

PARK CITY MUNICIPAL CORPORATION
HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD
MINUTES OF August 1, 2018

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

EX OFFICIO: Bruce Erickson, Anya Grahn, Polly Samuels McLean, Liz Jackson

ROLL CALL

Chair Stephens called the meeting to order at 5:02 p.m. and noted that all Board Members were present.

ADOPTION OF MINUTES

May 16, 2018

Chair Stephens referred to the signature line on the last page of the Minutes and changed Stephen Douglas to correctly read Douglas Stephens.

MOTION: Board Member Holmgren moved to APPROVE the minutes of May 16, 2018 as amended. Board Member Hutchings seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS

There were no comments.

STAFF/BOARD COMMUNICATIONS AND DISCLOSURES

Planner Grahn reported that the next regularly scheduled HPB meeting would be on Wednesday, September 5th. However, because that date is close to Labor Day the meeting was re-scheduled to Wednesday, September 19th. The Planning Department would send reminders to the Board.

Planner Grahn reported that prior to this meeting, the HPB held a site visit at 227 Main Street, the Star Hotel at 4:30 p.m. The Board went through the building and looked at the foundation and stones, and how the building was constructed on the lower. Some of the Board members went upstairs and toured the entire building. They were able to see the different eras of construction.

Board Member Hutchings disclosed that Brian Brassey, the contractor on the Star Hotel, was also the contractor for his house project at 943 Park Avenue;

however, he did not believe that would affect his ability to render a fair decision on the Star Hotel item on the agenda this evening.

REGULAR AGENDA – Discussion, Public Hearing and Possible Action

1. 664 Woodside Avenue (also known as 672 Woodside Avenue) –Historic District Design Review – Material Deconstruction on Significant Site. The applicant is proposing material deconstruction of the non-historic roof structure on the garage and the c.1900 roof structure of the house.
(Application PL-15-03046)

Planner Grahn reported that the HPB reviewed and approved the Material Deconstruction on this house nearly a year ago. As the contractor began working on the house they realized that the roof framing was significantly deteriorated. Planner Grahn stated that typically it is easy to sister new members to a gable roof because of the trusses. However, the way the trusses were cut and not well attached to other structural members, the roof is failing and creating a dangerous situation. The garage roof is in a similar condition.

Planner Grahn was prepared to answer specific questions. The Contractor and the Architect were also present to answer questions.

The Staff requested that the HPB approve only the material deconstruction to reconstruct the roof of both the house and the garage.

Chair Stephens commented on the HDDR process and asked whether the underside of the porch would look the same as it does now. Jonathan DeGray, the project architect, answered yes. Chair Stephens clarified that his question was primarily for the benefit of the Design Review Team, because it was not part of what the HPB was considering this evening. Mr. DeGray stated that it would be exposed boards with a T & G planking. It will not have the structurally unsound split connection that it has now.

Board Member Holmgren asked why the site had two address numbers. Planner Grahn explained that the historic house has always been on the 664 Woodside Avenue lot. Another lot to the north adjacent to the Tram tower would have been 672 Woodside. When a plat amendment was done to combine the two lots, 672 Woodside was chosen as the new address.

Chair Stephens opened the public hearing.

There were no comments.

Chair Stephens closed the public hearing.

MOTION: Board Member Scott moved to APPROVE the material deconstruction of non-historic and non-contributory materials at 664/672 Woodside Avenue, pursuant to the Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Conditions of Approval. Board Member Holmgren seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

Findings of Fact – 664/672 Woodside Avenue

1. The property is located at 664 Woodside Avenue, sometimes referred to 672 Woodside Avenue.
2. The site is designated as Significant on the Historic Sites Inventory.
3. Based on Sanborn Fire Insurance map analysis, the house was likely constructed c.1885 by Caroline K. Snyder. After her death, her son Frank Snyder constructed a gable addition to the north, converting the house from a hall-parlor to a cross-wing or a T-Cottage by Addition. It is unknown whether the original one-story dwelling depicted in the 1889 Sanborn map was demolished and replaced by a cross-wing house in 1900 or if the cross-wing form was created by an addition.
4. The “T-cottage by addition” was created by adding a cross-wing to one end of the rectangular cabin. The T-shape or cross-wing cottage was a popular house form in Park City during the 1880s and 1890s.
5. By 1929, the porch was extended to wrap-around to the east (rear) elevation of the structure and a new concrete block foundation was constructed along the north elevation.
6. The house remained largely unchanged in the 1941 Sanborn Map.
7. On September 7, 2016, the Planning Department received a Historic District Design Review (HDDR) application for the renovation of the historic house and construction of an addition to its north; the application was deemed complete on September 26, 2016. The HDDR application is still under review by the Planning Department.
8. On December 7, 2016, the Historic Preservation Board (HPB) approved the Material Deconstruction associated with the renovation of the historic house and historic garage.
9. On May 31, 2018, the Chief Building Official and Historic Preservation Planner met with the contractor and architect on-site to discuss the existing roof structures on the house and garage.
10. The applicant received approval to remove the existing standing seam metal roof, replace it with asphalt shingles, and construct two (2) new dormers from the HPB on December 7, 2016. The applicant is now proposing to remove the existing c.1885 and c.1900 roof structures on the historic house and reconstruct the roof structure. The existing roof structure consists of rafters that were toenailed to the wall structure with minimal nailing and then trimmed to cantilever

outside of the roof structure to support the overhang. The proposed material deconstruction to reconstruct the house roof is necessary to rehabilitate the house.

11. A similar method of construction was used to build the wraparound porch. The structural members are not sufficiently tied into the wall structure and are not sufficient to carry the loads of the roof. The applicant braced the existing porch roof and temporarily lifted it with the house when the foundation was poured. The applicant proposes to reconstruct the porch roof due to its poor structure. The proposed material deconstruction to reconstruct the porch is necessary to restore this detail and rehabilitate the historic house.

12. Portions of the garage appear to have been reconstructed over the last 50 years and are not historic. The existing roof structure of the garage consists of contemporary framing and plywood sheathing. The applicant proposes to remove the existing north and south sides of the gable roof and rebuild it. The proposed material deconstruct is necessary to rehabilitate the historic garage structure.

Conclusions of Law – 664/672 Woodside Avenue

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

Conditions of Approval – 664/672 Woodside Avenue

1. Final building plans and construction details shall reflect substantial compliance with the HDDR proposal stamped in on November 16, 2016. 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 update the façade easement to reflect the conditions of the historic house following the rehabilitation to the satisfaction of the grantee. The updated façade easement shall be recorded at the Summit County Recorder's Office.

4. The applicant shall comply with all previous Conditions of Approval outlined in the HPB's approval for the Material Deconstruction on December 7, 2016, as well as the approved HDDR dated February 9, 2017.

2. 227 Main Street – HDDR Material Deconstruction and Reconstruction –
The applicant is proposing to reconstruct the historic boarding house

designated as “Significant” on the City’s Historic Sites Inventory. In addition the applicant will be removing the existing c.1920 retaining and post-1976 retaining walls; c. 1889, c.1920, and 1976-1977 roof structures, non-historic asphalt and corrugated metal roofing materials; c.1920 brick chimney; c. 1889 wood drop novelty siding and wall structures, c.1920 stucco and wall structures, and 1976-1977 framed walls and wood paneling; c.1920 and 1976 enclosed piazza; c.1920 and contemporary doors units; and c.1889 double-hung wood window, c.1920 wood casement windows, 1976 picture windows, and contemporary aluminum and vinyl window units. (Application PL-17-03430)

Planner Grahn stated that based on their previous discussions, she assumed the HPB was familiar with the development history of the site.

Planner Grahn summarized that originally there was a historic cross-wing house on the site. Around 1920 the house was expanded to create the Star Hotel building that exists today. Additions were added to the front of the building and also towards the back. Planner Grahn pointed out that the structure was built in three eras and three different sections. She presented a color coded slide of the structure. The orange reflected the original parts of the cross-wing house. Highlighted in purple were some of the original roof forms that are hidden behind the Star Hotel. She believed those forms were added in the 1920s. Planner Grahn reported that the structure was renovated again in the 1970s by the Rixies. They reconstructed the front of the building and changed the window openings. The building originally had Spanish revival arches with columns. The Rixies changed the form, but decided to keep part of the oval. The areas on the top that were outdoor porches were enclosed to create habitable space.

Planner Grahn remarked that a number of changes were made to this building and they were all tacked on to each other. During the site visit the Board could see evidence of the different eras of construction.

Planner Grahn stated that the applicant was asking to reconstruct the historic building. The first criteria is whether or not the building has been deemed to be hazardous or dangerous per the International Building Code. Planner Grahn remarked that in 2015 the Building Department issued a Notice and Order. The Staff report contained a list of all the related issues.

Planner Grahn stated that in her opinion, the foundation was not built to be a foundation. She believed it was a retaining wall for the historic house, and a new addition was placed on top. For that reason, the foundation drifts off and gets lost in the hillside. It is not continuous under the building. As utility lines and other infrastructure were added, they were shoved up against the dirt and the back of the hillside. They were exposed to dampness

which caused them to decay. As the structure started to settle, shims and other material were used to level parts of the foundation. However, the fixes were haphazard and not continuous which caused additional structural issues.

Planner Grahn did not believe the building could be made safe and serviceable through repair. Because of the way the structure was built and because the different eras of construction have their own structural system, the building is settling at different rates which contributes to its overall instability.

Planner Grahn stated that the last criteria is whether or not the building will be reconstructed. The Staff was proposing a version of a façade-ectomy. She used the ZCMI façade at City Creek Mall in Salt Lake as an example. The façade is only the front wall and the rest of the building was replaced with new construction. Planner Grahn had highlighted in red the piece that would be preserved for the Star Hotel building, which is the 1920 addition that created the Star Hotel. The applicant would save it beyond the chimney, which is where the historic house would have started. Planner Grahn remarked that the applicant's proposal goes above and beyond a façade-ectomy, because in addition to saving the front wall, they were recreating the original piazza and the side elevations of that addition.

The Staff found that the proposal complies with all the requirements of the reconstruction.

Planner Grahn reviewed a number of typical site improvements, which included stone retaining walls. Some would be removed and others would be reconstructed with salvaged stone to recreate the look shown in the historic photographs.

Planner Grahn reiterated that three different structural systems need to be addressed. Therefore, reconstruction is the most plausible way to address that issue and achieve a building that meets Code and is no longer hazardous and dangerous.

Planner Grahn pointed out that the roof was also built in three different forms. The chimney is historic and the Staff believes it belongs to the Star Hotel period. It was originally used for a boiler, but it has since been closed off and not used. The applicant was proposing to salvage all the chimney bricks. If possible, the applicant would like to move the chimney in pieces and reconstruct it. If that is not possible, some reconstruction might be necessary. Planner Grahn had added conditions of approval to make sure the historic bricks go towards the Main Street façade, and that any new bricks be oriented towards the backyard.

Planner Grahn stated that the exterior walls are stucco, which started with the 1920 Star Hotel Spanish Revival style. In some places stucco was used to cover

up the original gables of the cross-wing house. In other places drop-novelty siding was placed on the building. It is a hodge-podge of different materials. Planner Grahn believed the Rixies came back in the 1970's and added another layer of new stucco. As the building settles and the different structures pull apart there are cracks and the stucco is delaminating due to moisture and other issues that need to be address. The applicant was proposing to stucco the exterior in an effort to recreate and reconstruct the original look of the building.

Planner Grahn presented images showing the 1970s addition, the cross-wing house, and the hip roof of the Star Hotel. She presented a black and white photo of how the building originally looked, and identified the areas that the applicant was proposing to reconstruct. The carriage doors on the lower level were filled in and those were used to create a commercial façade with a storefront window and a pedestrian entrance. The applicant was proposing to reconstruct these doors. She presented an image of the reconstruction. The Staff recommended that the applicant replicate the doors but put glass on the top half to allow for light and commercial activity inside. The applicant was also proposing to salvage and reinstall an inverted bay that was possibly original to the building.

Planner Grahn remarked that the windows were also a hodgepodge. The windows outlined in orange were wood double-hung windows original to the cross-wing house. The windows outlined in purple were a combination of wood, aluminum, and vinyl sliders that had been replaced over time. The 1970s windows were highlighted in green and reflected the windows the Rixies installed. The applicant was proposing to restore and maintain the original window configuration on the Star Hotel portion of the building, and to reconstruct it accurately. The applicant was proposing to change the windows beyond the chimney to allow more light into the back rooms. The Staff found this to be appropriate because it is beyond the mid-point and would not be visible from the Main Street right-of-way.

Board Member Scott was pleased that this project was before the HPB because they have watched this building deteriorate. He believes that historic buildings and the community deserve better, and he thanked the applicant for getting involved with this project. Mr. Scott stated that he walked through the building it was difficult to find anything historic that was still valuable. He found the radiators on the inside to be the most interesting, but he was unsure whether they had any value.

Brian Markkanen with Elliott Workgroup, stated that they were shown different types and styles of windows throughout. He was pleased that the window structures were staying on the front portion, but beyond that it was hard to connect many dots inside the structure.

Chair Stephens commented on the number of additions from different periods. However, in terms of restoration, he believed there were real challenges with regards to building materials. He gave several examples and asked the Design Review Team to look at that closely in the process of replication. Chair Stephens anticipated a lot of public comment on this building as it is torn down and rebuilt. He stressed the importance of having an accurate reproduction of the 1930s Spanish Revival. He asked if there was enough photographic evidence that show the smaller details. Mr. Markkanen replied that the previous owner had done a lot of photographic documentation. There were several folders on the survey that were not included in the Staff report. He explained that the front façade is supposedly 1970's construction. The previous owner surmised that the original façade was ripped down entirely and rebuilt with modern materials. They were recreating towards the historic photograph and match as much as possible combined with modern construction materials and methodologies to recreate the building as best as possible. There would also be a lot of documentation during deconstruction that they will refer to and match in the reconstruction.

Chair Stephens thought the process of deconstruction would be telling. He disagreed with the previous owner that the front façade was torn down and rebuilt; but he thought it would become more obvious once they start tearing the structure apart.

Chair Stephens did not have any issues with what the Board was being asked to determine this evening. He anticipated a lot of work and inspections on the part of the Staff, and encouraged them to accurately document throughout the process. If the HPB approves this request and the deconstruction begins, he asked that the Staff keep the Board informed so they can communicate with the public.

Board Member Holmgren pointed out that the only other stucco building on Main Street is Java Cow, which has the old stucco. She urged the Design Review Team to address the stucco. Planner Grahn asked if the Board preferred to add a condition of approval stating that the new stucco shall match the material composition and texture of the historic stucco. The Board members favored adding that condition of approval.

Mr. Markkanen was not opposed to the condition; however, they are subject to the methodologies and technologies of today's construction. If there is a blend of what was put on the exteriors historically with the materials used today that will last longer and cause less maintenance for the owner and the integrity of the structure, that material would be appropriate to use. Planner Grahn suggested that the condition should say material and texture. She believed the texture would help keep the same look. Mr. Markkanen pointed out that there may be Code issues with only laying plaster on a building. He requested that they be given some flexibility.

Chair Stephens preferred to leave approval to the Design Review Team so they could work with different samples and types of materials. He thought there might be other technologies where different stucco systems might be used. He believed the applicant and Staff needed to do extensive research to determine what material might be successful for the Design Review Team to approve.

Chair Stephens opened the public hearing.

There were no comments.

Chair Stephens closed the public hearing.

Director Erickson asked whether the Board wanted to add the condition of approval. He suggested that the language could be softened to say that the Planning Director and the Historic Preservation Planner approve the final selection of materials. Chair Stephens preferred that condition as opposed to being more specific.

Director Erickson drafted the proposed condition to read, "The Planning Director and Historic Preservation Planner shall approve the final material consistency and application techniques of the exterior stucco."

MOTION: Board Member Hutchings moved to APPROVE the Reconstruction and Material Deconstruction of the Significant structure at 227 Main Street, based on the Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Conditions of Approval as amended. Board Member Scott seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

Findings of Fact – 227 Main Street

Finding of Fact:

1. The site at 227 Main Street is located in the Historic Commercial Business (HCB) Zoning District.
2. The site has been designated as "Significant" on the City's Historic Sites Inventory (HSI) and includes a historic boarding house structure.
3. Sarah and John Huy constructed a simple, wood-frame cross-wing house c.1889 and this house is depicted on the 1889, 1900, and 1907 Sanborn Fire Insurance maps.
4. The c.1900 photograph of the house shows a simple cross-wing with projecting gable end on the south side. It had a decorative wood porch, simple two-over-two double-hung windows and a stacked stone retaining wall along Main Street.
5. In 1902, Sarah Huy sold the house to D.L.H.D. "Joe" Grover in 1920.

6. The Summit County Recorder's Office notes the date of construction of the Star Hotel building as c.1920. It is believed that the Spanish Revival addition to the front (east elevation) of the c.1889 cross-wing house was constructed at this time by Frank Allende, an immigrant from Spain. The 1929 Sanborn Map shows a boarding house and the 1930 census shows 11 boarders at the boarding house.

7. In 1975, the Rixies purchased the site. The following year, they completed a façade renovation to convert the two-story piazza to enclosed space. The stone foundation and staircase on the south side of the building were covered with stucco. Between 1976 and 1977, they constructed a fourth floor addition above the roof of the c.1889 cross wing house. Window and door openings were also altered during this period.

8. On November 2, 2016, the Historic Preservation Board (HPB) reviewed a Determination of Significance (DOS) application and found that the site should remain designated as Significant on the Historic Sites Inventory. Then-owner Westlake Lands, LLC appealed this determination to the Board of Adjustment (BOA). The BOA reviewed and denied the appeal of the DOS on February 21, 2017 and upheld the HPB's determination.

9. On May 2, 2017, Westlake Lands LLC submitted a Historic District Design Review (HDDR) application; the HDDR application was deemed complete on May 23, 2017.

10. On July 6, 2017, the Planning Director found that no payments were made for the Main Street Off-Street Parking Special Improvement District, thus Westlake Lands, LLC did not qualify for the parking exemption outlined in Land Management Code 15-2.6-9(D). The applicant is responsible for providing parking at a rate of 6 spaces/1,000 square feet of new construction.

11. On August 23, 2017, the Planning Commission reviewed and denied the appeal of the Planning Director's determination that the proposed project did not qualify for the parking exception outlined in LMC 15-2.6-9(D) upholding the Planning Director's determination.

12. The proposal complies with LMC 15-11-15(A) Criteria for Reconstruction of the Historic Building(s) and/or Structure(s) on a Significant Site:

a. On October 14, 2015, the Park City Building Department recorded a Notice and Order to Repair the property at 227 Main Street due to the building being unsafe for human occupancy and a health, life, safety concern for the public. The Notice and Order outlines issues such as water damage, structural instability, decaying water lines, drainage issues, hazardous gas lines, and fire dangers.

b. As existing, the Historic Building cannot be made safe and/or serviceable through repair. The structures of the c.1920 and 1976-1977 additions are not properly tied into the original c.1889 structure, causing the building to settle at different rates and pull apart. The existing structure sits on an inadequate stone foundation that disappears into the hillside. New supports and shims have been haphazardly added to stabilize and strengthen the structure; however, these new supports and shims were

often installed directly on the dirt or rubble stone causing them to rot and fail. There are also decades of heating, water, gas lines and electrical wiring running throughout the building that pose additional health and safety concerns due to their deteriorated state, exposure to moisture, and installation methods.

c. The form, features, detailing, placement, orientation and location of the Historic Building(s) and/or Structure(s) will be accurately depicted, by means of new construction, based on as-built measured drawings, historical records, and/or current or Historic photographs. The applicant proposes to complete a façade-ectomy and only reconstruct the c.1920 Spanish Revival addition based on historic photographs and physical evidence.

13. The proposal complies with LMC 15-11-15(B) Procedure for the Reconstruction of the Historic Building on a Significant Site as the Historic Preservation Board reviewed the reconstruction request on July 18, 2018.

14. The proposal complies with LMC 15-11-12.5 Historic Preservation Board Review for Material Deconstruction.

15. The applicant is proposing to remove c.1920 stacked stone retaining walls on the south side of the façade and the post-1976 stacked stone retaining wall on the north side of the facade. The applicant is proposing to reconstruct these retaining walls due to the extent of the excavation needed on the site and the need to construct an engineered, reinforced masonry wall. The proposed material deconstruction of the stone wall on the southeast corner of the site is necessary for its reconstruction. The demolition of the post-1976 stacked stone retaining wall will mitigate any impacts on the visual character of the neighborhood and will not impact the architectural integrity of the building on this site.

16. There are several stacked stone retaining walls in the backyard. The applicant is proposing to demolish these walls as part of the site's excavation and construction of a new addition. The proposed material deconstruction will mitigate any impacts on the visual character of the neighborhood as these walls are not visible from the Main Street right-of-way, and the demolition of these walls will not impact the architectural integrity of the building on this site.

17. The applicant proposes to salvage stones from the deconstructed retaining walls and reuse these to construct new retaining walls and the foundation of the building.

18. The building was constructed in three distinct phases: c.1889, c.1920, and then 1976-1977. Because the different structural components and building methods differ between the sections of this building, they are not properly tied into each other. This has caused the different sections of the building to settle at different rates and at times, even pull away from each other. The lack of foundation beneath the entire structure has caused additional problems. The applicant proposes to reconstruct the building. The proposed material deconstruction is necessary in order to restore and reconstruct the Spanish Revival addition.

19. There are three separate roof forms that have been constructed to cover this building: the original gable roof forms of the c.1889 cross-wing house; the shallow hip roof of the c.1920 Spanish Revival addition with a flat roof above the piazza; and a 1976-1977 fourth floor addition with a nearly flat roof. The applicant is proposing to reconstruct the shallow hip roof of the Spanish Revival addition. The proposed material deconstruction is necessary in order to restore the original shallow pitch roof form.

20. The brick chimney on the south elevation was constructed c.1920. The chimney has been retrofitted with a contemporary metal chimney flue. The chimney is in fair condition and is constructed of unreinforced masonry. The applicant is proposing to dismantle the chimney and reuse any salvageable bricks to reconstruct it. The applicant has proposed to prioritize the use of the historic bricks on the chimney's east side, visible from the Main Street right-of-way.

21. The foundation level of the building consists of thick, stacked stone walls, covered by stucco in 1976. The two-story piazza was remodeled in c.1976 and contains c.1920 and contemporary framing and stucco materials. The Spanish Revival addition was built c.1920 and consists of framed walls covered by chicken wire and stucco. The c.1889 historic house has framed walls consistent with their era of construction. The wood siding on the historic house has been covered with stucco to match the rest of the building. A contemporary addition was constructed above the c.1889 gable roof to create a fourth story in 1976-1977. The age of the building, deferred maintenance and shoddy repairs, and structural defects have led to concerns about the structural stability of the building.

22. The stucco on the exterior walls is in fair condition, with minor cracks and peeling. The most significant cracks are indicative of where the building is heaving outward due to its poor structural capacity, disconnected structural members, and/or weather damage.

23. The applicant is proposing to reconstruct the Spanish Revival façade. They propose to salvage the existing stones to use as a veneer on the new foundation. The proposed material reconstruction is necessary in order to restore the façade of the c.1920 Star Hotel.

24. The c.1920 facade of the two-story piazza was altered in 1976 to enclose this space. The arched openings on the second floor and rectangular openings of the third floor were altered in order to install new arched and rectangular picture openings. The applicant proposes to demolish the existing piazza and reconstruct it. The proposed material deconstruction is needed in order to reconstruct and restore the original appearance of the façade.

25. There are only three original door openings on the façade—an inverse bay with divided light door and sidelights on the second level and two entry door openings on the third level. The inverse bay door is likely historic, but the other window units are not will be replaced with French doors. On the foundation level, the applicant proposes to remove the c.1976 wall framing to restore the original carriage door openings seen in the c.1940 tax photograph. Contemporary service

doors are located on the west elevation. The proposed material deconstruction of the c.1976 doors, reconstruction of the carriage doors, and restoration of the inverse bay door unit are necessary to restore the original door configuration. The doors on the west elevation have been found to be non-contributory to the historic integrity and historical significance of the structure.

26. There are several eras of windows on this structure: c.1889 one-over-one, double-hung wood windows; c.1920 wood casement windows; c.1976 aluminum slider and picture windows; and contemporary vinyl replacement windows. The c.1889 and c.1920 windows are in fair and poor condition. The applicant is proposing to replace the windows in-kind on the reconstructed building. The material deconstruction is necessary in order to restore the original window openings and window types.

27. On the south elevation, an existing casement window will be replaced with a new double-hung window matching the one on the floor above. Modifying the existing casement window to a larger double-hung window is appropriate as the window opening is not visible from the street and the proposed exterior change will not damage or destroy the exterior architectural features of the subject property that are compatible with the character of the historic site.

Conclusions of Law - 227 Main Street

1. The proposal complies with the Land Management Code requirements pursuant to the HCB District and regarding material deconstruction.
2. The proposal complies with Land Management Code 15-11-15 Reconstruction of an Existing Historic Building or Historic Structure.

Conditions of Approval - 227 Main Street

1. Final building plans and construction details shall reflect substantial compliance with the HDDR proposal stamped in on May 23, 2018. Any changes, modifications, or deviations from the approved design that have not been approved by the Planning and Building Departments may result in a stop work order.
2. The applicant shall salvage rocks from the existing rock wall. These rocks shall then be reused on the site to construct any new retaining walls. If constructing an engineered retaining wall is necessary, the rocks can be used as a faux veneer over the concrete retaining wall.
3. The applicant shall accurately reconstruct the chimney in order to duplicate the original in design, location, dimension, texture, material, and finish.
4. Any new bricks used to reconstruct the chimney shall match the original bricks in all respects: scale, dimension, texture, profile, material, and finish. Special attention shall be paid to the type of mortar used to reconstruct the chimney to prevent damage to the historic bricks.
5. 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.

6. Should the applicant uncover historic window and door openings that were not documented at the time of the Historic Preservation Board's review, the applicant shall schedule a site visit with the Planning Department and determine if the window or door opening should be restored. Any physical evidence of lost historic window and door openings shall be documented to the satisfaction of the Preservation Planner, regardless of plans for restoration.

7. The Planning Director and Historic Preservation Planner shall approve the final material consistency and application techniques of the exterior stucco.

WORK SESSION – Historic District Grant Program

Planner Grahn assumed that the Board members had read the Staff report and the report from the Consultants. Based on the Consultant's report, Planner Grahn outlined the following To Do List: Establish target outcome; Develop a Mission Statement; Create a revised list of improvements; Create application deadlines; Develop a scorecard to rank the applications; Identify program funding sources and level; and Improve public engagement.

Recognizing that time would not permit addressing all the items this evening, Planner Grahn had broken the discussions into two or more work sessions. She requested that the Board address the first three items this evening.

Planner Grahn noted that the first item was to develop a Mission Statement. She read a mission statement proposed by the Staff as follows:

Park City is committed to creating an affordable, socially equitable, and complete community that honors its past by maintaining its historic buildings and structures while encouraging the adaptive reuse of historic buildings. The Historic District Grant program seeks to make a meaningful contribution to building community identity, improving public awareness of local history, and supporting local residents and businesses by financially incentivizing the preservation and emergency repair of historic sites and structures designated on the Historic Sites Inventory.

Planner Grahn asked the HPB for comments or suggestions related to the proposed mission statement.

Board Member Scott referred to the line, "...honors its past by maintaining its historic buildings" and suggested that they say "preserving and maintaining its historic buildings".

Board Member Hodgkins understood that the Mission Statement was from the City and not necessarily from the Historic Preservation Board. He asked if they were trying to match a grant program to meet the Mission Statement; or whether they were developing a Mission Statement along with the Grant Program. Planner Grahn replied that it was both. The idea is to develop a Mission Statement to figure out the overarching goals. The HPB and City Council will actually create the Grant Program. Planner Grahn explained that after the work session discussions are completed, a resolution will be developed on establishing the Grant Program and how it will function. The HPB will review the resolution and make a recommendation to the City Council.

Board Member Hutchings recalled reading that the Grant Program would only be available for primary owners and not second homeowners. Planner Grahn stated that limiting to primary owners was considered the last time the Grant Program was revised. The goal was to help primary residents, but the HPB ultimately decided that historic resources were more important than the ownership. If language referring to primary ownership was included in the Staff report it was done so inadvertently.

Board Member Beatlebrox suggested that the scoring could weight ownership or take it into consideration. Planner Grahn stated that the City Council and the HPB gave the consultant feedback on possibly using the Grant Program to incentivize affordable housing and helping primary residents remain in the District. However, she did not believe that was the sole goal. Board Member Hutchings clarified that it was a goal but not a requirement. Planner Grahn answered yes. It is one of the many goals for the program.

Board Member Scott read from page 187 of the Staff report, "Applicant to be a primary resident or use the building for a rental to primary residents". Planner Grahn recalled that the language was intended for emergency grant funds only. She offered to relook at the language.

The Board was comfortable with the Mission Statement as proposed by Staff and amended by Board Member Scott.

Board Member Hutchings asked what "socially equitable" referred to. Planner Grahn explained that the City was trying to create more social equity, and the goal for social equity is part of a complete community. They want to make sure that everyone feels welcome.

Director Erickson noted that the City imposes rigorous restrictions on historic homeowners. In an effort to equalize, the City offers the historic grant program to lessen some of the burdens that are placed on the owners of historic properties. It is also offered to encourage additional enhancements in the Historic District that allows more people to understand the Historic District. Director Erickson

remarked that the City Council will deal with other matters as a result of social equity. Director Erickson wished more could be done with the grant money that is available. Planner Grahn noted that the HPB would discuss funding at the next work session. She pointed out that the decisions will have to be rigorous because they are talking about a \$50,000 fund.

Chair Stephens stated that when they begin to judge the financial incentives, the Board will be judging financial incentives against actual available funds. If there is not enough financial incentive, it could be a waste of Staff time. Chair Stephens remarked that aside from the incentive and dollar amount, it is also about what is occurring financially within the Historic District. They will be looking at the number of homeowners coming forward to restore their house. He noted that recently, when homeowners come to the HPB for a determination on historic or non-historic and what they are allowed to do with their house, it is not uncommon for those homes to go up for sale after the HPB has made its decision.

Director Erickson stated that emergency funds are too small to make a difference, but the larger grants are more competitive. He suggested that they could require a mandatory time to reside in the structure if grant money is awarded to make sure someone does not flip the house on City money. Director Erickson stated that the plan is to follow the Mission Statement, use the money wisely, increase the visibility of the program, and work with the City Council in the CIP program to get more funding if they can demonstrate success.

Chair Stephens thought it was important to be aware of what was happening in the marketplace in Old Town. A program on paper looks good, but they cannot do it in a vacuum. In order for the program to be successful, it has to address the real needs of the property owners. At that point they can go back and grow the program financially. Director Erickson noted that some of the money could go to mine sites, which is also part of increasing the visibility of the program.

Planner Grahn stated that this would not be an easy task with the limited amount of funds available. The most is \$50,000 and the least is \$30,000 from the different RDAs. The HPB will need to weigh the grant applications and decide who gets what amount. It will not be a first come/first served program like it was in the past. The Board will need to be rigorous and try to make a difference.

Board Member Hutchings asked if the preservation easement was still part of the program. Planner Grahn stated that they still needed to work with the Legal and Budget Departments, but he assumed they would keep with the easement. Whether or not it is applied to both grant programs is an internal discussion that needs to occur to determine the best alternative.

Board Member Holmgren recalled that previously if an owner was awarded a grant they needed to stay in the home for at least five years. Planner Grahn stated that prior to the 2015 revision, the Grant Program would pay the homeowner, and if they sold the house within five years they owed a prorated amount of the grant back to the City. Eventually, the City decided that it was not a good approach because owners were forgetting to notify the City when their five years were up, and the City was not tracking it. When the properties were put up for sale, the Staff had to go back and research whether the work was maintained. The City came up with the façade easement program, which is fairly consistent with how other preservation non-profit works. If the City awards funds, it gets a façade easement in return. It was a better way to protect the buildings in perpetuity and in the long term. Planner Grahn suggested that this Board could discuss it further at another work session.

Board Member Hodgkins understood the reason for the easement, but he did not believe it addressed the flipping of using City money to make a profit. Mr. Hodgkins fully supported the easement and he believed it should be done regardless. However, he asked if they could consider having it be a loan that is converted to a grant after a period of time.

Assistant City Attorney McLean stated that when she started with the City, and up until four years ago, the Grant Program was such that when money was awarded people would sign a financial guarantee in which they promised to return the money. If they sold the home within one year they needed to return 100% to the City. Two years was 80%. Three was 60%; up to five years. The owner needed to keep the house for five years if they wanted to keep the full grant amount. Ms. McLean remarked that over her years with the City a couple of homes did flip and the money was returned to the City at closing.

Chair Stephens recalled that it was a trust deed that was recorded on the property. Therefore, the property could not be sold without notifying the City. Ms. McLean agreed.

Assistant City Attorney McLean explained that when the City Council relooked at the program, they didn't care that much about flipping because the priority was preservation of the home. Planner Grahn recalled that they also looked at it from the standpoint that the City was purchasing the façade easement with the grant funds. Regardless of the owner or how quickly it was sold, the City was getting something in return that would last.

Board Member Hodgkins questioned whether "affordable" should be included in the Mission Statement. Flipping versus making homeownership affordable so people can live in town are two different issues.

Board Member Hutchings stated that when his house was up for a grant, the preservation easement was an option. He had contacted several local realtors to evaluate whether the encumbrance of the easement would affect his ability to sell his house. The consensus opinion was yes it would be a significant encumbrance that might deter a potential buyer. Mr. Hutchings noted that for that reason he ultimately did not accept the grant.

Board Member Hodgkins noted that currently, the owner would need permission from the City to tear it down a historic home. The LMC is set up to give the HPB some say as to whether or not the home could come down. Mr. Hodgkins was not sure that the easement is the deterrent that it once was. Planner Grahn remarked that the only additional steps with an easement is that because the City Council holds the easement, they have to make sure that the work is consistent. For example, on 664 Woodside, because there was a façade easement on that property, the Staff needed to give the City Council an update. Planner Grahn agreed that whether or not there is an easement on the property, the LMC and the Design Guidelines treat everyone the same through the process.

Planner Grahn stated that given the small amounts of funding, aside from the easement the owner would need to be desperate for the funding to go through the effort of the process. It would not be worth it to someone who intends to flip the house.

Assistant City Attorney McLean stated that the Legal Department has strongly recommended the façade easement as a requirement when awarding a grant. While the City has a robust program, they are constantly threatened by State legislative mandates. It is possible that years in the future the State Legislature could obliterate their historic preservation program.

Board Member Hodgkins thought the program should be put into some kind of perpetuity. He was not opposed to the facade easement, but he was not sure that it affects the resale value of the home as the current LMC is set up. Ms. McLean pointed out that some houses flipped in the past, but there were various reasons why other houses were not sold. For example, the façade easement was restrictive and the owners needed to go through additional steps. Ms. McLean believed it was an added protection.

Mr. Hutchings asked if the City had ever explored putting a contractual provision in the easement whereby the homeowner could buy out the restriction for the value of the grant. Ms. McLean answered no. If the homeowner accepts the grant, they are required to preserve the façade. Mr. Hutchings noted that they were talking about an easement that would remain on the property for hundreds of years. Ms. McLean stated that some people might not choose a grant for that very reason. She pointed out that the easement is only for the façade. It does not restrict interior changes.

The Board discussed various scenarios in the distant future related to a façade easement. Planner Grahn remarked that the City holds the easement and there is no ability to transfer it based on the easement language. Ms. McLean stated that as the holder of the easement, if someone in the future convinces the City that the easement should be released, the City could consider it. Chair Stephens stated that an important concept of the façade easement is that it formalizes notice so the buyer understands that this is a historic home and they are made aware of any limitations before closing.

Mr. Hutchings asked if the City has a template easement that becomes part of the grant program. Planner Grahn stated that the Staff could create a template and bring it back to the HPB for review.

Director Erickson responded to the question regarding affordability. He stated that when the City Council uses the term “affordability” they are talking about home rental, home purchase, AMI, etc. In the Grant Program, the word “affordable” is making repairs to the home without changing the affordability of the house. The Staff could clarify that distinction if necessary. The Board thought it should be clarified.

Planner Grahn continued with her presentation. Emergency repair grant funds should go towards full-time residents or people who create local housing. Planner Grahn explained that emergency repair grant funds would be awarded on a monthly basis. In some cases, such as a tree falling on a house, the work might be started before the HPB and City Council conduct their review. The City would allow the owner to do the work at risk, knowing that approval of grant funds is not guaranteed. She emphasized that the emergency grant would come out of the annual funding; therefore, when they review a competitive grant, the full amount of money might be lessened depending on the number of emergency grants were awarded.

Planner Grahn stated that the Staff thought the competitive grant fund should be reviewed bi-annually. It would help create competition and help the City control and administer the funds. A scorecard would be developed to make sure everyone is treated fairly with the same criteria. The HPB would be reviewing the scorecard at a later work session. Planner Grahn stated that it would also be helpful because they would know what amounts of money are available when ranking the grants. She noted that the Consultant had also recommended a maximum cap on the grant awards. She thought the Board should look at that more in the future. Given the small amounts of funds, they would have to wait and see if it becomes an issue.

Planner Grahn presented the eligible improvements the Staff was proposing for emergency repair work only. They used the list from 2015 when the Grant

Program was relaunched. Additional improvements that were added to the list were highlighted in red. She had also identified ineligible improvements. Planner Grahn stated that she and Planner Tyler have been trying to define when these repairs would be considered an emergency and when they could wait for a competitive grant review. She provided examples of both emergency consideration and competitive grant funds.

Chair Stephens requested that the Staff come back with a strong definition of "emergency". He believed a number of items would qualify, but not as many as what Planner Grahn had listed. He also thought they needed to look at streamlining the process for approval, because if a property owner does not have the money they would have to wait for grant approval before making the repairs.

Board Member Holmgren suggested that they also add the phrase "act of God". Director Erickson recommended "force of nature".

Planner Grahn presented the list of eligible items for competitive grant applications, which would be reviewed bi-annually. She asked if the Board had comments or additions. Chair Stephens suggested a strong definition of what they would be looking for to help the HPB judge each application. Planner Grahn replied that the scorecard would also help them judge.

Board Member Hodgkins thought Routine Maintenance also needed to be defined.

Board Member Beatlebrox asked if commercial was included in the grant program. Planner Grahn answered yes. They already have storefront rehabilitation and she believed the commercial would have a number of features that would apply. She noted that historic awning and historic signs were typically on commercial buildings. Board Member Hutchings asked if chimneys would fall under masonry. Planner Grahn thought it would.

Planner Grahn commented on the mine structures. She explained that there is the Main Street RDA and the Park Avenue RDA. A very small pocket sits outside of both of those RDAs. Anything that is designated historic outside of the RDAs, as well as the mine structures, would all be competing for the General Fund, which has approximately \$47,000 that can be used for the Historic District Grant Program. In speaking with the Budget Department, the agreement was to incentivize the houses and commercial buildings over the mine structures. However, there is a movement to preserve the mining structures and they want to be diligent to that cause. Planner Grahn stated that the mine structures would be competing bi-annually to receive the awards, along with anyone else applying for the general funds. If money is leftover, a third grant cycle would be opened and specifically targeted to the mine structures.

Chair Stephens clarified that the General Fund could be used in either of the two RDAs and anywhere in the community. However, the Main Street RDA funds could only be used within the Main Street RDA area, and the Park Avenue RDA funds could only be used within the Park Avenue area. He asked if the funds could carry over to the next year. He was told that General Funds do not roll over each year. If they are not allocated, they are lost. Director Erickson explained that a Redevelopment Agency is a taxing mechanism, which is why the money has to go back to the District. If, in the future, they were to create another type of Development Authority, the City would create a separate taxing authority and use the revenues from that.

Chair Stephens asked if the City Council needed to approve the distribution of RDA funds for these grants. Planner Grahn replied that regardless of which fund the grant money comes from, it must be approved by the City Council. Chair Stephens asked if the City Council holds a separate meeting for discussion when acting as the Redevelopment Authority. Assistant City Attorney McLean stated that the City Council acts as the RDA at their regular meetings. The agenda will usually show the City Council meeting and then an RDA meeting.

Director Erickson noted that Planner Grahn made the “emergency” grants consent items on the City Council agenda to streamline the process.

Chair Stephens opened the public hearing.

Sally Elliott was grateful for the opportunity to address the funding of mining structures. She had submitted two applications for special service grants and they had not been funded. Ms. Elliott stated that the Friends of Ski Mountain Mining History did not get the money requested from restaurant tax this year. It was restaurant tax that started the restoration of mine sites in 1998 when the Mountain people and United Park City Mines tore down the Kearns-Keefe Mill without a demolition permit. She extorted \$38,000 from United Park City Mines with the promise that they would not be put in jail for doing that demolition. Ms. Elliott noted that the \$38,000 was matched with a restaurant tax grant. At that time the group consisted of herself, Sandra Morrison, and Marianne Cone. They are much larger now because more people realize the importance of preserving the mining structures.

Ms. Elliott commented on easements. She was on the City Council in 1989 when the Council administered the first few years of historic preservation grants. At that time people were ecstatic to be awarded \$5,000 to purchase paint to paint the outside of a historic home that had not been painted in 50 years.

Ms. Elliott noted that the number of requests were less than before, but it is generally accepted in preservation that if someone receives public money they donate an easement. She stated that before they started stabilizing any of the

mine structures on the mountain, the City required preservation easements in the form of 99 year leases. Ms. Elliott recalled that there was an easement on the original Brigham Young Academy which was the first part of BYU in Provo. They spent \$60,000 defending that easement against people who wanted to tear down the original Brigham Young University Buildings to build a Walmart or Kmart. They managed to preserve and it is now the Provo City Library. She emphasized that there is a lot of benefit to public easements, and it is standard in preservation circles.

Ms. Elliott stated that essentially everything related to the mine sites is an emergency. If they do not do it right now it will fall down. She believed there was agreement that the Thaynes Conveyor is this summer's emergency. Clark is almost finished with the Little Bell at Deer Valley. He will also do the Ore Bin and Jupiter Bell on the west face. As soon as the construction drawings are complete they will move down to Thaynes Canyon.

Ms. Elliott stated that they will not be asking for \$5,000 handouts, but they will be applying for competitive grants for long range projects. She remarked that they do not enter into a contract if they do not have money to pay the contractor. Therefore, the group is always looking for funding to carry on the next year's work. Ms. Elliott stated that Friends of Ski Mountain Mining History is an ad hoc committee of the Museum. They were officially organized at one of the Museum Board meetings. They do not operate with bylaws, but they do operate under all of the standards that the Museum is required to abide by for funding. All funding is audited. They have no overhead, and all the money raised goes into preservation stabilization. Any funding that the HPB would agree to give would be greatly appreciated.

Board Member Hutchings stated that one of his concerns is that the easement would discourage people from taking a grant or applying for a grant if there is no mechanism to buy back the easement.

Mr. Elliott stated that most people are proud to live in a historic home and they are honored to donate an easement. Owning a historic property comes with the obligation to maintain the historical integrity of the structure. Ms. Elliott noted that Douglas Stephens is one of the premier preservationists in Utah and commended the stellar work he has done through the years. She remarked that if someone refuses to take grant funds because they have to grant an easement, that leaves more funding for others who need the grant and are willing to donate the easement.

Director Erickson asked if there was any mention of quid pro quo for grants in the comparative work that was done by the Consultants. Planner Grahn could not recall. Director Erickson could not see it on the comparable eligible work list. The Staff would research other jurisdictions. He noted people who do not like

taxation or the government spending money want to see where the tax money goes and what they get for the money. The question is what that something is and how it operates.

Mr. Hutchings asked about the ownership of the mines. Planner Grahn explained that the City and Vail have a memorandum of understanding whereby each side pools funds to help stabilize the mines. A project is chosen every summer and the Friends of the Ski Mountain Mining History conduct their own fundraising, which is pooled with the money from City and Vail. A lot of the projects Ms. Elliott had mentioned were part of the scope of work with Vail this summer. The projects are ongoing and Vail is helping the group fundraise. Planner Grahn stated that the sites are on old mining claims and the ownership is complicated because Vail has leasable area, but there is actual ownership of the land underneath the sites. Director Erickson pointed out that the Mine Companies continues to exist. The Friends of Ski Mountain Mining History coordinate on the ownership of each individual parcel because some are in Deer Valley and not regulated under the City's agreement with Vail. Director Erickson noted that the money the City contributes comes out of the Planning Department operating budget.

Planner Grahn stated that the Staff was proposing a Spring and Fall timeline. There would be a bi-annual review. In a future work session the HPB will talk about public outreach to educate people on how to apply for the grants. If people apply in the Spring they should know by early April whether they were awarded the grant. If they apply in the Fall they should know by September.

Planner Grahn stated that for the September meeting the Board will continue their discussion on the items discussed this evening; talk more about easements; and the Staff will answer some of the questions and issues raised this evening.

Chair Stephens stated that in looking at developing a scorecard and evaluating against the Mission Statement, he understood some cases that may be emergencies; but he looked at grants as a carrot for the Planning Department in terms of an incentive to spend the money on a more historically accurate window or roof, etc. Planner Grahn believed it goes back to the scorecard and the level of the restoration proposed. Chair Stephens stated that in terms of flipping, if they end up with a better historic product and someone flips it, the community still benefits. He believed that would encourage the levels of the standard of quality for all the historic homes in the community. Chair Stephens remarked that if the HPB could come to a conclusion on that issue, the scorecard would be easy in terms of what they are trying to accomplish with the grant money. The issue is whether the primary goal is historic preservation or encouraging people to live in Park City.

Director Erickson explained that the City has the ability to waive fees for non-profits. The Planning Department is reviewing the possibility of waiving the marginal increased costs of the improved product as part of the building permit. He and Planner Grahn have found programs that provide a benefit other than a direct cash payment. In the end, they achieve a better historic product that preserves the District status and accomplishes other goals.

Board Member Hutchings agreed that the Grant Program should incentivize historic preservation first, regardless of the owner, whether it will be flipped, or their reason for purchasing the property and restoring it.

Board Member Beatlebrox asked if the Staff would prepare a list of criteria for the Board to review. Planner Grahn stated that she has been researching grant programs from other communities to see how they do their scorecards. They need policies, but they also need to keep it broad because every project is a historic building that is unique and has had multiple changes.

Chair Stephens noted that the entire discussion this evening related to historic residential properties. He pointed out that they rarely see a commercial restoration on Main Street. In terms of visibility, they could leverage the grant money by encouraging a building on Main Street to repair its façade. Director Erickson stated that in a broader context, as additional tax revenues are generated inside the RDA, it is additional money that can be spent inside the RDA. It is in the best of the City to do adaptive reuse in commercial buildings. Chair Stephens stressed the importance of discussing how they can leverage the money to actually build up the fund. Planner Grahn remarked that a robust discussion on the funds and how those funds are allocated would help the Board make the difficult decisions on what will or will not be funded.

The Meeting adjourned at 6:27 p.m.

Approved by _____
Douglas Stephens, Chair
Historic Preservation Board