

PARK CITY MUNICIPAL CORPORATION  
HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD  
MINUTES OF MARCH 6, 2019

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

EX OFFICIO: Bruce Erickson, Hannah Tyler, Mark Harrington, Liz Jackson

---

ROLL CALL

Chair Doug Stephens called the meeting to order at 5:00 p.m. and noted that all Board Members were present.

ADOPTION OF MINUTES

February 6, 2019

MOTION: Board Member Hodgkins moved to APPROVE the minutes of February 6, 2019 as written. Board Member Holmgren seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed. Board Members Brody and Beatlebrox abstained from the vote since they were not present for the February meeting.

PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS

There were no comments.

STAFF/BOARD COMMUNICATIONS AND DISCLOSURES

Planning Director Erickson announced that the next meeting was scheduled for April 3, 2019.

Director Erickson reported that there were two finalists in the interview process for the next Historic District Planner. Both candidates have very good credentials.

Planner Liz Jackson reported that she had met with Board Members Beatlebrox, Holmgren, and Scott to discuss the Preservation Award. They would be interviewing two candidates next week. After that they would be able to move forward on the award for May, which is Preservation Month.

Director Erickson assumed the Board had heard information in the press regarding the Historic Preservation Planning that was being done at the Flagstaff Mountain Resort and the technical report discussions. He stated that the City had received funding mechanisms from the two developers and they were

negotiating on how to bring some of the obsolete preservation techniques from 1997 forward to 2019. Director Erickson stated that the Staff was considering giving the HPB the opportunity to review it, even though the Board does not have approval or recommendation authority of it. He would keep the Board updated on the negotiations with all the parties involved.

## REGULAR AGENDA

1. 227 Main Street – Historic District Design Review – Reconstruction and Material Deconstruction Review of a Significant Site. On August 1, 2018, the Historic Preservation Board approved the Reconstruction of the front (eastern) half of the building and associated Material Deconstruction. The applicant is now proposing to Reconstruct the rear (western) half to the building. The applicant is also proposing the Material Deconstruction of a portion of the west wall to accommodate a 64 square foot addition, windows and doors, and a non-historic addition.

Hannah Tyler noted that 227 Main Street was the Star Hotel. The request was for the reconstruction and material deconstruction of a portion of the building. Planner Tyler stated that the HPB reviewed the Star Hotel on August 1, 2018. At that time the Board approved the reconstruction of the green portion shown on the slide, which was the proposed addition. In August the Board approved the deconstruction of the entire building due to the Notice and Order and other issues with the structural integrity. Planner Tyler pointed out that the Board had only approved reconstruction of the front east half.

Planner Tyler indicated a photo on the slide showing what the Board was only looking at reconstruction of the red portion this evening. She stated that the end product would be complete restoration of the entire Star Hotel where it would be returned to its 1920 period of Historic Significance. The purpose of this review was to memorialize the reconstruction of the rear; as well as associated material deconstruction of the rear wall to accommodate a 64 square foot addition.

Planner Tyler noted that this building has had many different phases of construction as outlined in the Staff report. She had included two historic photographs to remind the Board how this building evolved. One photo was the circa 1889 cross-wing cottage. Another photo, which she believed was from the 1930s, showed the Star Hotel addition. She indicated where the cross-wing cottage was tacked on. Planner Tyler stated that they would be able to see that exact image through the reconstruction. The rear addition will not be visible because it is shorter than the rear gables. The cross canyon view will be exactly what they were seeing in the 1889 photo.

Planner Tyler pointed to the red areas, which are the areas being reconstructed. The two gables on the rear portions of the building will be returned. She pointed

to the small addition that is inset from the outside walls and lower than the gables.

Planner Tyler reviewed the request for material deconstruction to help the Board understand exactly what needs to be removed in order to accommodate the reconstruction. Planner Tyler reviewed a photo of the current rear façade. The red area was the 1970s addition that would be removed. She showed another photo showing the restoration of the two gabled ends on the west side. She remarked that the Board needed to review the material deconstruction of the historic wall because they would be looking at removal of a portion of the wall to accommodate the 64 square foot addition. Director Erickson clarified that it was on the rear west façade, and it was below another house and not visible from the street.

Chair Stephens asked if the new addition was the area shown in gray. Planner Tyler answered yes. She noted that they were excavating the rear, but no material was being removed because it was the existing structure.

Planner Tyler indicated a photo showing the current conditions. The red area on the top of the ridge was the rear 1970s addition. Another photo showed the restorations of the structure in whole to match the cross-canyon view.

Planner Tyler reviewed the front façade. She stated that everything on top from the 1970s would be removed to return to the cross-wing cottage that was added to in the 1920s.

Commissioner Beatlebrox noted that the gable on the right-hand side was not shown in one of the photos. Planner Tyler referred to a photo in the Staff report showing that the roof line matches what was there historically. Director Erickson stated that the gables were progressive over time. Ms. Beatlebrox asked if it was necessary to have the gable on the left-hand side. Planner Tyler stated that through the Sanborn maps they have proven what the footprint of this building was originally. She pointed to the roof lines of the cross-wing cottage, and what was added on over time.

Board Member Hodgkins asked when the north gable was added. He understood that the applicant was proposing to keep the north gable. Planner Tyler replied that that portion would be restored in whole. She stated that the purpose of that section in the Staff report was to explain the center island area. There was no proof of what the roof shape was at one time. The Staff finds that restoring the two gable forms tells the actual story of the 1889 cross-wing cottage by having the flat roof in the back. The Staff thought it is an adequate interpretation based on the lack of evidence showing how it was historically.

Chair Stephens understood that the objective of the architect and the applicant was to achieve the look of the original residential cottage, and still be able to read the Spanish Revival that was attached in the 1930s.

Board Member Hodgkins wanted to know what the first floor street level façade looked like. Planner Tyler presented a tax photo, noting that it had already been approved for the reconstruction. She clarified that the Board previously approved the reconstruction of half the structure. They were being asked to approve reconstruction of the other half this evening.

Director Erickson reported that currently the applicant was doing exploratory demolition on the inside. The Staff was also keeping an eye on the roof structure. The work was slowed down due to Sundance and the World Cup; however, he anticipated that it would move forward this summer. The Staff had already approved the Construction Management Plan. They were only waiting on this approval by the HPB.

Chair Stephens understood that because the HPB had already approved the deconstruction, this evening the review and public hearing was on the reconstruction of the rear addition. Planner Tyler replied that he was correct. Director Erickson explained that there were two issues this evening. One was the reconstruction of the historic house, as well as the material deconstruction of the portion of the west side. Chair Stephens clarified that after they approve the reconstruction, the next step is to look at deconstruction of the back area for the addition.

Chair Stephens asked if the Board members had comments regarding the historic reconstruction of the rear of the Star Hotel as outlined in the Staff report. Board Member Hodgkins clarified that it was the 1889 addition. Planner Tyler stated that a small portion of the Star Hotel would be reconstructed as well. She noted that it was phrased in the Staff report as an amendment to the previously approved reconstruction.

Board Member Hodgkins asked if the previous approval approved a demolition, or whether the rear portion was not addressed at that time. Planner Tyler replied that the HPB approved that the rear portion would remain deconstructed. Mr. Hodgkins understood that if the addition was only 64 square feet, the back wall would only be moved back approximately two feet. Planner Tyler replied that he was correct.

Board Member Hutchings asked if any materials would be salvaged and reused. Planner Tyler replied that the only pieces that were salvageable was the basement foundation abutting Main Street, and that had already been reviewed by the Board. They would also try to salvage the bricks in the chimney, which was

also determined through a previous review. In terms of what was before them this evening, the Staff did not find anything that was salvageable.

Board Member Beatlebrox was excited about the project because it was very different from the original intent to demolish the entire building and erect something that didn't tell the building's story. What the applicant was proposing tells the story about the first home and the history of this building.

Board Member Hutchings asked if this was the last thing the HPB would be approving on this project. Planner Tyler answered yes.

Chair Stephens asked if the Board had comments about the removal of historic material on the back of the building. The Board had no objections to what was being proposed.

Chair Stephens opened the public hearing.

There were no comments.

Chair Stephens closed the public hearing.

MOTION: Board Member Hutchings moved to APPROVE the reconstruction and material deconstruction of the Significant structure at 227 Main Street pursuant to the Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Conditions of Approval as found in the Staff report. Board Member Holmgren seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

Chair Stephens stated that this building will tell an interesting story and he commended the Staff and the Architects for their efforts.

#### Findings of Fact – 227 Main Street

1. The site at 227 Main Street is located in the Historic Commercial Business (HCB) Zoning District.
2. The site has been designated as —Significantll 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 el 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. —Joell 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. The building at 227 Main Street was largely constructed in three significant phases:

- First Phase: Initially, the structure was built as a cross-wing cottage in c.1889; the architect has found that these walls consist of wood framing.
- Second Phase: Staff believes that the Allendes excavated behind a front yard stone retaining wall and used it as a foundation for the new Spanish-revival style addition to the front of the house that was built prior to 1929. The foundation was not built entirely under the building and disappears into the hillside as you move west away from the front wall of the Spanish-revival addition. This addition was also built of wood framing, but covered in stucco. To ensure it matched the rest of the building, stucco was also used to cover the original cross-wing house.
- Third Phase: Finally, a number of modifications were made after 1970. A second addition was constructed on the west (rear) elevation to add a fourth floor to the building (highlighted in blue). This addition has framed walls, consistent with the period that it was built.

9. 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.

10. 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.

11. 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.

12. 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.

13. On August 1, 2018, the HPB approved the Deconstruction and Reconstruction of the front (eastern) half of the building. The HPB allowed the western half (rear) of the building to remain deconstructed allowing for the construction of an addition. The HPB also approved associated Material Deconstruction of portions of the front (eastern) half of the building (window, non-historic porch enclosure, doors, etc.) which allowed the building to be returned to its ca. 1920s Spanish Revival Star Hotel Period of Historic Significance.

14. The August 1, 2018 the HPB reviewed a proposed Reconstruction of the front (eastern) half of the building just past the southerly chimney and associated Material Deconstruction. On August 1, 2018, the HPB found that the proposal complied with LMC 15-11-15(A) Criteria for Reconstruction of the Historic Building(s) and/or Structure(s) on a Significant Site, based on the following:

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.

15. Since the August 1, 2018 HPB approval, the applicant has been working closely with staff on the remaining review of the HDDR (final design, parking calculations, etc.).

16. On December 19, 2018 and January 16, 2019 the applicant submitted a series of updated plans which reflected their amended request to Reconstruct the

building in its entirety with the exception of a minor 68 square foot addition in the rear (west elevation).

17. The new proposal will result in the Reconstruction of a majority of the Significant Site and the building will be restored to its original ca. 1920s Spanish Revival Star Hotel Period of Historic Significance.

18. Because the Reconstruction and Material Deconstruction of portions of the front (eastern) half of the building was approved on August 1, 2018, the HPB will only be considering the following:

(1) Reconstruction of the rear (western) half of the building

(2) Material Deconstruction of:

- a portion of the west wall to accommodate a 64 square foot addition
- windows and doors
- a non-historic addition

19. The amended proposal complies with LMC 15-11-15(A)(1) as determined by the Historic Preservation Board on August 1, 2018.

20. The amended proposal complies with LMC 15-11-15(A)(2) as determined by the Historic Preservation Board on August 1, 2018.

21. The amended proposal complies with LMC 15-11-15(A)(2) as a majority of the Significant Structure will be Reconstructed and the building will be restored to its ca. 1920s Spanish Revival Star Hotel Period of Historic Significance.

22. The amended proposal complies with LMC 15-11-15(B) as determined by the Historic Preservation Board on August 1, 2018.

23. The amended proposal complies with LMC 15-11-12.5 Historic Preservation Board Review for Material Deconstruction as the removal of the 1970s alterations (phase three) will aid in restoring the structure to its ca. 1920s Spanish Revival Star Hotel Period of Historic Significance.

24. The amended proposal complies with LMC 15-11-12.5 Historic Preservation Board Review for Material Deconstruction as given the restoration of the gabled ends and the indentation of the addition from the rear corners of the building, the rear (western) addition and the removal of a portion of the rear (west) wall is minor and will have no negative impact on the integrity of the structure. In addition, the proposed addition is much less invasive than what was previously proposed.

25. The amended proposal complies with LMC 15-11-12.5 Historic Preservation Board Review for Material Deconstruction as all windows and doors on the existing structure are beyond repair or have been replaced during the 1970s modifications (phase three). The replacement doors and windows will match the historic windows and doors exactly.

#### Conclusions of Law – 227 Main Street

1. The proposal complies with the Land Management Code requirements pursuant to the HCB District and LMC 15-11-12.5 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 December 19, 2018 and January 16, 2019. 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. All Conditions of Approval from the August 1, 2018 Historic Preservation Board action shall apply.
3. 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.
4. The applicant shall accurately reconstruct the chimney in order to duplicate the original in design, location, dimension, texture, material, and finish.
5. 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.
6. 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.
7. 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.

2. 540 Main Street - Historic District Design Review –Material Deconstruction Review of a Landmark Site. The applicant is proposing to deconstruct (remove) a portion of the rear (east) wall to accommodate a new window opening (facing Swede Alley).

Planner Tyler provided a brief history on the structure at 540 Main Street. The structure has had several additions and has changed over the years. In 1980 it was restored to how it currently looks. Prior to 1980 the windows were not visible; but fortunately the windows were still under the board siding. Planner Tyler presented a photo of the structure and noted that it matched almost perfectly to the historic photo.

Planner Tyler stated that the rear façade was the portion of the structure being discussed this evening. She presented a photo showing what it looks like today. The addition shown in yellow was an addition that extends to Main Street. That addition was approved through the HDDR process in the 1990s. She indicated a window that she understood was part of that addition. Planner Tyler believed the historic photo was from the 1930s. She pointed to three windows and a door in the historic photo that still exist today. The addition was added on to the corner of the building and there was a window above it.

The Staff recommended that the HPB discuss historic preservation and direct the Staff to make findings for the meeting on April 3<sup>rd</sup>. On page 6 of the Staff report, Planner Tyler had provided several pages of points to consider; specifically, the Design Guidelines as well as any applicable LMC language. She explained that for the HPB review of material deconstruction, the LMC indicates that it shall comply with any of the LMC sections. The Design Guidelines are now part of the LMC, which was why she had outlined several different sections of the Design Guidelines for Board review and consideration. Planner Tyler had also provided a criteria checklist that the HPB developed when the material deconstruction review process was created.

Planner Tyler highlighted some of the items in the Staff report. She stated that Swede Alley is a prominent right-of-way. The building at 540 Main Street is a Landmark Structure with a secondary façade abutting that right-of-way. The facade was previously altered through the 1990s addition. The draft intensive level survey references that this structure is Landmark and it is also designated on the National Register of Historic Places because of its significant contribution to the Main Street Historic District, and that it almost replicates the original façade and design. Planner Tyler remarked that this structure approaches several Universal Design Guidelines. Universal Design Guidelines #7 states that each site shall be recognized as a physical record of its time, place, and use. Owners are discouraged from introducing architectural elements or details that visually modify or alter the original building design when no evidence of such elements or details exist.

Planner Tyler stated that the cumulative effects of not only the 1995 addition, but also the new window, may impact Universal Design Guideline #7.

Planner Tyler highlighted some of the higher level guidelines. Since it was obvious that the façade has already been altered, the point might be made that one additional window may or may not have an effect. Planner Tyler pointed to a photograph which represented four openings on the façade that could still be read today because that lower window is not added. The Staff was concerned that once the window is added, they might lose the ability to read the integrity of the rear facade.

Director Erickson stated that normally they address the Main Street side. On the west side of Main Street there are always lots behind and the rear façade is not visible. On the east side of Main Street or the west side of Swede, all the historic structures go all the way through or partially all the way through. As they attempt to maintain historic integrity, the difference in how Swede Alley functions compared to how Main Street functions, is that Swede Alley goes all the way through. Director Erickson remarked that part of the commentary in the Staff report is about historical integrity and the fact that this is a National Register Building.

Board Member Hodgkins asked if it was a National Register Building or just listed within the National Register District. Planner Tyler believed it was listed within the Main Street National Register District; as well as being designated a Landmark structure within the Park City Historic District. She explained that the building is one of the contributing structures of the Main Street National Register District, which is outside of the HPB purview, but it is an important fact that makes it a Landmark structure. The HPB regulates at the local level.

Jonathan DeGray, the project architect, stated that Marmot had acquired the rest of the floor all the way back to Swede Alley. They would like to have a presence on Swede Alley and utilize the existing doorway as an entrance for customers to come off of Swede Alley. The window being proposed would add to the retail environment of the space. Mr. DeGray stated that the idea would be to replicate the window that was added above it. He noted that the Exhibit on page 155 of the Staff report shows the existing window and the proposed window to give a sense of what the applicant was trying to achieve. Mr. DeGray remarked that the window is the only historic material that would be lost, which would be approximately 45 square feet.

Regarding the Staff analysis under Universal Guidelines #7, Mr. DeGray believed that the analysis that the window would add to an already defaced building was a far reach. The building is part of the National Register District but it is not on the National Register. If someone brought this building forward to the Park Service to be placed on the National Register, he questioned whether the window itself would diminish its historic integrity to such an extent that it would no longer be eligible. Mr. DeGray commented on other buildings on Main Street on the Swede Alley side that were allowed to have significant additions added to the rear of the structure, removing large amounts of the rear portion of those buildings. He noted the buildings as 301 Main Street, 368 Main Street, 440 Main Street, 508 Main Street, the Museum, 562 Main Street, Zooms, the Kimball, the Frank Andrews Building, and the No Name. All these buildings have significant additions added to the rear, and rear facades were completely removed. However, all of the buildings mentioned still contribute to the National Register District of Main Street.

Mr. DeGray pointed out that this applicant was only requesting a window. He did not believe that removal of the wall material to accommodate the window would diminish the historic integrity of the building to such an extent that it would no longer be seen as a historic structure. He thought it would add to the usability of the building for the tenant and for the owner. It would also encourage pedestrian and commercial use on Swede Alley.

Mr. DeGray referred to Universal Guidelines #9, which, "new additions and exterior alterations or related new construction should not destroy historic material, features or spatial relationships that characterize the site and building". Mr. DeGray did not believe that removal of the wall material would do that because it would still read as the building. He read from Universal Guideline #10, which states, "new additions related to new construction should be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment could be restored". Mr. DeGray stated that if the window were to be removed, the building would be brought back to its original condition.

Mr. DeGray urged the Planning Commission to allow Marmot to add the window as proposed.

Chair Stephens called for Board comments.

Board Member Beatlebrox asked when the window on the second floor was added. Planner Tyler replied that based on archived material for this site, she understood that it was part of the 1995 remodel. Board Member Beatlebrox thought the window between the two diamonds on the front of the building looked similar to the historic windows, but not exact. Mr. Hodgkins had noticed the same window and he thought it looked longer than the historic window. Planner Tyler noted that the front alterations were made in the 1980s. Ms. Beatlebrox understood that they took the motif but not the original window. She showed a photo from 1978 and another photo prior to 1978. The story from newspaper articles is that when the siding was removed from the front, they found the diamond shape windows.

Chair Stephens asked if the siding material was newer or whether it was a replication of historic siding on the rear of the building. Planner Tyler stated that the physical conditions report states that the building is stick frame. The exterior walls are 2 x 4 wood, 16" in center with 1" x 6" beveled lap cedar siding. Based on the photo she questioned whether that was correct. Prior to 1978 it looked like the building was altered extensively. The building was restored in the 1980s, but she was unsure whether the siding was from that time period. The physical conditions report does not state whether or not the siding is historic.

Mr. DeGray believed the siding was relatively new. It was not siding from the 1900s but it was replicated siding.

Chair Stephens tried to recall the last time the Board addressed the east façade of a Swede Alley Building through a design review process. He recalled that Fletcher's goes all the way through. He stated that a lot of effort has been spent in the community to bring people into the China Bridge area for parking and through the Transit system. This side of Swede Alley is the first impression people have of the Historic Main Street area. Chair Stephens thought the question was where the community was evolving to with regards to the development of Main Street, and whether Swede Alley should become a subservient Main Street with the use of other entrances into buildings or smaller shops on the Swede Alley side. Chair Stephens believed the issue went beyond this building on its own, because the Board was being asked to look at how it contributes to the entire Historic District.

Board Member Beatlebrox agreed. On the Leadership Tour they see a lot of western towns that have a grid system and shops around the block. Park City only has Main Street. They are starting to see stores on Swede Alley, a back entrance to the Ja Go Gallery, as well as other establishments. Ms. Beatlebrox thought Swede Alley was becoming more vibrant as opposed to being a place for recycling and trash. It is evolving and she like the idea of being able to walk through a store from Swede Alley.

Board Member Hutchings asked if that could be considered in their discussion, or whether they had to adhere to the Guidelines. Board Member Hodgkins thought this situation was different because both sides of the building face a public alley. He felt that the rear façade was already compromised significantly by the addition. In addition, the upper two historic window openings were not the size of a historic window opening. They were elongated to fit the new addition window. Board Member Scott had not noticed the window before, but he agreed with Mr. Hodgkins that it did look elongated.

Board Member Hodgkins believed the doorway and 80% of a window were the only historic elements left. He did not think an additional window would compromise the historic integrity.

Board Member Scott thought they still needed to look at it in context and whether it fits with the rhythm of the adjacent structures. They always worry about precedent and he believed this was an area where precedent could be an issue.

Board Member Hutchings stated that he agreed with the Staff analysis and he was against adding the window. However, he struggled with all the buildings that Mr. DeGray had listed. If they previously allowed material deconstruction on Swede Alley to occur, he had concerns about not being consistent.

Board Member Beatlebrox did not understand why they allowed the Museum to cover up the beautiful back wall of that historic building. The Museum is a Landmark structure and if that was allowed, she thought they should allow a window.

Board Member Hodgkins felt that when they talk about what was previously allowed or not allowed, it negates the fact that the LMC continually changes. When they talk about examples of what was previously allowed, the question is whether it occurred under the current LMC or a different LMC where it was allowed at the time.

Chair Stephens concurred with Board Member Hodgkins. He thought they needed to be careful about approving this with regards to what took place in the past. However, this is a commercial building and they were looking at it from Swede Alley. It is clearly a subservient entrance, but it will also become the front entrance as people come in and out of the parking structure and the transit center. It accomplishes the purpose if they are trying to make Swede Alley a commercial area and a Main Street first impression area. Chair Stephens thought Fletchers was a good example of that purpose and it was done well.

Chair Stephens stated that in considering overall design guidelines as they look at the neighborhoods, he would like to come up with guidelines for Swede Alley and the commercial district that gives consistency to what future development might be along that road. His thought would be to allow and encourage entrances off of Swede Alley into Main Street commercial buildings, but he would always want it understood and to read that the entrance into that building was a newer contemporary entrance and was not the original entrance to the building.

Chair Stephens stated that if the Board agrees to allow this request, in his opinion, it should be clear that the window going should not try to be a historic window. The entrance for the historic door should also read as a subservient entrance. Chair Stephens thought it was clear in the historic photo that it was a back door. Chair Stephens thought the City would see more of these requests and possibly other additions coming off the back as there are more pressures on Main Street.

Board Member Hodgkins asked if it was certain that historic material would be removed to accommodate the window. Planner Tyler replied that the physical conditions report does not specify whether or not there is historic material. Mr. DeGray stated that the applicant had done the Tenant Improvement for the retail space. That went into the walls a little, but not enough to be able to tell for sure about the materials. Mr. DeGray remarked that the floor structures have been completely renovated with a web joist material. There is no historic material. Mr. Hodgkins asked if it would still come before the HPB if the material is non-

historic. Planner Tyler replied that the HPB reviews all historic sites. For example, the Board reviewed the removal of a 1970s addition of the Star Hotel. For this application, there is no certainty of the wall material, but the wall is still in its historic location. She thought they could all agree that even if the material was changed in the 1980s or 1990s, everything else remained exactly where it was.

Board Member Hodgkins thought it was important to address that issue because that argument comes up all the time. He wanted it clear that regardless of the addition or what is underneath, it is still reviewed by the HPB. Chair Stephens clarified that if the HPB approves removal of the historic material, it then falls back to Planning and the design review for the actual window.

Director Erickson suggested that the Board think of the word "material" differently. Another definition is material change rather than just material. Director Erickson explained that in this case, Planner Tyler believes it is a material change to the back of the building. However, Mr. DeGray disagrees that it is a material change because the building would still read as the historic structure in the future.

Planner Tyler clarified that regarding the Universal Guidelines Mr. DeGray had referenced, the Staff was in agreement that if the window was removed ten years from now the rear façade could be restored. The Staff had referenced a cumulative effect and at this point adding a window was not worse. Planner Tyler stated that the Staff represented some of Mr. DeGray's findings, but they also represented other Design Guidelines. She pointed out that the HPB would make the final decision, but she wanted it clear that the Staff had not taken a position one way or the other. The intent was to represent the findings for the Board to consider in their decision.

Director Erickson remarked that Planner Tyler was only requesting a policy discussion by the Board. The Staff did not provide a recommendation this evening because they wanted to hear feedback from the Board members and what they thought about it. Director Erickson stated that there were other things occurring with the building from a policy standpoint. One is that it is not all the way out to the street, similar to Fletcher's, and that makes the façade slightly more subordinate than being right up against the street like the Elks Building, the Theater, or Flanagans. Board Member Hodgkins understood that Director Erickson was saying that the facade was slightly secondary to a streetscape. Director Erickson answered yes; and that was another policy discussion because they were protecting the historic structure more than protecting the streetscape. He thought it was worthwhile for the Board to have that conversation. Director Erickson emphasized that the Board was not being asked to take action this evening.

Chair Stephens commented on the issue of setting precedent. He pointed out that there have been many alterations on the Swede Alley side of these commercial buildings. If they allow this request because the building has been altered significantly, that will be the case for every building on the street. Chair Stephens stated in his opinion, the policy discussion is whether this is a reuse of these commercial buildings to reuse the Swede Alley facing side of the buildings. He preferred to look at it from the standpoint of whether it would be appropriate to have a reuse of a historic building by adding another entrance to the building in the back. Chair Stephens remarked that in looking at it in those terms, his tendency would be to say yes. He found it more difficult to say yes if the reason was that the building had been materially altered. Chair Stephens thought reuse were acceptable uses and changes to historic building that have been done historically across the country. He was encouraged and optimistic that if they allow this, it will create the opportunity to encourage better historic design on Swede Alley over time as it becomes economically feasible.

Director Erickson remarked that the management tools to do what Chair Stephens was suggesting are more efficient and clearer than they were in the 1980s. Independent of a decision by the Board, he thought there were tools available to put the window in through the HDDR process. Chair Stephens stated that if they are alterations to the building, whether on Main Street or Swede Alley, through the design process the historic aspects of the building could be easily read.

Board Member Scott remarked that it was important to look at the building in isolation to make sure they make the right decision for that unique situation.

Planner Tyler explained that the Staff was looking for direction from the HPB to prepare Findings for approval or denial, or an amendment. The Staff will come back in April with those Findings for action. Chair Stephen assumed it would also give the property owner and the architect some direction to move forward with the design review process. Planner Tyler stated that Staff could not approve the HDDR until the HPB provides direction to prepare Findings and takes final action. The next Staff report will be much shorter and only represent the Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law; and possibly Conditions of Approval, depending on the direction given this evening.

Chair Stephens opened the public hearing.

There were no comments.

Chair Stephens closed the public hearing.

Board Member Scott stated that when he thinks about the potential for some type of revival for Swede Alley, he asked if the Board could ask the applicant to tell a

story about the building since people would be entering a historic building from the back side. Director Erickson stated that the Board could make that request in their recommendations to have it considered as part of the Historic District Design Review process to help interpret that side of the building. What can occur with the window will be determined from the HDDR.

Board Member Beatlebrox stated that in looking at the photographs, the historic glass was significantly different in the back than in the front. The front of the building had decorative elements that were obvious to people entering from the front. However, the back only has four boxy windows with no architectural excitement interest. If the intent is to change the use of the historic building in the rear, she thought that would be acceptable. Ms. Beatlebrox thought it was evident that no one cared about the back of the building because it only had a door and three windows. She was not convinced that at that time they wanted to tell a story about the rear of the building. Ms. Beatlebrox believed that as time goes on, the buildings can become more current and yet even more historic.

Board Member Hodgkins thought Ms. Beatlebrox made a good point. He stated that if someone wrote an application for this building to be on the National Register, he did not believe they would cite the rear façade as part of the importance for being on the National Register. He thought the rear façade was extremely utilitarian. Windows were provided where needed and the entrance was small with a door. Mr. Hodgkins agreed that it was all about the front façade speaking to the use. Director Erickson stated that if there was a way to do more interpretation on the historic use of the building as a meeting hall as part of the HDDR review, it might help the cause for adding the window.

Board Member Holmgren stated that she also involved with the Historical Park City Alliance, and they are thrilled with encouraging Swede Alley to improve. Ms. Holmgren suggested that it might be time to draft guidelines for Swede Alley that everyone would need to follow. Ms. Holmgren remarked that when people get off the bus the first thing they see are dumpsters and recycle bins. She definitely favored developing Swede Alley.

Chair Stephens agreed that Swede Alley is a transitional area from the parking structures and the transit center. He believed this would fall under neighborhood categories as they work through the design review process by neighborhoods. Chair Stephens suggested that Swede Alley could be one of the earlier neighborhoods to be reviewed.

Planner Tyler understood from the comments that the Board would be directing the Staff to prepare Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Conditions for Approval.

MOTION: Board Member Beatlebrox moved to APPROVE the material deconstruction of a portion of the Swede Alley façade of the Landmark Structure located at 540 Main Street, and to direct the Staff to prepare Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Conditions of Approval for final action. Board Member Holmgren seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

Board Member Hutchings favored the suggestion to have guidelines if they intend to move forward with these actions. Planner Tyler noted that there were already design guidelines for Swede Alley that were included in the Staff report. Chair Stephens clarified that there are specific goals and values that the HPB would like to promote on Swede Alley that might not be addressed in the current design guidelines, which are general guidelines for the entire Historic District. He preferred something that gives the design community and the property owners a better understanding of what they can and cannot do on Swede Alley.

Mr. DeGray stated that having done a cursory field report, there were very few buildings facing Swede Alley that still maintain a historic façade on Swede Alley. He thought it would be an easy task for the Staff to identify the buildings that were still meaningful. Most of the buildings he noted have non-historic additions that back onto Swede Alley.

Chair Stephens agreed. However, his comments were based on the fact that the economics that drive Swede Alley will result in removing some of those additions, and they need to have guidelines in place when that occurs. Mr. DeGray thought the existing guidelines for the Historic District were sufficient to handle it. He suggested that the Planning Department take an inventory of what was left, because he recalled that 75% of the buildings were not applicable. Director Erickson agreed with Mr. DeGray. The conversation should focus on the question of what are the appropriate adaptive reuses within the context of the design guidelines on Swede Alley.

The Meeting adjourned at 6:10 p.m.

Approved by \_\_\_\_\_  
Douglas Stephens, Chair  
Historic Preservation Board