

PARK CITY MUNICIPAL CORPORATION
HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD
MINUTES OF JUNE 1, 2016

BOARD MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE: David White, Lola Beatlebrox, Puggy Holmgren, Jack Hodgkins, Doug Stephens

EX OFFICIO: Bruce Erickson, Anya Grahn, Hannah Turpen, Tom Daley, Louis Rodriguez

ROLL CALL

Chair White called the meeting to order at 5:06 p.m. and noted that all Board Members were present except for Cheryl Hewett who was excused. Jack Hodgkins arrived later in the meeting.

Director Erickson noted that without Mr. Hodgkins the Board still had a quorum pursuant to the LMC, and they could proceed with the meeting.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

May 4, 2016

MOTION: Board Member Holmgren moved to APPROVE the minutes of May 4, 2016 as written. Board Member Stephens seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously. Board Member Hodgkins was not present for the vote.

PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS

There were no comments.

STAFF/BOARD COMMUNICATIONS

Planning Director Bruce Erickson expressed appreciation to Doug Stephens and Sandra Morrison for taking the time to attend a customer focus service group meeting. Mr. Stephens, Sandra Morrison and other developers provided guidance to help the Planning Department improve what the Staff does for everyone. Director Erickson stated that the Staff had an opportunity to review their comments.

Director Erickson reported that the vacant seat previously held by Hope Melville is one that is recommended by the Historical Society. Sandra Morrison will recommend some names and the City Council will choose one to fill the Board position.

Chair White stated that he would have to recuse himself from the 45 King Road matter on the agenda this evening.

Planner Grahn noted that since Chair White would be recusing himself from 45 King Road and Board Member Hodgkins had not arrived the Board would be without a quorum. She recommended that they revise the agenda and discuss the Design Guidelines as the first item.

REGULAR AGENDA – Discussion, Public Hearing and Possible Action

1. Design Guideline Revisions - Staff recommends that the Historic Preservation Board take public comment on the proposed changes to the Design Guidelines for Park City's Historic Districts and Historically Significant Buildings. Specific Guidelines B. Primary Structures will be reviewed for: Roofs, Exterior Walls, Foundation, Doors, Windows, Gutters and Downspouts, Chimneys and Stovepipes, Porches, Architectural Features, Mechanical Systems, Utility Systems, and Service Equipment, Paint and Color; Additions to Primary Structures will be reviewed for: Protection for Historic Structures and Sites, Transitional Elements, General Compatibility, Scenario 1: Basement Addition Without a Garage, Scenario 2: Basement Addition with a Garage, Decks, Balconies and Roof Decks; H. Accessory Structures; Sidebars will be reviewed for: Fencing in Old Town, How to Case a Window, Why Preserving Historic Siding is Recommended, Why Preserving Original Siding is Recommended, Why Preserving Original Windows is Recommended. The Board will provide specific amendments to be made to the document if necessary; and make a recommendation to City Council (Council review will be after the entire Guidelines are reviewed by the HPB) (Application GI-13-00222)

Planner Grahn noted that the Board reviewed these design guidelines at the last meeting and provided direction. Based on that direction the Staff made additional edits to the proposed guidelines changes to reflect their discussion. The Staff also proposed side bars to be included in the design guidelines. Planner Grahn noted that the side bars are provided as additional information to help anyone using the guidelines understand the intent or how something should be done.

Planner Grahn referred to page 89 of the Staff report. She noted that there were concerns about the size and mass and scale of the dormer, but also that it does not touch the ridge of the roof. The Staff had incorporated a guideline requiring that the new dormer be at a minimum of 1 foot lower than the main ridge of the historic structure. If dormers are not historic, new dormers would have to be placed on the side or rear elevation. They would not be allowed on the façade.

Planner Grahn referred to page 90 of the Staff report and noted that wood shingles was an issue that required additional discussion. Historically most of the houses had wood cedar shake shingle roofs. However, they are combustible and tend to be fuel for fires. Planner Grahn had spoken with the Fire Marshall and he had concerns regarding the use of wood shingles. Planner Grahn proposed that the guideline state that “wood shingle roofs may be considered on the historic structure, but architectural shingles or multi-tab shingles made of fiberglass or asphalt composition are encouraged over standing seam”.

Board Member Stephens referred to the photos on page 89. He stated that he was particularly fond of the house at 964 Empire Avenue, which has wood cedar shingles on the historic home and what appears to be the detached garage. Mr. Stephen noted that the roofing material was worked out with the former Building Official Ron Ivie at the time. Therefore, he took issue with what the Fire Marshall has suggested based on his own personal experience. Mr. Stephens stated that for 964 Empire Avenue he and Mr. Ivie came to the conclusion to stay with the typical underlayment on the roof because they went with a fire-retardant shingle, which has the same rating as the asphalt shingle roofs. Mr. Stephens commented on another issue raised by the Fire Marshall and pointed to his experience with the house at 146 Main Street. When he first started reconstruction the house was over 100 years old. It still had the original cedar shingle roof and it was still functioning because of how it was installed. Mr. Stephens concurred with the Fire Marshall that cedar shingles do not have a long life, but that is because they are typically installed incorrectly. However, if they are installed with an air baffle underneath, which is what he did on the house at 964 Empire, the shingles should last longer than an asphalt roof. Mr. Stephens pointed out that fire retardant shingles are still sawn and smooth, but they are thicker for more retention.

Mr. Stephens remarked that there is a large addition to the back of the house at 964 Empire, and he believed cedar shingles help define the historic house from the additions. Mr. Stephen advocated for learning more about wood shingles. He also agreed with the Fire Marshall that wood shingles are unsafe if they are not treated, thick enough, and installed properly.

Planner Grahn asked if Mr. Stephens wanted to reword the design guideline or if the Board wanted to invite the Fire Marshall to attend a meeting to discuss the issue. Mr. Stephens wanted to make sure that the Staff could support whatever they put in the guidelines. He thought the language should be very specific and should be reviewed by the Building Department to make sure it meets fire safety issues as well as the design guidelines. He recommended that they continue this guideline for additional information and discussion.

Director Erickson clarified that for non-historic portions on a historic structure the architectural grade shingle is fine. Mr. Stephen replied that it was valuable on

non-historic additions because the difference in shingles is an easy way to differentiate between the historic and non-historic.

Planner Grahn referred to pages 90 and 91, the guideline regarding grading for a foundation. She noted that the concern was making sure that the house did not float too far above grade. They talked about how to regrade the site and the idea of adding a plinth or trim board around the base of the structure to help ground it to its new concrete foundation.

Planner Grahn stated that another concern that was raised related to visible mechanical equipment. Rather than trying to shield it from a couple of sides it should be looked at more holistically in trying to keep it off the rooftops of historic buildings.

Mr. Stephens recalled that if the mechanical equipment is not placed on the roof, it could not be put on the side yard in Old Town. Planner Grahn replied that it depends on the setbacks. Mechanical equipment has to be 3 feet from the setbacks. The Staff encourages people to put the mechanical equipment in the rear yard if possible.

The Board was comfortable with the design guideline language as proposed on page 91 of the Staff report.

Planner Turpen commented on side bars. She recalled that the Board previously talked about adding side bars that address specific topics that needed more explanation in terms of what is expected. Planner Turpen stated that the side bar for discussion this evening was compatibility and complementary. She noted that the Board discussed the definitions of compatibility and complementary at the last meeting and the Staff had put into bullet points the main characteristics that make up a compatible design.

Board Member Beatlebrox thought the Staff had done a good job making the two words as synonyms because it makes it simpler for everyone. The Board had no other comments on the bullet points.

Planner Turpen commented on masonry retaining walls. She noted that this was a difficult issue for the Staff because most people are unaware what the Staff expects for retaining walls. She provided examples of good infill retaining walls, as well as ones that have been a struggle for Staff. The examples were shown on pages 92 and 93 of the Staff report.

Board Member Beatlebrox referred to the example at 811 Norfolk Avenue, and she was pleased that Planner Turpen thought the retaining wall looked too uniform. Ms. Beatlebrox suggested adding a picture of a historic retaining wall so people could see the shapes and different sizes of stone. Planner Turpen

offered to add a photo of an appropriate historic wall that could be used as a reference but not replicated.

Board Member Stephens suggested that they show examples of a dry stacked wall and a wall that has been mortared.

Chair White understood that the wall shown for 843 Woodside was a historic wall towards the rear. Planner Grahn replied that it was, but it had bad repairs. Chair White agreed that the forward portion of the wall was poorly repaired. He thought the size of the stones and the lay on the rear portion looked better than the wall below in terms of looking historic.

Board Member Hodgkins asked about the wall at 963 Empire on page 89 of the Staff report. Planner Turpen thought that wall was much more appropriate. The front wall uses more complex stones that are a little more textured.

Planner Grahn commented on fencing. She noted that they rarely come across a historic fence but they do show up in historic tax photos. The Staff looked at different fences around town and researched the old design guidelines. She stated that the intent is to encourage compatible fencing. It can either mimic a historic dog-eared picket fence, a wire fence or a very simple wrought iron fence. They would discourage anything that is too glaring and would distract from the historic structure.

Planner Grahn replied that the next guideline was how to encase a window. There are many examples of how people think they should case a window around town. The Staff report provided examples of structures with different window casings. Planner Grahn thought that 703 Park Avenue at High West was a better example of how well it can be done. The Staff had provided recommendations for widths and measurements of the trim pieces.

Board Member Stephens stated that 3-1/2" is the dimension of current lumber. He believed the trim pieces would have historically been 4" long, 7/8" thick and 2" wide. Chair White agreed. Planner Grahn offered to make that change.

Director Erickson stated that the Planning Department is seeing some very contemporary fence materials coming in for approval. When fences are being replaced it is being replaced with a contemporary material. Board Member Stephens asked if it was a contemporary material or a contemporary design. Planner Grahn replied that it depends on the design of the house. Planner Turpen noted that people are using wood but in a very contemporary fashion. Mr. Stephens asked if the Staff was having issues with the design or type of materials. Planner Grahn replied that it was a combination of the two, but one of the weaknesses in the guidelines is the lack of information regarding fences. It only says to preserve a historic fence.

Director Erickson remarked that the Staff would come back with examples of fencing materials at the next meeting, but he wanted the Board to be aware that it was a difficult problem for the Staff.

Director Erickson stated that the Planning Department also struggles with gates and arbors over gates. Planner Grahn recalled that the Board looked at arbors as part of the landscaping design guidelines earlier in the year in terms of being more compatible and not overtaking the side yard or front yard.

Board Member Stephens asked if the issue with fencing materials and design was focused on what could be seen from the public rights-of-way. Planner Grahn answered yes. They were less concerned about rear and side yards.

Planner Turpen stated that the next sidebar to address was why preserving original windows is recommended. There has been a big push recently to get rid of all historic windows on a house even though they might not be in disrepair. The Staff had prepared a list of positive reasons for why it is important to preserve historic windows and why it can be beneficial. Planner Turpen reviewed examples on page 98 of the Staff report to explain why the Staff recommended preserving historic windows.

Board Member Stephens asked if the intent is to encourage preservation or whether it would be part of the design guidelines. Planner Grahn replied that as part of the design guidelines the owner has to show that the windows are rotted and beyond repair. Board Member Stephens stated that if the goal is to have wood windows in historic homes in areas visible from the public right-of way it should be part of the design guidelines. He understood the argument, but a wood window could be replicated. Planner Grahn believed it was previously addressed in the design guidelines in terms of retaining the wood window and reusing it as much as possible. However, a few of the many arguments they keep hearing from contractors is that the historic windows are not energy efficient or the window is too dilapidated to reuse. She thought it would be helpful to have the explanations included in the Design Guidelines. Planner Grahn clarified that the contractors are not opposed to wood windows, but they want to replace the historic window with new wood windows. Mr. Stephens asked if a clad wood window was acceptable. Planner Grahn replied that aluminum clad is only allowed on the basement or foundation level or the addition.

Board Member Hodgkins asked what the Staff was trying to accomplish in terms of the look and feel of the window. Planner Grahn stated that it is based on the house and what was there historically. They look at the tax card and try to be true to what was there originally or to the period it is being restored to. Mr. Hodgkins thought it was difficult to know what was there originally because windows get replaced frequently. Planner Grahn stated that the Staff tries to

bring the house back to what it looked like in the tax photo, and when historic windows are evident they try to encourage people to keep them.

Planner Grahn remarked that similar to the windows, the next sidebar emphasizes why it is important to preserve the original siding. Even subtle changes in siding can make a big difference on the character of the house. They want to be true to the original siding, which is why the sidebar was added to explain the benefits of preserving the wood siding.

Planner Grahn asked if the Board preferred to continue the item for further review or forward a recommendation to the City Council with everything minus the roof guideline.

Director Erickson stated that if the Board chose to move forward the Chair should open a public hearing and the Board would move to forward a positive recommendation to the City Council on this section of the Historic District Guidelines.

Chair White opened the public hearing.

Ruth Meintsma, a resident at 305 Woodside Avenue, commented on the examples of the rock walls, particularly the one with the square shaped stone from the quarry. She noted that there are also nice rubble walls around town and the rubble material lasts for a very long time. Ms. Meintsma suggested that they consider including rubble walls as an option.

Chair White closed the public hearing.

Planner Turpen asked if there was consensus from the Board for adding rubble walls as an option. The Board concurred.

Board Member Hodgkins asked if there were any changes to the transitional elements. Planner Grahn believed those changes were made at the last meeting and she did not believe there was anything new.

MOTION: Board Member Beatlebrox moved to forward a POSITIVE recommendation to the City Council to move forward with this section of the Design Guidelines with the exception of the section regarding wood shingles. Board Member Holmgren seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

2. 45 King Road – Determination of Significance for a shed structure.
(Application PL-16-03139)

Chair White recused himself and left the meeting.

MOTION: Board Member Holmgren moved to nominate Board Member Stephens as the Chair Pro Tem for this item. Board Member Beatlebrox seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

Planner Grahn reported that the shed was temporarily relocated as part of the Historic District Design Review to renovate the Landmark house at this site.

Planner Grahn stated that based on the Staff analysis, as well as input from the Preservation Consultant, Anne Oliver, the building was either moved to the site or constructed between 1927 and 1958. It did not appear on any of the Sanborn maps. Planner Grahn noted that sometimes the Sanborn maps do not include these structures because they either get missed, or by the time they come into existence the Sanborn maps are not as useful and they get overlooked.

Planner Grahn believed the shed had at least four additions. There was a shed roof addition across the front façade, a plywood clad vestibule over the front door, and a rear wood frame addition. Prior to it temporarily being located, there was also a large painted plywood and stud wall frame addition that the Staff deemed as non-historic. That portion was allowed to be removed because they wanted further analysis on the north portion of the building that is in existence today. Planner Grahn noted that the 1958 tax card indicates “old shed, no value”. The Staff assumes it refers to this shed, but it is not certain because there were no photos or an architectural description.

Planner Grahn stated that page 35 of the Staff report outlines why it does not comply with being designated as a Landmark. Due to the number of additions that have occurred the materials were changed and it caused the structure to lose its historic integrity because it is not in keeping with its original mass and scale. Planner Grahn stated that in order to be designated Landmark the structure would also have to qualify to be listed on the National Register. The Staff believed this building would not qualify because the number of additions and the changes that were made no longer identifies it with the mining era.

Planner Grahn remarked that page 36 of the Staff report outlined the criteria for a Significant designation. It is at least 50 years old based on when they think it was relocated to this site. No grant funds were awarded on this site. The shed is currently listed on the Historic Sites Inventory as part of the Landmark site. It was not described on the Historic Sites Form but rather it was just a checked box. The shed has never been individually identified on any reconnaissance level or intensive level survey. Planner Grahn reiterated that the structure has not retained its historic form based on the number of additions that consumed the

original shape. The Staff did not believe the structure complies with the criteria that it must retain its historic scale, context, material and manner, or reflects the historic or architectural character of the site or district, again because of the additions and the changes that have occurred. Planner Grahn stated that the house was designated as the Landmark because the house retained so much integrity and historic material. However, the shed was listed as part of the overall site and the Staff did not believe that it contributes to the site. If the house were to go away the shed alone would not be able to be recognized as a Landmark structure.

The Staff recommended that the Historic Preservation Board conduct a public hearing and remove the shed at 45 King Road, previously 15 Anchor Avenue, as a Landmark structure from the Park City Historic Sites Inventory.

Chair Pro Tem Stephens opened the public hearing.

There were no comments.

Chair Pro Tem Stephens closed the public hearing.

Board Member Hodgkins asked if the site ever received a grant that just did not apply to the shed. Planner Grahn replied that the site never had a grant.

Planner Grahn oriented the Board members to where the site is located. She identified the historic house designated as Landmark.

Chair Pro Tem Stephens noted that there were references in the context of the Staff report about the condition of the structure and the number of additions and the inability to restore it. As a general comment he thought they needed to be careful with the language because it could be misinterpreted by future applicants on projects that are dissimilar. It puts the Staff in a difficult situation of trying to defend it.

MOTION: Board Member Holmgren made a motion to remove the shed at 45 King Road, formerly 15 Anchor Avenue, off the Historic Sites Inventory. Board Member Beatlebrox seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

The meeting adjourned at 5:50 p.m.

Approved by _____
David White, Chair
Historic Preservation Board

Historic Preservation Board Meeting
June 1, 2016