

PARK CITY MUNICIPAL CORPORATION
HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD
MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 19, 2014

BOARD MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE: John Kenworthy – Chair; Gary Bush, Marion Crosby, Puggy Holmgren, Hope Melville, Clayton Vance, David White

EX OFFICIO: Thomas Eddington, Anya Grahn, Ryan Wassum, Polly Samuels McLean

ROLL CALL

Chair Kenworthy called the meeting to order at 5:06 p.m. and noted that all Board Members were present.

ADOPTION OF MINUTES

December 4, 2013

Chair Kenworthy referred to page 3 of the minutes and noted that it incorrectly stated that John Kenworthy made the motion to nominate John Kenworthy as Board Chairman. He was not present for that meeting and had not nominated himself.

The Board members could not recall who had made the motion but they verified that the vote was unanimous to elect John Kenworthy as Chair.

MOTION: Board Member Melville moved to ADOPT the minutes of December 4, 2014. Board Member Crosby seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS

There was no comment.

STAFF/BOARD MEMBERS COMMUNICATIONS AND DISCLOSURES

Planning Director Eddington announced that a General Plan Public Outreach meeting would be held on Tuesday, February 25th from 4:00-7:00 p.m. at the MARC. The specifics of the library remodel would not be addressed, but the general remodel would be addressed independent of the General Plan.

Board Member Melville noted that the historical plaque that was placed near the Zoom Building disappeared during the reconstruction for Sundance. She wanted to know where the sign went and when it would be placed back on the building.

Director Eddington was unaware that it had been removed and offered to find out.

Planner Grahn stated that the Utah Heritage Foundation was holding its annual state-wide preservation conference in Salt Lake City from Friday, May 9th through Saturday the 10th. Education sessions would be held on May 9th. The homes tour is on Saturday. Anyone interested in attending should contact the Planning Department and the Planning Department would pay their fee to attend.

CONTINUATION(S)

505 Woodside Avenue – Appeal of Historic Preservation Plan (Application PL-14-02241)

Chair Kenworthy continued the appeal of the 505 Woodside Avenue Historic Preservation Plan to March 5, 2014.

REGULAR MEETING – Discussion, Public Hearing and Possible Action

1102 Norfolk Avenue – Determination of Significance (Application #PL-14-02249)

Planner Ryan Wassum reported that due to limited information on the Historic Sites Inventory, the Planning Director directed the Staff to conduct additional research to determine the historic significance of the structure at 1102 Norfolk Avenue. The HPB was being asked to review the criteria to determine if the structure should be designated as significant rather than its current landmark status. They were also being asked to re-determine the significance of the post 1929 north side addition.

Planner Wassum stated that 1102 Norfolk was identified as Landmark on the 2009 Historic Sites Inventory. Based on the notes written in the HIS, the structure was identified as a hall-parlor home. The home was expanded several times outside of the mature mining era. However, part of the rear addition most likely occurred during the historic period. Planner Wassum remarked that some of the historic integrity was lost due to multiple exterior additions.

Planner Wassum presented slides and outlined the history of the structure. He noted the differences in the 1889 Sanborn map versus the 1900 Sanborn maps. In 1889 the home was a hall-parlor with a full width porch. By 1900 significant changes had occurred. It was uncertain whether an entirely new structure was built or if the house was expanded with multiple additions. Planner Wassum compared the 1907 Sanborn Map to the 1929 Sanborn Map to show how the house was expanded again, and how the L-shape design was squared off. Going from the 1929 Sanborn map to the 1968 tax appraisal card, Planner Wassum reviewed the additions that have taken place over time.

Planner Wassum reviewed the analysis for a significant site. The structure is older than 50 years because it was built prior to 1900. It has retained most of its essential historical form looking north from 11th Street. The structure is still historically significant to the Mature Mining Era. Therefore, it complies with the Significant designation.

Planner Wassum remarked that the structure did not comply with all the criteria for the Landmark designation. The integrity of the structure has been compromised. The location remains the same but the design of the structure has been altered due to the number of out-of-period additions. Even though the addition along the north elevation is historic in its own right, it altered the historic form from a hall-parlor plan to a cross-wing. The addition of new roof forms over the existing historic roof forms have also altered the profile of the structure, making the structure ineligible for the National Register of Historic Places.

Planner Wassum reviewed the analysis of the north addition relative to the overall structure and the criteria for Significant status. The north addition was built between 1929 and 1938 making it over 50 years old. It complies with the criteria for integrity because adding in-line additions for additional living space was common in this era. The north addition to the historic structure contributes to the understanding of Park City's Mature Mining Era architecture. It was not uncommon for additions to be added that transformed hall-parlor plans into cross-wing plans.

Planner Wassum reviewed additional analysis of the north addition going back to previous findings. In 2007 the HPB determined that the rear and north addition were not historically significant. The 2007 Staff report outlines that the north addition was added between 1941 and 1968. However, new evidence, including the 1930's tax photo, suggests that the north addition was built between the 1929 Sanborn Map and the 1930's tax photo. Planner Wassum explained that the new evidence requires the former findings and analysis to be reconsidered.

The Staff requested that the HPB determine whether the structure is Landmark or Significant and whether or not the north addition is significant.

The Staff recommended that the HPB conduct a public hearing and find that the criteria has been met to change the designation of 1102 Norfolk Avenue and the 1930's north addition to "Significant" within the Park City Historic Sites Inventory, according to the findings of fact and conclusions of law outlined in the Staff report.

Board Member Melville referred to the analysis on page 16 of the Staff report referencing the 1930's north addition, and asked whether or not it was Landmark. Planner Wassum replied that he had forgotten to correct an error in the Staff report. It should say "does not comply" under the question of whether it retains

its historic integrity in terms of location. It did not comply because the historic form was altered from the hall and parlor to cross-wing. Planner Wassum stated that the Staff did the analysis for the overall structure and a separate analysis for the overall structure. The house could go from Landmark to Significant and the HPB was being asked to make that same determination for the north addition.

Director Eddington remarked that based on new analysis, without the additions the house would maintain its integrity and essential form and; therefore, maintain Landmark status. The additions were more indicative of what are considered Significant structures.

Board Member Melville asked if the additions could be removed to bring the structure back to Landmark status. Planner Grahn stated that it would depend on which addition. She believed it was possible to see the historic form of the house from the roofline. When the shed addition that was built out of period was added, a new roof was constructed over the top of the original form. It would be possible to take off the addition and restore the original form. Planner Grahn noted that Planner Wassum was specifically talking about the addition along the north side. In 2007 the Staff and the HPB determined that it was not historically significant. However, in looking at the 1938 tax photo, it was evident that the north addition was either built in period or right after the period of significance. The Staff found that per the design guidelines, it has gained historical significance in its own right.

Board Member Melville asked for the new evidence that Dina Blaes did not have when she did the Historic Sites Inventory and determined it was Landmark. Director Eddington stated that Ms. Blaes did not have the 1930's photo.

Planner Grahn clarified that in 2007 the HPB did not have the tax photograph when they determined that the north addition was not significant. Ms. Blaes was able to find the photograph in 2009 and it was included in the Historic Sites Inventory. Ms. Blaes then determined that the structure was Landmark.

Assistant City Attorney McLean clarified that since the HPB had determined in 2007 that the additions were not significant, Ms. Blaes would not have been able to change the status without HPB approval. Ms. McLean explained that the HPB can re-evaluate the side addition because there is new evidence that the Board did not have in 2007, as well as the change in the criteria in determining significance.

Board Member Melville wanted to know the impact of reducing the status to Significant rather than Landmark for this property. Planner Grahn stated that they try to be consistent with how they treat Significant versus Landmark properties. There is more room to maneuver with Significant status because much of the historic integrity has already been lost. A Landmark structure is typically very pristine and in good condition and it has retained most of its historic

fabric. The structure at 1102 Norfolk has lost a lot because of all the alterations. Director Eddington pointed out that if the structure was Landmark it would qualify for the National Register Designation. Given the additions, it would not qualify. He did not believe they were being true with the current Landmark status.

Board Member Melville understood that the City was doing an intensive level site survey. She asked if the Staff had spoken with the people who were doing the survey for the entire City. Planner Grahn stated that they did speak with them, but they had finished Main Street and were just beginning to work on the residential. The Staff reached out to see if they had found any new historic evidence or tax photos; but they had nothing new that was not already in the HSI.

Board Member Melville asked if the Staff had researched this building at the Park City Museum archives. Planner Grahn stated that they had reached out to Sarah Hill at the Library and she had the same information that was on the HSI form.

Casey Crawford, the applicant, stated that she and her husband bought the house around 2005 and has used it as rental property. They are Old Town business owners and they would like it to be their permanent home. They would like to make the home work for them as full-time residents and still preserve the historic value of the home. Ms. Crawford stated that they live in a home at 812 Norfolk which they also own, but that home is not historic. They have three small children and 1102 Norfolk is a larger property. They love Old Town and need to live there, but they also need a practical place to raise their children.

Board Member Holmgren disclosed that she works next door to Ms. Crawford's business and she sees her daily.

Chair Kenworthy stated that as he drove by the property he noticed that the north wall appeared to be the center of this issue and the question was whether or not it could be removed if they reduce the status to Significant. He asked if Ms. Crawford intended to expand the house to the north property line. Ms. Crawford stated that they did not intend to max out the property because they would like to have a yard. However, they would like the ability to rotate the home. She believed that facing Woodside attracts from the historic value of the home.

Chair Kenworthy asked if it would be easier for the applicant to accomplish rotating the house and maintain the frontage facing Norfolk if it was significant rather than Landmark. Planner Grahn replied that there is a little more flexibility with a Significant designation in terms of re-orientation or rotation on the lot. She pointed out that the Chief Building Official and the Planning Director would determine whether there were unique conditions that warrant the relocation or reorientation.

Board Member Crosby asked Ms. Crawford if the first step was to get the Significant determination and based on that outcome, they would submit a plan

for HDDR. Ms. Crawford answered yes. She was unaware of how much the home had been changed until the Staff visited the site for the survey. She noted that when former planner Katie Cattan climbed into the attic she found that the original roof was completely gone. Ms. Crawford stated that there is an old chimney with a bunch of old brick that runs between the north side and the original hall-parlor of the home that would need to be restored as well. It is where the fireplace actually ran in the home.

Board Member White asked if the ceilings in the existing house were flat or vaulted. Ms. Crawford replied that they were flat but sagging. Board Member White assumed the existing roof structure was wood trusses. If the original roof was gone he was pleased that they had kept the skeleton look on the outside. If they wanted to return the structure to the higher designation, it would be easy to take off the existing roof and return the roof structure to its original shape.

Board Member Vance identified two issues. The first was Landmark versus Significant, which was independent of who owns the property or what could be done with it. The second issue was who owns the property and what do they intend to do with it. Board Member Vance stated that he sees a Landmark structure when he looks at the 1930's photo. However, in its present form it was not Landmark. Mr. Vance stated that the 1930's photo has the original roofline, which is very important for retaining the character of a Landmark building. He commented on the porch and the exposed rafters and explained how that relationship was based on the architectural language of the historic home. He pointed out how the current additions deter from the historic integrity of the structure, particularly the front porch and entry. Board Member Vance stated that based on the changes from the 1930's photo to the present, he definitely felt the structure did not have Landmark status. He encouraged the owners to pay attention to the architectural details when they renovate the home and possibly make changes that would return the home to Landmark status. He hoped the new addition would be more sensitive to the historic home than the current additions.

Ms. Crawford stated that they were proud to own a historic home and they intended to keep the historic character.

Chair Kenworthy opened the public hearing.

Ruth Meintsma, 305 Woodside Avenue, stated that she walks by this house three or four times a week. She always notices the altered roofline because altering the roofline of a historic structure is not currently allowed. However, she believed that the way it was altered did not take away from its 1900s ambiance. Ms. Meintsma referred to page 16 of the Staff report regarding the north addition. She remarked that even though the addition did not contribute and possibly takes away from the Landmark site, she did not think it diminished the importance of the 1930's addition. Mr. Meintsma referred to page 9 of the Staff report and the

reference that the addition to the north elevation believed to be constructed circa 1930 was not historically significant. She asked if that language was correct because she understood that it would have to be historically significant based on the new evidence from 1930. Ms. Meintsma read from the Historic Guidelines regarding Landmark structures; "Must retain the historic integrity as defined by the National Parks Service." She believed the HPB was dealing with two issues; the Significant or Landmark status and whether or not the 1930s addition was important to save for the house. Ms. Meintsma focused her comments on whether or not the north addition should be saved. She noted that both the Parks Service and the Historic Guidelines speak to "historic integrity". She read from the definition of "integrity as defined by the National Parks Service, "The authenticity of a property's historic identity evidenced by the survival of physical characteristics that existed during the property's historic period." Ms. Meintsma remarked that 1930 was the historic period because the Mature Mining Era was 1894-1930. She thought it was important to qualify the north addition as historically important and that it should be saved. Ms. Meintsma stated that it was still a viable property even though it was the Depression and the mineral prices had dropped families still lived in Park City, as evidenced by the timing of north addition. Ms. Meintsma noted that page 14 of the Staff reports reiterated the concept and importance of the addition.

Ms. Meintsma noted that the criteria for defining Park City Landmark structures was completely different from the National Historic Register in terms of level of determination. If a house qualifies for the National Register is it automatically designated Landmark. However, not having the National Register determination does not change Park City's determination from Landmark because the criteria is different. She provided an example to explain the difference. Ms. Meintsma had done her own research as well as contacting the SHPO office, and she believed that if the roofline was returned to the original roofline, it could possibly qualify again for the National Historic Register. It is very close to not only qualifying for the National Register, but also for being designated Landmark by Park City's criteria. The structure maintains its location and it retains its design, except for the change in the roofline, which could be restored. The setting is the same. The materials are the same, with the exception of the removal of the interior roof, as well as the workmanship, the feeling and the association. Those elements as defined by Park City qualify the structure for Landmark status. Ms. Meintsma agreed that the roofline could change it from a Landmark status to Significant status. However, in reading through the Park City criteria, she thought there was a fine line between Landmark and Significant. For various reasons she believed the home was very close to a Landmark structure. She reiterated that the 1930's addition should be saved because it has accomplished significance in its own right.

Board Member Vance noted that between the 1930s photos and the 2013 photo there was an addition to the addition. He wanted to know which addition Ms. Meintsma wanted to save. Board Member Bush noted that the new addition was

a closet that was clearly out of period. Ms. Meintsma clarified that she was referring to the addition that continues the roof line. Board Member Vance asked how Ms. Meintsma would deal with the situation of Landmark versus Significant for that particular element. He thought it was the most troubling aspect of trying to justify Landmark status. Ms. Meintsma was unsure whether it should retain Landmark status, but it is a fine line. She clarified that HPB needed to make that decision. In her opinion, the north addition that continues the historic roofline should be saved. She believed the change from Landmark to Significant was due to the altered roofline and loss of materials rather than the addition, and that the 1930s addition should be kept as part of the Significant structure.

Steve Swanson, the project architect, stated that he and Mr. and Mrs. Crawford had done extensive surveys and studies and came to the same conclusions about the underlying main structure and they agreed with the Staff findings. Mr. Swanson noted that Ms. Meintsma had commented on some of the finer points about designations and he recognized that it was not an easy job. He believed the overall survey would be exhaustive and thorough on all of the Park City historic properties, but because it is all new, it was too early to say what criteria would come to the forefront in terms of each property and creating a Significant or Landmark designation. Mr. Swanson stated that the owner was willing to work with whatever the HPB determines as the designated status. However, he asked that they keep in mind how much of the original fabric and detail has been lost. Mr. Swanson pointed out that a Significant determination would give the owners more flexibility than Landmark status to accommodate their needs. He looked forward to restoring and renovating the home.

Chair Kenworthy closed the public hearing.

Board Member Melville remarked this was a difficult issue. Referring to the north addition, she noted that the photos looking from the north show the old roofline before the additional roofline was placed and extended all the way to the north end of the house. Other than the roof, she asked if anything else had been added or altered to the north addition after the 1930s.

Board Member Bush noted that the original north addition changed the original hall-parlor design to a cross-wing. For that reason, he did not think the structure could be Landmark status.

Planner Wassum indicated the portion that they know was added between 1929 and the late 1930. It was the only information they had regarding the addition.

Board Member Melville asked if the historic period was older than 50 years or if it had an ending date. Mr. Bush stated that the period ended in 1930. Planner Grahn clarified that per the Design Guidelines, an addition which has acquired historical significance in its own right can remain significant. The question for the

Board was whether the north side addition has gained significance in its own right and whether it was worth saving.

Director Eddington noted that the mining decline occurred in the 1930s. The addition was clearly over 50 years old and it was added in the Mining Decline Era. He understood that it was difficult to make a determination on significance because there were no specific dates on record for the addition.

Board Member White referred to page 12 of the Staff report, Figure 7, the front of the north addition. He indicated a vertical piece that was probably trim and a small section moving to the left. In his opinion, he assumed that small piece was added to the addition into the porch. Board Member Melville clarified that her question was whether there was an addition to the north addition or whether there was another change to the house. Board Member White noted that the small piece was not shown on the late 1930s tax photo. Planner Wassum stated that the Staff knows it was added at some point but there is no evidence to determine exactly when it occurred. Board Member White stated that comparing the late 1930s tax file with the current 2013 photo it showed the difference. Planner Wassum agreed.

Board Member White thought the north addition is significant as shown on Figure 5. However, the existing roof was draped over the top and the historic roof structure was demolished. To the extent they could see the original roof form in Figure 7, he believed the structure could be no more than a Significant structure at this time.

Board Member Holmgren felt that a Significant determination for the property was being generous, and she found no historical significance for the north addition.

Board Member Crosby though enough evidence had been presented through the Sanborn maps and the archive photos to support that the original building itself could be Landmark. However, she did not feel that the north addition represented Landmark status at all and that it should be Significant.

Board Member Bush remarked that the fact that they were discussing the house and the addition precludes it from being Landmark. The addition changes the type of house and it should be no greater than Significant. In terms of the addition itself, Mr. Bush thought it met the criteria for Significant. However, whether it enhances the building depends on what the applicant plans to do with it. If they intend to retain its original form then it would not be significant. Board Member Bush would prefer to see the home returned to its original historic hall and parlor form, as opposed to the current cross-wing design with the north addition. He would encourage the owners to return to the original house form and stay within one period. In his opinion, it is never a good idea to mix periods.

Board Member White asked if the owners had a proposal on what they would like to do with the house. Ms. Crawford replied that they had started preliminary sketches but there were no solid plans. She agreed with the comment by Board Member Bush about mixing eras. She also preferred the original historic form.

Board Member Vance believed the north addition as it presently exists was not historic. If the north addition is not considered significant, there was more potential for the historic house to return to Landmark status in the future. Board Member Vance thought the structure should be designated as Significant and that they should not attach significance to the north addition.

Board Member Kenworthy concurred. There would be greater opportunity for the applicant to try to return the home to its original form if they do not label the post 1930s addition as Significant. Board Member Kenworthy clarified that there was agreement among the Board that the property should never have been designated as Landmark, but it is Significant.

MOTION: Board Member Holmgren moved to change the designation on 1102 Norfolk from Landmark to Significant. Board Member White seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

MOTION: Board Member Holmgren moved to maintain the non-historic status for the north addition on the historic home at 1102 Norfolk Avenue. Board Member Vance seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

Finding of Fact – 1102 Norfolk

1. 1102 Norfolk Avenue is within the Historic Residential (HR-1) zoning district.
2. There is an existing side gable hall-parlor structure at 1102 Norfolk Avenue. This structure is currently listed on the Park City Historic Sites Inventory (HSI) as a “Landmark” structure.
3. The existing structure has been in existence at 1102 Norfolk Avenue sometime before 1889 (exact date unknown). The structure appears in the 1889, 1900, 1907, and 1929 Sanborn Fire Insurance maps. Furthermore, the Historic Site Form contains tax cards of the structure from 1968.
4. The hall-and-parlor structure and first rear addition were both constructed within the Mature Mining Era (1894-1930) and are historic.

5. Though out of period, the side addition on the northern elevation added sometime between 1929 and the late 1930's does not detract from the historic significance of the structure.
6. The north elevation side addition was constructed between the end of the Mature Mining Era and the beginning of the Mining Decline.
7. Several additions and exterior modifications took place between the 1929 Sanborn map and the 1968 tax card. The extended rear addition on the west elevation detracts from the historic significance of the structure. The extended rear addition on the west elevation side was not constructed within the Mature Mining Era.
8. Most of the original exterior wood materials are remaining on the exterior of the historic structure.
9. The structure is a hall-in-parlor plan and typical of the Mature Mining Era.
10. The site meets the criteria as Significant on the City's Historic Sites Inventory.
11. The structure and the north addition is over fifty (50) years old and has achieved Significance in the past fifty (50) years.
12. Though the structure has lost its historic integrity due to the out-of-period alterations to its historic form, the historic form is visible because the new roof structures were added atop the existing historic roof form, and the north addition was only an extension of the structural form to gain more living space.
13. The structure is important in local or regional history because it is associated with an era of historic importance to the community, the Mature Mining Era (1894-1930).

Conclusions of Law – 1102 Norfolk

1. The existing structure located at 1102 Norfolk Avenue and the north addition meets all of the criteria for a Significant Site as set forth in LMC Section 15-11-10(A) (2) which includes:
 - (a) It is at least fifty (50) years old or has achieved Significance in the past fifty (50) years if the Site is of exceptional importance to the community; and
 - (b) It retains its Essential Historical Form, meaning there are no major alterations that have destroyed the Essential Historical Form. Major alterations that destroy the Essential Historical Form include:
 - (i) Changes in pitch of the main roof of the primary façade if 1) the change was made after the Period of Historic Significance; 2) the change is not due to any structural failure; or 3) the change is not due to collapse as a

result of inadequate maintenance on the part of the Applicant or a previous Owner, or
(ii) Addition of upper stories or the removal of original upper stories occurred after the Period of Historic Significance, or
(iii) Moving it from its original location to a Dissimilar Location, or
(iv) Addition(s) that significantly obscures the Essential Historical Form when viewed from the primary public Right-of-Way.

(c) It is important in local or regional history, architecture, engineering, or culture associated with at least one (1) of the following:

- (i) An era of Historic importance to the community, or
- (ii) Lives of Persons who were of Historic importance to the community, or
- (iii) Noteworthy methods of construction, materials, or craftsmanship used during the Historic period.

The Board adjourned the regular meeting and moved into Work Session.

WORK SESSION (Discussion Items only. No action taken)

Annual Historic Preservation Award

Planner Grahn reported that the Historic Preservation Board had indicated that one of their Visioning goals was the intent to continue the Preservation Awards program. The awards program is to be based on a Project utilizing the Design Guidelines for Historic Districts and Historic Sites and the focus of the award may change from year to year. In 2011, the Historic Preservation Board recognized the exemplary adaptive reuse of the High West Distillery and the City commissioned artist Sid Ostergaard to create an oil painting depicting the structure. The Washington School House Hotel received the 2012 Historic Preservation Award, and the City commissioned an oil painting by Jan Perkins. Both of these paintings are showcased outside of the Engineering Department in City Hall.

Planner Grahn noted that in December the HPB requested that the Staff select an awards subcommittee to nominate properties for the award and select an artist. Board Members Crosby, White and Melville volunteered to sit on the selection committee. The committee met on January 14, 2014, to discuss potential recipients of the art award. The Committee chose 929 Park Avenue and 515 Main Street as potential properties. Planner Grahn reviewed the two projects as outlined on page 57 of the Staff report.

The Board discussed 929 Park Avenue. Board Member Crosby referred to the photo of the addition looking from the north. She asked if they were looking at the addition with the garage running the whole width of the lot. Board Member

White thought the addition appeared to run the entire width of the house. Planner Grahn believed that it had a step that juts in and out rather than an inline addition. However, she agreed that it went across most of the backyard.

Board Member Melville clarified that the committee liked the way 929 Park Avenue had been rehabilitated and believed it was worthy of the award. However, she and Board Member Crosby also suggested that they think about the Talisker Building on Main Street because of the wonderful work on that structure.

The Board discussed the Talisker Building at 515 Main Street. Planner Grahn reviewed a series of photos showing the evolution of the building beginning with the 1940 tax photo and photos from 2008 and 2009 to present day. She noted that the renovation was done under the previous Design Guidelines. When the Talisker Building was remodeled the Staff made a major effort to the awning that was on the original structure.

Board Member Melville thought the work that was done on 515 Main Street was exactly what they were trying to encourage on Main Street. They are always encouraging people to preserve the building and keep it looking old. She believed it was a good draw for Talisker to have a restaurant in an authentic old building.

Board Member Crosby recalled talking about giving an award for more than one category. Board Member Melville agreed. She noted that 515 Main Street was remodeled a few years ago, but it is a high profile structure. She also liked the structure at 929 Park Avenue because the owners had done a nice job rehabilitating the house and adding the addition but still kept it looking authentic.

Planner Grahn stated that her concern with a dual award is primarily the cost of commissioning two paintings per year. Another concern is that the house at 929 Park Avenue was done under the current Design Guidelines and the structure on Main Street was under the previous Design Guidelines. She pointed out that it was the HPB's award and they could do whatever they wanted.

Board Member Melville remarked that the High West Distillery was also done under the previous Guidelines, and she did not think that should be a determining factor. Board Member Melville thought both structures were wonderful examples of preservation in different ways. She personally felt the structure at 929 Park Avenue looked reconstructed and less old and authentic; and it was not as noticeable as the structure at 515 Main Street. Board Member Crosby thought the structure at 929 Main Street looks like it has always been there.

Chair Kenworthy understood Board Member Melville's comment about 929 Park Avenue not having the same feeling of authenticity.

Board Member Crosby asked if the artist could do two smaller paintings if they chose dual awards this year, and keep within the cost realm of one larger painting. Board Member Holmgren pointed out that it would not have to be a painting. It could be a sculpture or another form to depict the recipient. Board Member Holmgren thought another issue that was not considered for the home on Park Avenue was the greenery that was shown in the old photos that was missing in the new photos. She thought the lack of greenery made it look less historical. Planner Grahn stated that the owner had planted trees but they had not filled in around the structure. Board Member Holmgren understood that the trees would be more effective without the snow and when the trees have leaves. She believed that was one of the reasons why the structure looked newer and less historic.

Board Member Crosby asked if Board Member Holmgren thought some of the trees were left but they were not visible because of the time of year. Board Member Holmgren stated that the trees were Box Elders and she was sure they had been removed. Planner Grahn remarked that the trees were overgrown.

Board Member White asked if the original porch on the house was concrete. Planner Grahn thought it was difficult to tell from the photo.

Board Member Melville liked both projects and she would vote for a dual award this year. Board Member Crosby concurred.

Board Member Bush agreed with all the comments. He thought the Talisker structure at 515 Main Street was high profile and it should be recognized to create similar enthusiasm. He also thought the residential structure on Park Avenue was done very well and it was adaptive re-use by creating off-street parking. Off-street parking is a community need and it should be commended. Board Member Bush supported the idea of giving two awards.

Board Member White was comfortable with dual awards for this year.

Chair Kenworthy asked if they should commission two paintings or something different. Board Member Holmgren thought they should get ideas from the artists rather than commission a painting. There are so many types of artists besides those who paint and she suggested that they open it up with an RFP. Planner Grahn stated that she was already looking at an RFP to avoid negotiating problems that occurred last year.

The Board discussed places in the Marsac Building other than the designated location where the paintings could be displayed for better public viewing. Board Member White suggested that the Council Chambers would be a good room to display the artwork. Director Eddington noted that placing sculptures would be more challenging than paintings and they would have to discuss where to display those if that occurred.

Board Member Holmgren stated that people are surprised when she mentions that the award was given to High West Distillery or the Washington School Inn. She asked if they should consider placing a plaque on the outside of the recipient building. Board Member Melville agreed with the idea of raising the profile of the recipient structure. However, she thought the buildings already had several plaques for various reasons and she was unsure whether there was room for another plaque. Board Member Holmgren noted that residences have ribbons rather than plaques. She also suggested that the sites be recognized on the walking tour. Planner Grahn favored the idea of a plaque. Since they were already working on an app for the walking tour, she thought it would be beneficial to list the HPB award recipients. Marion Crosby agreed that the award recipients should be identified.

Chair Kenworthy summarized that there was consensus for a dual award and that Planner Grahn would send out an RFP for the artwork. Planner Grahn stated that the committee would interview the artists and move forward.

Rehabilitation of Historic Structures

Planner Grahn provide information on different methods of rehabilitation and restoration. She noted that typically when people built a historic home it was built to last multiple generations. Substantial building materials and craftsmanship ensured that these historic structures lasted a long time. However, Park City structures were built in a hurry and they were essentially wood tents. Planner Grahn stated that in her research of historic structures she found that single wall construction was also common in Texas, Tennessee and other places where there was a boom in industry. The structures are often referred to as box houses because they do not have foundations and the single wall construction leaves no room for insulation.

Planner Grahn outlined the problems and issues that arise when a house does not have a foundation. In terms of materials failure, the wood rots out and causes different connections to break apart.

Planner Grahn reviewed the definitions for the treatment of historic structures provided per the Secretary of the Interior's Standards. The first is Preservation. Planner Grahn remarked that the idea of preservation is to keep the building as it exists, regardless of whether it has a 1900 addition or a 1970 addition. The second is Restoration, which returns the structure to a specific period or date. The third is Rehabilitation, which is to renovate a building to add apartments or a restaurant. The last is Reconstruction, which includes panelization and depicting the historic building through completely new construction and reapplying materials salvaged from the original structure.

Planner Grahn stated that the trend in Park City in terms of how to reach the point of panelization is when a new foundation is added. One of the options is lifting the house in whole, structural bracing occurs, and then the new foundation is poured. Sometimes it comes down to panelization where the structure is taken apart and stored and the pieces are put back together. Planner Grahn commented on a few cases where there is no historic material left to save. At that point a complete reconstruction is appropriate.

Planner Grahn stated that in order to qualify for reconstruction, specific criteria outlined in the LMC must be met. She explained the process for reconstruction. A structural engineer has to verify that the structure cannot be lifted in whole and for what reason. The Chief Building Official also has to find that the structure is dangerous or hazardous. The Planning Director and the Chief Building Official have to find unique conditions for reconstruction. Reconstruction also has to abate demolition. Planner Grahn pointed out that even when a structure is demolished it is required to be reconstructed. She stated that the Staff, the applicant and others visit the site to identify what material can be salvaged. If it comes down to panelization they determine the process for taking the structure apart and how the materials are stored. A financial guarantee and a preservation plan is always required and recorded with Summit County. The intent is to make sure that the work agreed to is done. If not, the City keeps the financial guarantee. The preservation plan helps to identify how the structure would be rebuilt and the treatments. Planner Grahn clarified that the financial guarantee and preservation plan are required for all historic properties and not just reconstruction.

Planner Grahn stated that foundation is a consistent issue in the Design Guidelines review. Typically the City does not allow a historic structure to be raised or lowered more than two feet. When a new foundation is poured they try to make sure that it is re-graded so less of the concrete foundation is visible. Sometimes it can be concealed by planting shrubs and bushes.

Planner Grahn stated that the Guidelines also provide steps to follow for disassembly or reassembly. It is primarily about documenting the structure.

Board Member Crosby asked if it was stipulated as to how the structure pieces would be stored during the construction process. Planner Grahn replied that the "where" is not always determined. The how is alluded to in the Design Guidelines. It depends on the project but she thought it would be helpful to have a standard set of guidelines. Board Member Crosby also suggested a time-frame for inspection to make sure there has been compliance with the storage.

Planner Grahn explained the procedure for disassembly or reassembly of a Landmark or Significant site as outlined on page 76 of the Staff report.

Based on her research, Planner Grahn found six properties since the 2009 Design Guidelines were adopted where the structure was actually lifted in whole and a new basement was poured. Three properties had panelization. Two properties were approved for reconstruction.

Planner Grahn commented on the realities of preserving historic structures. She pointed out that it is not always about the easiest method. Often it is choosing the most practical method because of how the structures are constructed. Given that most of Old Town is single wall construction, she thought it would be an easy discussion. Planner Grahn asked the HPB to consider three issues for discussion: 1) What are the realities of preserving historic structures; 2) What is really being saved; 3) What can be done to limit panelization as a preservation choice; 4) Is panelization a threat to the Historic District. She noted that the purpose of this work session was to frame the Historic Preservation Board discussion on different treatment methods.

Board Member Melville remarked that the projects they see appear to be more with reconstruction. She used the project at 109 Woodside as an example where the newly constructed garage did not match the house. She thought it was shameful when a reconstruction results in a brand new building that does not look historic. It is a waste of time and it does not enhance the Historic District.

Board Member Melville stated that when they start to do reconstruction or panelization, the Landmark status can be lost. If they allow one or two every year on Main Street, soon there would be none. She questioned whether that was good for the City. Board Member Melville was bothered by the rules that allow it and she suggested that the requirements needed to be strengthened. She could easily find a structural engineer who would say that the structure could not be lifted in whole, and she questioned whether the City should have its own structural engineer involved in that determination in order to protect the historic buildings.

Chair Kenworthy asked Board Member Bush for his opinion based on his experience in the business.

Board Member Bush thought Board Member Melville had raised a number of good points. He stated that collectively, whether it is City money or the applicant's money, the resources should be spent effectively. Board Member Bush believed that when certain things are forced on the homeowner, it creates an unfair burden and they do not always end up with what they wanted. He has always been in favor of the City doing some of the work and creating the preservation plan, finding the structural engineer and the team, or buying something to preserve it how they want. Board Member Bush did not believe that imposing the City's will on the homeowner was the right approach. He thought they needed to think about what they want, where they want to be, and the best way to get there.

Planner Grahn stated that the City has the grant program to help offset costs. Chair Kenworthy noted that the HPB had awarded a grant for the garage at 109 Woodside. He recalled that it was a lot line issue and the HPB did not have a choice but to do reconstruction. Board Member White recalled that the existing garage was falling down and all the materials were rotted. However, he thought the reconstruction should have been monitored much closer for a better result.

Board Member Melville understood that some of the reconstructions are under the current building codes versus the old codes, which changes the building to the point where it can never look historic or truly reconstructed. She thought that should be considered when they authorize reconstruction.

Board Member White stated that all the current preservation processes were useful. However, the HPB needed to be more efficient in trying to figure out the appropriate time and place to do each one.

Board Member Bush thought it was the execution of individual projects. A bigger vision is the infill that was lost to new construction, and how to achieve that compatibility. He stated that as a community they love their historic fabric and the Historic District, but they are not taking ownership. Instead, they create guidelines and impose them on the property owners. Board Member Bush stated that lifting a structure in whole is an expensive and dangerous process. He personally felt that panelizing the facades and storing them in a protective environment was a better process than lifting the house in terms of protecting the fabric. Board Member Bush commented on the importance of having the discussion, but it was elaborate and involved and would require more time than what they had this evening. Board Member Bush explained the difficulty in preserving structures with Landmark status. He clarified that he was trying to give life to the Historic District and these buildings. If they suffocate them, no one will want them. If they could find a reasonable equation to give people the ability to have a building that is functional in today's culture and still maintain the historic fabric, location and scale, they would be on a sustainable pace.

Board Member Crosby appreciated Board Member Bush's comments. She agreed that the term "Landmark status" is loosely used and easily attached to a property. Board Member Crosby was interested in all the comments because it helps her better understand. She felt an important aspect of being on the HPB was to educate each other and not take the determinations lightly. Park City is fortunate that people want to restore these historic homes and they should not make it so stringent that it becomes impractical.

Chair Kenworthy remarked that panelization is a good option but it negatively affects them for the National Registry. Planner Grahn thought it would be interesting to see the final findings of the Intensive Level Survey. She stated that even though the 2009 Design Guidelines are stringent they have brought back a

lot of the historic forms and features of the homes, particularly on the streetscape.

Board Member White suggested that it might be time to revisit the 2009 Design Guidelines. Board Member Melville pointed out that the HPB also has the purview to suggest changes to the LMC. Planner Grahn stated that once they finalize the General Plan they can start looking at the LMC and the Design Guidelines. However, before they get into the Design Guidelines she felt it was important as a group to identify the issues being encountered in the field or from an architectural standpoint, or something that was overlooked in the current Design Guidelines

Board Member Kenworthy asked what the Staff would recommend. Director Eddington replied that the preference is to keep the real panels and for the structure to look and feel historic. The concern is authenticity of the actual finished product. He agreed that the garage that was previously mentioned has the same shape but it does not feel and look authentic. Director Eddington thought the question was whether they wanted a more draconian LMC change saying that Landmark structures could only be panelized and not reconstructed. An appeal to that requirement would have to come before the HPB.

Director Eddington agreed that the City needed the ability to do the structural report, because when someone is paid they tend to provide the desired report rather than the reality. He suggested the possibility of increasing the fee for reconstruction to cover the cost of a structural report. Board Member White suggested the idea of having two opinions. Director Eddington remarked that the owner could obtain a professional report and the City could do one as well.

Board Members Melville and Crosby commented on the importance of oversight during the process to make sure the work was being done the way it was agreed to. Planner Grahn believed the Planners were conscientious about frequent visits to the site, particularly for historic structures. However, even if they visit the site three or four times during the project, it is impossible to catch everything. Board Member Melville wanted to know if they had any recourse if the completed project did not look right. Director Eddington replied that the City would still have the financial guarantee.

Board Member White reiterated that all three processes were useful, but it is important to make sure they assign the right process to a project. Whether to use panelization, reconstruction, or lifting in whole should be determined on a case by case basis. It is not a one-process fits all. Board Member Bush concurred.

Regarding the financial issues, Planner Grahn stated that when owners come in for a design review the Staff informs them of the different financial programs available, particularly if the site is Landmark. The Staff pushes the grant program

as much as possible, as well as the state tax credit and the federal tax credit. The problem is that most people are not interested. Board Member Crosby thought people might be concerned about the process of going through a financial program. Board Member Holmgren agreed, noting that it was an intimidating process.

Board Member Melville thought there should be an additional level of review for Landmark structures or projects that would greatly impact the Historic District.

Board Member Vance understood from all the comments that the desired end result is to have a building that looks historic. He supported reviewing structures on a case by case basis to determine the best method of preservation to achieve the end result. Board Member Melville noted that the Code and the Design Guidelines needed to be updated to reflect that intent before it could be achieved.

Chair Kenworthy felt the problem was that Park City structures were not meant for generations. They were constructed on the premise of get in, get rich and get out.

Planner Grahn thought the Board needed a better understanding of National Register eligibility and how it works. She suggested that they invite a guest speaker to talk with the Board. Director Eddington stated that they may not always attain National Register standards for individual buildings, but he felt it was pointless to do historic preservation without at least striving for National Register possibility on individual structures. Otherwise, the measurement has no value.

Board Member Melville pointed out that there will be no more historic buildings and when they let one go it is gone for good. She understood the cost burden to owners, but it was better to keep the restrictions in place because eventually someone else would purchase the structure and that person may be willing to spend the money to preserve it. Board Member Crosby was concerned about the structure deteriorating while it waits for a new owner who might preserve it.

Annual Legal Training on Public Meetings Act

Due to time constraints, the legal Training on Public Meetings Act was tabled to a future meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 7:45 p.m.

Historic Preservation Board Meeting
February 19, 2014

Approved by _____
John Kenworthy, Chair
Historic Preservation Board