

PARK CITY MUNICIPAL CORPORATION
HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD
MINUTES OF JUNE 3, 2020

BOARD MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE: Lola Beatlebrox, Puggy Holmgren, Jack Hodgkins, John Hutchings, Tana Toly

EX OFFICIO: Bruce Erickson, Caitlyn Barhorst, Laura Kuhrmeyer, Mark Harrington

The Historic Preservation Board meeting was conducted virtually via Zoom. The public was able to submit eComments during the meeting.

MOTION: Board Member Hodgkins nominated Lola Bealtebrox as Chair Pro Tem since Doug Stephens was not present this evening. Board Member Hutchings seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

ROLL CALL

Chair Pro Tem Beatlebrox called the meeting to order at 5:00 p.m. and noted that all Board Members were present except Doug Stephens and Randy Scott, who were excused. Puggy Holmgren joined later in the meeting.

Determination of the Health and Safety Risk under the OPMA

Planner Caitlyn Barhorst read the Determination of Health and Safety Risk under OPMA. Notice of electronic meeting and how to comment virtually. The meeting will be an electronic meeting without an anchor location as permitted by Utah Code Open and Public Meetings Act Section 52-4-207(4) as amended June 18, 2020, and Park City Resolution 18-2020 adopted March 19, 2020. The written determination of a substantial health and safety risk, required by Utah Code section 52-4-207(4) attached as Exhibit A.

The Board will connect electronically. Public comments will be accepted virtually. To comment virtually, use eComment or raise your hand on Zoom. eComments submitted before the meeting date will be attached to the packet as appendices. eComments submitted on HPB meeting days will be read aloud. For more information on participating virtually and to listen live, please go to www.parkcity.org

Planner Barhorst read from Exhibit A, Determination of Substantial Health and Safety Risk. On July 1, 2020, the Board Chair determined that conducting a meeting with an anchor location presents a substantial risk to the health and safety of those who may be present at the anchor location. Utah Code Section 52-4-207(4) requires this determination and the facts upon which it is based,

which include the percent of positive Covid-19 cases in Utah has been on the rise since May 27, 2020. Positive cases from testing have increased from 4.96% to 9.23% during the month of June, and COVID-19 patients in Utah hospitals have increased during the same time period. As of June 25, 2020, there have been 158 deaths in Utah due to COVID-19. Summit County has the third highest case rate of COVID-19 in the state.

This determination is valid for 30 days and is set to expire on July 31, 2020.

Chair Pro Tem Beatlebrox accepted the Determination of Health and Safety Risks under OPMA.

ADOPTION OF MINUTES

June 3, 2020

MOTION: Board Member Hutchings moved to APPROVE the minutes of June 3, 2020 as written. Board Member Hodgkins seconded the motion.

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

PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS

There were no comments.

STAFF/BOARD COMMUNICATIONS AND DISCLOSURES

Board Member Hodgkins noted that at the last meeting the Board had commented on the design of the addition at 1162 Woodside; however, the design was not final at that time. He asked for an update and whether any changes were made to the design since the last meeting.

Planner Barhorst stated that the Staff was still working with the applicant. The focus right now is to get the historic window dimensions finalized. The applicant was proposing to restore all the historic wood windows, which would potentially change the proportions of the opening.

Board Member Hodgkins recalled that the comments were more about the addition being compatible with the LMC for Old Town, rather than specifically about the windows and design of the historic structure.

Board Member Holmgren joined the meeting.

Planner Barhorst was not prepared to say whether the design would be approved or denied because they were still working through some of the issues. Planner

Barhorst noted that there would be one more design review team meeting for design of the addition. Overall, the mass and scale were not proposed to change, and the applicant was proposing a minimal footprint and a small amount of area where it attaches to the historic structure. She reported that a public meeting for the HDDR was held on June 18th. No one attended the public hearing and no public comments were received.

Chair Pro Tem Beatlebrox asked if there would be another public hearing once the design is finalized. Planner Barhorst replied that there would be an internal design review team meeting with the Preservation Consultant, the Planner, and the applicant to work through design guidelines compliance. She offered to review the Minutes from the last meeting and try to address the concerns the Board expressed. However, she recalled that the concerns related to the mass and scale of the addition.

Board Member Hodgkins thought it was more about the design and fenestration of the exterior. He recalled someone making the comment about how the Board previously provided feedback on various designs in Old Town, and which ones they thought were appropriate or inappropriate for Old Town. Mr. Hodgkins thought the design of the proposed addition is very modern and will be treated like the 1970s in 20 years. He did not believe it adheres to their feedback regarding compatible design in the Historic District. Chair Pro Tem Beatlebrox concurred.

Board Member Holmgren read through the Minutes and stated that her comments were the same as they were at the last meeting. She did not believe the proposed design was compatible.

Planner Barhorst stated that she would try to send out the link to the applicant's design statement and the plans that were reviewed at the public hearing.

Director Erickson asked Planner Barhorst to also send out the Appeal Regulations as to whether an appeal goes back to the HPB or to the City Council at the applicant's discretion. He believed they were beyond the ten-day appeal period. Planner Barhorst stated that they were beyond the appeal period for the HPB. However, since there has not been final action on the HDDR, that appeal is 30-days from the action date.

Chair Pro Tem Bealtebrox asked if the design has been finalized since the last HPB meeting. Planner Barhorst stated that she received a revision this week, but she had not yet formally addressed it. The Design Review Team would be reviewing the revised design in their DRT meeting next week. Board Member Hodgkins asked if anything in the design had changed based on feedback from the Board. Planner Barhorst replied that the applicant had not proposed any changes per the feedback. The changes strictly relate to the historic window

treatment. Ms. Beatlebrox pointed out that the windows are within the historic home. The Board was talking about the addition and its relationship to the rest of the neighborhood and its relationship to the existing historic structure. Planner Barhorst understood the concern. However, she reiterated that the only updates the applicant has made were the window modifications to the historic structure. No other changes were proposed at this time. Planner Barhorst remarked that at the last meeting, she was still working with the applicant to determine those dimensions, which could potentially alter the addition design. She had not yet done a side by side review, but she would urge the applicant to listen to the recording of this meeting and their comments would be in the record. Planner Barhorst stated that the design review team would have an extensive discussion next week.

City Attorney Harrington noted that the Board made comments and expressed concerns at the last meeting, and they asked for a follow-up status report today. Since this is a Staff decision, Mr. Harrington advised against asserting the Board into the process of the Staff review because it is not in accordance with the Code. However, once the Staff is ready to make their determination, they can inform the Board of their decision and let them know the various appeal or call-up timeframes and who has those rights. Mr. Harrington offered to provide the Board members with information on whether individually they have the right to appeal or whether they can try to call it up collectively as a Board so they will have that information when the 30-day appeal period begins. Mr. Harrington clarified that he did not want to prevent their concerns from being aired at the appropriate time by doing it prematurely and giving the applicant a reason to file a due process claim.

Board Member Hodgkins stated that when they reviewed the changes to the LMC, he was under the impression that the language would prevent such designs being built within a historic district. This is in a historic district and the basis for their concern.

Director Erickson stated that he and Planner Barhorst would work with City Attorney Harrington and provide the Board with options on how to take action if they do not believe it is not consistent with the Historic District Guidelines.

4.A. Fiscal Year 2020 Historic District Grant Program Update

Planner Barhorst updated the Board Members on which projects were approved for the Grant Program and what the project entailed, as outlined in the Staff report. The Planning Department received nine applications for the Fiscal Year 2020 Historic District Grant Program. Eight projects were awarded funds. She noted that half the projects had received a refund and the other half were still being finalized. Planner Barhorst stated that there were delays in the process

due to Covid-19. Some of the final deadlines for completion were extended an extra two weeks to compensate for the lag in construction work.

Planner Barhorst reported that applications for the next fiscal year are open now and that deadline was also extended an additional two weeks. She had received seven applications and she anticipated receiving more. The list will be updated once those applications are processed and approved.

Director Erickson asked if Planner Barhorst could estimate the total amount spent in 2020. Planner Barhorst replied that they used the entire General Fund and the entire Main Street RDA budget. No one applied out of the Lower Park RDA area, so those funds were not used. She estimated the total at under \$100,000. Director Erickson noted that both RDAs and the General Fund were now into the 2021 budgets.

Board Member Holmgren asked if paint for exterior was an eligible expense for grant funds. She thought paint was considered maintenance. Planner Barhorst stated that since the intent of the project is to use all the funds, she disbursed it evenly and put the priority projects at the \$15,000 cap of the larger repair categories. For applications that came in for other types of repair projects, the remaining funds were used for those projects. Planner Barhorst remarked that because of the Covid-19 delays, the eligible work has not been ironed out yet. However, the competitive cycle is getting pushed another year and those applications did not open. It was only the repair categories. Planner Barhorst noted that the Planning Department was accepting any and all proposals of what could fall under the repair grant category, which are maintenance-type proposals. She clarified that it was not a competitive fund. It was an equally disbursed amount.

Board Member Holmgren asked if the two \$15,000 awarded from the General Fund for Thaynes Conveyor Mine Site went to the same applicant. Planner Barhorst explained that \$15,000 went for needed emergency stabilization and the other \$15,000 went to ordinary repair and maintenance of the structure.

Board Member Hutchings asked if there was a specific reason why funds were not used from the Lower RDA. Planner Barhorst replied that no one had applied. For 2021 funds, postcards were sent to let everyone know that the Grant Program is open for applications. She had received more inquiries for this round of applications. The postcard notices will continue every year.

Board Member Hodgkins understood that 2020 was only repair and maintenance projects. He asked if those projects are scored. Planner Barhorst replied that those projects do not get scored. When the deadline closes, all the applicants are reviewed equally, and the funds are disbursed. It is not a competitive

process as previously discussed. The competitive process was put on hold and it will be reassessed next year.

Chair Pro Tem Beatlebrox asked why the addressee names were redacted. Planner Barhorst stated that she read through the Public Retention Code and the only information that is required to be publicized is the address of the project that received funding. After a request by one of the applicants, she looked into the Code to make sure the information could be redacted. Planner Barhorst pointed out that it is easy to find out who owns a particular property.

REGULAR AGENDA

5.A. Determination of Health and Safety Risk under OPMA

This item was addressed at the start of the meeting.

5.B. Land Management Code (LMC) Amendment – Proposal to amend the LMC to address inconsistencies and amend prohibited siding and roofing materials. The proposed LMC amendments would affect LMC 15-2.1, 15-2.2, 15-2.3, 15-2.4, 15-2.5, 15-2.6, 15-4, 15-5-5, and 15-15.

Planner Laura Kuhrmeyer reported that the Board previously reviewed the majority of these proposed amendments in 2018 when they were presented to the HPB, the Planning Commission, and the City Council. There was a hold up at the City Council and most of the amendments were not adopted.

Planner Kuhrmeyer provided a brief summary of the proposed changes. The sections within each zoning district will be rearranged to create a more consistent pattern to make it easier to find different sections within the Code. Regarding setback exceptions, the major changes are clarifying the setback tables by removing one of the tables that makes it more confusing and adding a new table. Other changes include adding a potential for a decreased setback on corner lots; limiting the size of window wells within the setbacks; and allowing a shared driveway in both the side and rear setbacks. In terms of building height, the Staff was proposing to remove the language that limits the 4' grade change to the periphery of the structure specifically. It will now just be a four-foot grade change across the site, which is how it has always been enforced. The intent is to clarify the Code to make it clear for applicants and Staff. Regarding the Architectural Design Guidelines, they were adding vinyl as a prohibited material, as well as untreated metal window frames as an inappropriate material in the Historic Districts and for any historic sites outside of the Historic Districts. Another amendment would add a definition for a shared driveway. Currently, there is no

definition and the Staff wanted to make it clear since a shared driveway is now being added as an allowed use within the setbacks.

Planner Kuhrmeyer remarked that the remainder of the changes were minor and included rearranging and correcting Scrivener errors and typos.

The Staff recommended that the Board conduct a public hearing and forward a positive recommendation to the Planning Commission and the City Council for the dates specified in the Staff report.

Board Member Hutchings wanted to know what the corner lot setbacks would change. Planner Kuhrmeyer explained that the change would allow a reduced setback if the property is on a platted unbuilt right-of-way. Instead of a 5' setback, a 3' setback would be allowed. However, if the setback is reduced, the owner would not be allowed to use other setback exceptions. Planner Kuhrmeyer explained that in order to reduce the setback on the corner lot from 5' to 3', the City Engineer would need to review the proposal and agree that the reduction would not impact anything within the right-of-way. Mr. Hutchings asked if it would impact parking on Old Town streets. Planner Kuhrmeyer did not believe parking would be affected because parking is required to be onsite for non-historic sites.

Chair Pro Tem Beatlebrox understood that window wells are not supposed to stick out into the setback; however, there are still egress window wells and those need to be large enough for a person to escape. Planner Kuhrmeyer replied that the Planning Department was having problems with people submitting applications where they identified a patio as a window well. The amendment was added to limit window wells to the minimum required by IRC for egress. Planner Barhorst clarified that instead of allowing for walkout windows that cross the line of egress, the amendment clarifies that it is only for a window well and not a sideyard cutout situation.

Board Member Hodgkins asked if patios would no longer be allowed as a paved use in the front yard. He pointed to Item 6 on page 42 of the Staff report where "patio" was crossed out. Planner Kuhrmeyer believed it was crossed out because patios are not listed as a front setback exception. Mr. Hodgkins clarified that paved patios are still allowed in the front yard, but not within the setbacks. Planner Kuhrmeyer answered yes.

Chair Pro Tem Beatlebrox opened the public hearing.

No eComments were submitted and there were no comments on Zoom.

Chair Pro Tem Beatlebrox closed the public hearing.

MOTION: Board Member Hutchings moved to forward as POSITIVE recommendation to the Planning Commission and the City Council on the proposed amendments to LMC Chapters 15-2.1, 15-2.2, 15-2.3, 15-2.4, 15-2.5, 15-2.6, 15-4, 15-5-5, and 15-15. Board Member Holmgren seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

- 5.C. 180 Daly Avenue – Historic District Design Review – Historic Preservation Board review for Material Deconstruction of a Significant Historic Site. The applicant is proposing Material Deconstruction for the Significant Historic Site consisting of removal of the Historic Foundation for the construction of a new foundation with crawlspace.
(Application PL-20-04537)

Planner Barhorst reviewed the application for the material deconstruction of a Significant historic site at 180 Daly Avenue. The applicant was proposing to lift the structure from its existing wood foundation and construct a crawlspace foundation beneath the historic structure. The floor elevation will be lifted two feet from the existing elevation to protect against erosion of the hillside on Daly Avenue.

Planner Barhorst stated that an addition was not proposed at this time. If an addition is proposed in the future, the HPB would review the removal of the rear wall where the addition would attach. The Staff would review and approve all other material deconstruction, which includes window restorations to the 1940s tax photo.

Planner Barhorst noted that the applicant would be constructing a retaining wall in the rear. The footprint of the addition has not been submitted at this time.

Planner Barhorst clarified that no material was being removed at this time. The applicant was only proposing to lift the house and to build a new crawl space foundation and setting the house on that foundation. The work will also include repairing floorboards and the floor structure. No exterior walls will be removed.

Board Member Hodgkins thought HPB approval was not required if the applicant was lifting the house two feet or less. Planner Barhorst replied that since the house will be lifted and set back on a new foundation, it qualifies as material deconstruction and requires Board approval. She noted that it was similar to what the Board reviewed last month for 1162 Woodside. Mr. Hodgkins recalled that the house at 1162 Woodside was lifted and put back at the same elevation. He wanted to know why the house at 180 Daly would be put back at a different elevation.

Dave Baglino, contractor and original owner of 180 Daly Avenue, explained that the elevation was being lifted two feet because the house is currently in a hole and the floorboards are rotting. If they only upgrade and replace the floor joists it would rot again in a few years. The only reason for lifting the house is to keep it out of the rotten soil it currently sits in. Mr. Baglino noted that 2' is the maximum and he believed lifting 12-18 inches would be sufficient to get the house off the ground. He stated that the reason for proposing a retaining wall is because the dirt on the hillside in the back is pushing the house over. They shored it up temporarily until they get the necessary approvals to complete the restoration of the home.

Chair Pro Tem Beatlebrox opened the public hearing.

No eComments were submitted and there were no comments on Zoom.

Chair Pro Tem Bealtebrox closed the public hearing.

Chair Pro Tem Beatlebrox stated that she is familiar with the steepness of the hillside and she thought it was necessary to raise the building from its current position.

Board Member Hutchings thought it was great that these old houses were being lifted up because they sink into the ground and deteriorate. He believed this was a good project.

Board Member Holmgren concurred.

MOTION: Board Member Hutchings moved to APPROVE the Material Deconstruction of the Significant Historic Site located at 180 Daly Avenue necessary to lift the house 2', based on the Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Conditions of Approval. Board Member Hodgkins seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

Findings of Fact – 180 Daly Avenue

1. The property is located at 180 Daly Avenue.
2. The legal description of the property is Lot A Daly Delight Plat Amendment. Parcel Number DALYDE-A.
3. The property is located in the Historic Residential (HR-1) Zoning District.
4. The property at 180 Daly Avenue is designated as Significant on the Park City Historic Sites Inventory.
5. On June 10, 2020 the Planning Department received a complete Historic District Design Review application.

6. The proposal complies with LMC § 15-2.2-3 Lot and Site Requirements, including:

Zoning Requirement

(A) Minimum Lot Size – 1,875 square feet
(B) Minimum Lot Width – 25 feet
(E) Maximum Building Footprint – 1,539 square feet
(F) Minimum Front and Rear Setback – 12 feet each for a total of 25 feet
(I) Minimum Side Setbacks – 5 feet each for a total of 10 feet.

Analysis of Proposal

Complies; Lot contains 3,858 square feet.
Complies; Lot Width is 44.24 feet.
Complies; Proposed Footprint is 790 sq. ft.
Complies; The existing Historic Structure encroaches into the Front Setback but is a valid Complying Structure per LMC § 15-2.2-4
Complies; Proposed Side Setbacks are 5 feet each for a total of 10 feet.

7. The proposal complies with LMC § 15-2.2-5 Building Height, including:

Zoning Requirement

Building Height – 27 feet from Existing Grade.

Final Grade within 4 feet of Existing Grade.

(A) Maximum interior height of 35 feet

(B) 10 foot minimum horizontal step

(C) Roof Pitch

Analysis of Proposal

Complies; Proposed height of the Historic Structure once on the new foundation will be approximately 17 feet, as measured, from Existing Grade

Complies; Final Grade is within 4 vertical feet of Existing Grade around the periphery of the Structure, except for the placement of approved window wells, emergency egress, and a garage entrance.

Complies; Proposed height is 9 feet, as measured.

Complies; The existing Historic Structure measures approximately 17 feet from where the foundation

meets the lowest point of existing grade.

Complies; the Historic Roof Form is 12:12

8. The proposal complies with LMC § 15-13-2 Design Guidelines for Historic Residential Sites, including:

A. Universal Guidelines

Analysis of Proposal

Universal Guideline No. 1

Complies; The Use is not proposed to change from a Single-Family Dwelling.

Universal Guideline No. 2

Complies; The Historic footprint as seen in the 1941 Sanborn Map will be retained.

Universal Guideline No. 3

Complies; The Historic exterior features will be Retained and preserved.

Universal Guideline No. 4

Complies; The applicant is proposing to Reconstruct the Historic windows and doors based on photographic evidence.

Universal Guideline No. 5

Complies as Conditioned (COA #4).

Universal Guideline No. 6

Complies; The applicant is proposing to remove the non-historic windows, doors, and siding.

Universal Guideline No. 7

Complies; No non-historic architectural elements are proposed.

Universal Guideline No. 8

Complies as Conditioned (COA #5).

Universal Guideline No. 9

Complies; The proposed foundation construction does not destroy any historic materials, features, or spatial relationships that characterize the historic site.

Universal Guideline No. 10

Complies; The proposed foundation is necessary for the Rehabilitation and does not negatively impact the historic site character

B. Specific Guidelines

Analysis of Proposal

1. Site Design

a. Building Setback and Orientation

Complies; The existing Front and Side Setbacks and original location of the main entry is maintained.

b. Topography and Grading

Complies; The character of the site is not significantly altered and the natural topography is maintained where feasible.

c. Landscaping and Vegetation

Complies; The majority of on-site plantings are maintained and the submitted landscape plan complies with LMC § 15-5-5(N).

d. Retaining Walls

Complies; The retaining wall at the rear of the

- Historic Structure is proposed to be constructed of concrete with a natural stone veneer; there are no existing Historic retaining walls.
- e. Fences
Complies; The applicant is proposing to reconstruct the Historic fence to resemble the one seen in the circ. 1940 tax photograph.
2. Primary Structures
- a. Exterior Walls
Complies; The applicant is proposing to restore the original windows and doors openings and restore the Historic wood siding. See Condition of Approval #4.
 - b. Foundation
Complies; The structure will not be raised more than two feet (2') from its original floor elevation upon the addition of the new concrete foundation, and the site will be re-graded following construction with no more than six inches (6") of the new foundation visible above final grade on the primary and secondary façades.
 - c. Doors
Complies; The applicant is proposing to restore the Historic door.
 - d. Windows
Complies; The applicant is proposing to restore the Historic windows.
5. Garages
- a. Scenario 1: Basement Addition without a Garage
Complies; The structure will not be raised more than two feet (2') from its original floor elevation. upon the addition of the new concrete foundation, and the site will be re-graded following construction with no more than six inches (6") of the new foundation visible above final grade on the primary and secondary façades. No basement is proposed, only crawlspace.
9. Staff published notice on the City's website and the Utah Public Notice website, and posted notice to the property on June 17, 2020. Staff mailed courtesy notice to property owners within 100 feet on June 17, 2020. The Park Record published notice on June 17, 2020.
10. Per LMC § 15-11-12.5(A)(2) Historic Preservation Board Review for Material Deconstruction, the Historic Preservation Board shall review the Removal of Historic Material to Accommodate New additions, New Construction, or Structural Upgrades. Prior to issuance of a Building Permit for any Material Deconstruction work, the Review Authority shall review the proposed plans for compliance with

the Land Management Code 15-13 Design Guidelines For Historic Districts and Historic Sites.

11. The Design Review Committee, Development Review Committee, and Planning and Legal Departments reviewed this application.

12. Staff did not receive any public input at the time this report was published.

Conclusions of Law – 180 Daly Avenue

1. The proposal complies with the Land Management Code requirements pursuant to LMC § 15-2.2 Historic Residential (HR-1) District.

2. The proposal complies with the Land Management Code requirements pursuant to LMC § 15-11-12.5 Historic Preservation Board Review for Material Deconstruction.

Conditions of Approval – 180 Daly Avenue

1. Final building plans and construction details shall reflect substantial compliance with the plans approved July 1, 2020 by the Historic Preservation Board regarding the proposed Material Deconstruction of the Historic foundation. Any changes, modifications, or deviations from the approved design that have not been approved in advance by the Planning and Building Departments may result in a stop work order.

2. The applicant is responsible for notifying the Building Department prior to making any changes to the approved plans.

3. Any changes, modifications, or deviations from the approved scope of work shall be submitted in writing for review and approval/denial in accordance with the applicable standards by the Planning Director or his/her designee prior to construction.

4. Where the Historic exterior materials cannot be repaired, they shall be replaced with materials that match the original in all respects: scale, dimension, texture, profile, material and finish. Prior to removing and replacing Historic materials, the applicant shall demonstrate to the Planning Director and Historic Preservation Planner that the materials are no longer safe and/or serviceable and cannot be repaired to a safe and/or serviceable condition. No Historic materials may be disposed of prior to advance approval by the Planning Director and Historic Preservation Planner.

5. Chemical or physical treatments, if appropriate, should be undertaken using recognized preservation methods. Treatments that cause damage to historic materials should not be used. Treatments that sustain and protect, but do not alter appearance, are encouraged.

6. The applicant shall submit a cribbing and excavation stabilization shoring plan reviewed and stamped by a State of Utah licensed and registered structural engineer prior to issuance of a building permit. Cribbing or shoring must be of engineer specified materials. Screw-type jacks for raising and lowering the building are not allowed as primary supports once the building is lifted.

7. An encroachment agreement may be required prior to issuance of a building permit for projects utilizing soils nails that encroach onto neighboring properties.
8. A Soils Report completed by a geotechnical engineer as well as a temporary shoring plan, if applicable, will be required at the time of building permit application.
9. Within five (5) days of installation of the cribbing and shoring, the structural engineer will inspect and approve the cribbing and shoring as constructed.
10. Historic Structures which are lifted off the foundation must be returned to the completed foundation within 45 days of the date the building permit was issued.
11. The Planning Director may make a written determination to extend this period up to 30 additional days if, after consultation with the Historic Preservation Planner, Chief Building Official, and City Engineer, he determines that it is necessary. This would be based upon the need to immediately stabilize an existing Historic property, or specific site conditions such as access, or lack thereof, exist, or in an effort to reduce impacts on adjacent properties. The applicant is responsible for notifying the Building Department if changes are made. If the cribbing and/or shoring plan(s) are to be altered at any time during the construction of the foundation by the contractor, the structural engineer shall submit a new cribbing and/or shoring plan for review. The structural engineer shall be required to re-inspect and approve the cribbing and/or shoring alterations within five (5) days of any relocation or alteration to the cribbing and/or shoring.
12. The applicant shall also request an inspection through the Building Department following the modification to the cribbing and/or shoring. Failure to request the inspection will be a violation of the Preservation Plan and enforcement action through the Historic Preservation Financial Guarantee or ACE could take place.
13. Prior to removal of any Historic material which is required to be reused, the applicant shall document their location and condition.
14. The historic site shall be returned to original grade following construction of a foundation. When the original grade cannot be achieved, generally no more than six inches (6") of the new foundation shall be visible above final grade on the primary and secondary facades. The site shall be re-graded so that all water drains away from the structure and does not enter the foundation. A plinth, or trim board at the base of the historic structure, shall be added to visually anchor the historic structure to the new foundation.
15. Per LMC 15-11-9 Preservation Policy, the Planning Department is authorized to require that the Applicant provide the City with a Financial Guarantee to ensure compliance with the conditions and terms of the Historic Preservation Plan.

Historic Preservation Board Meeting
July 1, 2020

The Historic Preservation Board Meeting adjourned at 6:10 p.m.

Approved by _____
Douglas Stephens, Chair
Historic Preservation Board

PENDING APPROVAL