

PARK CITY MUNICIPAL CORPORATION
HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD
MINUTES OF MAY 16, 2018

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

EX OFFICIO: Bruce Erickson, Anya Grahn, Hannah Tyler, Laura Newberry, Polly Samuels McLean, Liz Jackson

ROLL CALL

Chair Stephens called the meeting to order at 5:00 p.m. and noted that all Board Members were present except Randy Scott, who was excused.

ADOPTION OF MINUTES

May 2, 2018

Board Member Beatlebrox referred to page 16, and changed attractive to correctly read **unattractive**.

MOTION: Board Member Holmgren moved to APPROVE the minutes of May 2, 2018 as amended. Board Member Hutchings seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS

There were no comments.

STAFF/BOARD COMMUNICATIONS AND DISCLOSURES

Planner Grahn congratulated Assistant City Attorney McLean for being selected in an employee exchange program to work for six weeks in Courchevel, France. The Board congratulated Ms. McLean. Ms. McLean was excited for such an interesting experience; particularly since Courchevel has a different definition of historic. She explained that under the employee exchange program she would go to Courchevel in June and July, and an employee from the Courchevel Planning Department would come to Park City in October and November.

Planner Grahn reported that for the next meeting the HPB would have a work session to discuss relocation of historic accessory buildings and reorientation. She noted that the City Attorney's Office would have a substitute sitting in for Assistant City Attorney McLean during June and July if meetings are scheduled. The HPB would have legal counsel present for their meetings.

Chair Stephens asked if during the work session they could discuss the procedure for how the HPB handles the Vice-Chair in terms of how it is written in the LMC. Currently, the Codes says “per session” when necessary, and he thought it would be helpful to have a permanent Vice-Chair. Board Member Holmgren noted that the Vice-Chair position was permanent in the past.

Board Member Hutchings understood that Mike Stoker was the Architect on the 1021 Park Avenue project. Mr. Hutchings disclosed that Mr. Stoker was the Architect on his project at 943 Park Avenue. His project concluded in December of 2016 and they no longer have a business relationship.

REGULAR AGENDA – Discussion, Public Hearing and Possible Action

1. 1021 Park Avenue –Historic District Design Review – Material Deconstruction on Landmark Site. The applicant is proposing to impact a portion of the rear (west) elevation for a new addition, modifications to historic window and door openings. The house was approved to be reconstructed through the Historic District Design Review (HDDR) process in 2016. (Application PL-18-03797)

Planner Grahn reported that 1021 Park Avenue was likely built in 1887. There are limited documents on this house. Therefore, the Sanborn Maps are the best indication of how the house involved. The 1889 Sanborn map shows a porch off the back of the house. By 1900 the porch was enclosed and a separate shed structure is shown off the back. By 1929 an additional porch was shown on the south side. The house remained the same in 1941. By 1949 the tax code shows a full-width or a partial width front porch. In both 1958 and 1968 the tax card notes asbestos siding, which indicates that the house has seen several remodels.

Planner Grahn stated that the first photograph of the house was in 1981. It was difficult to see how the house evolved when they only had floor plans for comparison. Planner Grahn remarked that based on the photograph, the original windows that would have been more typical when the house was built in 1887 had been replaced by bungalow inspired picture windows. There is a chimney and a roof overhang for the porch on the side. It had asbestos siding. Moving into 1995, ornamental details were added on the porch. The siding was removed and replaced with wood siding.

Planner Grahn noted that a number of applications had occurred. This property had a Notice and Order that resulted in the house being torn down. Approval for reconstruction was given in 2015. The Staff has been working with the homeowner to reconstruct the house. It has been a lengthy process, however, the owner plans to rebuild the house following the HDDR.

Planner Grahn pointed out that the reconstruction itself has already been approved. The HPB was only looking at the material changes that would occur. Planner Grahn commented on the site conditions. There are ruins of a foundation and the site is overgrown. The applicant will clean up the site before the house is reconstructed and a new addition is built. It will be a simple yard consistent with Old Town.

Planner Grahn reviewed several non-historic additions on the house that were identified in photos in the Staff report. The first addition was an outdoor room that was later enclosed into interior space. It was in poor condition and the structure was tugging on the original pyramid roof, which caused it to sag. It had board and batt siding. The walls were thin and it was exposed to the elements. A second addition had vertical siding and windows and it was used as a bedroom. Planner Grahn noted that the additions did not contribute to the significance of the house. The significance was driven by the pyramid roof cottage.

Planner Grahn stated that the roof would be reconstructed. The applicant was proposing to rebuild the pyramid style roof based on the dimensions of the as-built drawings. Dormers will be added to the roof, but they will be set beyond the midpoint, and the dormer size is consistent with what would have been seen historically. Planner Grahn noted that there were two chimneys when the house was demolished. The chimneys were failing and that led to the Notice and Order. She did not believe the chimneys were historic, because other pyramid roof cottages included a chimney in the center of the roof. These chimneys were built later and on the outside of the house. Planner Grahn stated that because none of the chimney bricks were salvaged and in such poor condition, the applicant was not being asked to reconstruct the chimneys.

Planner Grahn noted that the exterior walls had a number of materials that varied from wood drop novelty siding to plywood and other new wood materials. A lot of it sat on the ground and was rotted. When the applicant deconstructed the house in 2013-2014, they were required to salvage as much of the siding as possible; however, there was not much to salvage because of the deteriorated condition, as well as the extensive window and door changes that occurred over time. Planner Grahn reported that in 2014 SWCA did the physical condition and found that there was not a foundation on the house. Portions of foundations and crawl spaces had been tacked in over time; possibly to address drainage issues. Planner Grahn stated that the applicant was proposing to construct a new basement foundation. The house will be lifted two feet to put in the foundation, and the site will be regraded.

Planner Grahn noted that based on the tax code the porch was not added until 1949. However, the Sanborn maps are not always the most accurate and it was

possible that the porch was added earlier than 1949. The porch does not take away from the historic building and the Staff was allowing the applicant to reconstruct it with details more consistent with the mining era. Planner Grahn noted that there were no historic doors on the house. The applicant was proposing to maintain the original historic door opening on the façade. The windows were a mismatch of aluminum windows and sliders. The applicant based the new window scheme on what was typical of pyramid roof cottages. Planner Grahn believed this was an appropriate approach given the deconstruction that occurred and the lack of physical evidence at the time of the demolition.

Board Member Hodgkins understood that a portion of the original house was stolen. Planner Grahn explained that the applicant had demolished the house and salvaged whatever historic siding materials could be salvaged. The materials were stored in a storage building and some of the materials were stolen. The applicant filed a police report, and he will be penalized in the financial guarantee because those materials were not protected. Mr. Hodgkins clarified that part of the materials were stolen but not all of them. Planner Grahn answered yes.

Chair Stephens clarified that this was a new application and that the approvals for reconstruction were granted in the past. He asked if the HPB was reconfirming what was previously done. Planner Grahn explained that the HPB would be reconfirming that the house is on the Historic Sites Inventory and that it will be reconstructed. The HPB would also affirm the proposed changes occurring as part of the reconstruction. Chair Stephens understood that at this point there were no materials remaining from the original application. If the HPB wanted to keep the back shed the applicant would have to redesign the plans and reconstruct the back shed. Chair Stephens clarified that the HPB was talking more about the redesign and reconstruction proposed for the HDDR review; and less about materials. Planner Grahn replied that he was correct. It was similar to the HPB review of the City project to reconstruct the house on Woodside.

Board Member Hodgkins asked which LMC would apply because of the long history. Planner Grahn stated that because the site is on the HSI the City would like to see it reconstructed; even though that approval occurred in 2015. She believed the LMC that applies would be the material deconstruction and the changes that will occur when the house is reconstructed.

Assistant City McLean explained that the material deconstruction is a new application and the LMC would be based on the date that the applicant applied for the material deconstruction. She believed the applicant also re-applied for an HDDR because the previous one had expired. That would also be based on the date they re-applied.

Board Member Hutchings understood that the Board was not actually approving the material deconstruction because it has already been deconstructed. Planner Grahn explained that the HPB should think of the building as still existing; and that the material deconstruction are the changes being made to that historic building. Board Member Hodgkins asked if it was the part that did exist but no longer exists. Planner Grahn answered yes, but it is coming back.

Board Member Holmgren clarified that they were looking at replication. Planner Grahn replied that she was correct.

Chair Stephens opened the public hearing.

There were no comments.

Chair Stephens closed the public hearing.

MOTION: Board Member Hutchings moved to APPROVE the material deconstruction of non-historic materials to a Landmark single-family dwelling at 1021 Park Avenue, pursuant to the Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Conditions of Approval found in the Staff report. Board Member Holmgren seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

Findings of Fact – 1021 Park Avenue

1. The property is located at 1021 Park Avenue. The property is located in the Historic Residential-1 (HR-1) Zoning District.
2. The historic site is listed as Landmark on the Historic Sites Inventory (HSI).
3. According to Summit County records, the single-family dwelling was constructed ca. 1901; however, it was first documented as part of the 1889 Sanborn Fire Insurance Map.
4. The 1900 Sanborn Fire Insurance Map shows an addition to the southwest corner of the house. This configuration remained through the 1907, 1929, and 1941 Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps.
5. The 1949 tax card shows a partial-width front porch, measuring approximately 4 feet by 20 feet. The exterior walls were sided and the assessor believed the house had a cellar. A 14 foot by 18 foot single-car garage was also noted in the assessment; however, it never appeared on any Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps.
6. By the 1958 and 1968 tax cards, asbestos shake siding had been used to cover the exterior walls.
7. In 1978, the house was evaluated as “Contributory” for the National Register of Historic Places District nomination.
8. On August 23, 1994, the City received an application for a Certificate of

Appropriateness for Demolition (CAD) from the present property owner; the CAD was closed by the Planning Department on December 29, 1995, due to inactivity.

9. On December 5, 1994, the Historic District Commission (HDC) heard an appeal by Bill Hart, submitted on October 14, 1994, and the HDC found that the structures at 1015 and 1021 Park Avenue were historically significant.

10. As early as 1994, site visits with the Planning and Building Departments found that the electrical system was inadequate and posed a fire hazard. The Building Department concluded the same in their 2013 site visits.

11. On April 11, 2013, the Park City Building Department issued a Notice and Order to Repair and Vacate for the structure at 1021 Park Avenue. The Notice and Order found the building to be dangerous and required that the building be secured, including covering windows and doors; the electrical meter be removed from the building and the meter base secured; the exterior branch circuit panel on the south side of the building removed; the chimney and roof be stabilized; and the building be vacated due to lack of sanitation and safety concerns.

12. On November 5, 2013, the Building Department issued an Administrative Citation to Bill Hart for not complying with the April 11, 2013, Notice and Order.

13. On July 13, 2014, Administrative Law Judge Alissa Owed ruled in favor of the plaintiff, Park City Municipal Corporation, in an Administrative Code Enforcement (ACE) hearing. The ACE hearing found that the property owner had failed to comply with the requirements as delineated by the Notice and Order and Administrative Citation.

14. The City commissioned a Physical Conditions Report for 1021 Park Avenue; SWCA submitted this report in an effort for the Building Department to move ahead on necessary repairs.

15. Bill Hart submitted a Pre-HDDR application with the intent to work with the City on moving ahead on necessary repairs on December 11, 2014. A full HDDR application to deconstruct and reconstruct the historic house was submitted on February 13, 2015, and was approved on March 18, 2015 (PL-14-02250).

16. On April 15, 2015, Bill Hart was served with an itemized bill for \$3,940.65, the costs incurred by the City to retain the services of SWCA Environmental Consultants to prepare the Physical Condition Report, Historic Preservation Plan and measured drawings. Payment was not received within the 30 days as identified within the itemized bill for costs.

17. On December 1, 2015, a judgment was given in the Summit County Third District Court, Case No. 158200085 in favor of Plaintiff, Park City Municipal Corporation against defendant William Hart and Pamela Hart for the costs identified in finding of fact #15.

18. On March 30, 2017, an Encumbrance and Agreement for Historic Preservation, Trust Deed Note, and Trust Deed in the amount of \$139,940.00 were recorded at the Summit County Recorder's Office. The financial guarantee required that the applicant obtain a "Certificate of Occupancy in accordance with the Historic Preservation Plan within 24 months of recording this financial guarantee."

19. On April 1, 2015, a permit (BD-15-20940) was issued for the deconstruction of the historic house at 1021 Park Avenue.
20. On June 22, 2015, the applicant informed Planning Staff that he had filed a police report for the theft of the salvaged historic materials at 1302 Woodside Avenue, the location where the salvaged materials for 1021 Park Avenue were being stored.
21. On September 8, 2015, staff sent Bill Hart a Notice of Default Non-Compliance of Agreement for Historic Preservation at 1021 Park Avenue, specifically finding noncompliance with Paragraphs 5, 7, 8, and 9. The non-compliance has not been rectified.
22. Bill Hart submitted an HDDR application to reconstruct the historic house with an addition on September 25, 2015. The application was approved on March 7, 2016. The HDDR approval included Condition of Approval #27 that said, "If a building permit has not been obtained by March 7, 2017, this HDDR approval will expire, unless an extension is requested prior to the expiration date and granted by the Planning Department."
23. On March 16, 2016, Bill Hart submitted an application for a building permit (BD-16-22408). The building permit has not been issued as it failed the LOD inspection on June 21, 2016, as a result of lack of toilet facilities, inability to locate the northeast property corner, lack of construction sign, LOD needing to be aligned to the property line, and lack of track pad.
24. On November 28, 2016, an Amendment to the Encumbrance and Agreement for Historic Preservation for 1021 Park Avenue was recorded at the Summit County Recorder's Office. It required that the applicant obtain a "Certificate of Occupancy in accordance with the Historic Preservation Plan within 18 months of recording this financial guarantee."
25. On February 10, 2017, the Building Department granted an extension for the building permit application until May 1, 2017.
26. On March 7, 2017, Bill Hart filed for an Extension of Approval for the Historic District Design Review approval to reconstruct the historic house with an addition. The extension application was deemed complete March 9, 2017.
27. On July 11, 2017, the Park City Planning and Building Departments issued a Notice of Default Non-Compliance of Agreement for Historic Preservation for 1021 Park Avenue related to the September 8, 2015 Notice of Non-Compliance. The notice provided the applicant 20 calendar days to correct the non-compliance by paying Park City Municipal Corporation a sum of \$2,880.00 for the missing historic materials. Fees have/have not been received.
28. On July 11, 2017, the Planning Department granted the applicant's extension request with Conditions of Approval requiring a timeline for completing construction, satisfying the costs of the ACE hearing, satisfying the Notice of

Default Non-Compliance of Agreement for Historic Preservation for the loss of historic materials, and requiring the applicant to record a Second Amendment to the recorded financial guarantee.

29. This extension of approval expired on January 7, 2018, and no progress was made to comply with the extension's conditions of approval.

30. The applicant submitted another Historic District Design Review (HDDR) application on March 26, 2018; the application was deemed complete on April 4, 2018. It is still under review with the Planning Department.

Conclusions of Law – 1021 Park Avenue

1. The proposal complies with the Land Management Code requirements pursuant to the HR-M District and regarding material deconstruction.
2. The proposal meets the criteria for material deconstruction pursuant to LMC 15-11-12.5 Historic Preservation Board Review for Material Deconstruction.

Conditions of Approval – 1021 Park Avenue

1. Final building plans and construction details shall reflect substantial compliance with the HDDR proposal stamped in on March 26, 2018. Any changes, modifications, or deviations from the approved design that have not been approved by the Planning and Building Departments may result in a stop work order.
2. 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 Project 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 Project Planner.
3. Any deviation from approved Material Deconstruction will require review by the Historic Preservation Board.

2. 115 Sampson Avenue – HDDR Material Deconstruction and Reconstruction – The applicant is proposing to reconstruct the historic house designated as “Significant” on the City’s Historic Sites Inventory. In addition the applicant will be removing existing non-historic parking pad along with its associated wood staircases and railroad tie retaining wall; non-historic stacked stone retaining walls and 1990s wood slat fences; post-1947 addition on the west elevation and an underground root cellar; rebuilding the historic pyramid roof and dormers; reconstructing the existing masonry chimney; raising the house 2 feet to pour a new foundation; reconstructing the historic ca.1900 wraparound porch on the

east and south elevations; replacing two non-historic doors; and removing non-historic aluminum windows and restoring 11 window openings.
(Application PL-17-03580)

Planner Grahn thanked Planning Tech, Laura Newberry, for her help in writing all the background and history for these applications.

Planning Tech Newberry reported that 115 Sampson was designated as a Significant site. The Staff believed it was built around 1904. From 1907 to 1941 the Sanborn maps show that the house remained largely unchanged. The first photo was not until 1920. The structure was a one-and-a-half story square pyramid roof house with a small one-story addition off the rear on the west side; and a wrap-around porch on the south and east elevations. No dormers were present at that time. Planner Newberry stated that since 1941 the Fire Insurance Maps show several additions, including a rear lean-to addition along the west; and an addition extending off the west elevation which is possibly a root cellar, which cannot be accessed from the interior of the house.

Planner Newberry stated that many of the changes present on the house today are believed to have occurred between 1960 and 1980 based on the materials and the designs. The windows and the doors have been substantially altered and replaced with aluminum frames, side sliders, and fixed transoms. New dormers were also built sometime after 1920. The Staff believes the dormers may have been introduced in the 1970s.

Planner Newberry noted that the parking pad along Sampson Avenue was added in 1983 and is supported by packed gravel and a railroad tie retaining wall. The set of stairs leading from the parking pad to the flat portion of the yard was also added in 1995.

Planner Grahn remarked that the first item for discussion was that the applicant was proposing disassembly and disassembly or panelization. The house had been mothballed in 2011, which means they added additional framing on the interior to keep it standing. The windows and doors were boarded up and there was an effort to limit access to the site. Planner Grahn noted that the structure continues to decline due to its location on the hillside.

Planner Grahn reviewed the Criteria. The first is that a licensed structural engineering has certified that the historic building cannot be reasonably lifted intact. She noted that the applicant had provided a structural engineers report, which indicated several deficiencies based on the floor and roof structures. Even with the temporary shoring that was done in 2011, the exterior walls are rotted and need to be rebuilt. She pointed out that lifting the house in whole was improbable.

Planner Grahn commented on the next criteria; 1) it will abate demolition; 2) it is found by the Chief Building Official to be hazardous or dangerous due to the section of the International Building Code; 3) the HPB determines, with input from the Planning Director and CBO, that the unique conditions warrant it.

Planner Grahn reported that the first Notice and Order was issued in 2010, and the applicant addressed those issues through the mothballing process in 2011. She stated that she and the Chief Building Official visited the site several times in 2018. The CBO concurs with the structural engineer's report. Planner Grahn noted that it is difficult to determine the condition of the historic materials because they have been extensively altered. Large window openings have been cut into the front panel. The door/window configuration has been changed. The structure is resting directly on the dirt. The porches are pulling away. The structure is in very poor condition.

Planner Grahn stated that the applicant was proposing to panelize the north, south and east sides of the building. The west side was up against the hillside and that wall is deteriorated. She noted that it was covered in aluminum siding in an effort to preserve some of the wood material, but because the house sits directly on the dirt, she did not think the aluminum siding protected much underneath. That was an issue the HPB could discuss in the material deconstruction.

Planner Grahn reported that the applicant has agreed to reassemble the house in its current form. They produced accurate dimension drawings. They will build a new structure and the panels will come back on it. Planner Grahn stated that several conditions of approval were added to ensure that the proposed plan is followed. The Staff will continue to work with the applicant through the building permit process. She thought the applicant was planning to store the panels vertically on-site. If that changes, the Staff wanted assurance that they would know where the panels are stored and that they were being preserved to the best extent possible.

Chair Stephens clarified that the house was being panelized rather than disassembled in pieces. Planner Grahn replied that the three walls would be taken down and put back up. Chair Stephens understood that it was currently vertical material with horizontal siding. Planner Grahn answered yes. She noted that 1970s wood panel was helping to hold it together with aluminum siding on the outside. Chair Stephens asked if exploratory demolition had been done through the aluminum siding. Planner Grahn replied that the applicant was able to take off a portion underneath the porch. The wood siding appeared to be in fair condition, but she thought it was hard to assess the entire house from one point. She believed there were different elements of wood depending on the side of the house.

Planner Grahn moved to material deconstruction. She noted that it is a steep downhill lot. A non-historic parking pad is being held together by railroad ties. Parts of the staircase were built in the 1980s and 1990s, and it leads to a 1970s deck with a vintage hot tub and additional site improvements. The site is overgrown. The applicant was proposing to add an addition connecting up to Sampson Avenue, which would provide a more pedestrian-friendly streetscape and access into the house and the yard. Terracing would be done to create a series of outdoor living spaces and patios in an effort to clean up the site.

Planner Grahn pointed out several non-historic additions. The applicant was proposing to remove those additions to restore the pyramid roof cottage. The roof is in poor condition and will need to be reconstructed. The applicant was proposing to restore the dormers. Two dormers have the look and proportions of being built within the historic period. Another dormer did not have that look. The Staff would work with the applicant to make that dormer comply and look the same as the other two.

Planner Grahn stated that it was difficult to know how this house evolved because of limited documentation and records. They were basing it off of what is seen in town and other pyramid roof cottages. Planner Grahn pointed to an existing chimney at the top of the peak. The applicant will salvage the bricks and reconstruct the chimney. She presented a photo of the exterior walls showing single-wall construction. The applicants will create a new structure and attach the panels as cladding.

Planner Grahn noted that there is no foundation. Parts of the house are floating on rock piers. Other parts are resting on the dirt which has caused the floors to rot out. The wrap-around porch is original, per the Sanborn maps. Parts of the porch roof were removed to incorporate skylights. The porch appears to have been updated in the 1970s or 1980s with ornate columns and ornamentation that did not exist historically. The applicant planned to reconstruct the porch and keep it simple as it would have existed originally.

Planner Grahn stated that there were no historic doors on the house. The only doors are two single-panel doors probably from the 1970s. The applicant was proposing to construct new doors in line with the design guidelines and the historic feel of the house. There are a total of 11 window openings in varying styles and eras. As the aluminum siding is removed, they will be able to assess where the original window openings were and restore them. Conditions of approval were added requiring the applicant to work with the Planning Department to make sure the original window openings will be restored.

Planner Grahn commented on three sheds on the property. The sheds were not listed as historic on the historic site form, possibly because they were not visible. She inspected them on the site visits and found various degrees of salvaged

material and plywood. She did not believe the sheds were historic. The applicant was proposing to demolish the sheds.

Board Member Hutchings asked if there was historic material on the porch. Planner Grahn did not believe there was historic material. There is some bead board on the ceiling, but because of how the porch was built and the amount of leaks in the roof, it has rotted out. She thought the applicant was planning to restore the bead board. The porch floor rests directly on the dirt and it appears to have been replaced with newer materials, but it was rotted out.

Chair Stephens thought the material around the front porch on the east and south side was the original material. Planner Grahn asked if Chair Stephens thought the columns and the brackets were historic. Chair Stephens clarified that he was talking about the flooring material. It was vertical grain, which would have been consistent with that era of construction. Most likely it would have been replaced with an expensive material later on. Chair Stephens agreed that the floor was under duress.

Chair Stephens opened the public hearing.

There were no comments.

Chair Stephens closed the public hearing.

MOTION: Board Member Beatlebrox moved to APPROVE the disassembly/reassembly panelization of the historic house at 115 Sampson Avenue; as well as material deconstruction of non-historic and non-contributory materials, pursuant to the Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Conditions of Approval found in the Staff report. Board Member Holmgren seconded the motion.

Findings of Fact – 115 Sampson Avenue

1. The property is located at 115 Sampson Avenue.
2. The site is designated as Significant on the Historic Sites Inventory.
3. On February 12, 2018, the Planning Department received a Historic District Design Review (HDDR) application for the property at 115 Sampson Avenue; it was deemed complete February 22, 2018. The HDDR application has not yet been approved as it is dependent on the HPB's Review for Material Deconstruction approval.
4. The exact date of construction of this house is unknown, but the Summit County Recorder's Office lists the date of construction as 1904 and it appears in 1920s photographs of Old Town as a simply pyramid-roof cottage with a porch and no dormers.

5. The first recorded owner of the property is the Park City Townsite Corporation, and the site may have housed mine workers. It was first purchased by an individual in 1937—Frank Pintar, his wife Celia, and son Victor lived in the house.

6. From 1907 to 1941, the Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps show the house remained largely unchanged. It was a one and one-half story, square pyramid-roof house with a small one-story addition on the southwest corner. It had a porch that wrapped around the east façade and south elevation.

7. Since the 1941 Sanborn Fire Insurance Map, there have been several additions including a rear lean-to addition across the west elevation. There is also a second addition on the west elevation that is built into the hillside and is closed off from the interior of the house. This addition is constructed of railroad ties with stacked stone on the exterior; it may have been used as a root cellar at one time.

8. Between 1960 and 1980, several modifications were made to the historic house that have diminished its historical significance. The window-door configuration was substantially altered after 1970, with new aluminum sliding and picture windows and flush wood doors. On the east façade, the original double-hung wood windows were replaced with large picture windows. A vinyl faux-Permastone product was installed on the east façade and aluminum siding covered the original wood drop novelty siding. Additionally, skylights were cut into the porch roof on the south elevation and new dormers were constructed after 1920.

9. The parking structure along Sampson Avenue was constructed in 1983 and consists of a railroad tie retaining wall with packed gravel. There is a newer set of stairs leading from the parking pad to the house, likely built in 1995.

10. On October 13, 2010, the Chief Building Official issued a Notice and Order to Repair and Vacate the historic house. Subsequently, the Planning Department received a plan to stabilize and mothball the house on November 4, 2011. Work included documenting the historic house, developing a Physical Conditions Report, as-built drawings, structurally stabilizing the house, making necessary repairs to achieve the preservation plan/mothballing plan, exterminate and control pests, protect the exterior envelope from moisture penetration, secure the building and its component features to reduce vandalism and break-ins, provide adequate ventilation, secure and/or modify the mechanical utility systems, and a plan for maintenance and monitoring.

11. On April 10, 2013, the Building Department issued a second Notice and Order to Repair or Vacate the house.

12. On March 6, 2014, Park City Council approved the 115 Sampson Avenue Subdivision through Ordinance 14-07; it was recorded on February 26, 2015.

13. Due to the deteriorated condition of the historic house and the total deterioration of the west wall against the hillside, the applicant has proposed to disassemble/reassemble the north, south, and east walls of the historic house.

14. The proposal complies with LMC 15-11-14 Disassembly and Reassembly of a Historic Building or Historic Structure as:

- a. Licensed Structural Engineer Henry Shen has certified that the Historic

Building cannot be reasonably moved intact. The exterior walls have no capacity for wind, seismic, or gravity loads and 75% of the wall materials have deteriorated.

b. The proposed disassembly and reassembly will abate demolition of the Historic Building on the site.

c. The Historic Building has been found by the Chief Building Official to be hazardous or dangerous, pursuant to Section 116.1 of the International Building Code. In 2010, the Park City Building Department issued a Notice and Order to Repair or Vacate the historic house due to its dilapidated and unsafe condition. Although the house was mothballed and temporarily stabilized in 2011, the condition of the house has continued to decline.

d. The Historic Preservation Board determined, with input from the Planning Director and Chief Building Official, that unique conditions and the quality of the Historic Preservation Plan warrant the proposed disassembly and reassembly due to unique conditions. On April 27, 2017, the Chief Building Official concurred with the structural engineer's report dated April 26, 2018 that the deteriorated condition and structural instability of the house prevented it from being lifted in whole.

e. The north, south and east walls will be disassembled; the west wall has deteriorated from sitting against the hillside along Sampson Avenue. Measured drawings have been submitted as part of the HDDR application to document the original dimensions of the walls. The Building will be reassembled in their original form, location, placement, and orientation.

15. The applicant is proposing to demolish the non-historic c.1983 parking pad, railroad tie retaining wall, and a series of stairs and landings that access the house. The proposed material deconstruction mitigates to the greatest extent practical any impact to the historical importance of the other structures located on the property and on adjacent parcels. Further, these improvements are not historic and do not contribute to the historical significance of the house.

16. On the south side of the historic house, there is a 1970s multi-level deck containing a hot tub. There are also a number of stone retaining walls and 1990s wood fences along the north and south property lines. These improvements are not historic and do not contribute to the historical significance of the property. The applicant is proposing to remove these dilapidated improvements in order to redevelop the site and construct a new addition to the house. These improvements do not contribute to the historic significance or historic integrity of the site.

17. There are two one-story additions along the west elevation of the historic house that was constructed after 1947. The first addition is seven feet wide and covered with aluminum siding. It attaches to an 8 foot wide addition that is partially buried in the hillside. This addition consists of railroad ties and dry-stacked stone on the exterior. The walls and roof are in severe disrepair. These additions to the Historic Site have been found to be non-contributory to the historic integrity and historical significance of the site.

18. The historic house has a pyramid roof form. There are simple gable dormers

perpendicular to the roof on the east, west, and south elevations. The roofing materials and structure are in poor condition, with the structural engineer finding that the existing roof structure does not have any capacity of shear diaphragm value. The applicant is proposing to reconstruct the roof form. Staff finds that the reconstruction is necessary for the restoration of the original roof form.

19. There is an existing masonry chimney that protrudes from the top of the pyramid roof structure. The chimney is original, but has been modified through shortening. The bricks and mortar are deteriorated. The applicant is proposing to salvage the bricks from the historic chimney and reconstruct it on the outside of the house. The proposed material deconstruction is necessary to restore the original chimney.

20. The exterior walls have no capacity for wind, seismic, or gravity loads. The west wall has rotted out, and the north, south, and east sides of the house are covered with aluminum siding. The structural engineer has found that 75% of the walls were deteriorated and would require reconstruction.

21. The historic structure does not have a foundation. The posts, beams, and bearing walls sit on stacked stone, wood piles, or directly on the soil. The structural engineer estimates that 90% of the posts supporting the floor structure have rotted. The applicant proposes raising the historic house 2 feet in order to construct a new foundation. The proposed material deconstruction mitigates any impacts that will occur to the architectural integrity of the structure.

22. There is an existing wraparound porch that extends across the east façade and south elevation of the house. A portion of the porch roof was removed in the 1970s to install new glass skylights on the east elevation. The porch posts and ornamentation are not historic and the floor structure has rotted. The applicant is proposing to reconstruct the historic porch form and restore its historic appearance. The proposed material deconstruction is necessary in order to restore the original wraparound porch.

23. There are only two historic door openings on the house on the south and east elevations. The existing doors are not historic and are in poor condition. The applicant is proposing to replace the doors with new wood doors that are historic in appearance. The proposed material deconstruction is necessary in order to restore the historic house.

24. There are a total of 11 window openings on the exterior of the structure. Ten of these openings appear to have been altered with non-historic aluminum frame windows. The applicant is proposing to restore the original window openings and install new wood windows on the historic house. The proposed material deconstruction is necessary in order to restore the historic house.

25. There are three existing sheds identified on the survey of the property. The sheds are not designated as historic on the 2009 Historic Sites Inventory; and these sheds were likely constructed of reclaimed materials after 1960. The sheds were built on flatter portions of the lot. The applicant is proposing to demolish these sheds as part of their site improvements. These sheds are not historic and do not contribute to the historical significance of the site.

Conclusions of Law – 115 Sampson Avenue

1. The proposal complies with the Land Management Code requirements pursuant to the HRL District and regarding historic structure deconstruction and reconstruction.
2. The proposal meets the criteria for disassembly and reassembly pursuant to LMC 15-11-14 Disassembly and Reassembly of a Historic Building or Historic Structure.
3. The proposal meets the criteria for material deconstruction pursuant to LMC 15-11-12.5 Historic Preservation Board Review for Material Deconstruction.

Conditions of Approval – 115 Sampson Avenue

1. Final building plans and construction details shall reflect substantial compliance with the HDDR proposal stamped in on February 12, 2018. Any changes, modifications, or deviations from the approved design that have not been approved by the Planning and Building Departments may result in a stop work order.
2. To ensure accurate reassembly, all parts of the building or element should be marked as they are systematically separated from the structure. Contrasting colors of paint or carpenter wax crayons should be used to establish a marking code for each component. The markings should be removable or should be made on surfaces that will be hidden from view when the structure is reassembled.
3. The process of disassembly should be recorded through photographic means; still photograph or video.
4. As each component is disassembled, its physical condition should be noted particularly if it differs from the condition stated in the pre-disassembly documentation. If a part is too deteriorated to move, it should be carefully documented—photograph, dimensions, finish, texture, color, etc.—to facilitate accurate reproduction.
5. Should the applicant not be able to panelize the north, south, or east wall due to its deteriorated condition following further material deconstruction, the applicant should immediately notify the Planning Department. The Planning Director, with input from the Chief Building Official and Historic Preservation Planner, may approve any deviations from this approved plan. The applicant is responsible for amending the Historic Preservation Plan and Physical Conditions Report.
6. Following removal of the non-historic aluminum siding, the applicant shall update his Historic Preservation Plan with a conditions report detailing the locations of original window openings. The applicant shall base any window modifications on the façade (east elevation) or secondary facades (north and south elevations) that will be visible from the Norfolk and Sampson Avenue rights-of-way on physical, measured evidence uncovered during the demolition

process. Planning staff shall review and approve the updated window configuration based on this new physical evidence.

7. Where the historic siding materials cannot be repaired, they shall be replaced with materials that match the original in all respects: scale, dimension, texture, profile, material, and finish. The replacement of existing historic material shall be allowed only after the applicant has demonstrated to the Planning Department that the historic materials are no longer safe and/or serviceable and cannot be repaired to a safe and/or serviceable condition. The Planning Department shall approve in writing the disposal of any historic siding materials.

3. 835 Empire Avenue –Historic District Design Review – Material Deconstruction on Landmark Site. The applicant is proposing to impact the following materials including the pre 1941 railroad tie retaining wall; non-historic wood landscape steps; post-1941 rear additions; non-historic 1997 asphalt shingle and rolled asphalt roofing materials; non-historic concrete block foundation; pre-1983 wraparound porch; 4 historic wood doors; and 10 historic wood windows. (Application PL-17-03556)

Planning Tech Newberry reviewed the application for 835 Empire Avenue, which was designated as a Landmark. She noted that the exact date this house was constructed is unknown, but it was likely around 1895. The structure first appears on the Sanborn map and Fire Insurance maps in 1900 as a one-and-a-half story house with a one story addition on the north side and west elevation, with no porch shown. Between 1900 and 1907 the rear addition was removed and a new square addition was constructed on the northwest corner of the house; as well as a smaller addition on the southwest corner of the house. An accessory structure was built approximately 20 feet west. Between 1929 and 1941 an addition was added on to the accessory building, which brought it to 15' from the rear of the house. The accessory structure has since been lost and the date of when it was demolished is unknown.

Planner Newberry noted that the first photograph was from 1941; where a portion of the 1907 rear addition could be seen on the right side of the photo. Between 1947 and 1964 the additions on the west side of the house shown in the 1941 Sanborn map were removed and expanded. Sometime before 1983 a wrap-around porch was added; as well as a small shed extension from the main gable to the porch.

Planner Newberry stated that the house has received several historic district grants. It was nominated for the National Register in 1984, but it was not listed due to the owner's objections. The house remains largely unchanged from the 1984 National Register nomination form.

Planner Grahn commented on material deconstruction. It is an uphill site and there are wood retaining walls in the City's right-of-way. In looking at different

photographs, the retaining walls do not appear to be historic as they have changed several times over time. It was the same with the staircase. The applicant was proposing to maintain the central access from the front door to the street. However, it would need to be rebuilt and new retaining walls would be constructed on the applicant's property and out of the City right-of-way.

Planner Grahn pointed to a couple of non-historic additions. She explained that this application was spurred last summer when they were doing material deconstruction. John DeGray, the architect, and the contractor, had asked her to come and look at it. Planner Grahn stated that this house was odd because there is a heavy stone addition that may have been a root cellar at one time and was converted into a dining room. She pointed to a rectangular portion that appears on the Sanborn map, but later appears to be extended. When looking inside the house they found two different construction methods on one wall. The slope of the roof changes slightly, and they concluded that this area was probably added much later and they just continued the slope.

Planner Grahn remarked that additional evidence that the additions were not historic is the belief that the area was originally buried further on the back of the house because there is a second floor door that would have led to a small porch or to the ground behind it.

Planner Grahn stated that the structure is in fairly good condition. The applicant was proposing to build new frame walls, which is typical for single-wall construction. The roof has an east-west front facing gable. Without removing or reconstructing the roof, the applicant will add additional structure to strengthen the gables. The exterior walls are drop novelty wood siding and are in good condition. In some places the walls rest directly on the dirt and will need to be replaced, but that is a maintenance issue that is not under the review of the HPB. Planner Grahn noted that due to the amount of grade, the applicant has not been able to verify whether or not it is a slab foundation or just concrete along the edges.

Planner Grahn stated that the applicant was proposing to lift the house in order to construct a new basement addition with a garage that comes out towards the street. The Staff has worked closely with the preservation consultant and the applicant to make sure it does not detract from the house or cause it to lose its National Register listing. As it typical, the Staff added a number of conditions of approval to make sure that when the house is lifted it remains safe and in one piece.

Planner Grahn noted that the porch is a non-historic wrap-around porch that was built prior to 1983. As described in the National Register Nomination, the porch does not detract from the historical significance of the house. It was well-designed and mimics the era that the house was constructed. The applicant was

proposing to re-construct the porch to comply with building codes, but the existing appearance will remain. Planner Grahn noted that there are four historic doors on the house. The applicant was proposing to remove door number 4 because that is where the new addition will abut. Door number 1 will become a faux door because it is towards the front of the house and visible from the right-of-way. The intent is to make it appear as a door. The applicant was proposing to reconstruct doors 2 and 3. The Staff will make sure the reconstruction matches the existing door to maintain the historic look.

Planner Grahn remarked that there is a total of ten windows on the house. The windows are original wood windows that the applicant believes need to be replaced. The Staff questioned whether it was possible to upgrade the windows and reuse the existing materials. A window specialist will look at the windows and provide an opinion. A window on one side of the porch, beyond the midpoint of the house and not visible from the right-of-way, will become a patio door. The Staff will make sure that it matches the look and feel of the overall house.

John DeGray, the project architect, was present to answer questions.

Board Member Hodgkins asked if the second floor door was original to the house. Planner Grahn stated that if it was not original, she thought it had been added early because it does not walk out nicely onto the shed roof. She pointed out that it had to exist before the shed roof additions; otherwise they would have added a deck or porch. It is definitely an old door. Planner Grahn suggested that it may have been moved from another part of the house and placed in that location. She thought it was likely that the grade has changed in the back and it was possible that originally there were stairs that provided access in a heavy snow storm. The Staff has seen similar situations with other homes in Old Town. Chair Stephens asked if there were other windows in the bedroom upstairs. He suggested that the door might have been added for safe egress.

Chair Stephens opened the public hearing.

There were no comments.

Chair Stephens closed the public hearing.

MOTION: Board Member Hutchings moved to APPROVE the material deconstruction of non-historic and non-contributory materials at 835 Empire Avenue, subject to the Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Conditions of Approval found in the Staff report. Board Member Hodgkins seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

Finding of Fact – 835 Empire Avenue

1. The property is located at 835 Empire Avenue.
2. The site is designated as Landmark on the Historic Sites Inventory.
3. On March 5, 2018, the Planning Department received a Historic District Design Review (HDDR) application for the property at 835 Empire Avenue; it was deemed complete March 8, 2018. The HDDR application has not yet been approved as it is dependent on the HPB's Review for Material Deconstruction approval.
4. The house was likely constructed c.1895 as a variant of the shotgun and hall-parlor style houses constructed during the Mining Era. It is only one of three examples of extant historic houses that are exemptions to Park City's standard historic house types.
5. The Historic Site Form has identified this site era of historical significance as the Settlement and Mining Boom Era (1868-1893).
6. The house first appears on the 1900 Sanborn Fire Insurance map as a simple 1-1/2 story house with one-story addition on the north and west elevations. It faced east toward town. No porch is shown on the Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps.
7. Between 1900 and 1907, the rear addition was removed and new additions were constructed in its place. This change is first documented by the 1907 Sanborn Fire Insurance map.
8. The first photograph of the house was taken as part of the c.1941 tax assessment. The photograph shows a railroad tie retaining wall along the street with wood landscape steps built into the grade. The front-gable shotgun house along with the north addition and c.1907 rear addition are visible in the photograph.
9. Under the ownership of Miriam Tessman, additions along the west elevation were removed and new additions were constructed to expand the interior of the house. On the southwest side of the house, the dining room addition is constructed of stacked stone and built into the hillside. On the northeast side of the house, the addition has a shed roof concrete walls; this area contains a portion of the bathroom and kitchen.
10. Sometime before 1983, a wraparound porch was added with a small shed extension from the main gable to the porch.
11. In 1984, the house was nominated to the National Register of Historic Places but was not listed due to the owner's objection.
12. The property has received several Historic Districts Grants. In June 1988, the Historic District Commission (HDC) awarded a grant in the amount of \$2,500 for a new foundation and repair of the wood retaining wall. They awarded a second grant in August 1994 for \$3,000 for the repair of the roof and the foundation, but the work was not completed in time and the grant was reallocated. In 1995, the owner received grant funds to reroof the house; however, the work was not completed. In 1997, \$2,250 was rewarded to repair the roof, and the work was completed in 1998.

13. The applicant proposes to remove the existing wood plank retaining wall, wood steps, and stone walkway. The material deconstruction involved in re-grading the site and adding new landscape elements mitigates to the greatest extent practical any impact to the historical importance of the house located on the property and on adjacent parcels. These later additions to the site do not contribute to its historical integrity or historical significance.

14. Based on physical evidence, the applicant has demonstrated that two additions were constructed on the west elevation of the historic house after 1941. These additions are proposed to be removed and replaced with a new, larger addition. The proposed scope of work mitigates any impact that will occur to the historical significance of the house and impact to the architectural integrity of the house.

15. The applicant proposes to reconstruct the second floor structure from the interior and add new framed walls on the interior, where necessary. The proposed interior changes will not damage or destroy the exterior architectural features of the subject property which are compatible with the character of the historic site and are not included in the proposed scope of work.

16. The roof is covered with non-historic three-tab asphalt shingle and rolled roofing. The applicant proposes to restructure the roof from the interior and replace the exterior roofing materials. The proposed scope of work mitigates any impacts that will occur to the historical significance of the house and any impact that will occur to the architectural integrity of the house.

17. The applicant only proposes to repair and replace rotted siding where necessary. The proposed scope of work is routine maintenance (including repair or replacement where there is no change in the design, materials, or general appearance of the elements of the structure or grounds) and does not require Historic Preservation Board Review.

18. Approximately 18.8 linear feet of the west elevation will be removed in order to accommodate the new addition. The proposed exterior changes shall not damage or destroy the exterior architectural features of the subject property which are compatible with the character of the historic site and are not included in the proposed scope of work.

19. The applicant has not been able to verify the condition of the slab foundation that is believed to have been constructed in 1988. The applicant proposes to replace the existing slab foundation with a new concrete basement foundation that will include a basement-level garage. The proposed exterior changes will not damage or destroy exterior architectural features of the subject property which are compatible with the character of the historic site and are not included in the proposed scope of work.

20. There is a non-historic wraparound porch along the north and east sides of the house that was added before 1983. While the porch is not historic, it was designed to complement the building and does not affect its original character. The applicant is proposing to reconstruct the porch. The reconstruction will mitigate any impacts that will occur to the historical significance of the house or any impact that will occur to the architectural integrity of the house.

21. There are four (4) historic doors on the house. The applicant proposes to reconstruct these doors on the north and east elevations. The door on the west elevation will be covered by the new addition. The material deconstruction is necessary in order to restore the historic wood paneled doors and the replacements will be in-kind.

22. There are a total of 10 historic wood, double-hung windows on the house. The applicant's Physical Conditions Report notes they are in good condition; however, the applicant proposes to replace them with new energy efficient wood windows. The windows on the west elevation will be blocked by the new addition. The material deconstruction associated with the historic wood windows is necessary in order to restore the historic house.

23. The applicant proposes to replace an existing wood window on the north elevation beneath the porch with a new French door. The window is located beyond the midpoint of the historic house and will not be visible from the right-of-way. The proposed exterior change will not damage or destroy the exterior architectural features of the subject property which are compatible with the character of the historic site and are not included in the proposed scope of work.

Conclusions of Law – 835 Empire Avenue

1. The proposal complies with the Land Management Code requirements pursuant to the HR-1 District and regarding historic structure deconstruction and reconstruction.
2. The proposal meets the criteria for material deconstruction pursuant to LMC 15-11-12.5 Historic Preservation Board Review for Material Deconstruction.

Conditions of Approval – 835 Empire Avenue

1. Final building plans and construction details shall reflect substantial compliance with the HDDR proposal stamped in on October 14, 2016. Any changes, modifications, or deviations from the approved design that have not been approved by the Planning and Building Departments may result in a stop work order.
2. The Preservation Plan must include 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.
3. An encroachment agreement may be required prior to issuance of a building permit for projects utilizing soils nails that encroach onto neighboring properties.
4. 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.

5. Within five (5) days of installation of the cribbing and shoring, the structural engineer will inspect and approve the cribbing and shoring as constructed.
 6. Historic buildings which are lifted off the foundation must be returned to the completed foundation within 45 days of the date the building permit was issued.
 7. 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.
 8. 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.
 9. 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 financial guarantee for historic preservation or ACE could take place.
 10. Replacement doors shall exactly match the historic door in size, material, profile, and style.
 11. An independent window evaluation specialist will assess and report on the existing window conditions and outline options for rehabilitation or replacement in satisfaction of the Planning Director.
 12. Should the original wood windows not be able to be restored, the replacement windows shall exactly match the historic window in size, dimensions, glazing pattern, depth, profile, and material.
4. 1503 Park Avenue – Determination of Significance for the proposed removal of a garage listed as Landmark on Park City’s Historic Sites Inventory, per Land Management Code (LMC) 15-11-10(C).
(Application PL-18-03830)

Planner Grahn reviewed the application for Determination of Significance for a garage structure. This site in Old Town has minimal documented history. Up until the 1930s the site was owned by the Mine Company; and because it was outside of the City limits there are no Sanborn Fire Insurance maps. In addition, it was difficult to trace the ownership because the site had always been owned by the Mine Company. The first actual owner shows up in the 1930 Federal Census. That was an indication that the house was built by 1930. Planner Grahn believed the house was built by 1952, based on an aerial photograph analysis that was done by the preservation consultant. It is a simple, two-car

garage typical to garages built in the 1950s. It has two wood panel garage doors and it sits on a concrete slab foundation. It has 2 x 4 exposed rafters.

Planner Grahn reported that a number of surveys have been completed on this property. When a Reconnaissance or Intensive Level survey is done, the main focus of the survey is the primary use of the site or the building. The house always trumps the accessory building. Planner Grahn noted that there is documented history from these surveys, such as when the house was built, the style, etc. However, for the most part these surveys have ignored the garage. Planner Grahn stated that in 2009, when the current historic site form was created, Dina Blaes, the preservation consultant for that project, just checked the box indicating an accessory building on the site.

Planner Grahn stated that the garage is mentioned in the 2015 CRSA Intensive Level survey, but it did not go into detail other than saying that the garage was at the rear of the house and had space for two cars. It also said that the overall form and material of the building remained intact and the building maintained retained its historic value. Planner Grahn remarked that a concern with these Surveys is the need to be careful about how the accessory buildings are analyzed.

Planner Grahn clarified that the applicant was not proposing to change the designation of the house. They were only looking at the 1952 garage. She reviewed the criteria for whether the garage meets for a Landmark or Significant designation. The first was for Landmark sites, which is the current designation of the site. The first criteria is whether the garage is at least 50 years old and has it achieved significance. Planner Grahn pointed out that the garage is approximately 66 years old. It is not Significant to the Mature Mining Era, which ended around 1930. It is the Era of significance of the historic house, but the garage came much later.

The second criteria is whether it retains its historic integrity. Planner Grahn remarked that the building has not changed much; however, she did not believe it has enough significance or integrity to stand on its own to be individually listed on the National Register of Historic Places. Planner Grahn pointed out that the garage does not contribute to the significance of this site, but it also does not detract.

The third criteria is whether it is significant to local, regional, or national history. Planner Grahn thought the garage was weak in this category and did not comply with the criteria. She stated that it is a double-car garage for a single family dwelling. It matches its intended use as a garage and the use has continued. However, she did not believe it contributes to the understanding of the site or the historical significance of the site. Garages that were built in the 1900s help in understanding the evolution of how cars came to be in Old Town. By the 1950s,

garages were common place in Old Town. It is a detached accessory building that is not indicative of what was occurring when the house was built in 1930.

The fourth criteria is whether the garage has significance based on the lives of the people associated with it. Planner Grahn reported that the garage was likely constructed by Victor Peterson, who was the first tenant of the house. The garage is linked to Mr. Peterson, but she thought the house was a better indication of his contribution to the community.

The fifth criteria is whether the structure is distinctive of a time or period. Planner Grahn noted that the garage was constructed with readily available construction materials and as a concrete slab. It does not contribute to the historical significance of the house that was constructed in 1930 and relates to the Mature Mining Era. If the garage is analyzed separately, there is nothing distinctive or special.

Planner Grahn reviewed the criteria for Significance. She noted that the garage is at least 50 years old and it has its essential historic form. The garage retains its scale and reflects the historic character, and it fits in nicely in Old Town, but that does not mean it is historically significant. Planner Grahn pointed out that the garage does not help talk about understanding the overall Park City history. By 1950 it was common to have cars in Old Town and people built two-car garages to house the two cars they had.

Planner Grahn requested that the HPB consider removing just the garage from the Historic Site Inventory.

The project architect, Craig Elliott, was present to answer questions.

Chair Stephens understood that the garage did not stand on its own historically; and, therefore, it was neither contributory or non-contributory to the house. In looking through all of the surveys, it was apparent that the garage was not researched as historic. Planner Grahn replied that he was correct.

Board Member Hodgkins noted that very few buildings were built in the 1950s time period. He asked what they called that era. Planner Grahn stated that 1932-1962 was the Decline of the Mining Era and the emergence of the Ski Era. They can point to buildings around town, particularly for the Ski Era, that helps understand linking buildings from the Mining Era to the Ski Era. Some buildings speak to the overall decline of the Mining Era, but in her opinion, a two-car garage does not contribute to understanding that Era. Board Member Hodgkins agreed; however, some buildings from that Era have been considered contributory. He understood that this garage was not part of the Mining Era, and even thought it was associated with the decline it is in between two eras.

Chair Stephens gave a scenario of a home similar to the home at 1503 Park Avenue, where the garage appeared to be more contributory and more significant. He asked if the HPB would be in a position to allow them to tear it down, even though it would be more contributory than the one being discussed this evening.

Director Erickson stated that there is a shortage in the criteria for the Mining Decline Rise to the Ski Resort Era. Garages have always been accessory units, but not necessarily contributory. In terms of storytelling the Mining Decline Era, just because a person built a garage does not necessarily make it significant to the Era. Planner Grahm provided an example of a 1960 Ranch house and garage. If someone had built that in Park City, there would be a discussion about how the house and the garage were designed together, how the house and garages relate and some of the design elements.

Chair Stephens asked if there was a 1930s home with a garage that was built in 1939 and architecturally contributory to the house, whether the Staff had the tools to significantly argue that the garage should remain. Planner Grahm thought they would if they could piece it together. Chair Stephens clarified that he did not want to set a precedent that would take away the opportunity to address an accessory building that may be historically significant. Planner Grahm replied that the Staff had the same concern. They did not want to open the door to demolishing or removing the historical significance of 1913 garages from 1895 houses because they do relate and explain how the sites have evolved. This garage was different because by 1950 garages had become commonplace and normal.

Board Member Hutchings wanted to know why being commonplace in the 1950s detracted from the historical significance of the house. Planner Grahm replied that visually it does not detract from the historic house. However, they have look at whether or not the garage itself is historically significant. For example, does it tell something about the history during that time period. She did not believe this garage tells a story. It was not the first of its kind, and the same garage could be built today. Mr. Hutchings noted that all the historic homes were built the same way, but they happen to be 100 years old. Planner Grahm replied that the fact that they are 100 years old makes them unique, and in some cases, they retain or restored their historic integrity. Regarding the question of whether this garage could stand alone and be National Register Eligible and listed as a Landmark site, Planner Grahm was unsure that it could. This garage was built to be a garage and to house cars. It was not contributing to a larger trend that was occurring in the community. Mr. Hutchings thought the trend was that people parked their car in garages. Planner Grahm stated that they could make the finding that the garage is historic because it is 50 years old and reflects the need to have two cars.

Board Member Hodgkins noted that the Mining period and the Ski Industry period were very different periods, but both contributed significantly to the history of the town. The in between period was a decline that led to the ability to redefine itself as a ski area, but by itself it was not necessarily historic in terms of the history of Park City. Mr. Hodgkins understood that the structures that were built during that time were commonplace and could be found anywhere. The post-World War II era and the building boom was not part of Park City's history. Planner Grahn agreed. She pointed out that there was a unique post-war style that evolved and a handful of houses in Park City that were built in that era have retained their integrity and help bridge that gap. The issue is that she did not believe the garage itself helps to bridge the gap. Mr. Hodgkins believed that if this garage was in a different area or neighborhood that was more architecturally historic, they would be having a different discussion. Planner Grahn agreed.

Chair Stephens clarified that 1503 Park Avenue was outside of the formal District. He asked if it was included because it was 50 years old, or because it goes to blocks past that district. Planner Grahn explained that the thematic National Register District extends beyond the historic H zoning districts. This is an example of a historic site that is outside of the H zoning districts. The site itself is historically significant because of the 1930 house on the site that was built during the Mining Era. Chair Stephens pointed out that because the garage is outside of the area, it is surrounded by resort commercial.

Planner Grahn reviewed the Historic Sites Form to determine whether this building was individually listed or if it was listed as part of the overall thematic district. She noted that Ms. Blaes had checked Building/Main. The site is eligible, but not listed on the National Register of Historic Places. The overall site is Landmark because it is eligible for the National Register. Ms. Blaes had checked Building Main, being the house. She then checked Building Accessory, which means the site form encompasses the garage. However, no analysis was done on the garage itself.

Mr. Hutchings understood that an ancillary building, such as a garage, in the Historic District that do not contribute to the Mining Era would not meet the criteria. However, if it was in a neighborhood that was built primarily in the 1950s, then a garage that was built in the 1950s era would likely meet the criteria.

Director Erickson stated that these buildings are considered on a case by case basis. If the same building could be built today and it does not tell a story, the Staff would suggest that it is not historic. On the other hand, if something in the building was unique to the Mining Decline Era, they would probably make sure it remained on the Site Inventory as Significant. If there is something unique in the architectural detailing, they would also recommend keeping it on the HSI. Director Erickson noted that the HPB will have a longer and more in-depth

discussion when they talk about the A-frames and the Pregnant A-frames moving forward in the Mining Decline Era. He reiterated all the reasons why the Staff believed that this garage was not Significant.

Board Member Hutchings asked if there was another 1950s garage that was built in the Historic District that they would recommend keeping on the Inventory. Planner Grahn thought that was a good question, but she had not analyzed the rest of the list to make that determination. The Staff would have to analyze each individual accessory building since they were not specifically called out on the HSI forms.

Chair Stephens was comfortable with the Staff recommendation. He only wanted to make sure that they could manage the expectation when the next applicant comes in with a request to tear down a garage or outbuilding. If the Planning Department had the tools to successfully make that argument when it is appropriate and can bring those discussions to the HPB, he had no issues with this request. Director Erickson stated that if it is on a designated site, the default condition is that it is Significant, unless evidence points to the contrary. In this case, they believed it points to the contrary. Planner Grahn remarked that she relied heavily on the historic preservation consultant and on Oliver who does the National Register Nominations on a daily basis because this was a unique site. The Staff wanted to make sure they were setting up a position to lose all the garages on Daly Avenue or something more drastic that would impact the District.

Board Member Beatlebrox was reminded of the house in the middle of Crescent Tram. It was a classic form from the Mining Era that had many additions that were added by Carl Winters, who was very important to the town. She recalled that the additions were so poorly constructed that the Board agreed that they did not add to the historic form and could be removed. Planner Grahn emphasized that the additions did not contribute to the historic form and the overall look and feel of the house, and actually detracted from it. Board Member Hodgkins added that part of their determination was that the historic nature of the house was evident even with the additions missing.

Board Member Beatlebrox was not opposed to removing the garage.

Chair Stephens opened the public hearing.

There were no comments.

Chair Stephens closed the public hearing.

MOTION: Board Member Holmgren moved to remove the designation of the garage at 1503 Park Avenue as a Landmark Structure from the Park City Historic

Sites Inventory, subject to the Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law found in the Staff report. Board Member Beatlebrox seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed 4-1. Board Member Hutchings voted against the motion.

Findings of Fact – 1503 Park Avenue

1. The property is located at 1503 Park Avenue, in the Recreation Commercial (RC) zoning district.
2. There is little evidence to trace the history and ownership of this property. Until 1935, the site was owned by the Ontario Mining Company and the location of the site was outside of the original Park City Survey. It was not documented by Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps. No historic photographs or tax assessments are available for this site.
3. The 1930 Federal Census shows that Victor and Jennie Peterson lived at this address and title research shows they purchased the site in 1935. Victor Peterson was a University of Utah graduate and teacher in the Park City School District for over 40 years. The Petersons sold the property and moved to Salt Lake City in 1973.
4. Based on the style and construction materials of the house, it is likely the house was built between 1920 and 1930. It is evident that the house was in existence by 1930 as the Federal Census shows the Petersons living at this address at that time.
5. The two-car garage to the west of the historic house was built in its present location by c.1952, based on analysis of historic aerial photographs, the building form and style, and construction materials.
6. The garage is a framed structure consisting of dimensional lumber, consistent with grade standards available after 1949. It was built on a concrete slab foundation. It has framed walls clad in contemporary drop siding that differs from the siding on the historic house. The roof has exposed 2x4 rafter tails beneath the eaves. The original roof decking has been covered with plywood and rolled asphalt siding.
7. In 1979, current owner Dennis Hulbert became part owner of the property, and he gained full ownership in 1991.
8. In 1994, the owner requested a Certificate of Appropriateness for Demolition (CAD) for the historic houses at 1503 Park Avenue and 1503-1/2 Park Avenue, as well as the garage at 1503 Park Avenue. In May 1995, the Historic District Commission (HDC) approved the demolition of the house at 1503-1/2 Park Avenue, but denied the demolition of the house at 1503 Park Avenue.
9. Per the May 15, 1994, HDC minutes, the commission discussed accessory buildings and found, "Because of their condition and their location outside the Historic District, they have little historical significance."

10. On January 14, 1999, the Park City Council approved the two-lot Hulbert-Holler Subdivision; however, the plat was never recorded.
11. In the early 2000s, Park City Municipal Corporation contracted Preservation Solutions, led by Dina Williams-Blaes, to refine and redefine Park City's preservation policy. She completed a reconnaissance level survey in 2007 . Her Site Form for 1503 Park Avenue only analyzes the historical significance of the house, not the garage, and found that it contributed to the "Mature Mining Era."
12. On February 4, 2009, the Historic Preservation Board approved a resolution adopting the Historic Sites Inventory. The garage and house at 1503 Park Avenue were designated as "Landmark" and found to be eligible for the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP). She found that the house was constructed c. 1900 and contributed to the Mature Mining Era (1894-1930).
13. In 2015, CRSA completed an intensive level survey and found that the site was "eligible-contributing" to the NRHP. Once again the garage was not individually reviewed and analyzed for its historic integrity and significance.
14. Based on aerial photograph analysis, the garage was built by 1952 making it at least 66 years old. While the site is significant to the Mature Mining Era (1894-1930) because of the c.1930 historic house, the garage individually is not of exceptional importance to the community and was built after the site's era of significance.
15. The garage does not meet the criteria to be designated as Landmark and as outlined by Land Management Code (LMC) 15-11-10(A)(1).
16. While the garage retains its integrity in terms of its location, design, setting, materials, and workmanship, it does not have sufficient integrity to be individually listed on the NRHP or the Park City HSI. The c.1952 garage structure does not evoke the aesthetic or historic sense of the Mature Mining Era (1894-1930). The c.1930 historic house was constructed during this era and reflects architectural styles and detailing that contribute to the look and feel typical of buildings constructed during this era. In the 1950s and 1960s, it was more common for women to have driver's licenses and families could afford two vehicles. This garage responds to the affordability of automobiles and the mobility of families in the postwar era.
17. This garage does not contribute to the Mature Mining Era (1894-1930), nor does it individually contribute to our understanding of the Mining Decline and Emergence of Recreation Industry Era (1931-1962). Original and historic accessory structures can contribute to the historical significance of a site and its surroundings when they have achieved historical significance in their own right. By the 1950s, garages were common and the garage at this site does not contribute to the historical significance of its c.1930 house.
18. While the garage was likely constructed by Victor Peterson, University of Utah alumnus and Park City school teacher, the historic house is a better reflection of his importance in the community. Primary structures dictate the principal use of the property.
19. This garage was constructed of readily available construction materials. Analyzing the garage separate from the historic house, there is nothing

distinctive about its character in terms of the building's type, form, or method of construction that contributes to the Mining Decline and Emergence of Recreation Industry Era (1931-1962). The design is consistent with garage styles that emerged during the postwar period and have continued to be utilized today. The original builder was not a notable architect or master craftsman.

20. The garage does not meet the criteria to be designated as Significant and as outlined by LMC 15-11-10(A)(2).

21. The overall design of the garage has not changed since its construction in c.1952. It is a rectangular building with shallow-pitched front-gable roof. There are two individual wood paneled garage doors on the façade, facing 15th Street.

22. The garage has never received a historic district grant from the City.

23. The site was designated as "Landmark" when the HSI was adopted in 2009; however, the historical significance of the site is due to the c.1930 house. The historical significance is not derived from the c.1952 two-car garage.

24. The garage retains its historic scale, context, and materials. Since its construction in c.1952, minimal changes have occurred to garage apart from maintenance and the construction of a plywood addition on the rear (north) elevation. It is small in scale and mass; it was designed and built to be subordinate to the c.1930 historic house and it has remained so. It is an ordinary detached two-car garage building that neither contributes nor detracts from the architecture of the bungalow-inspired cottage-style house. It does not contribute to the historical significance of the house, which has been determined by the c.1930 house to be the Mature Mining Era (1894-1930).

In order for the garage to contribute to local or regional history, architecture, engineering, or cultural associations, it needs to reflect the period in which it gained this significance. The garage does not reflect the Mature Mining Era (1894-1930). Constructed in 1950, the garage also does not individually contribute to our understanding of the Mining Decline and Emergence of Recreation Industry Era (1931-1962).

25. The garage does not have enough significance in its own right to be listed on the NRHP or the Park City Historic Sites Inventory independently of the house.

26. On March 28, 2018, the owner submitted a Determination of Significance application to remove the historic designation from the garage. The application was deemed complete on April 5, 2018.

Conclusions of Law – 1503 Park Avenue

1. The existing house located at 1503 Park Avenue does not meet all of the criteria for designating sites to the Park City Historic Sites Inventory as a Landmark Site including:

- a. It is at least fifty (50) years old or has achieved Significance or if the Site is of exceptional importance to the community; and Complies;
- b. It retains its Historic Integrity in terms of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling and association as defined by the National Park Service for the National Register of Historic Places; and Does Not

Comply.

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

- i. An era that has made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history;
- ii. The lives of Persons significant in the history of the community, state, region, or nation; or
- iii. The distinctive characteristics of type, period, or method of construction or the work of a notable architect or master craftsman. Does not comply.

2. The existing house at 819 Park Avenue does not meet 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 the Site is of exceptional importance to the community; and Complies.

(b) It retains its Historical Form as may be demonstrated but not limited by any of the following:

- (i) It previously received a historic grant from the City; or
- (ii) It was previously listed on the Historic Sites Inventory; or
- (iii) It was listed as Significant or on any reconnaissance or intensive level survey of historic resources; and Complies.

(c) It has one (1) or more of the following:

- (i) It retains its historic scale, context, materials in a manner and degree which can be restored to Historical Form even if it has non-historic additions; or
- (ii) It reflects the Historical or Architectural character of the site or district through design characteristics such as mass, scale, composition, materials, treatment, cornice, and/or other architectural features as are Visually Compatible to the Mining Era Residences National Register District even if it has non-historic additions; and Complies.

(d) 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. Does not comply.

The Meeting adjourned at 6:12 p.m.

Historic Preservation Board Meeting
May 16, 2018

Approved by _____
Douglas Stephens, Chair
Historic Preservation Board

APPROVED