

PARK CITY MUNICIPAL CORPORATION  
HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD  
MINUTES OF NOVEMBER 7, 2018

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

EX OFFICIO: Bruce Erickson, Anya Grahn, Laura Newberry, Mark Harrington, Liz Jackson

---

Douglas Stephens was absent and the Board voted on a Vice-Chair to conduct the meeting this evening.

MOTION: Board Member Holmgren nominated Randy Scott as Vice-Chair. Board Member Beatlebrox seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

ROLL CALL

Vice-Chair Scott called the meeting to order at 5:00 p.m. and noted that all Board Members were present except Douglas Stephens and John Hutchings.

ADOPTION OF MINUTES

October 3, 2018

Board Member Hodgkins referred to the motion on page 6 and changed John Hodgkins to correctly read John Hutchings.

MOTION: Board Member Holmgren moved to APPROVE the minutes of October 3, 2018 as corrected. Board Member Hodgkins seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed. Board Member Beatlebrox abstained since she was absent from the October 3<sup>rd</sup> meeting.

PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS

There were no comments.

STAFF/BOARD COMMUNICATIONS AND DISCLOSURES

Board Member Scott reported on the free film screening at the Park City Library on Monday, November 12<sup>th</sup> at 7:00 p.m. The film is called A Midnight Clear. It was filmed in Park City and most of the staff and crew are from Park City. The film shows a lot of Park City history. Mr. Scott encouraged everyone to attend.

Planner Grahn reported that the next HPB meeting is scheduled for December 5<sup>th</sup>. The Staff will determine the meeting dates for 2019 and send those dates to the Board before the end of the year.

Planner Grahn stated that the Design Guidelines were tentatively scheduled to go before the Planning Commission on December 12<sup>th</sup>.

#### REGULAR AGENDA – Discussion, Public Hearing and Possible Action

1. 140 Main Street – Material Deconstruction – Landmark Site. The applicant is proposing to impact the following materials including the removal of historic and non-historic siding material in order to construct a new addition. (Application PL-18-03994)

Planner Grahn reported that 140 Main Street was a simple material deconstruction. The house was extensively renovated and relocated in the early 1990s. The house as it exists today is largely historic. The applicant had restored a lot of the woodwork, the siding, and the materials with the restoration work in the 1990s.

Planner Grahn stated that the applicant would like to put in a breezeway between the house and the garage, which would be located at the midpoint of the historic house. It would impact approximately 54 square feet of siding on both the historic elevation, as well as the garage that was built in 1995. The applicant was proposing to replace a door with a window and cutting in a new door. Planner Grahn remarked that the work being proposed was very minimal.

The Staff found that the proposal complied with the Design Guidelines. The material deconstruction of the siding materials will not damage or destroy the exterior architectural features of the subject property that are compatible to the character of the historic site.

Vice-Chair Scott understood that it was a Landmark site; however, he was not familiar with the restrictions associated with a Landmark site. He assumed this project had gone through the proper qualifications and the material deconstruction would not disrupt the Landmark status. Planner Grahn replied that the Staff gave it careful consideration because it is a Landmark site. She believed the breezeway design is subtle and very subordinate to the historic house. The house itself will continue to be the gem and the focal point of the project.

Board Member Hodgkins understood that the site was City-designated Landmark and not a National Landmark. Planner Grahn replied that he was correct. Park City does not have any National Landmark sites.

Board Member Beatlebrox thought it looked like the breezeway was set back and angled more towards the garage. Planner Grahn thought the picture was distorted because of how curved the road looked. She noted that the house and the garage are already connected and share a basement. The breezeway addition is very small. The applicant used the same woodwork and detailing to connect with the garage and the house without being overwhelming.

Board Member Beatlebrox asked for the footprint of the actual breezeway. Planner Grahn did not have the exact measurement, but she believed it was less than 100 feet. She noted that it was at the midpoint of the gable and only one story in height. The garage is 1-1/2 stories with the pitch of the roof.

Board Member Hodgkins asked if it will sit on the existing foundation. Planner Grahn answered yes.

Board Member Beatlebrox asked if the door being removed was historic. Planner Grahn believed the door was added in when the house was remodeled. A new door would be added to connect the breezeway to the house.

Board Member Hodgkins noted that the Board considers most transitional elements to be on the back. Having a transitional element on the side is rare and he wanted to know how far back it needed to be per the Guidelines. Planner Grahn replied that currently the Design Guidelines are not that strategic; however, that was addressed in the Design Guideline revisions that are not yet in effect. The transitional elements are taken on a case by case basis. The main goal is to make sure the transitional element is subordinate. Planner Grahn stated that in this case the breezeway is the same height as the porch trip. The house is small and the breezeway will appear small and very subordinate to the house. Board Member Hodgkins asked if it would be mostly glass. Planner Grahn answered yes. It was beaded siding and two windows in the middle. It will be constructed to look like a sleeping porch but on the main level.

Board Member Holmgren liked the glass look and how it ties in with the windows. Board Member Hodgkins thought it would be nice to maintain a sense of the original volume of the house. Planner Grahn believed that would definitely occur and that the house would be minimally impacted.

Vice-Chair Scott opened the public hearing.

There were no comments.

Vice-Chair Scott closed the public hearing.

Board Member Holmgren referred to page 33 of the Staff report and the language referencing the materials at 732 Crescent Tram. Planner Grahn apologized for the inadvertent error and changed it to 140 Main Street.

MOTION: Board Member Beatlebrox moved to APPROVE the Material Deconstruction of historic and non-historic materials at 140 Main Street, 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 – 140 Main Street

1. The property is located at 140 Main Street.
2. The site is designated as Landmark on the Historic Sites Inventory (HSI).
3. In November 1892, Irish immigrant and widow Mary Sullivan purchased Lots 8 and 9 of Park City Block 20 in November of 1892 (roughly present-day 148 Main Street).
4. Immediately, Mary built the two-story T-shaped cottage which is believed to have been completed in 1892 or 1893. She lived in the home with her four children, and later her third husband John McLeod.
5. Upon Mary's death in 1915, her daughter Elizabeth and son-in-law John Tallon inherited the house. They lived in it with their five children. The house was later transferred to Elizabeth's daughter Mildred Tallon.
6. By the mid-1980s, the house was vacant and had become dilapidated. Then-Chief Building Official Ron Ivie condemned the house due to its uninhabitable condition and threat to community safety.
7. In 1988, Douglas Stephens purchased two lots on Main Street with the purpose of relocating the historic house. He received variances to the front and rear yard setbacks due to the unusual shape of the lots that same year.
8. In 1988, Stephens applied for a building permit to relocate the historic house to the lot at 140 Main Street. He also received \$5,000 in Historic District Incentives Program matching grant funds.
9. From 1993-1995, the house was restored. A new foundation was constructed beneath the historic house and extended beneath a new single-car garage. From the Main Street right-of-way, the house and garage appear as detached structures.
10. In 2018, the applicant obtained a building permit to complete some maintenance work on the house. The work included repairing and replacing the porch decking, restoring the wood siding on the historic house and garage, and replacing an exterior door on the historic house.
11. The applicant proposes to construct a breezeway measuring approximately 7 feet wide and 8 feet tall to connect the historic house to the garage. A new door

will be installed on the north wall of the historic house; the existing door will be replaced with a new double-hung window.

12. The proposed material deconstruction to the siding materials on the historic house and non-historic garage will not damage or destroy the exterior architectural features of the subject property which are compatible with the character of the historic site.

13. The project complies with the Design Guidelines for Historic Sites in Park City, specifically Universal Design Guidelines #9 and #10 in that the new addition will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the site or building. The new addition will also be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property could be restored.

14. The project also complies with Specific Design Guideline D.1.3 as the new addition will not obscure or contribute significantly to the loss of historic material.

#### Conclusions of Law – 140 Main Street

1. The proposal complies with the Land Management Code requirements pursuant to the HR-2 District and regarding historic structure 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 – 140 Main Street

1. Final building plans and construction details shall reflect substantial compliance with the HDDR proposal stamped in on October 1, 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. 732 Crescent Tramway—Material Deconstruction—Landmark Site. The applicant is proposing to remove of additions constructed between 1926 and 1938 in order to temporarily mothball the historic structure.  
(Application PL-17-03621)

Planner Grahn reported that the Planning Department had received significant public comment and the Board was provided with copies of the emails and the letter. She noted that the public has concerns with removing additions that they believe should be considered historic.

Planner Grahn stated that in March 2017 this applicant went through the Determination of Significance process and the HPB looked at those additions. The Board deemed certain additions were not historic and those are the

additions the applicant was proposing to remove. At this time a plan has not been submitted to the City for redevelopment of the site. Therefore, the applicant was proposing to mothball the building. Planner Grahn pointed out that the City does not see many requests for mothballing, but it does happen. The additions, particularly the one on the rooftop, is causing the building to settle and it is putting a strain on the original historic portion of the building they want to maintain.

Planner Grahn explained that the applicant was proposing to remove the non-historic additions which she had highlighted in red. Once the additions are removed the applicant will add framed walls and stabilize the building as necessary. Over the framed walls some exterior siding is still available in some areas. Where siding is not available, there will be plywood and the plywood will be painted to match the exterior walls. Planner Grahn stated that the plywood will not be visible when the building is viewed from Crescent Tram.

Planner Grahn remarked that the next step would be mothballing. Because the City does not have regulations, she had checked with the National Park Service. She believed the applicant was following best preservation practices as required by the Design Guidelines. They were sealing the openings to protect it from weather and vermin. The house will be reframed and structurally stabilized. Planner Grahn stated that the proposed work mitigates, to the best extent possible, any impact to the historic structure or the importance of the building. Planner Grahn stated that mothballing is intended to be temporary. Temporary is not defined, but the goal is to secure the building until a future plan to rehabilitate it is submitted.

Planner Grahn understood that the public was concerned this proposal was a way to let the building decline and be neglected. She did not believe that was the case, but if it becomes the case, it would be addressed by the City Code Enforcement Officers. If the building becomes rundown or a health and safety concern, the Building Department can issue a Notice and Order. However, based on what the applicant was proposing, Planner Grahn believed it was an effort to secure and stabilize the building and to prevent it from falling into further decline.

Director Erickson noted that the Preservation Planners would be looking at this building annually as they do their inventory. Planner Grahn stated that the Planning Staff and the Building Department visit the site regularly. The policy is if they see something they say something.

Board Member Hodgkins asked if temporary is not defined, who would make that judgement call. Planner Grahn stated that she spoke with the Building Department and as long as the building is not habitable they could have the plywood sheathing. The temporary nature is not defined, but as long as the

plywood is maintaining the building and it is not falling over, rotting through, or becoming a health and safety issue, it can remain. Planner Grahn believed the building was well documented, and if this applicant or a different owner tries to renovate the house in the future it would be easy to see what the City agreed to and why.

Vice-Chair Scott stated that when the Board previously visited the site the applicant had done an interior demo and they were able to see transitions of what they thought were the original versus additions. He recalled seeing a variety of construction techniques. Mr. Scott thought shoring it up with plywood would be a good idea to help preserve it.

Board Member Beatlebrox noted that the Board spent a great deal of time on this particular property. In the first meeting she recalled being very concerned about those additions because they were done in the very late Mining Era transitioning to later, and they were done by Mr. Carl Winters. Ms. Beatlebrox stated that the Board spent a lot of time discussing whether the fact that Mr. Winter had put up the additions in a haphazard manner meant that they were significant and contributed to the Landmark building. They also looked at a photograph of the property before the additions were added. The second meeting they visited the site and saw the poor condition of the additions. Ms. Beatlebrox stated that the Board had agonized over the decision and eventually realized that it was a Landmark building as it exists, and it would remain a Landmark building if the additions were removed and the house was put back to its original footprint.

Board Member Holmgren and other Boards members concurred with Board Member Beatlebrox's recollection of the two meetings. Ms. Holmgren noted that Mr. Winter's daughter remembers it initially as a small home. Planner Grahn stated that it started as a single cell dwelling that was later expanded in every direction, including up. Ms. Beatlebrox assumed Mr. Winters needed the space for his five children.

Board Member Beatlebrox referred to the public comment letter which talked about density as a future plan for the property. Planner Grahn stated that currently this was the only application that had been submitted for the site. If a future application comes in with a proposal to subdivide the lot or add more density, it would have to comply with the HRI Zoning District. She emphasized that at this time there was no other application to review. Ms. Beatlebrox asked if the applicant could address that issue. Director Erickson replied that it was outside the scope of the material deconstruction review. The public comment was noted and in the record, but it was outside of the HDDR review.

Planner Grahn stated that if the applicant comes in with a plan to add additions in the future, under the current LMC it would come back to the HPB for material deconstruction to see how the addition interacts with the historic house. Board

Member Hodgkins questioned why it would come back to the HPB if it meets the LMC once the historic material has been removed. He thought it would only come back if demolition was proposed. Planner Grahn explained that it would come back for something such as raising the house and taking out the flooring. She would not expect a re-review of the additions. Planner Grahn reiterated that density is outside the purview of the HPB.

Director Erickson asked Planner Grahn about the process after the stabilization. Planner Grahn stated that when the applicant applies for a building permit, before they close the building permit the Planning Staff will make sure the work was done in accordance with what was agreed to and approved by the HPB. Additionally, a financial guarantee will be put on the project. Before the Staff signs over the building permit, they will make sure the conditions of the financial guarantee have been met.

Board Member Hodgkins asked if there was a reason why the demolition needed to occur in order to mothball and stabilize the structure. Planner Grahn replied that a material deconstruction review is required any time a historic building is touched and modified. Director Erickson stated that another reason is that the roof is causing the walls to fail. Mr. Hodgkins understood that the second floor addition was causing strain and threatening the historic structure. He thought it made sense to remove that piece. He pointed out that the piece to the back and other pieces were determined by the Board to be non-historic, but they are clearly over 50 years old. He asked if those pieces needed to be removed at this time versus when the applicant has a plan for the structure. Planner Grahn did not believe the City had the right to ask the applicant to keep those pieces on the structure because they were already deemed as non-historic additions. The applicant was asking to remove the pieces and mothball the building.

City Attorney, Mark Harrington, stated that the only relevant question the HPB could ask the applicant is whether the materials on the stable sections are more protective than the proposed mothballing.

Tom Peek, the owner/applicant, asked the Board members to recall when they visited the site that the wall on the uphill side of the house was caved in from the rocks from above. When the driveway was cut in on the house above, a lot of the material came down off the driveway and kicked into the house. Therefore, the wall on the west side of the building is completely failed. Mr. Peek stated that the house is currently in a very detrimental situation and he did not believe it would last another winter. Mr. Peek remarked that he wanted to remove some of the non-historic pieces, but the primary goal was to stabilize the structure.

Board Member Hodgkins asked why this was before the HPB tonight if the Board already determined that the pieces were non-historic. He wanted to know what exactly was happening to the historic portion that the HPB needed to consider.



Planner Grahn stated that it goes back to the Code, which states that the HPB has to review all Historic District Design Reviews to make sure the proposed work is not impacting the historic materials. In this case there might be some changes to the historic materials only in the sense of removing the additions and making sure the framing is attached to other historic materials on the interior sides of the building. On the question of whether removing the additions will impact the historic building, Planner Grahn stated that if the additions were only removed it would structurally destabilize the building. However, because the applicant is proposing framing and patching the roof, it will stabilize and help preserve the historic materials for a longer period of time. Planner Grahn remarked that the HPB needs to consider 1) whether the proposal impacts the materials; 2) does it impact the historic structure. Planner Grahn stated that the additions have already been found to be non-historic and removal will not impact the designation of the historic building. Based on the conditions proposed and the scope of the work, they have mitigated anything that might endanger the historic building.

Board Member Hodgkins understood that based on the scope of the work, at this point material deconstruction was not anticipated on any historic materials. Planner Grahn replied that he was correct.

Mr. Peek clarified that when he previously came before the HPB he thought he was done with that process and could apply for a building permit to begin work in the summer. However, he later found out that he needed to go through this material deconstruction process before he could apply for a permit. Mr. Peek had no intention of mothballing the building for several years. He anticipated possibly one year or less. He commented on the condition of the back wall and stated that he would not be opposed if the Board wanted to include specific restrictions on how the back wall should be finished.

Vice-Chair Scott opened the public hearing.

Nick Frost stated that he was an attorney representing some of the adjoining land owners to Mr. Peek's property. His colleague was the author of the long public comment letter. Mr. Frost stated that the adjoining landowners wanted him to express that he was not here this evening in an adverse capacity. His clients have some concerns that he believed were accurately outlined in the letter. Mr. Frost highlighted some of the key points. He stated that one of the main concerns is the plywood. There appears to be a disconnect between the integrity that is usually given to historic homes, and the fact that they were contemplating approving plywood to replace 80-year-old material; even if it has been declared non-historic. The plywood will be visible to his clients and Mr. Peek's neighbors. Mr. Frost commented on the longevity of plywood. He pointed out that no time limits have been associated with how long the plywood could remain. He assumed it could be up indefinitely as long as the City approves it, which causes

a lot of concern for his clients. Mr. Frost thought a simple solution would be to add a condition of approval requiring a reasonable time line. He understood that Mr. Peek anticipates beginning the work by summer of next year. Mr. Frost suggested that a reasonable compromise would be a two or three-year timeline where Mr. Peek must take action by that time.

Mr. Frost stated that multiple adjoining property owners have a problem with the junk accumulating on the property. The concern is that the mothballing process will remove Mr. Peek from the property even more, and the junk will continue to accumulate. He requested adding a condition requiring that the property be cleaned up to be consistent with the surrounding houses.

Mr. Frost was concerned that there was always step in a multi-step process. He understood it was out of the jurisdiction of the HPB, but there is a lot of concern about what will happen to this property. It appeared they were trying to reduce the footprint to increase the density on the property. In his experience, the lack of knowledge creates nervous neighbors, and he suggested more transparency as a way to garnish more allies than opponents. Mr. Frost stated that other points were outlined in the letter and he had only underscored a few of them.

Vice-Chair Scott closed the public hearing.

Board Member Beatlebrox asked if the Board could address the clutter on the property. City Attorney Harrington was unsure of the degree of the clutter and asked the Staff to address whether it was at the level of Code Enforcement action. Planner Grahn stated that the neighbors have requested that Code Enforcement be made aware of some of the tractors and construction equipment being stored on the gravel driveway. She noted that a Code Enforcement Officer has been working with one of the neighbors who stores his materials on the property. If it had not already been removed it was in the process of being removed. Planner Grahn commented on concerns raised about another property that also had construction debris and clutter, and Code Enforcement has been working to address that complaint as well.

Board Member Beatlebrox stated that in her opinion the term “density” implies multiple homes. She had the impression from Mr. Frost that density implies one home with an addition, which is typical for historic homes of any size. She asked Mr. Frost to explain what he meant.

Mr. Frost stated that the concern is what comes next. He thought it was logical that a lot line adjustment would follow with additional homes. He pointed out that Mr. Peek owns several parcels that surround the current parcel at 732 Crescent Tram. Mr. Frost recognized that density was outside of the HPB purview.

Vice-Chair Scott thought Mr. Frost raised a good point regarding a potential condition of approval with a timeline. It is an important structure in the community and they were allowing deconstruction of portions. As much as the Board appreciates whatever can be done to preserve the structure, they do not want it in a state of flux for a long period of time.

Director Erickson stated that as part of the material deconstruction authority the Board has as the HPB, they may consider whether additional material will be negatively impacted if the house stays mothballed for too long. He noted that the Board could consider a reasonable time period, after which the applicant would have to reapply. Director Erickson clarified that when the applicant comes in with the Historic District Design Review, the property will be posted. Lot line adjustments or other proposals being requested would also be posted.

Planner Grahn drafted conditions of approval as follows:

Condition #4 – The applicant will use salvage siding from the demolition of the non-historic additions to side over the proposed new framed plywood exterior walls.

Condition #5 – The applicant will submit a Historic District Design Review (HDDR) application to redevelop the house within the next three years.

City Attorney Harrington simplified the condition to say, “The approval of the mothballing is effective for three years, unless the applicant returns to the HPB for an extension”. Planner Grahn preferred the language stated by Mr. Harrington.

Board Member Brody understood that the applicant wanted to blend the plywood with the rest of the house. He asked if that related to the conditions of approval and whether it would result in a stop work order. Planner Grahn stated that they initially thought that painting the plywood would help blend in a little more since it was temporary. However, she was less concerned about it now because they are using salvage siding.

Board Member Hodgkins thought the salvage siding would continue to deteriorate. If they intend to use it in the long term, he asked if it would be better to store the siding off-site. He was concerned they would risk losing historic siding if it was a condition of approval. Planner Grahn agreed. Once the house is sided it becomes a permanent solution. That is not a problem, but if the new addition cuts in in that area, they would be cutting out the historic siding that was just salvaged. That was one reason why they thought of plywood as a temporary solution to protect and secure the home.

Board Member Hodgkins thought plywood was the right solution for stabilization purposes. He thought it would help to preserve the historic structure. However, Mr. Hodgkins thought they should also consider the long-term historic piece they were trying to protect and how long they could protect the historic siding.

Director Erickson stated that the Staff has not had the opportunity to be specific about removing each individual board like they have on other properties. He suggested adding a condition of approval stating, "The final materials selection, with a preference towards preserving historic materials, can be at the discretion of the Historic Preservation Planner".

Planner Grahn stated that if the Board agrees to allow painting the plywood to blend with the historic house, that would implement a timeline by saying that mothballing is only good for 3 years. In 3 years-time, if the applicant has changed plans they could then discuss bringing back the siding to create a more permanent solution.

Board Member Hodgkins was not opposed to using the plywood as a temporary solution, and keeping the siding for future use. Mr. Peek reviewed images of the different sides to show what currently exists on each side. Mr. Hodgkins asked if Mr. Peek had a recommendation on what to use for the siding. Mr. Peek stated that using the original Channel 105 siding would work well on the top side. He recommended using pressure treated plywood on the other part. He thought everyone should be concerned about the hill falling into the house. The goal is to have a wall that can hold the weight of the roof above it to stabilize the roof structure.

Board Member Beatlebrox was impressed with mothballing rather than the benign neglect on other properties where the building falls down and nothing is done to protect it. She thought this was an important first step. Mr. Peek thanked Ms. Beatlebrox for recognizing that he was being responsible in maintaining the structure. No one has lived there for 15 years and they continued to take care of it. He was certain that the building would fall down if they did not do more.

Vice-Chair Scott asked City Attorney Harrington to state the added conditions. Mr. Harrington stated that Condition #4 should read, "The mothballing approval shall be limited to three years, unless the applicant returns to the Historic Preservation Board for an extension". Board Member Hodgkins asked if that was the only added condition of approval. Mr. Harrington understood that the Board intended to leave the determination of materials to Staff approval and the preservation plan as described by the applicant. He thought that was sufficient unless the Board wanted to codify the specificity. Mr. Hodgkins was comfortable leaving it to the Staff. The Board concurred.

MOTION: Board Member Hodgkins moved to APPROVE the material deconstruction for 732 Crescent Tramway, according to the Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Conditions of Approval as amended. Board Member Beatlebrox seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

#### Finding of Fact – 732 Crescent Tramways

1. The property is located at 732 Crescent Tram.
2. The site is designated as Landmark on the Historic Sites Inventory (HSI).
3. On March 1, 2017, the Historic Preservation Board (HPB) reviewed a Determination of Significance (DOS) application at this site and found that additions A, B, C, E, and F did not meet the criteria for historic designation as outlined in Land Management Code (LMC) 15-11-10(A).
4. On August 14, 2018, the owner submitted a Historic District Design Review (HDDR) application to remove the additions the HPB had found to not be historic. The applicant intends to secure and mothball the house after the additions are removed. The HDDR application has not yet been approved as it is dependent on the HPB's Review for Material Deconstruction approval.
5. The single-cell house was initially constructed on this site in c.1904.
6. Analysis of the 1900, 1907, and 1929 Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps demonstrates that a second room was added to the west of the single-cell to create a hall-parlor form by 1907. A third in-line addition was also added to the south of the single-cell to create an L-shape. This is further supported by physical evidence found inside the house.
7. Carl Winters purchased the house in 1926. His daughter Marie remembers the house only consisting of "a kitchen, bathroom, dining room, front room, and one bedroom." This is supported by the 1941 Sanborn Fire Insurance Map that shows the L-shaped cottage.
8. During Winters' ownership of the house (1926-1938) several additions were made that are documented by the c.1941 tax photograph. An in-line addition was constructed to expand the c.1907 rear addition; a staircase addition was constructed along the west wall of the c.1907 rear addition; a bathroom addition was built to the south of the original kitchen, or c.1907 west addition to the single cell; a root cellar was built west of the original kitchen, and a second story was added to the house.
9. Carl Winters' daughter also remembers that her father "tore off the kitchen and bathroom and made them new." It's unclear if he demolished and rebuilt the kitchen and bathroom or simply renovated them. New construction materials are found in the kitchen wing; however, it maintained the footprint of the original c.1907 addition that was made to the west side of the single-cell and that created the original hall-parlor form.
10. The house has remained largely unchanged since Winters' improvements were constructed between 1926 and 1938.

11. G. Leo and Margaret Rodgers purchased the house in 1985; in 1988, they received \$3,770 in grant funds for painting, a new roof, and fixing a wall.
12. The house, with its additions, was designated as a Landmark Structure in 2009 by the Historic Sites Inventory.
13. The applicant is proposing to remove Additions A, B, C, and E on the main level and Addition F on the second level, as identified in this report. Following removal of these additions, the openings will be closed with new framed walls. Plywood visible from the exterior will be painted to match the historic siding. The rooftop addition will be removed and the applicant will reframe the opening in the roof to restore the original side-gable form. The applicant will stabilize the existing roof form, as necessary, to hold the new roof structure. New metal roofing will be installed to cover the plywood sheathing. These additions to the Historic Building have been found to be non-contributory to the historic integrity or historical significance of the structure, they can be removed.
14. Following removal of the additions, the applicant will mothball the structure by adding new framed walls and bracing to the interior of the house to structurally stabilize it. The house will remain secured and regularly maintained. All utilities have been disconnected. The proposed scope of work mitigates to the greatest extent practical any impact to the historical importance of the structure located on the property and on adjacent parcels by only removing those additions that have been found to be non-historic. The applicant will then secure and stabilize the historic portions of the house.
15. The proposed work complies with Universal Design Guideline #3 in that the historic exterior features of the building that have been identified to be Historic by the DOS will be retained and preserved. The applicant is only proposing to remove non-historic additions.
16. All improvements made to stabilize and mothball the house are intended to be temporary, not permanent solutions.

#### Conclusions of Law – 732 Crescent Tramway

1. The proposal complies with the Land Management Code requirements pursuant to the HR-1 District and regarding historic structure deconstruction.
2. The proposal meets the criteria for material deconstruction pursuant to LMC 15-1112.5 Historic Preservation Board Review for Material Deconstruction.

#### Conditions of Approval – 732 Crescent Tramways

1. Final building plans and construction details shall reflect substantial compliance with the HDDR proposal stamped in on August 14, 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. Should additional framing or bracing be required to stabilize the historic house, the applicant shall work with the Chief Building Official and Historic Preservation

Planner to ensure the new framing and bracing does not detract from the historic integrity of the exterior of the house or cause damage to historic materials.

3. The applicant shall provide the city with a Financial Guarantee to ensure compliance with the conditions and terms of the Historic Preservation Plan.
4. The approval of the mothballing shall be limited for three years, unless the applicant returns to the Historic Preservation Board for an extension.

3. Amending the LMC to clarify and promote greater consistency in Zoning requirements in all six Historic Districts (H-zoning districts) by amending LMC 15-2.1, 15-2.2, 15-2.3, 15-2.4, 15-2.5, 15-2.6, and 15-4 Supplemental Regulations; codifying policy regarding vinyl and Solar Reflective Index by amending LMC 15-5-5 Architectural Design Guidelines; and 15-15 Defined Terms. (Application PL-18-03895)

Planner Laura Newberry reported that the proposed changes to the LMC were numerous, but most were minor changes. The intent is to make the language more consistent in the Historic Districts, which includes adjusting the window well, setback exception, the patio setback exception, adding a shared driveway exception in the rear yard, changing the corner lot setback, and moving goods and uses to be within an enclosed building into the Supplemental 15-4.

Planner Newberry stated that the most significant change was changing the Steep Slope CUPs to administrative if the lot is less than 3,750 square feet. The reason behind the change is that with the Historic District Design Guidelines and the HDDR review, there is no need for a conditional use permit review by the Planning Commission on smaller lots. The Steep Slope Conditional Use Permit would still be required on lots that are larger than 3,750 square feet.

Planner Newberry noted that in the Architectural Design Guidelines, a solar reflective index requirement was added. The intent is to keep metal materials from shining into neighboring properties. Planner Newberry stated that vinyl was being added to the list of discouraged materials to keep more in line with historic materials. Definitions were added for solar reflective index and a shared driveway.

Vice-Chair Scott understood that these items consistently go before the Planning Commission for approval; and that the intent is to incorporate them into the LMC for efficiency. Planner Newberry replied that he was correct. She explained that the Staff was bringing it to the HPB for a recommendation because most of the changes are in the Historic Districts.

Board Member Hodgkins had concerns with the section that talks about reducing the setback on corner lots on the side to 3 feet. From a preservation perspective, he wanted to know what happens if the 3' setback is not consistent with the

typical historic house setback for the street, and it interrupts the line of setbacks for the neighbors.

Planner Grahn stated that there is a lot of history behind why the Staff decided to make the Code change. She commented on the number of platted rights-of-way that do not have a built road. On 25' lots, to have a 5' setback and 3' on the other side takes away 8'. It is difficult to build a house with a garage and an entryway on an undeveloped lot. Per the Design Guidelines, entryways are encouraged. Many 25' x 75' single lots have to go through the Board of Adjustment for a variance. The BOA requested a change to the Code because it is so common.

Planner Grahn pointed out that a historic building on a corner could not be relocated to meet the setback without going through the HPB approval process. She believed it would impact the undeveloped lots more than the developed lots.

Board Member Hodgkins understood that in a historic situation, in order to encroach the setback, the owner would have to come before the HPB. He asked if that also applied to an addition to the historic structure. Planner Grahn stated that under the proposed amendment, an addition would be allowed to have a 3' setback off of the unbuilt right-of-way. If the historic portion of the house is only 1' off the platted right-of-way, it can remain unless the HPB approves relocation. She clarified that the encroachment would not have to be approved. It would just be recognized as an encroachment.

Director Erickson stated that the amendments also include what has been his administrative policies for the past year. The solar reflective and the window well has been an administrative policy. These items are not cold recommendations and already have a one to two-year life span under administrative review. The purpose is to have it in the Code so everyone is aware and it has more teeth.

Planner Grahn stated that the Board should take public input and forward a recommendation to the Planning Commission and the City Council.

Board Member Hodgkins commented on the height. He understood that it was 27' off grade, with few exceptions. He was surprised that a garage was one of the exceptions. Planner Grahn replied that the exception comes into play primarily on a downhill lot.

Vice-Chair Scott opened the public hearing.

There were no comments.

Vice-Chair Scott closed the public hearing.



MOTION: Board Member Brody moved to forward a POSITIVE recommendation to the Planning Commission on the Land Management Code Amendments to the Historic Districts as noted in the Staff report; and the Supplemental Regulations, Architectural Review, Architectural Design Guidelines, and Defined Terms as outlined in the draft ordinance. Board Member Beatlebrox seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

4. Annual Preservation Award - Staff recommends the Historic Preservation Board choose one (1) awardee for the annual Preservation Award, choose up to four (4) nominees for a historic award plaque, and select three (3) members to form an Artist Selection Committee.

Planner Grahn reported that there were two steps to the Preservation Award. The first is for three Board Members to volunteer to be part of an artist selection committee. Up to five award winners can be chosen for the award; however, the artwork is only done for one of the winners. The rest receive plaques.

Board Members Holmgren, Beatlebrox, and Scott volunteered for the committee.

Planner Grahn stated that she had emailed the Board Members asking them to contribute to the nominee list. The Planning Department Staff and the Historic Preservation Board were polled to create a list of final nominees. Planner Grahn asked the Board to keep in mind that the intent of the award is to honor the public. It is good recognize the City's efforts in historic preservation, but it is more meaningful to acknowledge what those in the public are doing.

Planner Grahn reviewed the list of nominees as follows:

- 1450 Park & 1460 Park is the City's affordable housing project. She explained what was done to restore and preserve the two structures. Six new single-family homes were built behind the historic houses. This project was a good adaptive reuse of the buildings.

- Little Bell Ore Bin and the Jupiter Ore Bin are the only remaining structures associated with those mine sites. The rest of the mill buildings, boarding houses and other structures on those sites were destroyed or demolished a long time ago. Planner Grahn stated that on the Little Bell it was Deer Valley, the Park City Museum, and the Friends of the Ski Mountain Mining History who raised money and stabilized the structure. The Jupiter Ore Bin was a project this year between Vail and Park City Municipal. In addition to the City contributing funds, it was also a project for the Museum and the Friends of the Ski Mountain Mining History. Both structures have been stabilized.

- The Alliance Mine Site. This site has been vandalized. Over the past couple of years, there has been a lot of painted graffiti on the inside and outside of the buildings, and concrete ramps were built. The City worked with United Park City Mines in an effort to clean up the mine site. The Friends of the Ski Mountain Mining History and the Mountain Trails Association organized a cleanup and removed as much graffiti as possible and removed debris from the site. The City Trail Department worked with the Water Department and a gate was installed on Daly Avenue to make the site less accessible. Planner Grahn thought this was a good example of stewardship.

- The Glenwood Cemetery is also an example of a stewardship project. The cemetery was developed in the 1880s by the local fraternal organizations. It was not a public cemetery and a person had to belong to a fraternity to be buried in the cemetery. It was in use through the 1920s, but as the mines declined and population left town, the fraternal organizations dissolved or relocated and the cemetery fell into neglect. By the 1980s the Glenwood Cemetery Committee was organized and they started doing work to restore the headstones and maintain the grounds. Currently, the site is owned by the Park City Museum, but the Glenwood Cemetery Committee continues to maintain the grounds.

Planner Grahn noted that the Board should choose five or less from the six projects mentioned.

Board Member Holmgren stated that she was disappointed with how 1450 & 1460 Park Avenue turned out. She thought they could have done a better job. In her opinion, cutting down the old apple trees and lilac trees was not acceptable, especially since she went on record more than once to say they should not be damaged. Ms. Holmgren was in favor of the other projects mentioned.

Board Member Hodgkins concurred with Board Member Holmgren. He also was disappointed with how it turned out. If they look at past award winners, the use of the land and the structures behind it distract from the historic piece. Mr. Hodgkins was also disappointed with the transitional element between the historic building and the addition. For those two reasons, he would eliminate 1450 & 1460 from the list.

Planner Grahn pointed out that 1450 & 1460 Park Avenue were considered two sites. If the HPB agreed on the other four; the two ore bins, the Alliance Mine Site, and the Glenwood Cemetery they could move forward on those four sites. They would all get plaques but the Board needed to choose one for the artwork.

Board Member Holmgren recalled that the current artwork hanging in City Hall includes a mining site, an iconic theater and several homes. They have never awarded a cemetery. Vice-Chair Scott agreed with the cemetery. Board

Historic Preservation Board Meeting  
November 7, 2018

Member Hodgkins liked the cemetery, but he also liked the stewardship project that was done on the Alliance Mine Site. That was his first choice.

Board Member Holmgren stated that her first choice would be the Glenwood Cemetery and her second choice was the Alliance Mine Site.

Planner Grahn clarified that the Board had acknowledged four sites; the Little Bell and Jupiter Ore Bins, the Alliance Mine Site, and the Glenwood Cemetery. Based on their comments, the Glenwood Cemetery would receive the art award. The Board concurred and gave a verbal vote to commission artwork for the Glenwood Cemetery.

The Meeting adjourned at 6:17 p.m.

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

APPROVED