Tapered columns were also introduced. Planner Grahn remarked that the house was changed, but the L-shape was still evident with the hip roof over it.

Planner Grahn reported that the house was renovated in 2000, and much of the work that the City would normally review was completed. The siding and windows were repaired. A new garage was built that faces Woodside Avenue. The shed between the house and the garage and is not visible from the street was fixed. Planner Grahn presented drawings showing the north side of the house and the addition that was added in 2000. She showed the front of the house and the back of the house, which is not visible from Woodside because of the new garage.

Planner Grahn believed this materials deconstruction was straightforward. When the house was renovated in 2000, the owners at that time put in a number of improvements, including mismatched fences, stone and concrete patios, and a wood deck. These improvements were added around 2000 and they are not historic. The applicant was proposing to remove those as part of this current renovation.

Planner Grahn stated that the applicant was proposing to add an addition that will have the same footprint as the 2000 addition; however, it will be taller and provide more square footage. They are also going to renovate the shed. The garage will stay as it is. Planner Grahn noted that there were minimal changes to the house because the work will be done over the 2000 addition.

Planner Grahn remarked that the 2000 addition was highlighted in the red in the Staff report. She reiterated that the addition is not historic and it does not contribute to the historic integrity or the historical significance of the site. The porch will only have minimal maintenance such as patching wood and repainting.

Planner Grahn stated that there are four existing doors on the house; three of which are in excellent condition and are reconstructions that appear to be historic. One door is not historic. Planner Grahn noted that the front door dimensions are historic, and the applicant would like to widen the dimensions to accommodate a new door. The Staff finds that modifying the historic door openings to accommodate contemporary doors is largely inappropriate. However, they requested discussion and feedback from the HPB on that issue. Planner Grahn stated that the historic door openings were identified in red. The blue color indicated the location of the new patio door on the back of the house and not visible. The Staff had no issues or concerns with the patio door because it would not affect the historic integrity of the house. Their primary concern was changing the front door dimension.

Planner Grahn reiterated that the windows were replaced in 2000 and were in good condition. The applicants were only proposing to modify and replace two of the windows. In looking at the documentation from the previous remodel, Planner Grahn did not believe they were original window openings. Therefore, changing the windows would not affect the historic integrity of this Landmark building. The roof would be replaced from asphalt to standing seam metal, which is a maintenance issue and not part of the materials deconstruction review.

Planner Grahn showed the shed and noted that the foundation was added in 2000. She assumed that minimal patching would be required. The exterior walls were in good condition since they were redone in 2000, and should only require routine maintenance such as painting. The one door on the building is not historic, and the applicant was proposing to replace it with something that keeps the historic look and feel. The Staff found that the proposed exterior change would not damage or destroy the architectural features of the shed. Planner Grahn remarked that the four existing window openings were new windows in 2000. The applicant proposes to switch out one of those windows, but it will not impact the architectural integrity of the shed. The roof would be changed from asphalt shingles to a standing seam metal roof. Planner Grahn pointed out that the Guidelines do not prohibit standing seam metal roofs. It only says that it

cannot be reflective. The Staff will work with the applicant to make sure the metal roof meets the Guidelines.

Planner Grahn remarked that the front door was the only issue the Staff had for the HPB to discuss.

Board Member Hewett recalled other projects where the Board required the applicant to maintain the existing size of the door. She found no reason why they should not have the same requirement for this project. Ms. Hewett thought the HPB had already set a precedent for maintaining the historic door size.

Board Member Holmgren concurred with Ms. Hewett. Board Member Beatlebrox agreed that the Board has consistently maintained the historical size of the door because it is what people see as they go through the neighborhood.

Chair Stephens asked if it was both doors shown in red on page 92 of the Staff report. Planner Grahn believed it was only the front door.

Samantha Ossalaer stated that the intent is not to widen the door. They only wanted to heighten the door slightly to align with the windows. Chair Stephens asked if it was a 6'8" door. He was told that the door opening was 7' and they were proposing to heighten the door to 7'2" to align with the windows. Planner Grahn remarked that the door could be seen more clearly on page 168 of the Staff report. She noted how the windows were slightly taller and where the door stops.

Board Member Holmgren thought the Board needed to be consistent in their decisions. The Board members concurred. Chair Stephens stated that windows and doors not lining up is not unusual in Park City. He believed that adding the height would make the door look out of proportion because it would be tall and narrow. Chair Stephens asked if the applicant was proposing to change the door on the side. Jordan Smith, representing the architect, replied that the side door and all other doors would remain the same.

Chair Stephens believed there was consensus among the Board about retaining the dimensions of the front doors. He asked if the Board had other issues or comments regarding the removal of non-historic materials.

Board Member Hewett was comfortable with what was being proposed. Board Members Scott and Holmgren agreed. Board Member Beatlebrox asked if the flat roof addition would have a garden on top. Mr. Smith replied that there would be a deck off of the third level, and the roof of the third level would be a green roof.

Chair Stephens opened the public hearing.

Sandra Hall thanked the Board for their service. Ms. Hall was had concerns about replacing the roof with metal because of how far the roof extends into her property. She has a metal roof and the snow slides off. She questioned whether they could prevent the snow from the new metal roof from sliding on to her yard or driveway.

Mr. Smith stated that they were planning to put cleats on the roof.

Chair Stephens informed Ms. Hall that the purpose this evening was for the HPB to determine whether or not the materials that the owner would like to remove were historic. He pointed out that the issue Ms. Hall raised would be a concern for the Building and Planning Departments, and she should make them aware.

Board Member White stated that when it reaches that point, the City would require a snow shed agreement between Ms. Hall and this neighbor. He assured her that the issue would be addressed at that point.

Director Erickson asked if the neighbors would be noticed when this project goes through the Historic District Design Review process. Planner Grahn answered yes. She explained that the neighbors would receive another level when the Design Team makes their final determination. She has been meeting with Ms. Hall and her daughter Rebecca, and they have shared concerns about snow shedding and other issues. Planner Grahn stated that she has been working with the owners to make sure those concerns are addressed to the best of their ability with the Design Guidelines and the LMC. She had also met with the Building Department to discuss the snow shedding issue. Planner Grahn pointed out that if the snow shed agreement does not work, the owner is responsible for holding the snow onto their property. She and the applicant have talked about mitigation measures.

Chair Stephens closed the public hearing.

MOTION: Board Member Scott moved to approve the Material Deconstruction of non-historic and non-contributory materials at 1141 Park Avenue, pursuant to the Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Conditions of Approval contained in the Staff Report. Board Member Beatlebrox seconded the motion.

Chair Stephens asked if the conditions of approval address the front doors. Planner Grahn noted that Condition #3 requires that the applicant maintain the dimensions of the extant historic door openings.

Chair Stephens called for a vote on the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

Findings of Fact – 1141 Park Avenue

1. The property is located at 1141 Park Avenue
2. The site is designated as Landmark on the Historic Sites Inventory.
3. Based on Sanborn Fire Insurance maps and historic research analysis, the house was likely constructed c.1885 by Cornelius Cottrell as a cross wing. There was a partial-width front porch across the front of the house and the projecting ell had a box bay window. There was also a rear addition across the length of the west (rear) elevation.
4. Based on Sanborn Fire Insurance maps, it appears that by 1929 the house had been renovated under the ownership of Lloyd Stanley. The overall shape of the house had become squarer and there was a rear addition off the west elevation. The shape does not change in the 1941 Sanborn Map and the c.1941 tax photograph shows that the house has been renovated to reflect the bungalow style that was popular at the time. Bungalow-inspired elements included the hip roof with exposed rafter tails, tapered porch columns, and Chicago bay windows.
5. By the time of the 1968 tax card, a wrap-around porch had been constructed that extended from the east (front) façade of the house to the south elevation.
6. By the 1980s photographs, the wood siding had been covered with Bricktex and a solid porch railing had been constructed. The windows had been replaced with aluminum or vinyl windows.
7. The site was renovated between 2000-2001. As part of the renovation, a new two-car garage was constructed along Woodside Avenue. The historic shed was renovated to create an office/studio space, and a one-story addition was constructed on the west (rear) elevation of the house. The yard was landscaped with planters as well as concrete and stone patios.
8. On January 30, 2017, the Planning Department received a Historic District Design Review (HDDR) application for the renovation of the historic house and construction of a new addition at 1141 Park Avenue as well as renovation of the historic shed; the application was deemed complete on February 21, 2017. The HDDR application is still under review by the Planning Department.
9. The applicant proposes to make a number of site improvements as part of this renovation. They will remove the c.2000 trellis, planters, stone and concrete patios, and a synthetic wood deck. Much of the masonry that was introduced in c.2000 has cracked and heaved due to poor drainage. These improvements are

not historic and do not contribute to the historic integrity or historical significance of the structure or site.

10. The applicant intends to remove the one-story addition that was introduced on the west (rear) elevation of the historic house in c.2000. It will be replaced with a new three-story addition with the same footprint. Because the addition is not historic, it does not contribute to the historic integrity or historical significance of the structure.

11. The porch is structurally sound with minor defects. Portions of the ceiling soffit are warped and there are significant layers of paint. The applicant proposes to strip the layers of paint and replace any deteriorated wood. The proposed scope of work on the porch is routine maintenance. The applicant will be repairing and replacing materials only when they are deteriorated beyond repair. No changes in the design, materials, or general appearance of the elements is needed. There are four (4) existing doors on the house. Three (3) are in excellent condition and one (1) is not historic. The applicant proposes to replace all the existing doors with new doors that mimic historic styles. On the west (rear) elevation, the applicant is proposing to remove a single door and expand it to install a patio door with sidelight.

12. The existing window openings on the historic house are significant to the bungalow era of the house. There are no historic windows. These were removed and replaced with new aluminum clad wood windows c.2000. The applicant is proposing to remove two (2) of the sliding window units on the back of the house, infill the openings with matching siding, and expand a third window to create a larger window opening. The sill height will be raised three (3) window in order to match the windows on the south side. The windows to be changed are not original window openings and were likely added as part of the c.2000 renovation. The proposed exterior changes are beyond the midpoint of the historic house and will not be visible from the primary public rights-of-way. These changes will not damage or destroy the exterior architectural features of the subject property which are compatible with the character of the historic site.

13. The roof of the historic house was structurally upgraded as part of the c.2000 renovation. The applicant is proposing to replace the existing asphalt shingles with a new standing seam metal roof. The proposed scope of work is routine maintenance and will not change the design, materials, or general appearance of the roof structure.

14. The foundation of the historic shed was poured during the c.2000 remodel. It is in excellent condition and requires only minor patching and repairs. The scope of work is minor routine maintenance.

15. The exterior walls of the shed were structurally upgraded in c.2000. The applicant proposes to remove layers of paint from the wood siding, repair, and defects and repaint. The scope of work is minor routine maintenance.

16. There are two (2) existing doors on the shed. The door openings are not original to the structure and appear to have been modified during the c.2000 remodel. Neither of the doors is historic. The applicant will replace one of the doors with a new door that matches historic styles. The proposed exterior changes will not damage or destroy the exterior architectural features of the subject property which are compatible with the character of the historic site.

17. There are four (4) historic window openings on the shed. The windows were all replaced during the c.2000 renovation. The applicant is requesting to replace one window on the existing shed that was introduced in c.2000. The proposed exterior changes will not damage or destroy the exterior architectural features of the subject property that are compatible with the character of the historic site.

18. The historic shed's roof is currently covered with asphalt shingles. The applicant is proposing to remove these and apply a new standing seam metal roof. The proposed scope of work is minor routine maintenance.

Conclusions of Law – 1141 Park Avenue

1. The proposal complies with the Land Management Code requirements pursuant to the HR-M District and regarding historic structure deconstruction and reconstruction.
2. The proposal meets the criteria for relocation pursuant to LMC 15-11-14 Disassembly and Reassembly of the Historic Building(s) and/or Structure(s) on a Landmark or Significant Site.

Conditions of Approval – 1141 Park Avenue

1. Final building plans and construction details shall reflect substantial compliance with the HDDR proposal stamped in on January 30, 2017. Any changes, modifications, or deviations from the approved design that have not been approved by the Planning and Building Departments may result in a stop work order.
2. Where the historic exterior materials cannot be repaired, they will be replaced with materials that match the original in all respects: scale, dimension, texture, profile, material and finish. Prior to replacement, the applicant shall demonstrate to the Historic Preservation Planner that the materials are no longer safe and/or serviceable and cannot be repaired to a safe and/or serviceable condition.

3. The applicant shall maintain the dimensions of the extant historic door openings.

3. Design Guideline Revisions – Staff recommends that the Historic Preservation Board take public comment on the proposed changes to the Design Guidelines for New Construction in Park City’s Historic Districts. Universal and Specific Guidelines will be reviewed for: Universal Guidelines; Site Design; Setback & Orientation; Topography & Grading; Landscaping & Vegetation; Retaining Walls; Fences; Paths, Steps, Handrails, & Railings (Not Associated With Porches); Gazebos, Pergolas, and Other Shade Structures; Parking Areas & Driveways; Mass, Scale & Height; Foundation; Doors; Windows; Roofs; Dormers; Gutters & Downspouts; Chimneys & Stovepipes; Porches; Architectural Features; Mechanical Systems, Utility Systems; & Service Equipment; Materials; Paint & Color; Garages; New Accessory Structures; Additions to Existing Non-Historic Structures; Reconstruction of Non-Surviving Structures; Compatibility & Complementary; Masonry Retaining Walls; and Fencing. (Application GI-13-00222)

Planner Grahn noted that the HPB had reviewed all the Guidelines related to work on historic residential and historic commercial buildings. She and Planner Tyler had hosted a number of work sessions with the Board to talk about compatibility and guidelines for new construction. This evening, they were only presenting the guidelines for the construction of new residential buildings. The guidelines for new commercial buildings would be presented at a future meeting.

Planner Grahn stated that the first item for discussion was the idea of infill. Currently the guidelines are called the Design Guidelines for New Construction. In looking at other communities, the question was how to define new construction versus infill constructions. She pointed out that new construction applies to anywhere. Infill talks about being sensitive to context and being developed on either a vacant or undeveloped land within an existing community with other kinds of development. Planner Grahn noted that the word infill is used a lot in historic districts.

Planner Grahn asked if the Board was comfortable using the word “infill construction” rather than “new construction”, of if they preferred to say “new construction”. She noted that changing would be a shift in the guidelines.

Board Member Hewett was comfortable using “infill construction”. Chair Stephens stated that a vacant lot is infill. Renovating a historic home such as the last item is a remodel. However, the home on Crescent Tram that was discussed earlier this evening was more extensive. He asked if they would be looking at the guidelines for that property as being infill. Planner Grahn stated that based

on the revisions, if the owner would do some work to redevelop that site, they would look to the design guidelines for historic residential buildings, and the section about additions and site improvements. She thought it would be treated as the redevelopment of a site rather than starting anew. However, if the applicant requested a plat amendment to create a new lot, that lot would be infill development. Chair Stephens asked if a historic home on the site triggers infill. Planner Grahn believed it would be redevelopment. Chair Stephens clarified that the Staff would be looking at guidelines with regards to additions to historic homes. A vacant lot or a new lot would be new construction infill. Planner Grahn stated that if a structure was built in the 1970s, they could argue that it was infill that was brought in in the 1970s based on the assumption that a structure existed on the lot originally in a historic period.

Planner Hannah Tyler stated that some of the items presented this evening were similar to what the HPB had previously seen for historic residential structures, and it was carried over to new infill.

Planner Tyler noted that the main changes to the Universal Guidelines included changing “should” to “shall”, but keeping the word “should” where it was more appropriate than “shall” to give latitude on some of the elements. Two new guidelines were added to emphasize the importance of compatible infill. Planner Tyler requested discussion on Universal Guideline #3, which talks broadly about style. She read the current language, “Styles that never appeared in Park City shall be avoided”. She asked if the Board would like to keep that statement. She presented a photo of 459 Woodside, showing how traditional forms were put into one to create a structure that would have probably not been seen historically. However, it maintained some of the historic elements of structures seen throughout town. Planner Tyler stated that while it is not a style that appeared, the Staff believed they had taken pieces and put them into one. Planner Tyler presented a photo of 535 Woodside and noted that it was a style that has never appeared in the residential district in Park City. It was more of a modern form using traditional materials.

Board Member Hewett thought they would need to add a time period if they kept that statement. Board Member Beatlebrox agreed, because mountain modern has appeared. Planner Tyler stated that it has become difficult for the Staff to defend in that sense. She suggested saying that if it appeared after a defined historic era, which would push it into 1962.

Chair Stephens noted that reading further into the Design Guidelines changes, they were talking about how the style needs to be consistent with not only the built architecture adjacent, but possibly the entire block. He questioned whether the paragraph was needed or if it could be removed. Chair Stephens asked when the Staff would use Universal Guideline #3 to help with the design review process. Planner Grahn provided an example to show why the Guidelines is

used more than they would think. She asked if Chair Stephens thought the entire Guidelines should be removed or just the sentence about “never appeared in Park City”. She pointed out that she uses the first sentence of the Guideline quite often. Chair Stephens thought there was better verbiage and guidelines further into the revisions that gave the Staff the tools they needed. He stated that one of the problems he has with new construction is that it might pick up the gables and some of the styles and massing, but it still looks like a 2500 square foot house. He thought the best designs were historic homes with the addition behind it. Planner Grahn believed Chair Stephens raised a good point and they should talk about breaking up the mass in the Guidelines.

Board Member Holmgren commented on the statement that styles that have never appeared in Park City should be avoided. They have had the golf ball, atriums, and mountain casual, and she was unsure how they could avoid it.

Director Erickson noted that the two sentences may not be in the correct order, because “...radically conflict with the character of the Park City Historic Sites”, is the controller. They could then say something such as, “design styles that never appeared in Park City should be avoided”, as a supplement to the controller sentence. He suggested wordsmithing to reflect the idea that some stylistic elements conflict with the district, particularly in terms of roof forms. For example, mountain contemporary could be accomplished without the dominant roof form being flat. Chair Stephens agreed that reversing the two sentences would better accomplish what they wanted to achieve.

Planner Grahn asked if the Board had comments regarding the other Universal Guidelines. She noted that Guidelines #4 and #10 were added to help with the compatibility issue. Chair Stephens stated that Guideline #4 addressed his comment regarding the massing. He liked that they were trying to minimize the cut, fill and use of retaining walls on the steep slopes. However, if they were talking about the visual impact of retaining walls, he thought it should be clarified. Planner Grahn offered to relook at the language. She reminded the Board that Universal Guidelines are broader. The Design Guidelines are more specific.

Board Member Beatlebrox had no concerns or issues. Board Member Scott like the addition of Guideline #10. In a previous discussion they talked about the difficulty of addressing the different characters of the neighborhood. He thought Guideline #10 helps with that issue. Chair Stephens agreed that Guideline #10 was important because it gives them the ability to treat Daly Avenue different from Park Avenue, etc.

Planner Grahn stated that the Staff used a lot of the feedback from the Board during the discussion on the historic residential buildings to help draft these revisions. They talked about trying to maintain the historic grid pattern, orientation of buildings, and they were seeing a huge push to put the entrances

on the sides of the buildings, especially as the garages start consuming the whole façade. She stated that historically the front entry was the main focal point of the building, which is the why the language talks a lot about primary entrances. Planner Grahn remarked that they moved things around and created a section about topography and grade, and maintaining it; stepping the building design, and so forth. Landscaping and vegetation were the same guidelines approved for the residential historic buildings. Retaining walls were addressed in terms of where they should be located and how they should look. Occasionally boulders have to be used, but if they can be pushed to the backyard rather than the front yard it helps maintain the integrity of the streetscape. Fences, paths, gazebos, parking areas and driveways have already been discussed.

Planner Grahn asked for comments on the above mentioned sections. Chair Stephens referred to page 35, New Buildings, and the language regarding setbacks in A.1.2. He understood that they were trying to come up with new infill structures that are consistent with those around them, and asked if changes to the setbacks could only be granted by the Board of Adjustment, or whether the Planning Department would have any flexibility to allow new construction to be consistent with other homes. Planner Tyler replied that it would be a Board of Adjustment decision based on uniqueness. Chair Stephens asked if it was something the Planning Department would typically support if it was consistent with the other homes on the street. Planner Grahn stated that the Planning Department would have to look at it on a case by case basis because besides consistency with the grid pattern of the street, they would have to consider the guidelines and what the building looks like.

The Board reviewed parking. Chair Stephens referred to D.1.1, “off-street parking should be located within the rear yard”. Planner Grahn stated that from a preservation standpoint it should be encouraged whenever possible because the garage is less intrusive if it is located in the back of the house. She noted that the sentence was carried over from the previous Design Guidelines. She asked if the Board preferred to remove the sentence or keep it.

Board Member Beatlebrox thought they should keep the sentence and encourage it when feasible. Planner Tyler stated that there are a lot of corner lots in the lower Park area where this is an option, and historically it was done that way. She noted that there are historic structures on lower Woodside with garages located at the back of the lot. Planner Tyler believed there were areas where it would be a character defining features. She recommended that they encourage it because a lot of the lots may be 37' wide and they may be able to convince the applicant to put in a driveway and locate the garage in the rear.

There were no further comments regarding parking and garages.

Planner Tyler commented on mass, scale and height. She stated that a number of applicants try to maximize the development potential of their lots. It is understandable, but sometimes it results in out-of-scale development. The Staff tried to address that issue in the new set of guidelines because it was not specifically talked about in the old guidelines.

Planner Tyler presented a photo of 331 Park, and noted that bungalow type pieces of that style were implemented into new development. The Staff found it to be a better scale than the structure in another photo, which was an older building and built under a different set of guidelines. However, even though it had a gabled roof and had other elements of traditional form, it was out of scale. Planner Tyler stated that in an effort to address this, the Staff included changes to add clarity in the sections where they needed to define the appropriate mass, scale and height. In their discussion regarding the historic revision, they talked about additions being smaller modules rather than a larger addition. They were encouraging the same for new development. The guidelines also speak more to traditional styles as a way of establishing that mass and scale on the street.

Chair Stephens thought it encouraged breaking up the mass of a new infill construction project so it does not appear as one building. Board Member Scott thought the guideline added clarity.

Chair Stephens referred to B.1.7, "Modules on a primary façade should generally not exceed 11' to 25' in width". He asked if there was a reason to have that sentence. Planner Grahn stated that it was based off the dimensions they see on historic buildings, but it was not necessary if the Board thought it should be removed. Chair Stephens believed that as long as there is flexibility to regulate the design, he preferred to eliminate the sentence because otherwise an owner could push the façade to 25' and wonder why it could not be done. Board Member Scott asked if it could be applied to the house shown in the photo at 907 Norfolk. Planner Grahn answered yes. She thought Chair Stephens had made a good point. Planner Tyler deleted the sentence in B.1.7.

Planner Tyler commented on foundations and noted that the HPB had discussed foundations as part of the historic revisions. Overall, the guidelines would address appearance and scale of the foundation. On new development the foundations appeared to be very tall, but it was just a rock face and the foundation was not actually that tall. The intent is to make sure that issue is addressed. Planner Tyler commented on site management as it relates to the relationship between site design and where it meets the foundation, and that speaks to regrading or overall patio design and how those two integrate. Retaining and drainage addresses retaining wall issues and drainage away from the house.

Chair Stephens noted that 6” is the minimum for the Building Code; however, the guidelines say no more than 6”. Planner Tyler questioned why they did not say no more than 2 feet to be consistent with the historic guidelines. Planner Grahn recalled that when they did the guidelines for the historic residential they were concerned about the amount of concrete they were seeing when the houses were lifted. For that reason, it was limited to 6” on the primary façade in an effort to protect the historic house. She suggested that the amount of visible concrete on new houses might be less bothersome. The Board thought it was bothersome. Chair Stephens was not in favor of a 2-foot foundation, and suggested the possibility of 8”. Board Member Hewett thought 6” of visible concrete was fine. Chair Stephens pointed out that specifying 6” would not leave any leeway.

Planner Grahn stated that she and Planner Tyler could relook at it and come up with a better number.

Chair Stephens read from the guidelines, “A site shall be regraded so all water drains away from the structure and does not enter the foundation”. He asked if that was an issue for the Planning Department or the Building Department. Board Member White stated that it was definitely a building issue. Chair Stephens thought they should let the Building Department address those issues to keep the Design Guidelines more concise. Planner Grahn offered to remove that language.

Planner Grahn commented on doors and windows. She noted that door and window styles and the proportions make or break the structure in how it appears. The intent of the guideline is to get the doors back into scale with what was seen historically. The Planning Department is seeing a lot of demand for double doors or doors well over 8’ tall, which skews the historic proportions. It was the same issue with the windows. Large expanses of glass were being proposed that do not match the solid to void ratio that is typically seen on historic buildings. People want to take advantage of their views, but walls of glass detract from the Historic District.

There were no comments from the Board regarding doors or windows.

Planner Tyler stated that since roofs are an important piece of the overall mass and scale of a building, especially as it relates to the entire streetscape, the Staff found that the current guidelines did not address or add enough clarity to enforce it. The guideline revisions speak to roofs as they contribute to the surrounding district, roof pitches and combinations of roof forms and how that is done successfully, heights, and materials.

Board Member Beatlebrox noted that the language states that flat roofs as the primary roof form along the street shall be avoided. Planner Grahn pointed out

that it was only limited to along the street to keep the consistency along the street, but it allows more flexibility in the back. Director Erickson stated that LMC amendments were coming forward on that issue as well. Planner Grahn stated that she and Planner Tyler were working on a flat roof study and they hoped to have it ready for the HPB to discuss it in June.

Board Member Beatlebrox noted that a roof deck versus a green roof versus a party deck on the back of a historic building in a densely populated area could be a problem.

Board Member White asked if the Planning Department was still considering the 30% rule. Planner Grahn answered yes, but they were trying to figure out what was already in the District and how it works together, so when they propose LMC revisions it makes sense and would not adversely affect the District. Planner Tyler pointed out that it would be addressed in the LMC and not the Design Guidelines.

The Board concurred that the sentence about avoiding flat roofs along the street should remain. Chair Stephens thought they should be mimicking the patterns of the built environment around the infill construction. They could reduce the massing with the module effect, and new construction could be added on to the back of a smaller, more traditional looking home for Park City. He thought a flat roof on the addition would help minimize the impact from the street in terms of massing.

Director Erickson stated that over the course of the winter a number of houses did not have eaves on the snow slide side of the homes in order to maximize the width. The Staff was thinking about requiring eaves so when the snow slides off it does not take off the gas meter. Chair White stated that per the Building Department, if the gas meter is located near a roof slope that snow slides, the gas meter should be sheltered. However, Chair White agreed that an eave is necessary. Director Erickson stated that the eave reduces the apparent mass, bulk and scale of the building by pulling the walls in by six inches on the snow slide side. In addition, on the snow slide side, if icicles form against the siding because there is not an eave, the water penetrates the siding. Director Erickson remarked that he was raising a new issue for Planner Grahn and Planner Tyler because he had missed it when he read through it the first time. They would consult the professionals for input. Chair Stephens pointed out that historic homes had eaves as a designing feature. Planner Grahn stated that in addition to the Building Department issues that Director Erickson mentioned, eaves also create unique shadow lines, which helps with the compatibility of the District. They would make sure to add appropriate language.

Planner Tyler stated that dormers were another piece of the roof that, if done incorrectly, could detract from the overall streetscape compatibility. She

presented photos showing appropriate and inappropriate dormers. She noted that the previous Guidelines did not address dormers.

Chair Stephens questioned whether the Guidelines sufficiently address dormers. He believes dormers are more important than doors and windows because they are a dominant mass form and it is easy to do them wrong. He wanted to make sure they had the necessary tools to regulate. Planner Tyler suggested adding language about pulling it back from the wall plane. Chair Stephens stated that he would favor that language.

Planner Tyler commented on gutters and downspouts. She recalled that it was the same or similar language as the historic residential buildings. She noted that the previous guidelines did not address gutters. Chair Stephens thought the sentence talking about water from gutters and downspouts was a Building Department issue. The language referring to the style was appropriate for the Design Guidelines. Planner Tyler deleted the sentence regarding water from gutters and downspouts.

Planner Tyler commented on chimneys. In this section they found that they were getting more of the out-of-scale Deer Valley style chimney, which is too big for Old Town. Historically, chimneys were small square brick chimneys. The Staff added guidelines that address chimneys and scaled them down. She provided examples. One example was an out-of-scale chimney that was minimized and hidden by the materials that were used. The chimney in the second example was too wide for the Historic District.

Planner Grahn stated that porches are a character defining feature that contributes to the streetscape and highlights the prominent pedestrian entrance to the building. She reviewed examples of different porch styles. Planner Grahn noted that the proposed revisions emphasize using porches to define the primary entrance, but also making sure that they are not over-scaled and monumental.

Chair Stephens stated that the front porch and the front entrance should have some relationship to the street. He pointed out that often times now the porch comes out from the side. He thought this might be the place to reiterate the relationship to the street

Board Member Holmgren recalled language at one time that addressed a large expanse of cement before reaching the porch. Planner Grahn thought it had to do with extra wide steps. She suggested that they add language about the width of porch steps.

Planner Grahn commented on the one guideline addressing architectural features. The Board had no comments or questions.

Planner Tyler stated that they used the same guidelines for mechanical systems and utility systems that were proposed for the historic.

Planner Grahn stated that materials make or break infill construction. She noted that most of the guidelines remained, but changes were made to make sure it is more similar to historic buildings in terms of proportion, scale, types of materials. They also added language about the hierarchy.

Chair Stephens questioned the 50% recycled and/or reclaimed materials. On one hand they prohibit fiber cement board or vinyl, but it is allowed if it is 50% recycled. If traditional building materials are used correctly and with the Park City climate in mind, the natural materials will last.

Planner Grahn asked if they should remove the use of synthetic materials altogether. Director Erickson stated that they were seeing composite wood coming back or hardy board, and frames around windows where waste wood is repurposed and reprocessed, but it is a painted wood window. If the Board believes it is not an appropriate use of recycled or repurposed materials, it should not be allowed.

Chair Stephens thought they should look at this guideline with the anticipation that the Staff would be seeing a lot of new synthetic materials introduced into Old Town. Director Erickson stated that the City Council has requested that the Sustainability and Planning Departments move forward on a construction waste diversion program forward, which means that a certain proportion of construction materials on a project over a certain size need to be diverted from the landfill. In order to accomplish that, they have to have a return market. If they want to keep that return market out of the Historic District they could put it in all the other districts.

Board Member Holmgren asked if the applicants list their materials when they present plans before the Design Review Team. She asked if they could add verbiage saying that non-natural materials must be approved. Planner Grahn replied that they do not always see the materials list at the DRT meetings; but they do see them at the HDDR phase. She remarked that many times the Staff will request a material sample. Planner Tyler stated that the actual application requires a list of all the materials. She suggested putting on the application that if they intend to use a recycled material they must provide a sample. Ms. Holmgren thought they should require samples of the building product.

Board Member Scott pointed out that the intent is to allow recycled or synthetic material as long as it does not distract from the appearance of a typical material. He liked the idea of a review process of the actual material. Chair Stephens thought they should have something in the design guidelines so the architect

would know upfront, rather than always having to ask why they cannot use Trex or a certain material. He requested that the Staff look into their own procedures.

Planner Grahn commented on paint and noted that paint would not be regulated by the design colors. It is not healthy to paint brick and stone that was naturally left unpainted. The Staff has been seeing a big push for rustic unfinished wood siding. She noted that Breckenridge tried to keep it on the use of the additions and the accessory building because it was more back of house. For the front of the house and on the street, it was more traditional to see painted surfaces.

The Board had no comments or issues with the guidelines regarding paint.

Planner Tyler commented on garages. She noted that there were no garages historically, and this has been an issue with infill development. The Staff discourages two-car garages; therefore, they have had a large push for two separate single car garages located next to each other. The Staff has been challenged with how to keep the house from looking automobile oriented. Planner Tyler stated that the primary changes to the guidelines addressed the offset between two single car garages, because currently, it is not listed anywhere. They have been using an internal rules of thumb but applicants want to know where it is written. The next change is to encourage pedestrian oriented design. They address basement garages and their general compatibility with the entire site. They also wanted to talk about general site design as it relates to where the garage is located and how it is integrated.

Board Member Hewett stated that there is not street parking where she lives. She thought the City Engineering Department comes into it as well. She was comfortable with the proposed guidelines, but she thought there might be some exceptions.

Planner Grahn stated that they used the same criteria for decks as the historic residential. The intent is to make sure that decks are not the prominent feature. The same applies to balconies and roof decks.

Planner Tyler stated that currently there were no guidelines to address new accessory structures. They wanted to talk about general compatibility and how it relates to location and site orientation, as well as the mass and scale of individual accessory structures so they do not overwhelm the district and the site.

Planner Grahn stated that another issue without guidelines are houses from the 1980s and 1990s where the owner would like to add an addition. The question is how to accommodate the addition. She introduced guidelines that echoed what was in the rest of the chapter.

Planner Grahn commented on reconstruction of non-surviving structures. She noted that it was already in the guidelines and they only changed the “should” to “shall”. They wanted to make sure it was a documented structure and not something that somebody had a whim to rebuild.

Planner Tyler commented on sidebars. The HPB had reviewed this as part of the historic piece. The only thing added was general compatibility with the District for new construction and retaining walls for new infill.

The Board had no further questions or comments.

Planner Grahn requested that the Board continue this item to June 7th. They would come back with the revisions and additional information on some of the items that were discussed this evening.

Chair Stephens opened the public hearing.

Ruth Meintsma stated that she would submit her comments in writing.

Planner Tyler noted that Ms. Meintsma’s written comments would be included in the Staff report for the next meeting.

Cindy Matsumoto referred to a picture sample of a front porch with a flat roof. She did not believe they should use that photo in the guidelines since they are not allowing flat roofs in the front.

Chair Stephens closed the public hearing.

MOTION: Board Member Holmgren moved to CONTINUE the Design Guidelines to June 7, 2017. Board Member Beatlebrox seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

WORK SESSION

The Board moved into Work Session for the Historic District Grant Program Policy Discussion.

Planner Grahn provide a brief history of the grant program. It started in the 1980s and it was revised in 2015 due to changes in the government accounting rules. After realizing they had not worked out all the kinks, they hired a consultant to help regroup and restructure the grant program.

Planner Grahn had two questions for the Board. Is the purpose of the Historic District Grant to preserve the historic structures in Old Town; or whether the program is more to address social issues such as incentivizing primary homeownership in Old Town.

Board Member Hewett thought the purpose should be to maintain historic structures.

Board Member Beatlebrox asked if it had to be either/or, or if they could have both goals. She thought both were very good goals.

Board Member Holmgren agreed that it should be both goals.

Board Member Scott thought the challenge was how to apply grant money to keep more people here. However, he agreed that both goals were important.

Board Member Holmgren stated that with preserving and not being primary residents, there should be some kind of criteria.

Planner Grahn stated that if the goal is to address some of the social issues in Old Town, the criteria might be structured such that more grant money is awarded to a primary owner versus a secondary homeowner. The Staff would work on the criteria, but they would like the Board to help with the goals of the Historic District Grant Program.

Director Erickson suggested that they could look at a Phase 2 of starting a revolving loan program for permanent residences. In order to encourage permanent residency and to keep the house sizes correct, the revolving loan fund may be more appropriate. Chair Stephens thought it made more sense. Board Member Holmgren liked the idea.

Chair Stephens did not think they should deal with the social issues at all because it would create problems. He believed they were beyond preserving historic buildings and structures. When the program first started the intent was to preserve them to make sure they did not deteriorate through neglect. However, based on a previous discussion, the intent now is to use the grant money to elevate preservation. They were already asking for preservation to be a certain level, and they should not be compensating people for something they should be doing and knew they needed to do it when they purchased the home. Chair Stephens thought the question was how to elevate the level of historic restoration past the guidelines they already have, and incentivize people to go the extra step to come up with a more accurate restoration of the home. In the case of homes that were done in 2000 and were coming back for more restoration, if they could encourage that kind of a property to be elevated up to something in line with National Park Service Guidelines for Historic Restoration on the Exterior, the

Historic Preservation Board Meeting
April 5, 2017

money could be well-spent and more easily monitored. More importantly, it would address a social issue because a better restoration would be a community benefit and an example for other properties. Board Member Hewett agreed.

Director Erickson stated that the consultant had interviewed Sandra Morrison, members of the public, architects, contractors and others. Planner Grahn noted that the consultant was given a wide spectrum to get good feedback and understand the over-arching themes and concerns that people have with the Historic District Grant Program. The consultant planned to come back the end of April to meet with the Staff to see figure out how the program will function. It would eventually be presented to the HPB for review and discussion before it goes to the City Council.

Board Member Holmgren asked if it was for residential or commercial. Planner Grahn replied that it was both.

The meeting adjourned at 7:04 p.m.

Approved by _____
Stephen Douglas, Chair
Historic Preservation Board