

**PARK CITY MUNICIPAL CORPORATION
HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD
CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS
July 19, 2017**



AGENDA

MEETING CALLED TO ORDER AT 5:00 PM

ROLL CALL

ADOPTION OF MINUTES OF June 7, 2017

PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS – *Items not scheduled on the regular agenda*

STAFF/BOARD COMMUNICATIONS AND DISCLOSURES

REGULAR AGENDA – *Discussion and possible action as outlined below*

424 Woodside Avenue – HDDR Review for Reorientation - Reorientation (rotation) of a “Significant” Structure towards Woodside Avenue and lifting of the Historic Structure 7 feet 7 ¾ inches. The primary façade of the Significant Structure is currently oriented towards Main Street and the applicant is proposing to rotate the structure 180 degrees so that the primary façade is oriented towards Woodside Avenue. Upon reorientation, the Historic Structure would be lifted 7 feet 7 ¾ inches.

Public Hearing and possible action

PL-16-03379 25

Planner

Tyler

ADJOURN

PARK CITY MUNICIPAL CORPORATION
HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD
MINUTES OF JUNE 7, 2017

BOARD MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE: Douglas Stephens, Lola Beatlebrox, Jack Hodgkins, Randy Scott

EX OFFICIO: Bruce Erickson, Anya Grahn, Hannah Tyler, Polly Samuels McLean, Louis Rodriguez

ROLL CALL

Chair Stephens called the meeting to order at 5:00 p.m. and noted that all Board Members were present except Cheryl Hewett and David White.

ADOPTION OF MINUTES

May 3, 2017

MOTION: Board Member Holmgren moved to APPROVE the minutes of May 3, 2017 as written. Board Member Scott seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

NOTE: The following corrections to the Minutes were made later in the meeting at the suggestion of Director Erickson.

Chair Stephens re-opened approval of the Minutes.

Chair Stephens referred to page 34 of the Staff report and noted that his first and last name were reversed under the signature line. He changed Stephen Douglas to correctly read **Douglas Stephens**.

Board Member Hodgkins referred to page three and noted that the Minutes indicated that Chair White called the meeting to order. He changed that to correctly read, **Chair Stephens** called the meeting to order.

MOTION: Board Member Holmgren moved to APPROVE the Minutes of May 3, 2017 as amended. Board Member Beatlebrox seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS

There were no comments.

STAFF/BOARD COMMUNICATIONS AND DISCLOSURES

Planner Grahn had emailed the Board members asking for their availability on July 19th. The July meeting had to be moved from July 5th due to the holiday schedule. She asked anyone who had not responded to let her know whether or not they would be able to attend to make sure they would have a quorum.

Planner Grahn stated that in the past the Staff committed to sharing event information with the Board regarding the unveiling of the McPolin Barn and interior tours. She noted that the Friends of the Farm was hosting the "Your Barn Door is Open" event on June 24th from 5:30 to 8:30. Tickets could be purchased online.

Planner Grahn thanked everyone who participated in the Vernacular Architecture Forum Conference last Thursday. It was very helpful to have them as volunteers, opening up their houses and buildings. Everyone appreciated the efforts and had a good time.

Director Erickson believed they were close to having a quorum on July 19th. He suggested that the Board put that date in their calendar; however, if they lack a quorum the meeting would be postponed to the regular meeting in August. He pointed out that the August agenda was already full and it would be best if they could plan to meet in July.

Director Erickson announced that the City Council had postponed the quarterly update with the HPB to June 29th.

Director Erickson reported that there were nine candidates for the Historic Preservation Board. Seven candidates would be interviewed and two current Board members would be reappointed. The interviews may not be scheduled until the end of July.

REGULAR AGENDA – Discussion, Public Hearing and Possible Action

1. 1302 Norfolk Avenue – Determination of Significance
(Application PL-16-03181)

Planner Grahn introduced Jodi Hoffman and Rick Brighton, who were representing the owner this evening.

Planner Grahn reported that the Staff has been working with CRSA and the Park City Museum, as well as doing their own research on the Summit County Recorder's website, to make sure they were capturing all the historic sites in Park City and creating as complete an inventory as possible. Planner Grahn stated

that the Planning Department initially filed an application for determination of Significance in May of 2016, and they have been working with the owner to continue that as they look at development opportunities.

Planner Grahm provided a brief history of the building. It was initially constructed as a hall-parlor during the mining era. She presented a photo showing a fence around the structure in the 1927 Sanborn map. They know from the photograph which direction the house was facing. The location of Norfolk was actually platted, however; Planner Grahm assumed that when the house was built the road was in a different location, which is why the house was oriented as it was. She thought it was important to note that there was a previous house on the site. According to the Summit County Recorder, the existing house on the site was built in 1932. She presented a 1940's photo showing the house in the background of the Park City High School.

Planner Grahm stated that the house was built during the mining decline and the emergence of the recreation industry, which was the historic period from 1931 to 1962. Because it was built on Ontario Mining Claims, they had to piece together a title search at the Summit County Recorder's Office. Planner Grahm reported that their research found that it was either built on land owned by the Ontario Mining Company at the time, or possibly squatters had built on it, or it may have been constructed by the Mining Company itself.

Planner Grahm presented a tax photo from 1968 showing what the house looked like at that time. It is a typical ranch home that was been seen in post-war housing. This house is unique because being in 1932, it was built during the Great Depression, but it was also built at a time when no one was investing in Park City because of the Depression and the Mining Decline. Planner Grahm outlined the features of post-war housing, such as the low profile of the house, the rectangular to square shape, modern windows compare to the traditional double-hung windows previously seen, an attic feature that later became a second story for the house. She pointed out that the house has modified over the years. In 1967 the dormer above the door actually became a shed, and the living space and the upstairs was either added or expanded. Planner Grahm remarked that the house historically faced east, evidenced by the primary front entrance, even though the entrance is now in the back yard and Norfolk had been relocated to where it was built.

Planner Grahm stated that it was not unusual for houses to be located outside of the Historic Zoning Districts. Currently, there are approximately 25, not including the mine sites. She noted that a house constructed in 1946 at 1060 Park Avenue constructed in 1946 is listed on the HSI and designated as part of the mining decline and the emergence of the recreation industry era.

Planner Grahn reported that the Staff did not believe this house meets the criteria to be a Landmark site. Changes have occurred to the exterior of the building and it is not in its original state. She noted that the National Register of Historic Places, nominations for the Mining Boom Era and Thematic Residences District was initiated in 1984 and had a final date of 1929. This came after that. The house differs in architecture from what was typically seen during the Vernacular Victorian Housing Era in Park City. It is more contemporary in form and represents a style of architecture that became more popular after World War II.

Planner Grahn stated that the Staff believed the house met the criteria for a Significant structure. The house was constructed in 1932, which is over 50 years old. Its essential overall form has not been modified significantly. An addition was added in 1967, but the historic form is still evident. The house was never listed on the HSI in the past, and it was overlooked in the reconnaissance level and intensive level surveys. In addition to retaining its essential historic form and only having minor changes, the Staff found that some persons of interest within Park City lived in the home. They were not famous or noteworthy in the grand scheme of State or National history, but they were everyday people in Park City, reflecting the people who were building these houses. She reiterated that it also reflects the mining decline and the emergence of the recreation industry.

Planner Grahn remarked that Jodi Hoffman had prepared an outline of her response to the Staff report that was distributed to the Board just prior to this meeting.

Jodi Hoffman, legal counsel representing the applicant, introduced Rick Brighton, the architect. Ms. Hoffman remarked that years ago she was the City Attorney for Park City, and Rick Brighton has practiced as an architect in Park City for nearly 40 years. Because they both understand Park City, and based on their connection with this site, they would not be here if they had any concerns about this being was a historically Significant home.

Ms. Hoffman remarked that the house is definitely old and no one was contesting that the house did not exist. However, the form of the house did not fit into any kind of categorization. She did not believe it was the colonial ranch style as indicated in the Staff report. It is a two-story structure. The Staff report says that it has a low pitched roof. Ms. Hoffman noted that it was actually a 12:12 pitch roof, which is very steep on the front façade. She stated that the Staff report characterizes this particular house as having a gable on the east elevation that was shallow. Ms. Hoffman remarked that there was not a gable on that corner of the house. It was a tiny pitched roof over the door. In looking at a blown-up photograph, it intersects very low on the front façade of the roof.

Ms. Hoffman clarified that there is evidence that the house was substantially changed as a result of a fire in 1967, and a remodel in 1967 or 1968. She

presented a 1968 photograph showing the result of the remodel and how the house had changed. Ms. Hoffman remarked that the Staff's assessment of this photo was that the change in the original roof form detracts from the historic integrity of the structure as a change to make the character defining façade outside the period of significance. She noted that less than 50 years ago, the historic integrity of the building was changed.

Ms. Hoffman stated that at the same time the historic fabric was replaced with shake shingles. The house has had a metal roof and aluminum windows since 1968. Ms. Hoffman presented a slide showing how the house looks today, and pointed out items that were substantially different from what they saw in the photo from 1968. The dormers are larger, the upper windows are different, and a good sized addition was added. The home sits at least three feet below the rights-of-way and faces inward to the property. It does not face the street. The house is surrounded by very mature landscaping and it has almost no historic fabric. It also has a flat roof. Ms. Hoffman stated that she had researched the Utah Historic Sites data base, and there is no style in Utah in that data base that describes it as anything that meets the historic standard.

Ms. Hoffman stated that the current owner purchased the house in 1976 and remodeled it again. The metal roof was replaced with asphalt shingles. A variety of other materials were replaced as necessary to keep the house sound.

Mr. Hoffman remarked that the Staff report implies that there has been an inexplicable delay or that something was going on. She explained that the owner had commissioned Rick Brighton to design a home for her in Deer Valley. She called Mr. Brighton when she heard that the City was trying to designate her house at 1302 Norfolk as Significant on the Historic Sites Inventory. Since the owner lives in California, Mr. Brighton contacted the Planning Department to find out about it. He was told that there was a thin file and the Staff was interested in having the house considered for designation, but the historic sites had not yet been completed. There was some mention that a carpenter owned the house, and she was unsure whether it was intended to mean Otto Carpenter, who would be a significant historic figure for the emergence of the recreation industry in Park City. Board Member Beatlebrox clarified that Ms. Hoffman was talking about the Otto Carpenter who started Deer Valley. Ms. Hoffman answered yes. That the structure itself was not as important as an association with Otto Carpenter. Ms. Hoffman stated that she had researched everything associated with the house and Otto Carpenter never owned the house or lived there. She later learned from Staff that it was a Frank Carpenter who owned the house for a year. Ms. Hoffman remarked that they would understand the reason for the designation if there was an association with Otto Carpenter. However, since that was not the case, she believed the house was less significant.

Ms. Hoffman later learned that a lot of property surrounding this home was being considered for a very large affordable housing project. Phase I was still on the table and Phase II was upcoming. Ms. Hoffman showed photos of the three-story stacked flats immediately adjacent to this house. She also indicated two and three story homes on the hill immediately above the house. Ms. Hoffman showed the historic context of the house compared to the current context of the house. It is surrounded by stacked flats, hotels, and very large imposing structures. The site is surrounded by the RC zone and the house is in the RC zone. The house is hidden by landscaping and the historic context is gone.

Board Member Beatlebrox referred to the slide showing the affordable housing plan and asked where 1302 Norfolk was located on the scheme. Ms. Hoffman pointed to the house and noted that it was in the midst of an apartment complex with three-story houses on the hillside above it.

Ms. Hoffman stated that after talking with the Staff about the number of projects in the area and the City's assessment of value, it was determined that the value in that area is so high that it was probably not the best use of City funds for affordable housing. The City came back and offered to purchase the house at 1302 Norfolk if the owner was willing to donate 50% of the value. The owner actually looked into it and decided that it was not in her best interest. Ms. Hoffman stated that the owner approached Mr. Brighton years ago to see what she could do with her property. He laid out subdivision plans because aside from the house, there were four fragment parcels that could be subdivided and the lot lines removed to create four 25' x 75' traditional Old Town lots for four homes. The owner was not interested in doing that at the time, but kept it as a future option. Now she does not want her development options precluded by having the house designated as historic, particularly when the house is really not historic and there is no historic context or fabric, or a particular architectural style. In addition, it will be overshadowed by a fairly significant affordable housing project.

Ms. Hoffman remarked that 1302 Norfolk has never been on the HIS nor should it be. However, the City has disassembled properties in the same area that are listed on the HSI to build this affordable housing project, and those structures will be reassembled in another location. The rationale was that the historic context was gone and the structures no longer belonged in their current location.

Ms. Hoffman reviewed the criteria and explained why she disputed the Staff's interpretation of the criteria. She agreed that the house was 50 years old but its current form was not 50 years old due to the number of significant changes. On whether it retained its essential historic form, Ms. Hoffman read the definition of essential historic form, and noted that there was nothing in particular about this home that suggests mining decline era. The house does not retain its historic scale, context, or materials in a manner and degree. The context is gone and the fabric is gone. The essential form is gone. There are no architectural

characteristics of the site, and there is no mining decline ambience left. It is not similar to mining era residences, and it is not appropriate for the National Register District. Regarding its association to local or regional history, architecture, engineering or culture, Ms. Hoffman noted that the structure was built in 1932. Without disparaging people who actually lived there, Ms. Hoffman did not believe they were of significant importance to the community or to this house.

Ms. Hoffman did not believe this house met any of the criteria for Significance other than the fact that it was constructed over 50 years ago.

Board Member Scott referred to page 2 of Ms. Hoffman's response, and asked about the picture showing the gable above the front door. He could not see a difference between that picture and the first picture showing the original structure in the field.

Mr. Brighton pointed out that there was no gable on the original structure shown in the field. There was a bay window on the first story on the south facing part of the house. Ms. Hoffman noted that originally there was a small A-frame over the door probably to stop snow shedding when you walked out the door. However, it did not come up high on the roof as shown in the second picture, which means that the gable was less than 50 years old. Mr. Brighton stated that it was called a clipped gable, but it was actually a flat roof and did not fit the category of a clipped gable. Mr. Brighton could see from the windows on the end that it was always a two-story structure. In his opinion, it was never a one-story ranch style. The colonial style was cottage and not defined as ranch-style. He was unsure where the definitions were coming from. He felt that someone was trying to make this home fit into something that was not representative of what it actually was.

Board Member Beatlebrox noted that according to the Staff report, the Project Planner thought it could be brought back to its original form. Planner Grahm explained that she compared two photographs and noted that the major alterations were the addition that was added after the 1960s, as well as the expansion of the dormer. She believed the dormer could be altered to create the shape that was more consistent with what was alluded to in the picture.

Chair Stephens noted that the picture from 1968 did not have a flat roof. Mr. Brighton thought it did have a flat roof. Ms. Hoffman was not certain. Chair Stephens clarified that if it was a flat roof there would not be a clip with a ridge. With a flat roof the profile where it is clipped on the end would be flat across, but it appears to go right to the ridge. Mr. Brighton referred to the original photo, which showed a flat roof. Ms. Hoffman and the Board thought it was difficult to say for sure. Mr. Brighton could not understand why, if there was a gable, it would be clipped off.

Chair Stephens questioned why it was now considered a 12:12 pitch when before it was a shallow pitch. Ms. Hoffman replied that it was always a 12:12 pitch. Planner Grahn explained that Ms. Hoffman was correct in saying that the pitch is 12:12. When she mentioned the shallow roof forms, she was intending to show that it was characteristic of these homes. It tends to be sunken low on the ends and sits low to the ground. It is not a full second story because you can stand up in the center but not on the ends. Chair Stephens asked if everyone was consistent on the pitch of the roof and that it has not changed. It has always been a two-story since it was built. Mr. Brighton and Ms. Hoffman were only saying that there was not a gable over the front porch in the 1930 version but by 1968 there was a gable. Ms. Hoffman remarked that the Staff's position in the Staff report is that the gable constituted a change that lost the historic integrity of the front façade. Mr. Stephens recalled from the Staff report that it was the gable and an addition that kept the house from Landmark status, but it still met the criteria for Significant. Planner Grahn replied that he was correct.

Chair Stephens understood that at some shingles were put on the exterior. He asked if they were put over the existing material, or if the existing exterior fabric was removed before the shingles were put on. Ms. Hoffman could not answer that question, but she knew for sure that there was a fire and a good portion of the burned material was removed. Ms. Hoffman clarified that it was a fire that led to the 1968 remodel. Chair Stephens asked if she knew the extent of the fire and whether it was an exterior or interior fire. Ms. Hoffman was unsure of the extent, but there were still charred roof members inside the house.

Chair Stephens remarked that the problem is that this house is outside of the traditional historic district; and any time they do a historic home outside of the historic district it does lose its context. Mr. Stephens asked if there were many of these structures left. Planner Grahn did not believe there were many left. There was not a lot of building during the Mining Decline Era, and she thought they had captured everything that was built during the Mining Era. If they move forward they would be looking at ski era buildings, that was another topic for another time.

Board Member Holmgren commented on the status of how to consider people of importance. Not everyone was an Otto Carpenter or a Leland Wilde, and she finds that taking title back is very important. She did it on her house. Including herself, the people who lived in that house they were not well-known names, but they are very important to the history of Park City. Ms. Holmgren thought it was disrespectful to dismiss their importance.

Ms. Hoffman apologized for her previous comment and it was not her intent to be disrespectful. She was trying to say that the people who are listed were listed as found within the primary resources within the City. They are in title, but they are

not tied to the home itself. She stated that Dee Marzec, the current owner, has owned this property for nearly 40 years, but she never lived there. Ms. Hoffman believed there was a difference between someone living there, making it their home, and associating the house with their personality and good works versus just owning it.

Board Member Holmgren believed that owning it and/or living there are important to the history of their fabric. She pointed out that before her, many renters lived in the house she now owns and lives in, and several of them made significant contributions to Park City; yet they are not on the title. She emphasized her concern that they should not be dismissed or shown disrespect so easily. Ms. Hoffman reiterated that it was not her intent.

Chair Stephens asked if the current windows were placed into the same openings. Planner Grahn thought it was difficult to say because of the quality of the photo. Chair Stephens thought they appeared to be the same shape. He asked if the Staff found any evidence when they visited the site. Planner Grahn replied that they viewed the building standing in the right-of-way, so they were not close to the building. Mr. Brighton stated that there is a mish-mash of windows but the size of the window opening size appeared to be the same.

Chair Stephens opened the public hearing.

Ruth Meintsma, a resident at 305 Woodside, addressed context. She referred to the photo of the house in the field that was presented by the applicant. Before she sees anything else, she sees the field. She referred to page 6 of the same presentation, showing the house in the next context surrounded by larger buildings, but the first thing they see is the historic field. Ms. Meintsma stated that the historic field is so important to this community that there was a recent fight to save it. It is valuable property. The context of the field in front of the house disputes the applicant's claim that the context has been lost.

Ms. Meintsma presented an image she had prepared showing the historic structures around the field that were currently on the Historic Sites Inventory. She pointed out that it was a neighborhood around the historic field. Ms. Meintsma read from the proposed revised guidelines that have not yet been adopted, as a way to understand context. "The specific context of each block is an important feature of the historic district. The context of each block shall be considered in its entirety."

Ms. Meintsma referred to the applicant's comment about there not being a particular architectural type or style. The house was built in 1932 and she believed it was vernacular, which means a common man's structure. She thought everyone recognizes how important vernacular is in town, because a forum was held last week to celebrate vernacular. Ms. Meintsma was surprised

by the discussion regarding the flat roof. She noted that there are a few historic flat roofs in town, which are the pyramid roofs that do not come to a point at the top. She thought maybe that was the roof being described for this house.

Ms. Meintsma referred to Criteria C, and noted that the essential historic form of the building has been largely preserved, and the modifications are reversible. She referred to a comment about a moved structure and noted that it was 1323 Woodside. That structure was further in and separated from the field, and the house was moved to the affordable housing section. The house at 1302 is right on the field. Ms. Meintsma disagreed about the importance of people that lived at this house.

Chair Stephens closed the public hearing.

Board Member Hodgkins thought Ms. Meintsma made excellent comments about the field. If the trees were taken down in the corner, they would have a similar view of the house as shown in the 1940s photograph. He thought the façade was important and believed he was seeing a similar façade image in the bottom photograph on page 40 of the Staff report. In his opinion, the house is still there. Another point is that not many structures were built during the 1932-time period, and that is important.

Board Member Scott echoed Board Member Hodgkins. As he walked by the home and then read the Staff report, he found it to be historic because nothing else was being built at the time. He thought the house represented an interesting time period in Park City, and the style and construction of the house was different from the mining shacks. He commented on a handful of other structures in Old Town that were designated Significant that have bays windows and other elements that are represented in the house at 1302 Norfolk.

Mr. Scott understood that the role of the HPB is to determine whether the structure is historic and not so much about the context. Assistant City Attorney replied that context is part of the criteria listed in the Code for a Significant structure. Mr. Scott that he was comfortable with his opinion that this structure is historic.

Board Member Beatlebrox believed that context is important; however, she commented on recent decisions the Board has made about context. Ms. Meintsma had pointed out that very recently the HPB had designated the smaller house in between Chateau Après and the large condos to be on the HSI. She recalled that it was an older house. Planner Grahn stated that it was built during the Mining Era, it was constructed, panelized, and reconstructed. Ms. Beatlebrox noted that there had been a fire in that house and it had been restored with new materials. Since restoration is part of the historic fabric, the HPB deemed it appropriate to be on the HSI list.

Ms. Hoffman commented on the house Ms. Beatlebrox mentioned in her comments, and noted that the owner had applied for and received a historic district grant. Usually, with a historic district grant the applicant signs a façade easement where they agree to have restrictions placed on their home to preserve the historic significance of the home. It was owner initiated rules that must be complied with. Ms. Hoffman pointed out that it was not the case with the house at 1302 Norfolk. No one has asked for a historic grant, nor have they been given a façade easement. She understood the decision that was made for the other house, but in her mind the rationale was that the applicant had availed themselves of the protection of the historic system in Park City to encourage historic preservation. That house was also in a historic zone, as opposed to the RC zone.

Board Member Beatlebrox noted that in the 1400 block of Park Avenue the HPB looked at a house where its essential form had been changed and could not be put back to its original form, and the Board did not put it on the HSI. She recalled another house where the context had changed and they allowed two historic houses to be moved five to eight feet. Those houses remained on the HSI and they cannot be demolished. Ms. Beatlebrox was concerned about the house at 1302 Norfolk being demolished. She noted that the HPB had saved a house on Park Avenue that had an application for a demolition permit. Ms. Beatlebrox thought it was important to be concerned about these historic houses.

Board Member Holmgren was surprised by the comments presented by Jodi Hoffman. She did not see this as a flat roof, and she never has. It looks like it has a flat point on top, but it is not a flat roof. Chair Stephens believed Ms. Holmgren was correct. Mr. Brighton argued that the roof is not a clipped gable by definition.

Board Member Holmgren stated that she walks by this house often and he sees a lot of the old house that can be pulled back out. She agreed with her fellow Board members that the house should be designated as Significant on the HSI.

Chair Stephens stated that Park City has shown a pattern over decades where a property outside of the Historic District has been deemed historic. He believed that in most of those instances it would have lost its context based on what was built around it. There is precedence of deeming something Significant in this type of situation. Chair Stephens believed that they look at properties inside the Historic District a little different than properties outside of the District. He assumed, based on the presentations and the Staff report, that the shingles on the exterior were probably placed over the existing siding. With that in mind, other than the gable, he could still the original form and he believed there was probably historic material underneath. Chair Stephens stated that most of the homes in the Historic District have all had substantial modifications with regards

to windows and doors, sizes and shapes. In this case he thought the windows and doors were consistent even though the materials have been changed. The fact that the roof trusses are charred tells him that the original structure on the outside is still there, because they would not put up a new structure and leave the charred roof members in place. Without any evidence to the contrary, he would keep with that assumption.

Chair Stephens agreed with his fellow Board members that this home is Significant. He could understand why the applicant felt that it was no longer part of the context of the neighborhood, and they continually wrestle with that problem in Park City because of what is built around it. However, it is the purview of the HPB and what they have to look at, and he thought the Staff made a compelling argument that this structure meets the requirements for a Significant designation.

MOTION: Board Member Holmgren moved to designate the house at 1302 Norfolk as a Significant Structure on the Park City Historic Sites Inventory, in accordance with the Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law found in the Staff report. Randy Scott seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

Findings of Fact – 1302 Norfolk Avenue

1. The Park City Historic Sites Inventory (HSI), adopted February 4, 2009, includes 414 sites of which 192 sites meet the criteria for designation as Landmark Sites and 222 sites meet the criteria for designation as Significant Sites.
2. Historic character is one of four core Park City values. Park City protects historic buildings to “[p]reserve a strong sense of place, character and heritage.” (General Plan 2014, p. 104).
3. The Park City Land Management Code 15-11-9 states that “It is deemed to be in the interest of the citizens of Park City, as well as the State of Utah, to encourage the preservation of Buildings, Structures, and Sites of Historic Significance in Park City. These Buildings, Structures, and Sites are among the City’s most important cultural, educational, and economic assets. In order that they are not lost through neglect, Demolition, expansion or change within the City, the preservation of Historic Sites, Buildings, and Structures is required.”
4. The house at 1302 Norfolk is within the Recreation Commercial (RC) zoning district.
5. In December 2015, City Council amended the Land Management Code to expand the criteria for what structures qualify to be landmark and significant sites.
6. On May 17, 2016, the Planning Department submitted an application for a Determination of Significance for this site pursuant to LMC 15-11-10(B),
7. On January 24, 2017, the Building Department received a demolition permit to

demolish the house at 1302 Norfolk Avenue.

8. There is a wood-frame house located at 1302 Norfolk Avenue.

9. According to the Summit County Recorder's Office, the current house was constructed in 1932.

10. Originally, there was a wood-frame hall-parlor house at this site that is documented by the 1927 Sanborn Fire Insurance Map; however, this house was demolished after 1927 and before the present house was constructed in 1932.

11. The 1932 retains its Essential Historical Form. The house was constructed in an early interpretation of the Colonial style ranch form that was popularized in post- World War II housing. The house is characterized by its low, one-story height, its nearly square form with a length-to-width ratio of less than 2:1, clipped gables on the side elevations, corner window openings, and wide vertical and horizontal siding.

12. Only minor alterations have occurred to the house. The house was renovated in 1967 and a new addition was constructed to the north elevation. Sometime after 1967, the shallow gable dormer above the front door was replaced with a new shed-roof dormer. The two (2) attic windows on the north and south elevations were replaced with vinyl windows sometime after 1967 and the house was reroofed in 1998.

13. The house was constructed in 1932 and is 84 years old.

14. The historic house at this site contributes the Mining Decline and Emergence of the Recreation Industry (1931-1962).

15. The house retains its Essential Historic Form as there have been only minor alterations to the original form such as the 1967 addition on the north elevation and the change to the original gable dormer after 1967.

16. The house retains its historic scale, context, materials in a manner and degree which can be restored to the Essential Historical Form even if it has non-historic additions; the shed dormer on the east elevation could be removed the gable dormer restored.

17. The house reflects the Historical and Architectural character of the site and district through its mass, scale, composition, materials, treatment, and other architectural features that are Visually Compatible to the Mining Era Residences National Register District. The Depression Era cottage was constructed in a style commonly seen throughout Utah in the mid-20th Century and in a style typical of World War II-era housing.

18. The house was owned by prominent Park City residents, such as former City Councilman Gordon Tessman; Ernest DeJonge, a miner at the Silver King; local businessman Frank Carpenter; and former Marsac School principal Julian Hibbert.

19. The modification of the gable to a shed dormer on the façade have made the structure ineligible for an individual listing on the National Register of Historic Places.

20. Although the house meets the criteria for a Significant site, the house at 1302 Norfolk does not meet the standards for "Landmark" designation as it is not eligible for the National Register of Historic Places; however, it does meet the

criteria for “Significant” due to its age; retention of its Essential Historical Form; reflection of the Historical and Architectural character of the site and district through design characteristics such as its mass, scale, composition, materials, treatment, and other architectural features that are Visually Compatible to the Mining Era Residences National Register District; and its importance in local and regional history, architecture, and culture.

Conclusions of Law – 1302 Norfolk

1. The existing house located at 1302 Norfolk 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. Complies.

2. The existing house at 1302 Norfolk meets all of the criteria for a Significant Site as set forth in LMC Section 15-11-10(A)(2) which includes:

- (a) It is at least fifty (50) years old or 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. Complies.

3. As a significant site, prevention of the demolition of the structure is a compelling countervailing public interest.

2. Design Guideline Revisions – Staff recommends that the Historic Preservation Board take public comment on the proposed changes to the Design Guidelines for New Construction in Park City’s Historic Districts. Universal and Specific Guidelines will be reviewed for: Universal Guidelines; Site Design; Setback & Orientation; Topography & Grading; Landscaping & Vegetation; Retaining Walls; Fences; Paths, Steps, Handrails, & Railings (Not Associated With Porches); Gazebos, Pergolas, and Other Shade Structures; Parking Areas & Driveways; Mass, Scale & Height; Foundation; Doors; Windows; Roofs; Dormers; Gutters & Downspouts; Chimneys & Stovepipes; Porches; Architectural Features; Mechanical Systems, Utility Systems; & Service Equipment; Materials; Paint & Color; Garages; New Accessory Structures; Additions to Existing Non-Historic Structures; Reconstruction of Non-Surviving Structures; Compatibility & Complementary; Masonry Retaining Walls; and Fencing. (Application GI-13-00222)

It was noted that Planner Tyler had left the meeting. Planner Grahn was prepared to continue unless the Board preferred to continue the item to the next meeting.

Planner Grahn remarked that at the last meeting the HPB provided significant input on the design guidelines for new infill residential structures.

Universal Design Guidelines

Board Member Holmgren read the language, “Styles that never appeared before in Park City shall be avoided”. She noted that there were a few styles that they would like to avoid, such as the dome home that burned down. Planner Grahn stated that if the dome home were to come back, the LMC would have to be changed because it currently prohibits domes.

Foundations

Planner Grahn noted that based on comments from the last meeting the language was changed to reflect “no more than 2’ of foundation should be visible above final grade on secondary and tertiary facades” and “no more than 8 inches visible on the primary facade” which is consistent with the IBC.

Roofs

Planner Grahn stated that the Board has asked the Staff to look at overhangs and eaves and a new Design Guidelines was added to address their comments.

Dormers

The Staff added an additional Design Guideline for the dormers. They had originally proposed two guidelines for new construction; however, the feedback was to make sure that the dormers stayed modest in size and not consume the roof. The Board also wanted to see the dormers set back from the main wall of the building, and lower at the primary ridge.

Gutters and Downspouts

Planner Grahn remarked that gutters and downspouts were not easy to address. She provided examples; one over a non-historic building and another on a historic building, showing how gutters can work well. She noted that a new Guideline was added to say, “The downspout should be located away from architectural features and shall be visually minimized when viewed from the primary right-of-way”.

Board Member Beatlebrox asked if the photograph was a negative or positive example. Planner Grahn thought it was positive because it was not noticeable walking by. If she had taken the photo from afar, the architectural features would have been more prominent and the gutter and downspout would blend in.

Porches

Planner Grahn remarked that language was added to emphasize that porches are over the entrance and mimic the historic house pattern of porches. The revised language corrected the previous language and added additional detail. They also talked about locating porches in a way that follows the pattern of the historic porches along the street. Language was also stating that porch columns and railings should be simple in design, and using square or rectangular columns. Planner Grahn pointed out that the bulky Deer Valley look is not part of the Old Town vernacular.

Chair Stephens understood that the added guidelines applied to new houses. Planner Grahn answered yes.

Materials

Planner Grahn noted that the Board gave little feedback on materials. However, they wanted the Staff to think ahead in terms of sustainable materials. She pointed out that the Guideline requires submitting a sample of the material to the Planning Department to determine whether or not it is appropriate for the Historic District. Language was also added to say, "The synthetic material should have a similar appearance and profile of the historic siding and trim materials, and it should be applied as traditional materials".

Board Member Beatlebrox thought Planners Tyler and Grahn had done a good job capturing the Board's comments and intent. Chair Stephens agreed. He believed the idea was to allow flexibility to make decisions; and at the same time avoid the unintended consequence of every house looking the same.

Board Member Hodgkins thought it was flexible enough to apply five or ten years from now; but it still gives them what they are looking for.

Chair Stephens opened the public hearing.

Ruth Meintsma referred to the Materials section on page 70 of the Staff report. It says the materials shall be compatible in scale, proportion, texture; and then it talks about masonry, wood, and other building materials shall be similarly used as it was historically. Ms. Meintsma stated that she considers glass and glazing as a material, and the revised Design Guidelines section on Windows talks about solid devoid. She asked if glazing was a material that should be appropriate to historic character.

Chair Stephens noted that patterns of windows were part of a previous discussion, and he thought those guidelines had already been revised. Planner Grahn replied that the Board spent considerable time talking about windows at the last meeting in terms of proportions of opening to solid, styles, sizes, etc. However, she believed Ms. Meintsma raised a good point because sometimes glass is used as a planning material.

Ms. Meintsma noted that the guidelines mention scale and proportion, and there is discussion about the Mountain Modern. In the new structures she sees across canyon, the new Mountain Modern is the flat roof. The glazing is massive and does not fit with building materials being compatible in proportion and texture.

Chair Stephens understood that glass could not be used as an exterior product, and he asked how the proportion of glass could be regulated. Director Erickson

suggested that they add language stating that glass and plastic are not appropriate as building materials because they would never meet the requirements for texture and scale. The Board could recommend that the Staff consider the glazing itself and to eliminate reflective glasses or at least highly reflective glass. Director Erickson thought they should also consider avoiding overly-darkened windows as well.

Director Erickson stated that if the HPB forwarded a recommendation to the City Council this evening, they could recommend that the Staff include language with respect to glazing.

Chair Stephens commented on previous discussions regarding stone, type of stone, how it is stacked, etc. He asked if the Staff felt they had the tools to regulate that effectively without pushing everyone to look exactly the same.

Planner Grahm remarked that they had a good start with the existing Guidelines and the revised Guidelines take it one step further. Calling out the dimensions of the masonry units is helpful. If the Staff could include photos of what is appropriate and what is not, it would also give people an idea of appropriate color and size. Chair Stephens asked about using synthetic stone in the Historic District. Planner Grahm replied that synthetic stone was not allowed by the LMC.

Board Member Holmgren asked to make a comment about landscaping and vegetation. She noted that there is always an emphasis on xeriscaping, and she would like the Guidelines to push historic bushes such as lilacs, fruit trees, and roses. She recognized that they require a lot of watering, but once they are planted they last forever. Planner Grahm recalled from the last meeting that they talked about creating a sidebar of the varieties that existed in Park City historically. Chair Stephens noted that most of the traditional plant materials could survive with a drip irrigation system.

Board Member Beatlebrox was prepared to make a motion, and asked for help with the language to include the glazing.

Director Erickson stated that the motion would be to forward a POSITIVE recommendation for this section of the proposed changes to the Park City Design Guidelines, and in accordance with the specific direction in their discussion this evening regarding glazing and other materials.

MOTION: Board Member Beatlebrox moved to forward a POSITIVE recommendation to the Planning Commission as stated above by Director Erickson. Board Member Holmgren seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

3. Consideration of an ordinance amending the Land Management Code Section 15, Chapters 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, and 2.5 regarding roof pitches and limiting the use of flat roofs to protect streetscape façades.
(Application PL-16-03352)

Planner Grahn stated that the Staff has been working on flat roofs and trying to determine when it is appropriate to have roof top decks versus patios and balconies, as well as how green roofs fit in. Another discussion has been how building out to the maximum footprints results in less side and backyards for people to have outdoor space, and it gets moved to the rooftop. She noted that there were also sustainability benefits, but they needed to be balanced with the historic integrity and character, and maintaining the historic districts.

Planner Grahn stated that in talking about the desired outcome, she and Planner Tyler thought it was to encourage a compatible roof design. One way to make it compatible was the pitch. She pointed out that when driving on Deer Valley Drive and looking at the town, the character defining features are the different roof pitches. She remarked that they would not want to discourage flat roofs on the back of the house, but it is important to keep a pitch along the street. Planner Grahn remarked that another issue is that flat roofs become detrimental to the Historic District due to the lack of compatibility with the mass, scale and height. In terms of green roofs, comments heard from the public and others is that green roof often go from being green and vegetated to not being maintained. They turn into brown lawn areas and then party decks and hot tubs.

Planner Grahn presented examples of green roofs. She explained why the green roof was the garage at the Washington School House Inn was successful. Planner Grahn reviewed examples of other flat roofs in Old Town where they did a good job of maintaining the streetscape.

Planner Grahn stated that she and Planner Tyler went through the LMC to determine what is or is not allowed. They took a step back and tried to keep it simple. She pointed to the language in red which was amended language to the LMC. It read, "The primary structure needs to have a primary roof pitch between 7:12 and 12:12. A roof that is not part of the primary roof design may be below the 7:12 roof pitch". "Accessory structures may be below the required 7:12 roof pitch".

Planner Grahn noted that the language about a flat roof having a maximum height of 35' was removed. It was replaced with, "The flat roof shall not be permitted as the primary roof form on the primary structure's façade". "The green roof has to meet the definition as provided in the LMC", which means it has to be vegetated. Hot tubs, outdoor cooking areas, and seating areas are not allowed on a green roof if it is the primary roof form. The roof deck shall not be located more than 23' above existing grade, including the height of any required

parapets, railings or similar features". She pointed out that for residential structures the railing has to be about 3' tall. They did not want to extend it another 3' to avoid increasing the mass and bulk of the structure.

Board Member Beatlebrox asked about the 23' above existing grade. Planner Grahm explained that on a downhill lot there is a requirement to step it in 10' at the 23' point. Most people use that step to create an outdoor deck, which is why the Staff tied it that. If the Board thought an exception was needed for specific cases, the Staff could come up with one. Chair Stephens asked if the 23' was measured to the top of the deck or the top of the rail. Planner Grahm replied that it was measured from existing grade to the top of the rail.

Director Erickson reported that the Staff was adjusting the LMC outside of the Historic District to include railings and other things because it tends to overbear the neighborhood. He pointed out that in some of the flat roof houses the railing are above height and the building suddenly gets bigger.

Planner Grahm thought another point to consider is if someone wants a patio area they would lose ceiling height and also wall height. If they lose the wall height it would reduce the scale, which is more compatible with the historic houses. Chair Stephens stated that one advantage of a flat roof is that it decreases the massing of the building. Without the specified height, they still get the same mass but with a roof deck on top. Board Member Hodgkins agreed that the point should be to decrease rather than increase. He believed they could come up with flat roof examples that increased the volume of the building.

Chair Stephens referred to the example of the deck with the hot tub and asked if it would preclude the deck from being used. Planner Grahm replied that if the owner would come in under the proposed guidelines and they had the flat roof space, it would not be the primary roof form because it has gables on both ends. Chair Stephens clarified that it would only apply to a green roof. Planner Grahm answered yes.

Chair Stephens asked how they define primary roof form. Planner Grahm explained that the Planning Department looks at the overall roof plan and calculates a percentage of each roof form. For example, if the flat roof is 51% and the gables between 7:12 and 12:12 that add up to 49%, the 51% is the green roof. Chair Stephens asked if they were looking at the area of square footage. Planner Grahm answered yes. He believed that being able to do gable on the front with a little bit of flat helps to keep down the scale of the home. Chair Stephens thought the calculations needed to be very clear to the architectural community. Planner Grahm agreed and offered to look further into the primary roof form and either tie it to square footage or what is visible from the street. Chair Stephens thought they should look at it from the street, but also from the

uphill and downhill lots. Board Member Hodgkins suggested saying that it could not be visible from the public right-of-way.

Director Erickson stated that the Board could forward the recommendations in their discussion to the Planning Commission this evening for debate, or they could ask the Staff to bring back portions at the next meeting.

Chair Stephens preferred that it come back to the HPB. He was concerned about the unintended consequences and he wanted to see the new calculation works out.

Chair Stephens opened the public hearing.

Ruth Meintsma referred to page 89 of the Staff report, the Desired Outcome, the second bullet item stating that, "flat roofs are generally not a desired outcome for the public face and along the street." She remarked that the cross canyon view also needed to be considered. She commented on the flat roof structures that she can see from across the canyon. Ms. Meintsma stated that she likes flat roofs, but she could also understand how people do not think it works, particularly the larger, mountain modern flat roofs. She had been looking at flat roofs in Salt Lake because a lot of them appear as infill. She thought one speaks to the other, but the massing is an issue. Ms. Meintsma understood how flat roofs in town could be an issue. However, for cross canyon views she thought there should be some accommodation for when you read the house, you read it as a gabled house with a flat roof, as opposed to a flat roof house with a little gable. Ms. Meintsma commented on green roofs not being maintained. She noted that green roofs can be gorgeous roofs, but it does not play out that way, especially on a flat roof where no one can see it. However, if green roofs could be allowed on a 5:12 pitch, and the green growth could be seen, it might encourage people to have beautiful green roofs that are sustainable and compatible. Ms. Meintsma stated that if she had a flat roof on the back of her house no one would see it except for the condos above who look down at her ugly roof. She thought it would be great if those condos could look down and see a garden of green.

Ms. Meintsma noted that currently the LMC says, "The primary roof pitch must be between 7:12 and 12:12". "A green roof may be below the required, which means the green roof could be flat, as part of the primary roof design". She noted that homes have been approved with 100% flat roofs, but when she reads the Code it says that the flat roof is only part of the primary roof that must be a minimum of 7:12. She found that confusing and no one has been able to explain it to her. Her interpretation of the existing Code is that it prevents a home with 100% flat roof.

Chair Stephens believed that once the revisions are completed, the Guidelines will reinforce the LMC and provide more clarity on the options.

MOTION: Board Member Holmgren moved to CONTINUE the discussion on flat roofs to a date uncertain. Board Member Scott seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

The meeting adjourned at 6:42 p.m.

Approved by _____
Douglas Stephens, Chair
Historic Preservation Board



Historic Preservation Board Staff Report

Planning Department

Author: Hannah M. Tyler, Planner
Subject: Reorientation and Material Deconstruction Review
Address: 424 Woodside Avenue
Project Number: PL-16-03379
Date: July 19, 2017
Type of Item: Administrative – Reorientation (Rotation and Lifting) and Disassembly/Reassembly (Panelization)

Summary Recommendation:

Staff recommends the Historic Preservation Board review the (1) Reorientation (Rotation and Lifting) and (2) Disassembly/Reassembly (Panelization) of the Significant Structure at 424 Woodside Avenue, conduct a public hearing, and deny the Reorientation and Material Deconstruction pursuant to the following findings of fact, conclusions of law, and conditions of approval.

Topic:

Address: 424 Woodside Avenue
Zoning: Historic Residential (HR-1) District
Designation: Significant
Applicant: Jon and Heather Berkley (Represented by Jonathan DeGray, Architect)
Proposal: (1) Reorient the Historic Structure towards Woodside Avenue (west). The primary façade of the Historic Structure currently faces towards Main Street (east), and the applicant is proposing to reorient the building 180 degrees towards Woodside Avenue. The Historic Structure will be lifted 7 feet 7 $\frac{3}{4}$ inches upon reorientation.
(2) Panelize the Historic Structure in order to facilitate the reorientation.

Background:

The Duplex Dwelling located at 424 Woodside Avenue is listed as “Significant” on the Park City Historic Sites Inventory (HSI). The property consists of a Historic Single-Family dwelling that had an addition constructed in 1993 to create a Duplex Dwelling. The property is located in the Historic Residential (HR-1) zone current use of the property is a Duplex Dwelling. The Historic portion of the existing Duplex Dwelling will be referred to as the “Historic Structure” herein.

The Historic Structure is oriented towards Main Street in that the original primary entrance faces east. In 1993, a 700 square foot (SF) addition was constructed to the south of the Historic Structure to create the Duplex Dwelling Use. The Historic Structure is one (1) unit of the Duplex and the 1993 addition contains the other unit. In 2005, a Plat Amendment was approved creating a 75 foot wide lot by combining three (3) existing lots into one legal lot of record.

In 2011, a Historic District Design Review (HDDR) application was submitted for the Reorientation and Relocation of the Historic Structure and construction of a new Addition. The HDDR proposal triggered a Variance. In 2011, the Variance application was submitted for a Height Exception and for Front and Side Yard Setback Exception(s) citing a hardship regarding the elevation of Woodside Avenue in relation to the Historic Structure and the orientation towards Main Street (east) rather than the modern-day Public Right-of-Way (Woodside Avenue).

Historically, the Historic Structure was associated with a network of pedestrian paths on the east side of the structure that connected the residence to Main Street. The networks of pedestrian paths would have been similar to those found today on the east side of Old Town that exists in the McHenry Avenue neighborhood, such as the connected walking paths that lead off of Shorty's Stairs.

The Variance was Denied by the Board of Adjustment (2011 Variance Staff Report – Exhibit E; 2011 Variance Minutes – Exhibit F). Staff finds that the conditions of the property in 2011, outlined specifically in Finding of Fact #16 of the Board of Adjustment Staff Report have not changed to date. Finding of Fact #16 states:

“The alleged hardship comes from conditions general to the neighborhood, not from circumstances peculiar to this property. Several houses on the downhill side of the street are situated in much the same way as the applicant's home. The positioning of the home on the lot is not unique to this area as many homes were constructed in a manner that allowed the home to face downward towards Main Street, The applicant previously combined three lots and has ample room to expand the existing non-historic portion of the home to add additional living space.”

On November 16, 2016, the applicant submitted a HDDR Application for the subject property. The project scope of the HDDR included:

- Reorient (rotate) the Historic Structure so that the primary entrance faces Woodside Avenue (west).
- Lift the Historic Structure 7 feet 7 ¾ inches upon reorientation to “align with Woodside Avenue” and accommodate a basement addition.
- Panelize the Historic Structure in order to facilitate the reorientation.
- Remodel the existing non-historic addition.
- Construct an addition to the rear (now east facing) façade of the Historic Structure.

After working with the applicant on the required materials for their submittal, the current HDDR application was deemed complete on March 2, 2017. The current HDDR application submittal is very similar to that of the 2011 HDDR, however, as proposed, the current HDDR will comply with the applicable Land Management Code (LMC) requirements and will not require a Variance application.

The HDDR application is currently under review and has not yet been approved, as it is dependent on Historic Preservation Board's (HPB) review for Reorientation and Material

Deconstruction. If Reorientation is approved, staff will conduct further review of the proposal, provide comments to the applicant regarding the proposed design, and return to the HPB with a Material Deconstruction review once staff's comments are addressed. At this time, the HPB is only being asked to review the Reorientation and the Panelization.

Figures 1a through 1f identify the current conditions and existing orientation of the Historic Structure towards Main Street (east). Renderings provided by Jonathan DeGray. Photographs provided by Jonathan DeGray and CRSA.

Figure 1a: *Current Site Orientation – Photographs West Façade*



Figure 1b: *Current Site Orientation – As-Built Rendering West Façade*




Figure 1c: Current Site Orientation – Photographs North Façade



Figure 1d: Current Site Orientation – As-Built Rendering North Façade




Figure 1e: Current Site Orientation – Photographs East Façade



Figure 1f: Current Site Orientation – As-Built Rendering East Façade



Figures 2a-2d identify the proposed reorientation of the Historic Structures towards Woodside Avenue (west). Renderings provided by Jonathan DeGray.

Figure 2a: Proposed Reorientation – West Façade



Figure 2b: Proposed Reorientation – West Façade




Figure 2c: Proposed Reorientation – North Façade



Figure 2d: Proposed Reorientation – Streetscape View (West Façade)



424 Woodside Avenue Developmental History:


The 424 Woodside Avenue Duplex Dwelling is designated as “Significant” on the Park City Historic Sites Inventory (HSI). According to Summit County, the Historic Structure located at 424 Woodside Avenue was constructed ca. 1900. Based on additional analysis by the Planning Department’s Historic Preservation Consultant, Anne Oliver

(Principal Investigator, SWCA Environmental Consultants), staff finds that the Historic Structure may have an earlier construction date (see Exhibit K for Anne Oliver's complete Assessment of Proposed Reorientation). According to the Intensive Level Survey (Exhibit D), the title search indicates that several mortgagees were taken out on the property in 1886, likely for the construction of a house. Anne Oliver finds that because of the title search evidence and the Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps (Sanborn Maps), the Historic Structure was likely constructed prior to 1900. Staff concurs with Anne Oliver and finds that the Historic Structure was constructed ca. 1886.

The Park City HSI identifies the Historic Structure as significant to the Mature Mining Era (1894-1930). Anne Oliver provided the following analysis depicted from historic photographs, Sanborn Maps, and current as-built drawings:


- Originally, the Historic Structure was a hall-parlor type single-family dwelling with a side-gabled roof; it was built on a relatively steep slope that was terraced toward the rear of the house (the Woodside Avenue side) to provide a more level building lot.
- The Historic Structure first appears on the 1889 Sanborn Fire Insurance Map as a wood-framed and wood-sided house originally faced east, providing a view of Main Street. Physical evidence and the 1889 Sanborn map indicate that it had a small shed-roofed wing on the south end of the rear (west) side but no front porch.
- By 1900, the original shed-roofed wing had been extended across the rear (west) side.

Figure 3: 1889 and 1900 Sanborn Fire Insurance Map



- The 1907 Sanborn Map indicates that a formal front porch was added to the east side, further defining it as the primary façade, at the same time that a secondary entry porch was added to the west side. The house retained this configuration through 1930.

Figure 4: 1907 Sanborn Fire Insurance Map



- As visible in historic photographs, the principal façade was composed of a central doorway flanked by a window on each side. Woodside Avenue was present to the west but, in the pedestrian-oriented city of the time, access to the house was via a footpath leading north from Fourth Street behind the Park Avenue houses, and then a short staircase leading up to the east façade (obscured by houses in the foreground). The orientation of houses along the uphill (west) side of Woodside was uniformly east-facing, while orientations along the downhill (east) side was mixed, with some facing Woodside Avenue and others Main Street.

Figure 5: View of property ca. 1905-1907, facing west-northwest (circled in red). Note retention of simple hall-parlor form and continued absence of front porch on east side. Photograph provided by Jonathan DeGray courtesy of Park City Historical Society and Museum



Figure 6: View of property ca. 1905-1907 facing north-west (circled in red). Note retention of simple hall-parlor form and continued absence of front porch on east side. Photograph provided by Jonathan DeGray courtesy of Park City Historical Society and Museum



Figure 7: View of property in 1907, facing west-northwest (circled in red). Note simple hall-parlor form, east-facing aspect with a view across canyon, and access via a footpath leading north from Fourth Street behind the Park Avenue houses. Note the absence of a front porch on east side, although according to the 1907 Sanborn map a porch was added in this year. Also note the mix of house orientations along the downhill (east) side of Woodside, with some facing the street and others the canyon. Photograph provided by Jonathan DeGray courtesy of Park City Historical Society and Museum




Figure 8: 1929 Sanborn Fire Insurance Map




Figure 9: View of property at 424 Woodside in 1930, facing northwest. Note the retention of the simple hall-parlor form and addition of hip-roofed front porch, which was removed by 1941 according to the Sanborn Map. Photograph provided by Jonathan DeGray courtesy of Park City Historical Society and Museum.



- By 1941, a second shed-roofed addition had been built across the west side, incorporating the 1907 rear screened porch and essentially filling the terrace between the rear wall of the house and the retaining wall so that the eave was nearly at grade. The front porch had been removed and asbestos shingles had been applied over the original wood siding by this time.

Figure 10: 1941 Sanborn Fire Insurance Map



Figure 11: Tax appraisal photograph of property at 424 Woodside dating to ca. 1941, facing southeast.



- Asbestos shingle siding was also noted on the 1957 tax appraisal card, which also documents the absence of an east porch.
- The 1968 tax appraisal card indicates that a porch had been rebuilt across the east façade.
- Between 1978 and 1993, the east façade was modified by the addition of a sunroom across the north two-thirds (which likely was created by enclosing the ca. 1968 front porch), covering the original doorway and north window. The interior floor plan indicates that these historic openings were completely removed or covered at the time. As well, the south window on the east façade was enlarged to accommodate two one-over-one windows (see as-built drawings in Exhibit I). The asbestos shingles were also removed during this period and replaced with new drop siding; on the west and north elevations this was applied

over the original 1 x 12 vertical plank sheathing. It appears that all original windows and doors were replaced as well (see as-built drawings in Exhibit I).

- The historic house was extensively rehabilitated and altered in 1993, when the large south addition was built. The south wall of the historic house (between the historic house and the addition) was completely rebuilt and no original materials remain in the east wall. The south addition was enlarged with an east-facing dormer in about 2005 (see as-built drawings in Exhibit I).
- Through time, as Woodside Avenue has been paved, improved, and widened with curb, gutter, and sewer, the level of the road has risen higher above the rear (west) wall and terrace of the house at 424 Woodside. The change in width is uncertain, as is the change in historic grade, but it is likely to be a few feet in both cases.

Analysis:

Please note that staff is aware of discrepancies in the renderings of the reoriented Historic Structure regarding an accurate depiction of the Historic Form. Staff will address these and any other issues pertaining to the design after Final Action is taken by the HPB pertaining to the Reorientation and Panelization. After in-depth discussions with the applicant, staff determined that the first step in their review process shall be to determine if Reorientation is possible. If denied, there will be a redesign so this would save architectural fees and time allotted in the process. Staff is confident that regardless of the decision made by the HPB, the final design will be compliant with the LMC and applicable Design Guidelines. As stated previously, a Material Deconstruction review by HPB will be required at a later date – the renderings will be updated to staff's satisfaction prior to that HPB review.

This analysis will address both proposals as they are closely related, though there are two (2) sets of Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law:

Proposal #1: The applicant proposes to reorient (rotate) the Historic Structure towards Woodside Avenue. As a part of the reorientation, the structure will be panelized and lifted 7 feet 7 ¾ inches.

Proposal #2: The applicant is also proposing to panelize the Historic Structure in order to facilitate the reorientation.

The proposal will comply with the required ten foot (10') Front Yard Setback and minimum five foot (5') Side Yard Setback (total of 18 feet [18'] required), as dictated by the Historic Residential (HR-1) zoning district, described in [Land Management Code \(LMC\) 15-2.2-3](#). In addition, the Historic Structure will comply with the 27 foot height requirement, described in [LMC 15-2.2-5](#). Staff has provided analysis based on the [Design Guidelines for Historic Sites](#) and [LMC 15-11-13](#).

Design Guidelines for Historic Sites

The *Design Guidelines for Historic Sites* provide guidance on lifting Historic Structures (page 31-32), the Relocation and/or Reorientation of Intact Buildings (pages 36-37), and Disassembly/Reassembly of all or part of Historic Structures (page 37-38). Staff commentary can be found in **bold** and *italics* below.

Staff and the Design Review Team have reviewed the proposed reorientation, lifting, and panelization of the Historic Structure using the Design Guidelines for Historic Sites. Staff and the Design Review team do not find that the proposal complies with Design Guidelines B.3 Foundations, E.1 Protection for the Historic Site and F. Disassembly/Reassembly of all or part of a Historic Structure. As stated previously in this staff report and in the 2011 Variance Staff Report (Exhibit E), the relationship between the orientation of the Historic Structure and Main Street is important in conveying the history of the Historic District and this site. Anne Oliver provided an in-depth analysis of the site significance and integrity using the National Park Service (NPS) definition of Significance and Integrity. She stated:

“The house at 424 Woodside remains in its original location and therefore retains that aspect of integrity, including its original orientation to the east and its siting on a small terrace below the street. And although much of the original setting has been lost, including adjacent historic houses, footpaths, staircases, and open space, the house at 424 Woodside retains its relationship to that earlier setting through its orientation and position on a shallow terrace below street level. The property is one of the few reminders of the historic development pattern on a part of the street where much of it has been lost, and is thus important in maintaining a district-wide sense of the historic setting.

(...)

In summary, the house at 424 Woodside retains integrity in the component aspect of location, as well as diminished but significant integrity in the aspects of setting and design. Because the property has already been so altered, it will be critical to preserve these aspects if 424 Woodside is to remain a Significant Site on the HSI and a contributing resource in the historic district.”

The Design Guidelines address lifting Historic Structures to accommodate a foundation. The guidelines specifically state:

B. PRIMARY STRUCTURES

B.3. Foundations

B.3.1 A new foundation should not raise or lower the historic structure generally more than two (2) feet from its original floor elevation. See D.4 for exceptions.

Does not comply.

B.3.2 The original placement, orientation, and grade of the historic building should be retained. **Does not comply.**

B.3.3 If the original grade cannot be achieved, no more than two (2) feet of the new foundation should be visible above finished grade on the primary and secondary facades. **Does not comply.**

The proposal does not comply with Design Guideline B.3.1 as the proposed lifting will lift the structure 7 feet 7 ¾ inches from its existing floor elevation rather than the permitted 2 feet. Staff has not determined adverse or unique conditions that would warrant the disproportionate lifting. The current site conditions listed in the Findings of Fact of the 2011 Variance are still applicable. The Board of Adjustment based their Denial on conditions of the site that are still existent and are common to the neighborhood, including the elevation of Woodside Avenue.

The proposal would not comply with Design Guideline B.3.2 as the original placement, orientation, and grade of the historic building would not be retained. As stated previously, the original placement and orientation are essential to the integrity and significance of the site and prominence within the Historic District. The proposal does not comply with Design Guideline B.3.3 as the proposed lifting would require the foundation to be greater than 2 feet above Final Grade in several locations due to the topography.

The Design Guidelines also address the reorientation of Historic Structures. The guidelines specifically state:

E. RELOCATION AND/OR REORIENTATION OF INTACT BUILDINGS

E.1. Protection for the Historic Site

E.1.1 Relocation and/or reorientation of historic buildings should be considered only after it has been determined by the Design Review Team that the integrity and significance of the historic building will not be diminished by such action and the application meets one of the criterion listed in the sidebar to the left. **Does not comply.**

“SIDE BAR”:

In the HRL, HR1, HR2, HRM, and HRC zones, existing Historic Sites that do not comply with building setbacks are considered valid complying structures. Therefore, proposals to relocate and/or reorient a historic building may be considered ONLY:

- if a portion of the historic building encroaches on an adjacent property and an easement cannot be secured **Not applicable**; or
- if relocating the building onto a different site is the only alternative to demolition **Not applicable**; or
- if the Planning Director and Chief Building Official determine that unique conditions warrant the relocation or reorientation on the existing site **Does not comply.**

E.1.2 Relocation and/or reorientation of historic buildings should be considered only after it has been determined that the structural soundness of the building will not be negatively impacted. **Does not comply.**

E.1.3 The structure should be protected from adverse weather conditions, water infiltration, and vandalism before, during, and after the relocation/reorientation process. **Complies.**

E.1.4 If rehabilitation of the structure will be delayed, temporary improvements should be made—roof repairs, windows/doors secured and/ or covered, adequate ventilation—to the structure to protect the historic fabric until rehabilitation can commence. **Complies.**

E.1.5 A written plan detailing the steps and procedures should be completed and approved by the Planning and Building Departments. **Complies.**

The proposal does not comply with Design Guideline E.1.1 because the reorientation of the Historic Structure will diminish the integrity and significance of the site and its context (this has been discussed at length previously in this staff report and in Exhibit K). Bullet points 1 and 2 of the “Side Bars” are not applicable to the proposal as there are no encroachment issues and the structure is not currently threatened by demolition. The proposal does not comply with Design Guideline E.1.2 as the structure is currently structurally sound and panelization is only necessary to facilitate the proposed reorientation. The proposal would comply with Design Guidelines E.1.3 through E.1.5 as these would be mitigated through proper construction techniques and documentation processes.

The Design Guidelines also address disassembly/reassembly (panelization in this case) of Historic Structures. Please note that the LMC now guides Panelization; however, staff finds it important to identify compliance with applicable Design Guidelines. A complete LMC analysis will be provided later in this Analysis Section. The guidelines specifically state:

F. DISASSEMBLY/REASSEMBLY OF ALL OR PART OF A HISTORIC STRUCTURE

F.1. General Principles

F.1.1 Disassembly of a historic building should be considered only after it has been determined by the Design Review Team that the application meets one of the criteria listed in the sidebar. **Does not comply.**

“SIDE BAR”

Disassembly/Reassembly of historic structures is not a common practice in the field of Historic Preservation. Therefore, a proposal to disassemble/reassemble a historic structure will be considered ONLY:

- if a licensed structural engineer certifies that the building cannot reasonably be moved intact **Does not comply**; or
- if disassembly/reassembly is the best alternative to demolition **Does not comply**; or
- if the building is determined by the Chief Building Official to be a hazardous or dangerous building, pursuant to Section 115.1 of the International Building Code **Does not comply**; or
- if the Planning Director and the Chief Building Official determine that unique conditions and overall quality of the historic preservation effort warrant the disassembly/reassembly of part or all of the building **Does not comply**, AND
- if it is to be accurately reassembled in its original form, location, placement and orientation **Complies**.

F.1.2 Though disassembly/reassembly is not a common practice in the preservation field, if it must be undertaken, it should be done using recognized preservation methods. **Complies.**

The proposed panelization does not comply with F.1 General Principles of F. Disassembly/Reassembly of all or part of a Historic Structure. Staff finds that the panelization of the structure is not required as the current Historic Structure is structurally sound. The panelization would result from a “self-inflicted” issue (reorientation) which would result in additional loss of Historic materials and may compromise the little material that is remaining. Staff does not find that there are any conditions on the site that would warrant the additional material loss. As stated previously, staff and the Design Review Team have not determined unique or adverse conditions that would warrant the reorientation of the Historic Structure. Panelization is only necessary in order to reorient the structure towards Woodside Avenue.

The HPB shall also review the proposal against the HPB Criteria for Material Deconstruction Review (Exhibit B) and the Criteria for Disassembly found in LMC 15-11-14 (below). Staff does not find that the proposed panelization complies with the Design Guidelines for Disassembly/Reassembly as this structure is currently structurally sound and may risk further material loss.

Land Management Code 15-11-13 RELOCATION AND/OR REORIENTATION OF A HISTORIC BUILDING OR HISTORIC STRUCTURE.

Additionally, any relocation of a historic building or historic structure must comply with LMC 15-11-13. The HPB shall review staff’s analysis and find that the project complies with the following criteria in order for the relocation to occur. Staff commentary and analysis is in **bold** or *italics* below:

15-11-13. RELOCATION AND/OR REORIENTATION OF A HISTORIC BUILDING OR HISTORIC STRUCTURE.

B. PROCEDURE FOR THE RELOCATION AND/OR REORIENTATION OF THE HISTORIC BUILDING(S) AND/OR STRUCTURE(S) TO A PERMANENT NEW SITE. To approve a Historic District or Historic Site design review Application involving relocation and/or reorientation of the Historic Building(s) and/or Structure(s) on a Landmark Site or a Significant Site to a new site, the Historic Preservation Board shall find the project complies with the following criteria.

1. For either a Landmark or Significant Site, all of the following shall be met:
 - a. A licensed structural engineer has certified that the Historic Building(s) and/or Structure(s) can successfully be relocated and the applicant has demonstrated that a professional building mover will move the building and protect it while being stored; and
 - b. The proposed relocation will not have a detrimental effect on the structural soundness of the building or structure; **Does not comply.**

The proposal does not comply as although the applicant has submitted a plan for rotation and staff will require a Structural Engineer’s report, the structure is currently structurally sound and panelization is only necessary to facilitate the proposed reorientation.

2. Landmark structures shall only be permitted to be relocated to a new site if the relocation will abate demolition and the Planning Director and Chief Building Official find that the relocation will abate a hazardous condition at the present setting and enhance the preservation of the structure. **Not Applicable.**

This is not applicable as the structure is designated as "Significant" on the Park City Historic Sites Inventory.

3. For Significant Sites, at least one of the following must be met:
 - a. The proposed relocation and/or reorientation will abate demolition of the Historic Building(s) and/or Structure(s) on the Site; or **Not Applicable.**

This is not applicable as the structure is not threatened by demolition.

- b. The Planning Director and Chief Building Official determine that the building is threatened in its present setting because of hazardous conditions and the preservation of the building will be enhanced by relocating it; or **Does not comply.**

The proposal does not comply as the structure is not threatened by hazardous conditions and the preservation of the building will not be enhanced by relocating it.

- c. The Historic Preservation Board, with input from the Planning Director and the Chief Building Official, determines that unique conditions warrant the proposed relocation and/or reorientation to a new Site. This criterion is only available to Significant Sites. Unique conditions shall include all of the following:
 - i. The relocation/reorientation will not negatively affect the historic integrity of the Historic District, nor the area of receiving site; and **Does not Comply.**

As stated previously, staff and the Design Review Team find that the Historic Structure at 424 Woodside Avenue retains integrity in the component aspect of location, as well as diminished but significant integrity in the aspects of setting and design. Because the property has already been so altered, it will be critical to preserve these aspects if 424 Woodside Avenue is to remain a Significant Site on the HSI and a contributing resource in the Historic District.

- ii. One of the following must also be met:

- a. The historic building is located within the Historic districts, but its historic context and setting have become so radically

altered that the building may be enhanced by its new setting if the receiving site is more similar to its historic setting in terms of architecture, style, period, height, mass, volume, scale, use and location of the structure on the lot as well as neighborhood features and uses; or **Does not Comply**.

As stated previously, staff and the Design Review Team find that the house at 424 Woodside remains in its original location and therefore retains that aspect of integrity, including its original orientation to the east and its siting on a small terrace below the street. And although much of the original setting has been lost, including adjacent historic houses, footpaths, staircases, and open space, the house at 424 Woodside retains its relationship to that earlier setting through its orientation and position on a shallow terrace below street level. The property is one of the few reminders of the historic development pattern on a part of the street where much of it has been lost, and is thus important in maintaining a district-wide sense of the historic setting.

Anne Oliver stated: "The historic context of 424 Woodside has been radically altered through the construction of additions to the historic house and associated development of non-historic residential infill along the street and on surrounding lots. However, reorienting the building will destroy its remaining integrity, which lies solely in the aspects of location, setting, and design. Reorientation will render the property incapable of conveying its significance in the history of Park City and make it impossible to interpret its historic character."

- b. The historic building is located outside of the Historic districts, and its historic context and setting have been so radically altered that the building may be enhanced by its new setting if the receiving site is more similar to its historic setting in terms of architecture, style, period, height, mass, volume, scale, use, and location of the structure on the lot as well as neighborhood features and uses; or **Not Applicable**.

This is not applicable as the Historic Structure is located within the HR-1 Zoning District.

- d. City Council, with input from the Historic Preservation Board, Planning Director, and Chief Building Official, determines that the Historic Building(s) and/or Structure(s) is deterrent to a major improvement program outside of the Historic districts that will be of Substantial Benefit to the community, such as, but not limited to:
 - a. The relocation of the Historic Building(s) and/or Structure(s) will result in the restoration of the house—both the interior and exterior—in compliance with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and the relocation will aid in the interpretation of the

history of the Historic Building(s) and/or Structure(s); or **Does not Comply**.

As stated previously, the reorientation and lifting of the structure will not result aid in the interpretation of the historic of the Historic Building and/or site as the original orientation is crucial to maintaining the remaining integrity that the site retains.

- b. The relocation of the Historic Building(s) and/or Structure(s) will result in the revitalization of the receiving neighborhood due to the relocation; or **Not applicable**.

The proposal is not to relocate the Historic Structure to a different site. The reorientation will not result in the revitalization of the existing site.

- c. The relocation of the Historic Building(s) and/or Structure(s) will result in a new affordable housing development on the original site that creates more units than currently provided on the existing site and the rehabilitation of the Historic Building(s) and/or Structure(s) on the new receiving site. **Does not comply**.

The proposal will not result in Affordable Housing.

Land Management Code 15-11-14 DISASSEMBLY AND REASSEMBLY OF A HISTORIC BUILDING OR HISTORIC STRUCTURE.

Additionally, any disassembly/relocation of a historic building or historic structure must comply with LMC 15-11-14. The HPB shall review staff's analysis and find that the project complies with the following criteria in order for the relocation to occur. Staff commentary and analysis is in **bold** or *italics* below:

15-11-14 DISASSEMBLY AND REASSEMBLY OF A HISTORIC BUILDING OR HISTORIC STRUCTURE. It is the intent of this section to preserve the Historic and architectural resources of Park City through limitations on the disassembly and reassembly of Historic Buildings, Structures, and Sites.

- A. **CRITERIA FOR DISASSEMBLY AND REASSEMBLY OF THE HISTORIC BUILDING(S) AND/OR STRUCTURE(S) ON A LANDMARK SITE OR SIGNIFICANT SITE**. In approving a Historic District or Historic Site design review Application involving disassembly and reassembly of the Historic Building(s) and/or Structure(s) on a Landmark Site or Significant Site, the Historic Preservation Board shall find the project complies with the following criteria:

- 1. A licensed structural engineer has certified that the Historic Building(s) and/or Structure(s) cannot reasonably be moved intact **Complies**; and

The applicant is proposing panelization because the structure cannot be reoriented (rotated) in one piece due to a lack of area to rotate the structure between the neighboring property and the 1993 addition. See Historic Preservation Plan in Exhibit G.

2. At least one of the following:

- a. The proposed disassembly and reassembly will abate demolition of the Historic Building(s) and/or Structure(s) on the Site **Does not comply**; or

The proposal does not comply as the Historic Structure is not threatened by demolition.

- b. The Historic Building(s) and/or Structure(s) are found by the Chief Building Official to be hazardous or dangerous, pursuant to Section 116.1 of the International Building Code **Does not comply**; or

The proposal does not comply as the historic structure is not threatened by hazardous or dangerous conditions pursuant to Section 116.1 of the International Building Code.

- c. The Historic Preservation Board determines, with input from the Planning Director and the Chief Building Official, that unique conditions and the quality of the Historic Preservation Plan warrant the proposed disassembly and reassembly; unique conditions include but are not limited to:

- 1. If problematic site or structural conditions preclude temporarily lifting or moving a building as a single unit **Does not comply**; or

The Planning Director and Chief Building Official do not find unique site conditions that would warrant a disassembly and reassembly. The structure is currently structurally sound; however the proposal to reorient the structure towards Woodside Avenue would result in the disassembly/reassembly (panelization) of the structure. While there is limited space between the neighboring property and the 1993 addition, staff finds that the current orientation of the structure would facilitate redevelopment without harming the historic structure or creating the potential for further historic material loss.

- 2. If the physical conditions of the existing materials prevent temporarily lifting or moving a building and the applicant has demonstrated that panelization will result in the preservation of a greater amount of historic material **Does not comply**; or

The proposal does not comply as the physical conditions of the existing materials are not in disrepair. The panelization would result in the loss of historic materials and is not required to facilitate a remodel/restoration of the structure.

3. All other alternatives have been shown to result in additional damage or loss of historic materials.

The proposal does not comply as a remodel/restoration of the structure is possible in its current location/orientation and would not require panelization.

Under all of the above criteria, the Historic Structure(s) and or Building(s) must be reassembled using the original materials that are found to be safe and/or serviceable condition in combination with new materials; and

The Building(s) and/or Structure(s) will be reassembled in their original form, location, placement, and orientation.

As can be seen in Exhibit K, Anne Oliver provided a conclusion to her analysis that staff finds sums up the Design Review Team's analysis and provided an alternative to the proposed Reorientation (rotation and lifting) and Material Deconstruction (Panelization):

The reorientation of the historic house at 424 Woodside Avenue will have a significant effect on its integrity, which has already been compromised by an addition and alterations on the east side and the large addition on the south side. In fact reorientation will diminish integrity to the degree that the property can no longer be considered a Significant Site as defined in PCMC's LMC and Design Guidelines.

An option consistent with PCMC's LMC and Historic District Design Guidelines would be to raise the house two feet while maintaining its original orientation (see Section B.3. Foundations). This will allow for the addition of a modern foundation, promote material preservation of the house, and improve visibility from Woodside, thereby counteracting the adverse effects of the raised and widened roadbed to a significant degree. Raising the historic house two feet is also encouraged because it will improve the relationship with the south addition by making the historic house less visually and physically subordinate and increasing general compatibility, as discussed in Section D (Additions to Historic Structures) of the Design Guidelines.

Process:

The HPB will hear testimony from the applicant and the public and will review the Application for compliance with the "Criteria for Relocation and/or Reorientation of the Historic Structure." The HPB shall forward a copy of its written findings to the Owner and/or Applicant.

The Applicant or any party participating in the hearing may appeal the Historic Preservation Board decision to the Board of Adjustment. Appeal requests shall be submitted to the Planning Department ten (10) days of the Historic Preservation Board decision. Appeals shall be considered only on the record made before the HPB and will be reviewed for correctness.

Notice:

On July 1, 2017 Legal Notice of this public hearing was published in the Park Record and posted in the required public spaces. Staff sent a mailing notice to property owners within 100 feet on and posted the property on July 5, 2017.

Recommendation:

Staff recommends the Historic Preservation Board review the (1) Reorientation (Rotation and Lifting) and (2) Disassembly/Reassembly(Panelization) of the Significant Structure at 424 Woodside Avenue, conduct a public hearing, and deny the Reorientation and Material Deconstruction pursuant to the following findings of fact, conclusions of law, and conditions of approval.

Finding of Fact for Proposal #1: Reorientation of a Historic Structure:

1. The applicant, Jon and Heather Berkley (Represented by Jonathan DeGray, Architect), are proposing to (1) Reorient the Historic Structure towards Woodside Avenue (west). The primary façade of the Historic Structure currently faces towards Main Street (east), and the applicant is proposing to reorient the building 180 degrees towards Woodside Avenue. The Historic Structure will be lifted 7 feet 7 $\frac{3}{4}$ inches upon reorientation. (2) Panelize the Historic Structure in order to facilitate the reorientation.
2. The Duplex Dwelling located at 424 Woodside Avenue is listed as “Significant” on the Park City Historic Sites Inventory (HSI).
3. The property is located in the Historic Residential (HR-1) zone.
4. The Historic Structure faces towards Main Street in that the original primary entrance faces east. In 1993, a 700 square foot (SF) addition was constructed to the south of the Historic Structure to create the Duplex Dwelling Use.
5. In 2005 a Plat Amendment was approved creating a 75 foot wide lot by combining three (3) existing lots into one legal lot of record. The Historic Structure straddles two (2) of the three (3) lots that were combined.
6. In 2011, a Historic District Design Review (HDDR) application was submitted for the Reorientation and Relocation of the Historic Structure and construction of a new Addition. The HDDR proposal triggered a Variance.
7. In 2011, the Variance application was submitted for a Height Exception and for Front and Side Yard Setback Exception(s) citing a hardship regarding the elevation of Woodside Avenue in relation to the Historic Structure and the orientation towards Main Street (east) rather than the modern-day Public Right-of-Way (Woodside Avenue).
8. The Variance was Denied by the Board of Adjustment. Staff finds that the conditions of the property in 2011, outlined specifically in Finding of Fact #16 of the 2011 Variance Staff Report have not changed to date.

9. Historically, the Historic Structure was associated with a network of pedestrian paths on the east side of the structure that connected the residence to Main Street.
10. On November 16, 2016, the applicant submitted a HDDR Application for the subject property. The project scope of the HDDR included: Reorient (rotate) the Historic Structure so that the primary entrance faces Woodside Avenue (west); Lift the Historic Structure 7 feet 7 $\frac{3}{4}$ inches upon reorientation to "align with Woodside Avenue" and accommodate a basement addition; Panelize the Historic Structure in order to facilitate the reorientation; Remodel the existing non-historic addition; and Construct an addition to the rear (now east facing) façade of the Historic Structure.
11. After working with the applicant on the required materials for their submittal, the current HDDR application was deemed complete on March 2, 2017.
12. The HDDR application is currently under review and has not yet been approved, as it is dependent on Historic Preservation Board's (HPB) review for Reorientation and Material Deconstruction.
13. The Historic Structure was constructed ca. 1886. The Park City HSI identifies the Historic Structure as significant to the Mature Mining Era (1894-1930).
14. Originally, the Historic Structure was a hall-parlor type single-family dwelling with a side-gabled roof; it was built on a relatively steep slope that was terraced toward the rear of the house (the Woodside Avenue side) to provide a more level building lot.
15. The Historic Structure first appears on the 1889 Sanborn Fire Insurance Map as a wood-framed and wood-sided house originally faced east, providing a view over Main Street. Physical evidence and the 1889 Sanborn map indicate that it had a small shed-roofed wing on the south end of the rear (west) side but no front porch.
16. By 1900, the original shed-roofed wing had been extended across the rear (west) side.
17. In 1907, the Sanborn Map indicates that a formal front porch was added to the east side, further defining it as the primary façade, at the same time that a secondary entry porch was added to the west side. The house retained this configuration through 1930.
18. The principal façade was composed of a central doorway flanked by a window on each side. Woodside Avenue was present to the west but, access to the house was via a footpath leading north from Fourth Street behind the Park Avenue houses, and then a short staircase leading up to the east façade. The orientation of houses along the uphill (west) side of Woodside was uniformly east-facing, while orientations along the downhill (east) side was mixed, with some facing the street and others the canyon.
19. By 1941, a second shed-roofed addition had been built across the west side, incorporating the 1907 rear screened porch and essentially filling the terrace between the rear wall of the house and the retaining wall so that the eave was nearly at grade. The front porch had been removed and asbestos shingles had been applied over the original wood siding by this time.
20. Asbestos shingle siding was noted on the 1957 tax appraisal card, which also documents the absence of an east porch.
21. The 1968 tax appraisal card indicates that a porch had been rebuilt across the east façade.
22. Between 1978 and 1993, the east façade was modified by the addition of a sunroom across the north two-thirds, covering the original doorway and north window.

23. The proposal will comply with the required ten foot (10') Front Yard Setback and minimum five foot (5') Side Yard Setback (total of 18 feet [18'] required), as dictated by the Historic Residential (HR-1) zoning district, described in Land Management Code (LMC) 15-2.2-3. In addition, the Historic Structure will comply with the 27 foot height requirement, described in LMC 15-2.2-5.
24. The proposal does not comply with Design Guideline B.3.1 as the proposed lifting will lift the structure 7 feet 7 ¾ inches from its existing floor elevation rather than the permitted 2 feet. Staff has not determined adverse or unique conditions that would warrant the disproportionate lifting.
25. The current site conditions listed in the Findings of Fact of the 2011 Variance are still applicable. The Board of Adjustment based their Denial on conditions of the site that are still existent and are common to the neighborhood, including the elevation of Woodside Avenue.
26. The proposal would not comply with Design Guideline B.3.2 as the original placement, orientation, and grade of the historic building would not be retained. The relationship between the orientation of the Historic Structure and Main Street is important in conveying the history of the Historic District and this site.
27. The proposal does not comply with Design Guideline B.3.3 as the proposed lifting would require the foundation to be greater than 2 feet above Final Grade in several locations due to the topography.
28. The proposal does not comply with Design Guideline E.1.1 because the reorientation of the Historic Structure will diminish the integrity and significance of the site and its context.
29. Bullet points 1 and 2 of the "Side Bars" for E.1.1 are not applicable to the proposal as there are no encroachment issues and the structure is not currently threatened by demolition.
30. The proposal would comply with Design Guidelines E.1.2 through E.1.5 as these would be mitigated through proper construction techniques and documentation processes.
31. The proposal complies with LMC 15-11-13(B)(1) as the applicant has submitted a plan for rotation and staff will require a Structural Engineer's report. The Historic Structure would remain structurally sound when it was reattached to a new structure in the new orientation.
32. LMC 15-11-13(B)(2) is not applicable as the structure is designated as "Significant" on the Park City Historic Sites Inventory.
33. LMC 15-11-13(B)(3)(a) is not applicable as the structure is not threatened by demolition.
34. The proposal does not comply with LMC 15-11-13(B)(3)(b) as the structure is not threatened by hazardous conditions and the preservation of the building will not be enhanced by relocating it.
35. The proposal does not comply with LMC 15-11-13(B)(3)(c)(i) as staff and the Design Review Team find that the Historic Structure at 424 Woodside Avenue retains integrity in the component aspect of location, as well as diminished but significant integrity in the aspects of setting and design. Because the property has already been so altered, it will be critical to preserve these aspects if 424 Woodside Avenue is to remain a Significant Site on the HSI and a contributing resource in the Historic District.

36. The proposal does not comply with LMC 15-11-13(B)(3)(c)(ii)(a) as staff and the Design Review Team find that the house at 424 Woodside remains in its original location and therefore retains that aspect of integrity, including its original orientation to the east and its siting on a small terrace below the street. And although much of the original setting has been lost, including adjacent historic houses, footpaths, staircases, and open space, the house at 424 Woodside retains its relationship to that earlier setting through its orientation and position on a shallow terrace below street level. The property is one of the few reminders of the historic development pattern on a part of the street where much of it has been lost, and is thus important in maintaining a district-wide sense of the historic setting.
37. LMC 15-11-13(B)(3)(c)(ii)(b) is not applicable as the Historic Structure is located within the HR-1 Zoning District.
38. The proposal does not comply with LMC 15-11-13(B)(3)(d)(a) as the reorientation and lifting of the structure will not result aid in the interpretation of the historic of the Historic Building and/or site as the original orientation is crucial to maintaining the remaining integrity that the site retains.
39. LMC 15-11-13(B)(3)(d)(b) is not applicable as the proposal is not to relocate the Historic Structure to a different site. The reorientation will not result in the revitalization of the existing site.
40. The proposal does not comply with LMC 15-11-13(B)(3)(d)(c) as the proposal will not result in Affordable Housing.
41. The reorientation of the historic house at 424 Woodside Avenue will have a significant effect on its integrity, which has already been compromised by an addition and alterations on the east side and the large addition on the south side. Reorientation will diminish integrity to the degree that the property can no longer be considered a Significant Site as defined in the LMC and Design Guidelines.

Conclusions of Law:

1. The proposal does not meet the criteria for reorientation pursuant to LMC 15-11-13 Reorientation of a Historic Building or Historic Structure.

Finding of Fact for Proposal #2: Material Deconstruction (Panelization):

1. The applicant, Jon and Heather Berkley (Represented by Jonathan DeGray, Architect), are proposing to (1) Reorient the Historic Structure towards Woodside Avenue (west). The primary façade of the Historic Structure currently faces towards Main Street (east), and the applicant is proposing to reorient the building 180 degrees towards Woodside Avenue. The Historic Structure will be lifted 7 feet 7 ³/₄ inches upon reorientation. (2) Panelize the Historic Structure in order to facilitate the reorientation.
2. The Duplex Dwelling located at 424 Woodside Avenue is listed as “Significant” on the Park City Historic Sites Inventory (HSI).
3. The property is located in the Historic Residential (HR-1) zone.
4. The Historic Structure faces towards Main Street in that the original primary entrance faces east. In 1993, a 700 square foot (SF) addition was constructed to the south of the Historic Structure to create the Duplex Dwelling Use.

5. In 2005 a Plat Amendment was approved creating a 75 foot wide lot by combining three (3) existing lots into one legal lot of record. The Historic Structure straddles two (2) of the three (3) lots that were combined.
6. In 2011, a Historic District Design Review (HDDR) application was submitted for the Reorientation and Relocation of the Historic Structure and construction of a new Addition. The HDDR proposal triggered a Variance.
7. In 2011, the Variance application was submitted for a Height Exception and for Front and Side Yard Setback Exception(s) citing a hardship regarding the elevation of Woodside Avenue in relation to the Historic Structure and the orientation towards Main Street (east) rather than the modern-day Public Right-of-Way (Woodside Avenue).
8. The Variance was Denied by the Board of Adjustment. Staff finds that the conditions of the property in 2011, outlined specifically in Finding of Fact #16 of the 2011 Variance Staff Report have not changed to date.
9. Historically, the Historic Structure was associated with a network of pedestrian paths on the east side of the structure that connected the residence to Main Street.
10. On November 16, 2016, the applicant submitted a HDDR Application for the subject property. The project scope of the HDDR included: Reorient (rotate) the Historic Structure so that the primary entrance faces Woodside Avenue (west); Lift the Historic Structure 7 feet 7 ¾ inches upon reorientation to “align with Woodside Avenue” and accommodate a basement addition; Panelize the Historic Structure in order to facilitate the reorientation; Remodel the existing non-historic addition; and Construct an addition to the rear (now east facing) façade of the Historic Structure.
11. After working with the applicant on the required materials for their submittal, the current HDDR application was deemed complete on March 2, 2017.
12. The HDDR application is currently under review and has not yet been approved, as it is dependent on Historic Preservation Board’s (HPB) review for Reorientation and Material Deconstruction.
13. The Historic Structure was constructed ca. 1886. The Park City HSI identifies the Historic Structure as significant to the Mature Mining Era (1894-1930).
14. Originally, the Historic Structure was a hall-parlor type single-family dwelling with a side-gabled roof; it was built on a relatively steep slope that was terraced toward the rear of the house (the Woodside Avenue side) to provide a more level building lot.
15. The Historic Structure first appears on the 1889 Sanborn Fire Insurance Map as a wood-framed and wood-sided house originally faced east, providing a view over Main Street. Physical evidence and the 1889 Sanborn map indicate that it had a small shed-roofed wing on the south end of the rear (west) side but no front porch.
16. By 1900, the original shed-roofed wing had been extended across the rear (west) side.
17. In 1907, the Sanborn Map indicates that a formal front porch was added to the east side, further defining it as the primary façade, at the same time that a secondary entry porch was added to the west side. The house retained this configuration through 1930.
18. The principal façade was composed of a central doorway flanked by a window on each side. Woodside Avenue was present to the west but, access to the house was via a footpath leading north from Fourth Street behind the Park Avenue houses, and then a short staircase leading up to the east façade. The orientation of houses along

the uphill (west) side of Woodside was uniformly east-facing, while orientations along the downhill (east) side was mixed, with some facing the street and others the canyon.

19. By 1941, a second shed-roofed addition had been built across the west side, incorporating the 1907 rear screened porch and essentially filling the terrace between the rear wall of the house and the retaining wall so that the eave was nearly at grade. The front porch had been removed and asbestos shingles had been applied over the original wood siding by this time.
20. Asbestos shingle siding was noted on the 1957 tax appraisal card, which also documents the absence of an east porch.
21. The 1968 tax appraisal card indicates that a porch had been rebuilt across the east façade.
22. Between 1978 and 1993, the east façade was modified by the addition of a sunroom across the north two-thirds, covering the original doorway and north window.
23. The proposal will comply with the required ten foot (10') Front Yard Setback and minimum five foot (5') Side Yard Setback (total of 18 feet [18'] required), as dictated by the Historic Residential (HR-1) zoning district, described in Land Management Code (LMC) 15-2.2-3. In addition, the Historic Structure will comply with the 27 foot height requirement, described in LMC 15-2.2-5.
24. The proposed panelization does not comply with F.1 General Principles of F. Disassembly/Reassembly of all or part of a Historic Structure. Staff finds that the panelization of the structure is not required as the current Historic Structure is structurally sound.
25. The panelization would result from a "self-inflicted" issue (reorientation) which would result in additional loss of Historic materials and may compromise the little material that is remaining.
26. There are any conditions on the site that would warrant the additional material loss.
27. There are no unique or adverse conditions that would warrant the reorientation of the Historic Structure. Panelization is only necessary in order to reorient the structure towards Woodside Avenue.
28. The HPB shall review the proposed panelization against the HPB Criteria for Material Deconstruction Review.
29. Staff does not find that the proposed panelization complies with the Design Guidelines for Disassembly/Reassembly as this structure is currently structurally sound and may risk further material loss.
30. The proposal complies with LMC 15-11-14(A)(1) as the applicant is proposing panelization because the structure cannot be reoriented (rotated) in one piece due to a lack of area to rotate the structure between the neighboring property and the 1993 addition. See Historic Preservation Plan in Exhibit G.
31. The proposal does not comply with 15-11-14(2)(a) as the Historic Structure is not threatened by demolition.
32. The proposal does not comply with 15-11-14(2)(b) as the historic structure is not threatened by hazardous or dangerous conditions pursuant to Section 116.1 of the International Building Code.
33. The proposal does not comply with 15-11-14(2)(c)(1) as the Planning Director and Chief Building Official do not find unique site conditions that would warrant a disassembly and reassembly. The structure is currently structurally sound; however

the proposal to reorient the structure towards Woodside Avenue would result in the disassembly/reassembly (panelization) of the structure. While there is limited space between the neighboring property and the 1993 addition, staff finds that the current orientation of the structure would facilitate redevelopment without harming the historic structure or creating the potential for further historic material loss.

34. The proposal does not comply with 15-11-14(2)(c)(2) as the physical conditions of the existing materials are not in disrepair. The panelization would result in the loss of historic materials and is not required to facilitate a remodel/restoration of the structure.
35. The proposal does not comply with 15-11-14(2)(c)(3) as a remodel/restoration of the structure is possible in its current location/orientation and would not require panelization.

Conclusions of Law:

1. The proposal does not comply with the Land Management Code requirements pursuant to the HR-1 District and regarding material deconstruction.

Exhibits:

Exhibit A	HPB Criteria for Relocation of Historic Structures
Exhibit B	HPB Material Deconstruction Review Checklist
Exhibit C	Historic Sites Inventory Form
Exhibit D	Intensive Level Survey Draft Form
Exhibit E	2011 Variance Staff Report
Exhibit F	2011 Variance Minutes
Exhibit G	Historic District Design Review Historic Preservation Plan
Exhibit H	Historic District Design Review Physical Conditions Report
Exhibit I	Historic District Design Review Existing and Proposed Plans
Exhibit J	Applicant's Reorientation Analysis
Exhibit K	Park City Municipal Corporation's Historic Preservation Consultant, Anne Oliver, SWCA - Assessment of Proposed Reorientation
Exhibit L	Public Comment

Exhibit A: HPB Criteria for Relocation of Historic Structures

The Historic Preservation Board shall find the project complies with the following criteria (Exhibit A):

1. For either a Landmark or Significant Site, all of the following shall be met:
 - a. A licensed structural engineer has certified that the Historic Building(s) and/or Structure(s) can successfully be relocated and the applicant has demonstrated that a professional building mover will move the building and protect it while being stored; and
 - b. The proposed relocation will not have a detrimental effect on the structural soundness of the building or structure;
2. Landmark structures shall only be permitted to be relocated to a new site if the relocation will abate demolition and the Planning Director and Chief Building Official find that the relocation will abate a hazardous condition at the present setting and enhance the preservation of the structure.
3. For Significant Sites, at least one of the following must be met:
 - a. The proposed relocation and/or reorientation will abate demolition of the Historic Building(s) and/or Structure(s) on the Site; or
 - b. The Planning Director and Chief Building Official determine that the building is threatened in its present setting because of hazardous conditions and the preservation of the building will be enhanced by relocating it; or
 - c. The Historic Preservation Board, with input from the Planning Director and the Chief Building Official, determines that unique conditions warrant the proposed relocation and/or reorientation to a new Site. This criterion is only available to Significant Sites. Unique conditions shall include all of the following:
 - i. The relocation will not negatively affect the historic integrity of the Historic District, nor the area of receiving site; and
 - ii. One of the following must also be met:
 - a. The historic building is located within the Historic districts, but its historic context and setting have become so radically altered that the building may be enhanced by its new setting if the receiving site is more similar to its historic setting in terms of architecture, style, period, height, mass, volume, scale, use and location of the structure on the lot as well as neighborhood features and uses; or
 - b. The historic building is located outside of the Historic districts, and its historic context and setting have been so radically altered that the building may be enhanced by its new setting if the receiving site is more similar to its historic setting in terms of architecture, style, period, height, mass, volume, scale, use, and location of the structure on the lot as well as neighborhood features and uses; or
 - d. City Council, with input from the Historic Preservation Board, Planning Director, and Chief Building Official, determines that the Historic Building(s) and/or Structure(s) is deterrent to a major improvement

program outside of the Historic districts that will be of Substantial Benefit to the community, such as, but not limited to:

- a. The relocation of the Historic Building(s) and/or Structure(s) will result in the restoration of the house—both the interior and exterior—in compliance with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and the relocation will aid in the interpretation of the history of the Historic Building(s) and/or Structure(s);
- b. The relocation of the Historic Building(s) and/or Structure(s) will result in the revitalization of the receiving neighborhood due to the relocation; or
- c. The relocation of the Historic Building(s) and/or Structure(s) will result in a new affordable housing development on the original site that creates more units than currently provided on the existing site and the rehabilitation of the Historic Building(s) and/or Structure(s) on the new receiving site.

Exhibit B: HPB Material Deconstruction Review Checklist

Historic Preservation Board Material Deconstruction Review Checklist:

1. 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) does not require Historic Preservation Board Review (HPBR).
2. The material deconstruction is required for the renovation, restoration, or rehabilitation of the building, structure, or object.
3. 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.
4. The proposed scope of work mitigates any impacts that will occur to the visual character of the neighborhood where material deconstruction is proposed to occur; any impacts that will occur to the historical significance of the buildings, structures, or objects located on the property; any impact that will occur to the architectural integrity of the buildings, structures, or objects located on the property; and any impact that will compromise the structural stability of the historic building.
5. The proposed scope of work mitigates to the greatest extent practical any impact to the historical importance of other structures located on the property and on adjacent parcels.
6. Any addition to a Historic Building, Site, or Structure has been found to be non-contributory to the historic integrity or historical significance of the structure or site.

EXHIBIT C
Historic Sites Inventory Form

HISTORIC SITE FORM - HISTORIC SITES INVENTORY

PARK CITY MUNICIPAL CORPORATION (10-08)

1 IDENTIFICATION

Name of Property:

Address: 424 Woodside Avenue

AKA:

City, County: Park City, Summit County, Utah

Tax Number: 424-WS-1

Current Owner Name: Heather Berkley

Parent Parcel(s): PC-66

Current Owner Address: 9308 Tournament Canyon Drive, Las Vegas, NV 89144

Legal Description (include acreage): 0.13 acres; LOT 1 424 WOODSIDE AVENUE SUBDIVISION.

2 STATUS/USE

Property Category

- ☒ building(s), main
- ☐ building(s), attached
- ☐ building(s), detached
- ☐ building(s), public
- ☐ building(s), accessory
- ☐ structure(s)

Evaluation*

- ☐ Landmark Site
- ☒ Significant Site
- ☐ Not Historic

Reconstruction

- Date:
- Permit #:
- ☐ Full ☐ Partial

Use

- Original Use: Residential
- Current Use: Residential

- *National Register of Historic Places: ☒ ineligible ☐ eligible
☐ listed (date:)

3 DOCUMENTATION

Photos: Dates

- ☒ tax photo:
- ☒ prints: 1995 & 2006
- ☐ historic: c.

Drawings and Plans

- ☐ measured floor plans
- ☐ site sketch map
- ☐ Historic American Bldg. Survey
- ☐ original plans:
- ☐ other:

Research Sources (check all sources consulted, whether useful or not)

- ☐ abstract of title
- ☒ tax card
- ☐ original building permit
- ☐ sewer permit
- ☒ Sanborn Maps
- ☐ obituary index
- ☐ city directories/gazetteers
- ☐ census records
- ☐ biographical encyclopedias
- ☐ newspapers
- ☒ city/county histories
- ☐ personal interviews
- ☐ Utah Hist. Research Center
- ☐ USHS Preservation Files
- ☐ USHS Architects File
- ☐ LDS Family History Library
- ☐ Park City Hist. Soc/Museum
- ☐ university library(ies):
- ☐ other:

Bibliographical References (books, articles, interviews, etc.) Attach copies of all research notes and materials.

Blaes, Dina. "Final Report." Park City Historic Building Inventory. Salt Lake City: 2007.

Carter, Thomas and Goss, Peter. *Utah's Historic Architecture, 1847-1940: a Guide*. Salt Lake City, Utah:

University of Utah Graduate School of Architecture and Utah State Historical Society, 1991.

McAlester, Virginia and Lee. *A Field Guide to American Houses*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1998.

Roberts, Allen. "Final Report." Park City Reconnaissance Level Survey. Salt Lake City: 1995.

Roper, Roger & Deborah Randall. "Residences of Mining Boom Era, Park City - Thematic Nomination." National Register of Historic Places Inventory, Nomination Form. 1984.

4 ARCHITECTURAL DESCRIPTION & INTEGRITY

Building Type and/or Style: Hall-Parlor / Vernacular style

No. Stories: 1 & 1 ½

Additions: ☐ none ☐ minor ☒ major (describe below) Alterations: ☐ none ☒ minor ☐ major (describe below)

Number of associated outbuildings and/or structures: ☐ accessory building(s), # ____; ☐ structure(s), # ____.

General Condition of Exterior Materials:

Researcher/Organization: Dina Blaes/Park City Municipal Corporation Date: November, 08

- ☒ Good (Well maintained with no serious problems apparent.)
- ☐ Fair (Some problems are apparent. Describe the problems.):
- ☐ Poor (Major problems are apparent and constitute an imminent threat. Describe the problems.):
- ☐ Uninhabitable/Ruin

Materials (The physical elements that were combined or deposited during a particular period of time in a particular pattern or configuration. Describe the materials.):

Site: Site drops sharply from the finished roadway. Includes mature trees and shrubs.

Foundation: Assumed to be concrete based on an early photograph.

Walls: Clad in wood drop siding and corner boards.

Roof: Side gable with long rear shed extension is sheathed in metal standing seam material.

Windows: Windows include small fixed casement windows on the rear elevation and doubled-hung wood units on the side.

Essential Historical Form: ☒ Retains ☐ Does Not Retain, due to:

Location: ☒ Original Location ☐ Moved (date _____) Original Location:

Design (The combination of physical elements that create the form, plan, space, structure, and style. Describe additions and/or alterations from the original design, including dates--known or estimated--when alterations were made): The one-story frame hall-parlor house has been modified significantly. A 1978 Structure/Site form indicates possible minor additions the original house, but pre-1995 a large addition was constructed to the south. The changes to the original house are minor but the construction of such a large side addition diminishes the site's original character.

Setting (The physical environment--natural or manmade--of a historic site. Describe the setting and how it has changed over time.): The setting has been significantly altered by the construction of a 1 ½ story addition to the south side of the original structure. The addition includes a two-car garage and large paved parking area.

Workmanship (The physical evidence of the crafts of a particular culture or people during a given period in history. Describe the distinctive elements.): Though the physical evidence from the period that defines this as a typical Park City mining era house--the simple methods of construction, the use of non-beveled (drop-novelty) wood siding, the plan type, the simple roof form, the informal landscaping, the restrained ornamentation, and the plain finishes--remain on original part of the house.

Feeling (Describe the property's historic character.): The physical elements of the site, in combination, do not effectively convey a sense of life in a western mining town of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.

Association (Describe the link between the important historic era or person and the property.): The Hall-Parlor house form is the earliest type to be built in Park City and one of the three most common house types built in Park City during the mining era; however, the extent of the alterations to the main building diminishes its association with the past.

The extent and cumulative effect of alterations to the site render it ineligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places.

5 SIGNIFICANCE

Architect: ☒ Not Known ☐ Known: (source:)

Date of Construction: c. 1900¹

Builder: ☒ Not Known ☐ Known: (source:)

¹ Summit County Tax Assessor.

The site must represent an important part of the history or architecture of the community. A site need only be significant under one of the three areas listed below:

1. Historic Era:

- ☐ Settlement & Mining Boom Era (1868-1893)
- ☒ Mature Mining Era (1894-1930)
- ☐ Mining Decline & Emergence of Recreation Industry (1931-1962)

Park City was the center of one of the top three metal mining districts in the state during Utah's mining boom period of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, and it is one of only two major metal mining communities that have survived to the present. Park City's houses are the largest and best-preserved group of residential buildings in a metal mining town in Utah. As such, they provide the most complete documentation of the residential character of mining towns of that period, including their settlement patterns, building materials, construction techniques, and socio-economic make-up. The residences also represent the state's largest collection of nineteenth and early twentieth century frame houses. They contribute to our understanding of a significant aspect of Park City's economic growth and architectural development as a mining community.²

2. Persons (Describe how the site is associated with the lives of persons who were of historic importance to the community or those who were significant in the history of the state, region, or nation):

3. Architecture (Describe how the site exemplifies noteworthy methods of construction, materials or craftsmanship used during the historic period or is the work of a master craftsman or notable architect):

6 PHOTOS

Digital color photographs are on file with the Planning Department, Park City Municipal Corp.

Photo No. 1: Northwest oblique. Camera facing southeast, 2006.

Photo No. 2: Addition. Camera facing northeast, 2006.

Photo No. 3: Northwest oblique. Camera facing southeast, 1995.

Photo No. 4: Addition. Camera facing northeast, 1995.

Photo No. 5: Northwest oblique. Camera facing southeast, tax photo.

² From "Residences of Mining Boom Era, Park City - Thematic Nomination" written by Roger Roper, 1984.


Location _____
 Kind of Bldg. Res St. No. 424 Woodside
 Class 3 Type 1 3 Cost \$ _____ X _____ %

Stories	Dimensions	Cu. Ft.	Sq. Ft.	Factor	Totals
1	x x		736		\$ 1504
	x x				
	x x				

 Gar.—Carport x Flr. _____ Walls _____ Cl. _____

Description of Buildings	Additions
Foundation—Stone _____ Conc. <u>1/2</u> None <u>1/2</u>	
Ext. Walls <u>Asb Sides on Sid</u>	
Insulation—Floors _____ Walls <u>✓</u> Cigs. _____	
Roof Type <u>Gable</u> Mtl. <u>pat</u>	
Dormers—Small _____ Med. _____ Large _____	
Bays—Small _____ Med. _____ Large _____	
Porches—Front <u>48</u> @ <u>100</u>	48
Rear _____ @ _____	
Porch _____ @ _____	
Metal Awnings _____ Mtl. Rail _____	
Basement Entr. _____ @ _____	
Planters _____ @ _____	
Cellar—Bsmt. — <u>1/4</u> <u>1/2</u> <u>3/4</u> Full _____ Floor <u>conc</u>	50
Bsmt. Apt. _____ Rooms Fin. _____ Unfin. _____	
Attic Rooms Fin. _____ Unfin. _____	
Plumbing { Class <u>1</u> Tub <u>1</u> Trays _____ Basin _____ Sink <u>1</u> Toilet <u>1</u> Wtr. Sfr. _____ Shr. St. _____ O.T. _____ Dishwasher _____ Garbage Disp. _____	315
Built-in-Appliances _____	
Heat—Stove <u>✓</u> H.A. _____ Steam _____ Stkr. _____ Blr. <u>X</u>	
Oil _____ Gas <u>X</u> Coal _____ Pipeless _____ Radiant _____	
Air Cond. _____	
Finish—Fir <u>✓</u> Hd. Wd. _____	
Floor—Fir <u>✓</u> Hd. Wd. _____ Other _____	
Cabinets _____ Mantels _____	
Tile—Walls _____ Wainseot _____ Floors _____	
Storm Sash—Wood D. _____ S. _____; Metal D. _____ S. _____	
Total Additions	413

Year Built _____	Avg. Age <u>59</u>	Current Value	\$ 1917
Inf. by { Owner—Tenant— Neighbor—Record—Est.		Commission Adj. _____ %	
		Bldg. Value	
		Depr. Co. <u>1</u> 2 3 4 5 6 <u>30</u> %	
Remodel Year _____	Est. Cost _____	Current Value Minus Depr.	\$ 575
Garage—Class <u>1</u> Depr. 2% 3% _____	Carport—Factor _____		
Cars <u>1</u> Floor <u>wd</u> Walls <u>slit</u> Roof <u>G I</u> Doors <u>1</u>			
Size— <u>10</u> x <u>18</u> Age <u>26</u> Cost <u>123</u> x <u>30</u> %			37
Other _____			
Total Building Value			\$



RESIDENTIAL OUT BUILDINGS	Age	Size	Area	Factor	Cost	Depr. Value
		x				
		x				
		x				
		x				
		x				
TOTAL						

Remarks: _____

KIND OF BUILDING	19	19	19	19	19	19	19	19	19	19	19	19
GARAGE												
RESIDENCE												
TOTAL												
ASSESSED VALUE												
KIND OF BUILDING	1958	1959	1960	1961	1962	19	19	19	19	19	19	19
GARAGE	37	37	37	37	37							
RESIDENCE	575	575	575	575	575							
TOTAL	612	612	612	612	612							
ASSESSED VALUE	245	245	245	245	245							

PC 66
Serial Number

OF
Card Number

Owners Name _____

Location _____


Kind of Bldg. Res St. No. 424 Woodside

Class 3- Type 1 2 3 4. Cost \$ 3310 x 94 %

Stories	Dimensions	Sq. Ft.	Factor	Totals	Totals
	x x	736		\$ 3111	\$
	x x				
	x x				

Att. Gar. — C.P. — x — Flr. — Walls — Cl. —

Description of Buildings	Additions	Additions
Foundation—Stone — Conc. <u>x</u> Sills —		
Ext. Walls <u>Sid</u> (A)		
Roof Type <u>Gab</u> Mtl. <u>Pate RB</u>		
Dormers—Small — Med. — Large		
Bays—Small — Med — Large		
Porches—Front <u>48'</u> @ <u>125</u> <u>60</u>		
Rear — @		
Porch — @		
Planters — @		
Ext. Base. Entry — @		
Cellar/Bsm. — 1/4 1/2 3/4 Full — Floor		
Bsm. Gar. —		
Basement—Apt. — Rms. — Fin. Rms. —		
Attic Rooms Fin. — Unfin. —		
Plumbing { Class <u>1</u> Tub. <u>1</u> Trays — Basin — Sink <u>1</u> Toilet <u>1</u> Wtr. Sfr. — Shr. St. — O.T. — Dishwasher — Garbage Disp. —	460	
Heat—Stove — H.A. — FA <u>X</u> HW — Stkr — Elec. —	326	
Oil — Gas <u>X</u> Coal — Pipeless — Radiant —		
Air Cond. — Full — Zone —		
Finish—Fir. <u>✓</u> Hd. Wd. — Panel —		
Floor—Fir. — Hd. Wd — Other —		
Cabinets — Mantels —		
Tile—Walls — Wainscot — Floors —		
Storm Sash—Wood D. — S. —; Metal D. — S. —		
Awnings — Metal — Fiberglass —		
Total Additions	846	
Year Built <u>1898</u> Avg. 1. <u>1898</u> Replacement Cost <u>3957</u>		
Age 2. — Obsolescence		
Inf. by <u>Owner</u> Tenant — Adj. Bld. Value		
<u>Neighbor</u> Record — Est. — Conv. Factor <u>125%</u>		
Replacement Cost—1940 Base		
Depreciation Column <u>1</u> 2 3 4 5 6		
1940 Base Cost, Less Depreciation		
Total Value from reverse side		
Total Building Value \$		



RESIDENTIAL OUT BUILDINGS	Age	Size	Area	Fac- tor	Cost	Conv. Fac.	Adj. Cost	Depr. Value
		x				.47		
		x				.47		
		x				.47		
		x				.47		
		x				.47		
		x				.47		

Garage — Class _____ Depr. 2% 3% _____

Cars _____ Floor _____ Walls _____ Roof _____ Doors _____

Size _____ x _____ Age _____ Cost _____ x 47% _____

_____ 1940 Base Cost _____ x _____ % Depr. _____

_____ Total _____

REMARKS _____



Researcher: Philip F. Notarianni
Date: August, 1978

Site No. SU-10-157

Utah State Historical Society
Historic Preservation Research Office
Structure/Site Information Form

IDENTIFICATION 1

Street Address: 424 Woodside Ave. Plat PCS Bl. 4 Lot 26-27
Name of Structure: T. R. S.
Present Owner: Esther Anderson UTM:
Owner Address: P.O. Box, Park City, 84060 Tax #: PC-66

2

AGE/CONDITION/USE

Original Owner: Construction Date: @1898 Demolition Date:
Original Use: residential
Present Use: Occupants:
☒ Single-Family ☐ Park ☐ Vacant
☐ Multi-Family ☐ Industrial ☐ Religious
☐ Public ☐ Agricultural ☐ Other
☐ Commercial
Building Condition: Integrity:
☐ Excellent ☐ Site ☐ Unaltered
☒ Good ☐ Ruins ☒ Minor Alterations
☐ Deteriorated ☐ Major Alterations

STATUS

Preliminary Evaluation: Final Register Status:
☐ Significant ☐ National Landmark ☐ District
☒ Contributory ☐ National Register ☐ Multi-Resource
☐ Not Contributory ☐ State Register ☐ Thematic
☐ Intrusion

4

DOCUMENTATION

Photography: Date of Slides: 11/77 Date of Photographs:
Views: Front ☒ Side ☐ Rear ☐ Other ☐ Views: Front ☐ Side ☐ Rear ☐ Other ☐

Research Sources:
☐ Abstract of Title ☐ City Directories ☐ LDS Church Archives
☒ Plat Records ☐ Biographical Encyclopedias ☐ LDS Genealogical Society
☒ Plat Map ☒ Obituary Index ☒ U of U Library
☒ Tax Card & Photo ☐ County & City Histories ☐ BYU Library
☐ Building Permit ☐ Personal Interviews ☐ USU Library
☐ Sewer Permit ☒ Newspapers ☐ SLC Library
☒ Sanborn Maps 1889, 1900, ☒ Utah State Historical Society Library ☐ Other
1907.

Bibliographical References (books, articles, records, interviews, old photographs and maps, etc.):

Summit County Records.
Deseret News, April 3, 1915, p. 3.

Architect/Builder: unknown

Building Materials: wood


Building Type/Style: residential

Description of physical appearance & significant architectural features:

(Include additions, alterations, ancillary structures, and landscaping if applicable)

One-story frame with a gable roof and sloping rear. Window placements appear to have changed little. Tax photographs indicate that the chimney, located on the north end, has remained the same since the 1940's.

Sanborn Map sketches show a possible alteration and/or additions between 1900-1907.



Statement of Historical Significance:

- ☐ Aboriginal Americans
- ☐ Agriculture
- ☐ Architecture
- ☐ The Arts
- ☐ Commerce

- ☐ Communication
- ☐ Conservation
- ☐ Education
- ☐ Exploration/Settlement
- ☐ Industry

- ☐ Military
- ☐ Mining
- ☐ Minority Groups
- ☐ Political
- ☐ Recreation

- ☐ Religion
- ☐ Science
- ☐ Socio-Humanitarian
- ☐ Transportation

This structure is also contributory to the Park City residential district; but in addition helps to illustrate how early housing was constructed to adapt to the steep terrain that exists in the area.

In the early 189's the lot belonged to C.W. Allen; and in 1896 sold by Charles Allen to Chelsey C. Barker. William T. Backus became an owner in the 1900's. Fraser Buck, of the firm Welsh, Driscoll and Buck, and local author, purchased the property in 1914 from William Dickett. Finally, in 1916 sold to Erick Anderson.

Chesley C. Barker was an engineer for the Daly-West Mine for more than twenty-five years, and was considered well versed in mine hoists and pumps. He was also a member of the Park City lodge Knights of Pythias.









EXHIBIT D
Intensive Level Survey DRAFT Form

HISTORIC SITE FORM

UTAH STATE HISTORIC PRESERVATION OFFICE

(10-91)

1 IDENTIFICATION

Name of Property: **William T. Backus House**

Address: **424 Woodside Avenue**

Twtnshp

Range

Section:

City, County: **Park City, Summit, Utah**

UTM:

Current Owner Name: **Heather Berkley**

USGS Map Name & Date: **Park City East**

Current Owner Address: **9308 Tournament Canyon Drive**

Quad/2011

Las Vegas, NV 89144

Tax Number: **424-WS-1**

Legal Description (include acreage): **LOT 1 424 WOODSIDE AVENUE SUBDIVISION; ACCORDING TO THE OFFICIAL PLAT ON FILE IN THE SUMMIT COUNTY RECORDERS OFFICE CONT 5625 SQ FT OR 0.13 AC**

2 STATUS/USE

Property Category

☒ building(s)

☐ structure

☐ site

☐ object

Evaluation

☐ eligible/contributing

☒ ineligible/non-contributing

☐ out-of-period

Use

Original Use: **single dwelling**

Current Use: **single dwelling**

3 DOCUMENTATION

Photos: Dates

☒ digital: **Nov. 2013 (4)**

☒ prints: **2006 (2), 1995 (2)**

☐ historic:

Drawings and Plans

☐ measured floor plans

☐ site sketch map

☐ Historic American Bldg. Survey

☐ original plans available at:

☐ other:

Research Sources (check all sources consulted, whether useful or not)

☒ abstract of title

☒ tax card & photo

☐ building permit

☐ sewer permit

☒ Sanborn Maps

☐ obituary index

☐ city directories/gazetteers

☒ census records

☐ biographical encyclopedias

☐ newspapers

☒ city/county histories

☐ personal interviews

☐ USHS History Research Center

☒ USHS Preservation Files

☐ USHS Architects File

☐ LDS Family History Library

☒ local library: **Park City Museum**

☐ university library(ies):

Bibliographical References (books, articles, interviews, etc.)

Attach copies of all research notes, title searches, obituaries, and so forth.

Boutwell, John Mason and Lester Hood Woolsey. *Geology and Ore Deposits of the Park City District, Utah*. White Paper, Department of the Interior, United States Geological Survey. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1912.

Carter, Thomas and Peter Goss. *Utah's Historic Architecture, 1847-1940*. Salt Lake City: Center for Architectural Studies, Graduate School of Architecture, University of Utah and Utah State Historical Society, 1988.

Hampshire, David, Martha Sonntag Bradley and Allen Roberts. *A History of Summit County*. Coalville, UT: Summit County Commission, 1998.

National Register of Historic Places. Park City Main Street Historic District. Park City, Utah, National Register #79002511.

Peterson, Marie Ross and Mary M. Pearson. *Echoes of Yesterday: Summit County Centennial History*. Salt Lake City: Daughters of Utah Pioneers, 1947.

Pieros, Rick. *Park City: Past & Present*. Park City: self-published, 2011.

Randall, Deborah Lyn. *Park City, Utah: An Architectural History of Mining Town Housing, 1869 to 1907*. Master of Arts thesis, University of Utah, 1985.

Ringholz, Raye Carleson. *Diggings and Doings in Park City: Revised and Enlarged*. Salt Lake City: Western Epics, 1972.

Ringholz, Raye Carleson and Bea Kummer. *Walking Through Historic Park City*. Self-published, 1984.

Thompson, George A., and Fraser Buck. *Treasure Mountain Home: Park City Revisited*. Salt Lake City: Dream Garden Press, 1993.

4 ARCHITECTURAL DESCRIPTION

Building Style/Type: hall-parlor type / vernacular style No. Stories: 1.5

Foundation Material: concrete Wall Material(s): drop-novelty wood siding

Additions: none minor x major (describe below) Alterations: none x minor major (describe below)

Number of associated outbuildings 0 and/or structures 0.

Briefly describe the principal building, additions or alterations and their dates, and associated outbuildings and structures. Use continuation sheets as necessary.

424 Woodside is a hall-parlor type house that has been modified significantly. The hall-parlor is one of the main three house types built during the historic Park City mining era, and is the earliest of those three, occurring mostly toward the beginning of that period. A large addition has been built to the side at the street level above the original house which is well below the road grade. The side gable roof of the original house is sheathed with standing seam metal, while the complex roof of the addition is sheathed with composition shingles. The walls of both the original house and the addition are clad with drop-novelty wood siding. The façade of the original house that is facing the street has at least four casement windows spaced across it, while the side has several one-over-one double hung sash windows. The addition has a one-over-one double hung sash window in its gable and two of the same type in the front most section. The addition has a two-car garage that is on the same level as the street. The original house is much lower than the road grade, and a concrete stair leads down to the primary façade of the house. Although the overall form remains legible, the cumulative formal and material changes have diminished its historic value.

5 HISTORY

Architect/Builder: **unknown**

Date of Construction: **c. 1900**

Historic Themes: Mark themes related to this property with "S" or "C" (S = significant, C = contributing).
(see instructions for details)

<u>__</u> Agriculture	<u>__</u> Economics	<u>C</u> Industry	<u>__</u> Politics/
<u>__</u> Architecture	<u>__</u> Education	<u>__</u> Invention	<u>__</u> Government
<u>__</u> Archeology	<u>__</u> Engineering	<u>__</u> Landscape	<u>__</u> Religion
<u>__</u> Art	<u>__</u> Entertainment/	<u>__</u> Architecture	<u>__</u> Science
<u>__</u> Commerce	<u>__</u> Recreation	<u>__</u> Law	<u>__</u> Social History
<u>__</u> Communications	<u>__</u> Ethnic Heritage	<u>__</u> Literature	<u>__</u> Transportation
<u>__</u> Community Planning	<u>__</u> Exploration/	<u>__</u> Maritime History	<u>C</u> Other: Mining
<u>__</u> & Development	<u>__</u> Settlement	<u>__</u> Military	
<u>__</u> Conservation	<u>__</u> Health/Medicine	<u>__</u> Performing Arts	

Write a chronological history of the property, focusing primarily on the original or principal owners & significant events. Explain and justify any significant themes marked above. Use continuation sheets as necessary.

A brief history of the house was given in a 1978 National Register nomination:

"This structure is also contributory to the Park City residential district; but in addition helps to illustrate how early housing was constructed to adapt to the steep terrain that exists in the area.

"In the early 1890's the lot belonged to C.W. Allen; and in 1896 sold by Charles Allen to Chelsey C. Barker. William T. Backus became an owner in the 1900's. Fraser Buck, of the firm Welsh, Driscoll and Buck, and local author, purchased the property in 1914 from William Dickett, Finally, in 1916 sold to Erick Anderson.

"Chesley C. Barker was an engineer for the Daly-West Mine for more than twenty-five years, and was considered well versed in mine hoists and pumps. He was also a member of the Park City lodge Knights of Pythias."

Due to the commonness of the name Charles Allen, it is difficult to determine who the owner of the property was initially, as several lived in Park City at the time.

William T Backus, the owner after Charles (or Chelsey) Barker and also his nephew, had lived in Park City previously, leaving for Nevada in 1904. They returned at some point, and lived in this house for a time, before selling it to Charles Barker's wife Luella, who quickly sold it to William Dickert in 1909.

Not much information was found on William Dickert, and he does not appear on the 1910 census, so it can be assumed he did not live on the property. He transferred the property to Fraser Buck in 1914.

Fraser Buck was a salesman in the hardware industry. It is noted in the 1920 census that he lived with his parents and sister. No other information is known about him. The property was transferred to Erick Anderson in 1916.

It appears that Erick Anderson did not live at the house, at least during the time of the 1920 census, when the house was vacant. The house was also vacant during the 1930 census.

In 1931, Erick Anderson transferred the property to his daughter Esther Anderson, who retained it until 1981. It was rented by Andles Henderson and his wife Sydona during the 1940 census. Andles was a laborer in a mine, but nothing else is known of him. The property is currently owned by Heather Berkley.



424 Woodside Avenue. Southwest oblique. November 2013.



424 Woodside Avenue. West elevation. November 2013.



424 Woodside Avenue. Northwest oblique. November 2013.

TITLE SEARCH FORM

[Obtain information from title abstract books at County Recorder's Office]

Address: 424 Woodside Avenue

City: Park City, UT

Current Owner: Heather Berkley

Address: (see historic site form for address)






Tax Number: 424-WS-1 (parent parcel: PC-66)

Legal Description (include acreage): Lot 1 424 Woodside Sub. (PC BK4 L26, L27, L28)
(see historic site form for complete legal description)

TRANSACTION DATES	GRANTOR (SELLER)	GRANTEE (BUYER)	TYPE OF TRANSACTION	DOLLAR AMOUNT	COMMENTS
4/12/1886	Alfred B. Mulhall (ill.)	Henry Newell	Mortgage	\$100.00	"26,27"
6/4/1886	A.B. Mulhall (ill.)	Charles W. Allen	W		"26,27"
6/8/1886	Charles W. Allen	Gilbert Gregor	Mortgage	\$200.00	"26,27"
7/17/1893	C.W. Allen & wife	John Kennedy	Mortgage	\$195.00	"26,27"
4/18/1896	Chas W. Allen	Charles C. Barker	W		"26,27"
12/19/1901	Charles C. Barker & w.	Jennie H. Backus	W.D.		"26,27"
9/25/1909	Wm. T. Backus & wife	Luella V. Barker	Deed		"26,27"
12/23/1909	Luella V. Barker	Wm. Dickert & wife	W.D.		"26,27"
12/21/1914	William Dickert & wife	Fraser Buck	W.D.		"26,27"
5/6/1916	Fraser Buck & wife	Erick Anderson	W.D.		"26,27"
12/18/1931	Erick Anderson	Esther Anderson	W.D.		"26,27"
6/16/1981	Esther Anderson	Ennis J. Gibbs	W.D.		"26,27"
2/21/1989	Ennis J. Gibbs	Richard B. & Robert L. Peek	W.D.		"26,27,28"
12/14/1989	Robert L. Peek	Richard B. Peek	W.D.		"26,27,28"
12/20/1996	Richard B. Peek	Roger D. Armstrong	W.D.		"26,27,28"
10/9/2003	Roger D. Armstrong	Heather Berkeley	W.D.		"26,27,28"


Researcher: John Ewanowski, CRSA Architecture

Date: 1/6/2015







Tax photo c. 1940



Produced by the United States Geological Survey
 North American Datum of 1983 (NAD83)
 World Geodetic System of 1984 (WGS84). Projection and
 1 000-meter grid: Universal Transverse Mercator, Zone 12T
 10 000-foot ticks: Utah Coordinate System of 1983
 (north and central zones)

Imagery.....NAIP, July 2009 - August 2009
 Roads.....©2006-2010 Tele Atlas
 Names.....GNIS, 2009
 Hydrography.....National Hydrography Dataset, 2009
 Contours.....National Elevation Dataset, 2008



U.S. National Grid	
100,000-m Square ID	
VL	4500
VK	
Grid Zone Designation	
12T	

EXHIBIT E

2011 Variance Meeting Staff Report ([link in this Staff Report](#))

EXHIBIT F
2011 Variance Meeting Minutes

MINUTES OF PARK CITY BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT
CITY HALL, COUNCIL CHAMBERS
OCTOBER 4, 2011

IN ATTENDANCE: Ruth Gezelius, Mary Wintzer, Hans Fuegi, Richard Miller

EX OFFICIO: Thomas Eddington, Planning Director; Polly Samuels-Mclean, City Attorney; Mathew Evans, City Planner

I. ROLL CALL

Chair Gezelius called the meeting to order at 5:08 PM and noted that all Board members not present were excused.

II. PUBLIC COMMUNICATION

There was no comment.

III. STAFF & BOARD COMMUNICATIONS

There was discussion among Staff and Board concerning the issue of the re-hearing for the agenda item. City Attorney Mclean explained that the applicant was notified that the ratification was scheduled but the date of the hearing and staff report was not made available to the applicant three days prior to the meeting as required by Code. The applicant did have the ability to wave the three day period but chose not to. It was noticed that neither the applicant nor public was in attendance for the re-hearing. City Attorney Mclean made the Board aware that the vote of the ratification on September 27, 2011 should be vacated by the Board prior to hearing the item on regular agenda.

City Attorney Mclean updated the Board of Adjustment on 129 Main Street, a Variance and Special Exception that was heard before the Board and recently ruled on at District Court. The settlement by the Court upheld the denial of the Variance by the Board of Adjustment though the Special Exception was overturned. Staff was concerned with the broad language in the Land Management Code regarding Special Exceptions and that the language may be amended in the future.

Board member Miller directed Staff to deliver packets to all members of the Board whether they were scheduled to be present at the meeting or not. He further asked that emails be sent to confirm meetings to all members, not just those that confirmed they were available on the scheduled dates.

IV. REGULAR AGENDA

MOTION: Board member Fuegi moved to vacate the vote of the Board of Adjustment on September 27, 2011 on the matter of the ratification of Findings of Facts, Conclusions of Law, and Order for 424 Woodside Avenue. Board member Wintzer seconded.

VOTE: 4-0. Unanimously carried.

PL-11-01317 424 Woodside Avenue – Ratification of Findings

The Board reviewed and made changes to the Findings of Facts as follows:

- Finding of Fact #13 as pointed out by Board member Miller should have the singular "prevent" instead of "prevents".
- Finding of Fact #15 was amended by Board member Miller to read "All three variance requests are based upon self- imposed design hardships..."

MOTION: Board member Wintzer moved to ratify the Findings of Facts. Conclusions of Law and Order as amended for 424 Woodside Avenue Variances to height, front setback, and side yard setback. Board member Fuegi seconded the motion.

VOTE: 4-0. Motion carries unanimously.

Finding of Fact

1. The property is located in the Historic Residential (HR-1) zone.
2. Records indicate that in 1900 a 956 square foot Historic home was built at 424 Woodside Avenue and is currently listed as Significant on the Historic Sites Inventory.
3. In 1993, two additional lots adjacent to the property were combined into one lot and a building permit was issued for a 700 square foot addition which would be used as a duplex.
4. The 1993 addition was built to a height of 28 feet which was the permitted zone height at the time.
5. Because of the topography of the site, a height of 29 feet would be required of the portion of the historic house in order to match the height of the 1993 addition.
6. The duplex is located on a lot that is 75 feet wide and 75 feet deep, the existing historic home is located approximately 6 feet below the top grade of Woodside Avenue.
7. The maximum height in the HR-1 Zone is 27 feet, the applicant proposed to raise the historic portion of their home to 29 feet, thus the applicant needed a 2 foot variance to the maximum height allowed in the HR-1 Zone.
8. The maximum front yard setback in the HR-1 Zone is 10 feet as measured from the property line; the applicant proposed to raise and rotate the historic portion of the home and place additional living space directly under the historic home with a 0 foot front yard setback, thus the applicant needed a 10 foot variance for the front yard setback for the proposed addition as required in the HR-1 Zone.
9. The combined total side yard setback requirements for a lot that is 75' wide by 75' feet deep is 18 feet with each side having a minimum 5 foot setback. The existing combined setbacks are 15 feet, with 5 feet on the south-side property line, and 10 feet on the north-side property line. The applicant was proposing to have a 10 foot setback for the additional living space below the historic portion of the home on the north side of the property after it was to be raised and rotated, thus necessitating a need for a three foot variance to the total side-yard setback standards in the HR-1 Zone.
10. The applicant requested to raise the home a total of 10 feet to bring the overall height to 29 feet in order to match the floor elevation of the 1993 addition and bring it to street level.
11. Applicant failed to show specifically why raising the house to a height of 29 feet as opposed to the zone height of 27 feet was necessary and created a hardship.
12. Matching the height of a historic house to a modern addition is not a hardship and does not meet the spirit of the zoning ordinance or the general plan.

13. Applicants failed to show how a two foot difference (i.e. raising the house to 29 feet as opposed to the zone height of 27 feet) creates a hardship. Two feet would not require an exposed staircase or prevent the house from being close to street elevation.
14. Raising the home 27 feet would bring the historic portion of the home to the same elevation as the street. The 2 foot variance to the maximum height allowed would have raised the home to one-foot (1') above the street elevation.
15. All three variance requests are based upon self- imposed design hardships due to the fact that the applicant could achieve the lifting and rotating of the home without the addition of living space below the building, and without matching the exact floor elevation of the 1993 addition to the home. The applicants request for additional living space below the historic portion of the building, and matching the existing floor elevation of the 1993 addition is not a hardship created by special circumstances associated with the property.
16. The alleged hardship comes from conditions general to the neighborhood, not from circumstances peculiar to the property. Several houses on the downhill side of the street are situated in much the same way as the applicant's home. The positioning of the home on the lot is not unique to this area as many homes were constructed in a manner that allowed the home to face downward towards Main Street. The applicant previously combined three lots and has ample room to expand the existing non-historic portion of the home to add additional living space.
17. Any life-safety issues related to the existing location of the home on the property and its proximity to the street and position below the established grade of the street can be mitigated without the need for a variance, including raising the historic portion of home without the addition of living space underneath and without violating the maximum height requirement. The matching of the floor elevation of the existing home, or bringing the home up to above street level is not a necessity; the applicant can accomplish the rising of the home with a "step-down" from the 1993 addition.
18. The determination whether to raise and rotate the existing home is made as part of the Design Guidelines for Historic Districts and Historic Sites determination. However, raising and rotating the historic house can be achieved without the need for the variance.
19. Additional living space is also proposed behind (in the rear yard) of the existing historic portion of the home. Due to the size of the lot and current placement of the historic home, additional living space can be achieved without the need for the variance.

Conclusions of Law

1. Literal enforcement of the HR-1 zone requirements for a maximum height of 27 feet, front-yard setback requirements of 10 feet and a combined sideyard requirements of 18 feet does not cause an unreasonable hardship. This is not necessary to carry out the general purpose of the zoning ordinance.
2. There are no special circumstances attached to the property that do not generally apply to other properties in the same district
3. Granting the variances is not essential to the enjoyment of substantial property right possessed by other property owners in the same district.
4. The proposal is inconsistent with the General Plan.
5. The spirit of the zoning ordinance is not observed by this application.
6. All of the criteria needed to allow for a variance for each request, pursuant to LMC section 15-10-9, have not been met, thus the variances are not justified.

Order: The variances to LMC section 15-2.2-5 (A) and 15-2.2-3 (D) are hereby denied for:

- (1) A variance to exceed the maximum height requirement to allow an overall height of 29 feet where a maximum 27 foot height is allowed; and,
- (2) A variance to reduce the minimum front yard setback to 0 feet where 10 is required; and,
- (3) A variance to reduce the minimum total combined side-yard setbacks to 15 feet where 18 feet is required.

Chair Gezelius adjourned the October 4, 2011 Board of Adjustment meeting at 5:42 PM.

Minutes prepared by:

Patricia Abdullah, Planning Analyst

EXHIBIT G
Historic Preservation Plan

PARK CITY MUNICIPAL CORPORATION
PLANNING DEPARTMENT
445 MARSAC AVE - PO BOX 1480
PARK CITY, UT 84060
(435) 615-5060



HISTORIC PRESERVATION PLAN

For Use with the *Historic District/Site Design Review Application*

For Official Use Only

PLANNER: HANNAH TURPEN APPLICATION #: PL-16-03379
DATE RECEIVED: 11/16/16
PLANNING DIRECTOR _____ CHIEF BUILDING OFFICIAL _____
APPROVAL DATE/INITIALS: _____ APPROVAL DATE/INITIALS: _____

PROJECT INFORMATION

☐ LANDMARK ☒ SIGNIFICANT DISTRICT: _____

NAME: JOHN & HEATHER BERKLEY
ADDRESS: 424 WOODSIDE AVE

TAX ID: 424.WS.1 OR _____

SUBDIVISION: _____ OR _____

SURVEY: _____ LOT #: _____ BLOCK #: _____

APPLICANT INFORMATION

NAME: JONATHAN DEGRAY
PHONE #: (435) 649-7263 FAX #: ()
EMAIL: degrayarch@westoffice.net

If you have questions regarding the requirements on this application or process please contact a member of the Park City Planning Staff at (435) 615-5060 or visit us online at www.parkcity.org. Updated 10/2014.



Site Design

Use this section should describe the scope of work and preservation treatment for landscape features such as stone retaining walls, hillside steps, and fencing. Existing landscaping and site grading as well as parking should also be documented. Use supplemental pages if necessary.

Element/Feature: Site Design

This involves: ☐ Preservation ☐ Restoration
☒ Reconstruction ☒ Rehabilitation

Based on the condition and deficiencies outlined in the Physical Conditions Report, please describe in detail the proposed work:

The existing historic form is oriented so that the front of the building faces the back yard, or rear of the site. The historic form is a full story below the street level of Woodside Avenue so the only thing visible of the historic form from the street is the metal roof. This condition along with the scale of the addition to the south places the historic form in a hole. Per the Site Inventory 424 Woodside Ave. has been extensively modified creating a situation where the historic form is dwarfed by surrounding structures and is a full level below street level. By raising and rotating the historic form we will establish it as a visually prominent element along the street. The new location will fit in with the current rhythm of building forms along the street. The proposed addition, located below the historic form, will not be visible from the street. The proposed changes outlined here are all intended to improve the appearance of the historic form and reestablish its presence along Woodside Avenue making it once again a valuable asset to the district for years to come.



Structural

Use this section to describe scope of work and preservation treatment for the general structural system of the building including floor and ceiling systems as well as the roof structure. Supplemental pages should be used to describe additional elements and features.

Element/Feature: Structure

This involves: ☐ Preservation ☐ Restoration
☒ Reconstruction ☒ Rehabilitation

Based on the condition and deficiencies outlined in the Physical Conditions Report, please describe in detail the proposed work:

It is our intention to strip the existing historic form building down, removing all the contemporary material and then see what we have. We anticipate not finding any historic material other than 1x12 exterior wall sheathing attached to new stud walls.

If this is the case we would propose to proceed as follows.

1. Panelize the exterior north and east walls.
2. Change the orientation of the building so that it faces Woodside Avenue and is raised to the street level, **9' from its existing location**, so the front of the historic building faces the street, not the back yard.
3. Construct a new foundation
4. Re-build the structural frame placing the historic form on top, front facing Woodside Ave.

Through the renovation and addition of this residence we will:

- a. Provide a foundation to the structure.
- b. Re-orient the building so the front faces the street and is elevated to have a relationship to the street that is currently not present

Roof

Use this section to describe the proposed scope of work and preservation treatment for the roofing system, flashing, drainage such as downspouts and gutters, skylights, chimneys, and other rooftop features. Use supplemental pages if necessary.

Element/Feature: Roof

This involves: ☐ Preservation ☐ Restoration
☒ Reconstruction ☒ Rehabilitation

Based on the condition and deficiencies outlined in the Physical Conditions Report, please describe in detail the proposed work:

The roof will be rebuilt to meet the structural requirements of code and retain the historic form and appearance.

Chimney

Use this section to describe the proposed scope of work and preservation treatment for any existing chimneys. One box should be devoted to each existing chimney. Supplemental pages should be used to describe additional elements and features.

Element/Feature: None



Exterior Walls

Use this section to describe the proposed scope of work and preservation treatment for the exterior wall construction, finishes, and masonry. Please describe the scope of work for each individual exterior wall, use supplemental pages if necessary.

Element/Feature: Exterior walls

This involves: ☐ Preservation ☐ Restoration
☒ Reconstruction ☒ Rehabilitation

Based on the condition and deficiencies outlined in the Physical Conditions Report, please describe in detail the proposed work:

It is our intention to strip the existing historic form building down, removing all the contemporary material and then see what we have. We anticipate not finding any historic material other than 1x12 exterior wall sheathing attached to new stud walls.

If this is the case we would propose to proceed as follows.

5. Panelize the exterior north and east walls.
 6. Change the orientation of the building so that it faces Woodside Avenue and is raised to the street level, **9' from its existing location**, so the front of the historic building faces the street, not the back yard.
 7. Construct a new foundation
 8. Re-build the structural frame placing the historic form on top, front facing Woodside Ave.
- Through the renovation and addition of this residence we will:
- c. Provide a foundation to the structure.
 - d. Re-orient the building so the front faces the street and is elevated to have a relationship to the street that is currently not present
 - e. Replace the non-historic windows with period correct units Replace/repair siding.

Foundation

Use this section to describe the proposed scope of work and preservation treatment for the foundation including its system, materials, perimeter foundation drainage, and other foundation-related features. Use supplemental pages if necessary.

Element/Feature: Foundation

This involves: ☐ Preservation ☐ Restoration
☒ Reconstruction ☐ Rehabilitation

Based on the condition and deficiencies outlined in the Physical Conditions Report, please describe in detail the proposed work:

A new foundation will be built that is code compliant.



Porches

Use this section to describe the proposed scope of work and preservation treatment for all porches. Address decorative features including porch posts, brackets, railing, and floor and ceiling materials.

Element/Feature: Porch

This involves: ☐ Preservation ☐ Restoration
☒ Reconstruction ☐ Rehabilitation

Based on the condition and deficiencies outlined in the Physical Conditions Report, please describe in detail the proposed work:

The front porch, currently facing the rear of the site, has been walled in to create more interior living space. We would propose to bring the porch back to its historic appearance and use.

Doors

Use this section to describe the proposed scope of work and preservation treatment for all exterior doors, door openings, and door parts referenced in the Door Survey of the Physical Conditions Report. Please describe the scope of work for each individual exterior door, use supplemental pages if necessary.

Element/Feature: Doors

This involves: ☐ Preservation ☐ Restoration
☒ Reconstruction ☐ Rehabilitation

Based on the condition and deficiencies outlined in the Physical Conditions Report, please describe in detail the proposed work:

All historic doors have been replaced, see physical condition report. All new doors will be historic in appearance.

Windows

Use this section to describe the proposed scope of work and preservation treatment for all exterior windows, window openings, and windows parts referenced in the Door Survey of the Physical Conditions Report. Please describe the scope of work for each individual exterior window, use supplemental pages if necessary.

Element/Feature: Windows

This involves: ☐ Preservation ☐ Restoration
☒ Reconstruction ☐ Rehabilitation

Based on the condition and deficiencies outlined in the Physical Conditions Report, please describe in detail the proposed work:

All historic windows have been replaced, see physical condition report. All new windows will be historic in appearance.



Mechanical System, Utility Systems, Service Equipment & Electrical

Use this section to describe proposed scope of work and preservation treatment for items such as the existing HVAC system, ventilation, plumbing, electrical, and fire suppression systems. Supplemental pages should be used to describe additional elements and features. Use supplemental pages if necessary.

Element/Feature: Mechanical & Electrical systems

This involves: ☐ Preservation ☐ Restoration
☒ Reconstruction ☐ Rehabilitation

Based on the condition and deficiencies outlined in the Physical Conditions Report, please describe in detail the proposed work:

All Mechanical and Electrical systems will be new and code compliant.

Additions

Use this section to describe the proposed scope of work for any additions. Describe the impact and the preservation treatment for any historic materials. Supplemental pages should be used to describe additional elements and features. Use supplemental pages if necessary.

Element/Feature: Addition

This involves: ☐ Preservation ☐ Restoration
☒ Reconstruction ☐ Rehabilitation

Based on the condition and deficiencies outlined in the Physical Conditions Report, please describe in detail the proposed work:

The new addition will be placed below and to the rear of the historic form and be distinctive from the exiting home.



4. PROJECT TEAM

List the individuals and firms involved in designing and executing the proposed work. Include the names and contact information for the architect, designer, preservation professional, contractor, subcontractors, specialized craftspeople, specialty fabricators, etc...

Provide a statement of competency for each individual and/or firm listed above. Include a list or description of relevant experience and/or specialized training or skills.

Will a licensed architect or qualified preservation professional be involved in the analysis and design alternatives chosen for the project? Yes or No. If yes, provide his/her name.

Will a licensed architect or other qualified professional be available during construction to ensure the project is executed according to the approved plans? Yes or No. If yes, provide his/her name.

1. Architect: Jonathan DeGray Architect, 435-649-7263, degrayarch@qwestoffice.net.
2. Structural Engineer: Shen Engineers, Henry Shen, 801-466-2625, sheneng@msn.com
3. Contractor: None chosen at this phase in the project.

5. SITE HISTORY

Provide a brief history of the site to augment information from the Historic Site Form. Include information about uses, owners, and dates of changes made (if known) to the site and/or buildings. Please list all sources such as permit records, current/past owner interviews, newspapers, etc. used in compiling the information.

1. See Historic Site Inventory

6. FINANCIAL GUARANTEE

The Planning Department is authorized to require that the Applicant provide the City with a financial Guarantee to ensure compliance with the conditions and terms of the Historic Preservation Plan. (See Title 15, LMC Chapter 11-9) Describe how you will satisfy the financial guarantee requirements.

1. Owner will place a lien on the property in favor of the city.

7. ACKNOWLEDGMENT OF RESPONSIBILITY

I have read and understand the instructions supplied by Park City for processing this form as part of the Historic District/Site Design Review application. The information I have provided is true and correct to the best of my knowledge.

Signature of Applicant: _____ Date: _____

Name of Applicant: _____



EXHIBIT H
Physical Conditions Report

PARK CITY MUNICIPAL CORPORATION
PLANNING DEPARTMENT
445 MARSAC AVE ° PO BOX 1480
PARK CITY, UT 84060
(435) 615-5060 ° (435) 615-4906 FAX



PHYSICAL CONDITION REPORT

For use with the Historic District/Site Design Review Application

For Office Use Only	
PROJECT PLANNER	APPLICATION #
	DATE RECEIVED

PROJECT INFORMATION

HISTORIC SITE? ☐ NO ☐ YES ☐ LANDMARK ☐ SIGNIFICANT ☐ DISTRICT: _____

NAME: Berkley Residence		
ADDRESS: 424 Woodside Avenue		
TAX ID #: 424-WS-1		OR
SUBVISION:		OR
SURVEY:	LOT #:	BLOCK #:

CONTACT INFORMATION

NAME: Jonathan DeGray Architect	
PHONE #: 435-649-7263	FAX #:
EMAIL: degrayarch@qwestoffice.net	

Instructions for Completing the PHYSICAL CONDITION REPORT

The purpose of the PHYSICAL CONDITION REPORT is to document the existing conditions of the site, its buildings and structures. All sites, historic or otherwise, that are the subject of a Historic District/Site Design Review application are required to complete a PHYSICAL CONDITION REPORT. This form should be completed and submitted to the Planning Department prior to your Pre-Application Conference.

WRITTEN DESCRIPTION

The features listed below, if extant on your site, must be described in full. If the scope of your project is limited (window replacement, porch rehabilitation, etc.) describe only those elements directly impacted by your proposal and write "not applicable" in other sections. Descriptions should be concise and detailed and should include materials, dimensions, present condition, and approximate date (if known). If your descriptions require additional space, please attach a continuation sheet OR you may create a separate document by restating each numbered item followed by your full response. Documentation from a licensed professional must be submitted to support claims regarding severely deteriorated or defective conditions.

PHOTOGRAPHS

Digital photographs must be included with this report. Specifications and a template for organizing and labeling photographs are provided on the last page of this report.

If you have questions regarding the requirements for completing the PHYSICAL CONDITION REPORT, please contact a member of the Park City Planning Staff at (435) 615-5060.

The property slopes downhill from west to east off Woodside Avenue. From Woodside Avenue to the front property line is approximately 17.5 feet and slopes down 8' with a rock retaining wall that runs parallel to Woodside Avenue. From front property line to back property line is 75 feet and slopes downhill approximately 13 feet.



Page 98

A.2. LANDSCAPING - Describe the natural and/or planted materials, paths, decks, patios or other elements that are part of the existing landscaping scheme, including approximate dates. Describe existing feature(s) and condition:

The front of the property off Woodside Avenue has rock retaining wall that runs parallel with the street. The entry stairs are wood and are in fair shape. Stone walkway leads from the entry to the rear yard. All vegetation is natural and maintained.



Rock retaining wall and entry stairs along west elevation

If you have questions regarding the requirements for completing the PHYSICAL CONDITION REPORT, please contact a member of the Park City Planning Staff at (435) 615-5060.



Stone walkway at entry leading to rear yard (north elevation)



Rear yard looking southeast

If you have questions regarding the requirements for completing the PHYSICAL CONDITION REPORT, please contact a member of the Park City Planning Staff at (435) 615-5060.

A.3. RETAINING WALL(S) - Describe any functional or decorative walls on the site, including approximate dates of construction.

Describe the existing feature(s) and condition:

See A.2 Landscaping

A.4. EXTERIOR STEPS - Describe any exterior steps on the property including location, dimensions, materials, and approximate dates of construction.

Describe the existing feature(s) and condition:

See A.2 Landscaping

A.5. FENCE(S) - Describe any fences on the property including location, dimensions, materials, and approximate dates of construction.

Describe the existing feature(s) and condition:

The rear fence (owned by adjacent property) runs north to south and is 4x4 wood post with 1x4 wood slats in need of repair. The wood fence along the north property line is 6' length sections of 1x6 dog eared cedar slats and in need of repair.



Rear yard fence

If you have questions regarding the requirements for completing the PHYSICAL CONDITION REPORT, please contact a member of the Park City Planning Staff at (435) 615-5060.



Fence on north side of property

A.6. OTHER SITE FEATURES (SPECIFY):

Describe the existing feature(s) and condition: ***None***

If you have questions regarding the requirements for completing the PHYSICAL CONDITION REPORT, please contact a member of the Park City Planning Staff at (435) 615-5060.

MAIN BUILDING

B.1. ROOF - Describe the existing roof materials, roof framing, pitch and elements such as skylights, vents or chimneys along with the approximate dates of the features. Describe the existing feature(s) and condition:

The roof is simple gable with a 10/12 pitch with a shed running west at a 2.5/12 pitch. This form was the original built about 1900. The shed roof running east off the main gable is a 4/12 pitch and was added after 1978. The roof material is standing seam metal applied after 1978. The main gable form is standing seam metal roof over historic wood shake over historic 1x8 skip plank over historic 2x4 truss at 24" o.c., the truss has 2x4 bottom chord with 1x4 kickers. The two sheds of the gable running east and west were updated after 1978 with standing seam metal over 5/8" plywood over 2x12 joist at 24" o.c.



Roof looking east

If you have questions regarding the requirements for completing the PHYSICAL CONDITION REPORT, please contact a member of the Park City Planning Staff at (435) 615-5060.



Roof looking southeast

If you have questions regarding the requirements for completing the PHYSICAL CONDITION REPORT, please contact a member of the Park City Planning Staff at (435) 615-5060.

B.2. EXTERIOR WALL -PRIMARY FACADE - Describe the exterior facade including materials, dimensions, finishes and approximate dates of construction. Describe the existing feature(s) and condition:

The north elevation is 1x8 horizontal lap siding applied after 1978, over historic 1x12 vertical plank on 2x4 studs at 24" o.c.



North elevation

If you have questions regarding the requirements for completing the PHYSICAL CONDITION REPORT, please contact a member of the Park City Planning Staff at (435) 615-5060.

B.3. EXTERIOR WALL -SECONDARY FACADE 1 - Describe the exterior facade including materials, dimensions, finishes and approximate dates of construction.
Describe the existing feature(s) and condition:

The west elevation is 1x8 horizontal lap siding applied after 1978, over historic 1x12 vertical plank on 2x4 studs at 24" o.c



West elevation

If you have questions regarding the requirements for completing the PHYSICAL CONDITION REPORT, please contact a member of the Park City Planning Staff at (435) 615-5060.

B.4. EXTERIOR WALL -SECONDARY FACADE 2 - Describe the exterior facade including materials, dimensions, finishes and approximate dates of construction.
Describe the existing feature(s) and condition:

The south elevation has an addition built after 1993.



Addition on the south elevation built after 1993

If you have questions regarding the requirements for completing the PHYSICAL CONDITION REPORT, please contact a member of the Park City Planning Staff at (435) 615-5060.

B.5. EXTERIOR WALL -REAR FACADE - Describe the exterior facade including materials, dimensions, finishes and approximate dates of construction. Describe the existing feature(s) and condition:

The east elevation is 1x8 horizontal lap siding applied after 1978, over 5/8" plywood on 2x4 studs at 24" o.c



East elevation

If you have questions regarding the requirements for completing the PHYSICAL CONDITION REPORT, please contact a member of the Park City Planning Staff at (435) 615-5060.

B.6. FOUNDATION - Describe the existing foundation noting the current materials, evidence of previous upgrades as well as evidence and probable cause of failure or deterioration and approximate dates of construction.

Describe the existing feature(s) and condition:

The foundation under the historic house is 8" thick concrete, due to it's age we are assuming it has no steel reinforcing. Concrete is in fair condition.

B.7. PORCH(ES) - Describe the current porch(es) including materials, finishes, dimensions, evidence of changes and the approximate date of construction.

Describe the existing feature(s) and condition:

The rear porch was enclosed after 1978 and built into interior living space. See east elevation on previous page.


B.8. DORMER(S) / BAY(S) - Describe any projecting dormers or bays noting the location, materials, finishes, dimensions and approximate date of construction.

Describe the existing feature(s) and condition: **None**

B.9. ADDITION(S) - Describe any additions to the original building in a chronological order of development (if known) and include information on the construction methods, materials, finishes, dimensions, condition and approximate dates of each addition. For Historic Sites, this description should correspond to the measured as-built drawings of the buildings/structures.

Describe the existing feature(s) and condition:

The Sanborn maps show an alteration or addition between 1900-1907. No changes were made through 1941. There were updates/additions after 1978 to the east and west elevation. The addition on the south elevation was built after 1993.



1900-1907 Sanborn maps

If you have questions regarding the requirements for completing the PHYSICAL CONDITION REPORT, please contact a member of the Park City Planning Staff at (435) 615-5060.



1929 Sanborn map



1941 Sanborn maps

If you have questions regarding the requirements for completing the PHYSICAL CONDITION REPORT, please contact a member of the Park City Planning Staff at (435) 615-5060.

B.10. MECHANICAL SYSTEM

Describe the existing mechanical system and condition:

The mechanical system was updated after 1978 and is fair condition and appears to be up to code.

B.11. ELECTRICAL SYSTEM

Describe the existing electrical system and condition:

The electrical system was updated after 1978 and is fair condition and appears to be up to code.

B.12. STRUCTURAL SYSTEM

Describe the existing structural system, including the foundation, floors, walls, and roof structure. Park City will allow very limited and non-structural disassembly of a structure to investigate these conditions.

Describe the existing structural system and condition:

The structural system was updated after 1978 and is fair condition. See framing plans on sheet A1.1.

B.13. HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

Provide a statement regarding the presence of hazardous materials including, but not limited to, lead-based paint, asbestos and mold. Describe the materials' location on the site, the test methods used to verify the hazardous material, and the extent of the problem:

The house was built before 1978, the presence of lead-based paint according to the EPA can be assumed. The regulations for working in the presence of lead-based paint is covered in the April 22, 2010 RRP rule.

The house appears to be dry and free of mold.

B.14. OTHER (SPECIFY):

Describe the existing feature(s) and condition: ***None***

MAIN BUILDING -DETAILS

C.1. WINDOWS - Describe the number of windows, dimensions, configuration of panes, types, whether the windows are original to the building (if known) and approximate dates. Describe the existing feature(s) and condition:

The windows were updated after 1978 with insulated wood aluminum clad. No historic windows remain.



Wood aluminum clad window- typical

If you have questions regarding the requirements for completing the PHYSICAL CONDITION REPORT, please contact a member of the Park City Planning Staff at (435) 615-5060.

C.2. DOORS - Describe the doors including materials, dimensions, types, whether the doors are original to the building (if known) and approximate dates.

Describe the existing feature(s) and condition:

The doors were updated after 1978 with solid core interior doors and the exterior patio door is insulated wood clad aluminum. No historic doors remain.



Interior doors

If you have questions regarding the requirements for completing the PHYSICAL CONDITION REPORT, please contact a member of the Park City Planning Staff at (435) 615-5060.

C.3. TRIM - Describe the trim (window and door, eaves and soffits, corner boards, pilasters, etc.) including location, dimensions, and approximate dates.
Describe the existing feature(s) and condition:

All exterior and interior trim was replaced after 1978. No historic trim remains.



Typical base and window casing

If you have questions regarding the requirements for completing the PHYSICAL CONDITION REPORT, please contact a member of the Park City Planning Staff at (435) 615-5060.



Typical ceiling trim and door casing



Typical exterior trim

If you have questions regarding the requirements for completing the PHYSICAL CONDITION REPORT, please contact a member of the Park City Planning Staff at (435) 615-5060.

C.4. ARCHITECTURAL ORNAMENTATION - Describe the architectural ornamentation that is applied or integrated into the exterior facades including the location, dimensions, materials and approximate dates.

Describe the existing feature(s) and condition: **None**

C.5. OTHER (SPECIFY):

Describe the existing feature(s) and condition: **None**

ACCESSORY BUILDING(S)

D.1. ACCESSORY BUILDING(S) - Mark all the boxes below that apply to your property.

Describe each accessory building including location on the site (should correspond to the existing site plan), materials, and approximate dates.

Type(s): ☐ Garage ☐ Root Cellar ☐ Shed ☐ Other (specify):

Describe existing accessory building(s) and condition: **None**

STRUCTURE(S)

E.1. STRUCTURE(S) - Mark all the boxes below that apply to your property. Describe each structure including location on the site (should correspond to the existing site plan), materials and approximate dates.

Type(s): ☐ Tram ☐ Tower ☐ Animal Enclosure ☐ Other (specify):

Describe existing structure(s) and condition: **None**

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF RESPONSIBILITY

I have read and understand the instructions supplied by Park City for processing this form as part of the Historic District/Site Design Review application. The documents and/or information I have submitted are true and correct to the best of my knowledge.

Signature of Applicant: _____ Date: _____

Name of Applicant: _____

EXHIBIT I
Existing and Proposed Plans

Historic Preservation Board Meeting July 19, 2017 Page 118

ARCHITECTURAL
JONATHAN DEGRAY
P.O. BOX 1674
614 MAIN STREET SUITE 302
PARK CITY, UTAH 84060
TEL. (435) 649-7263
FAX. (435) 649-7263
EMAIL: degrayarch@comcast.net

ARCHITECTURAL
JONATHAN DEGRAY
P.O. BOX 1674
614 MAIN STREET SUITE
PARK CITY, UTAH 84001
TEL. (435) 649-7263
FAX. (435) 649-7263
EMAIL: degrayj@power.com

	BRICK & STONE		OFFICE 100		ROOM NAME
	BATTER		FLOOR, POINT ELEV.		CENTER LINE
	CONCRETE		ROUND DIM.		CHANNEL
	STEEL (LARGE SCALE)		ANGLE		DETAIL
	ROUGH WOOD		SECTION CUT, DETAIL		BUILDING SECTION
	BLOCKING		KEYED NOTCH		WINDOW TYPE
	ALUMINUM (LARGE SCALE)		DOOR NUMBER		REVISION
	GRAVEL		NORTH		INTERIOR WALL ELEV.
	BATT OR BLOWN INSULATION		FINISH		FURNITURE
	PLASTER, SAND, GROUT, MORTAR		FURNITURE		FURNITURE
	STEEL (SMALL SCALE)		FURNITURE		FURNITURE
	BITUMINOUS PAYING		FURNITURE		FURNITURE
	FLYWOOD		FURNITURE		FURNITURE
	GYPSEUM BOARD		FURNITURE		FURNITURE

APPLICABLE CODES	2015 IRC	2015 IBC	2015 IMC	2015 IFGC	2015 IPC
OCCUPANCY: R2					
CONSTRUCTION TYPE					
BUILDING TO BE FIRE					
TO PROVIDE APPROVA					
INSTALLATION					

AREA CALCULATIONS				TOTAL
	EXISTING		NEW	
LOWER LEVEL	1342		1342	
MAIN LEVEL	494		1501	1995
ENTRY LEVEL	194		1050	1244
LOFT LEVEL	435			435
TOTAL	1143		3893	5036
GARAGE	505			
LOT AREA	5625			
ALLOWABLE FOOTPRINT	2020			
PROPOSED FOOTPRINT	2007			
	6690			
LOT AREA	5690			


#	SHEET #	COVER SHEET	SHEET DESCRIPTION
1	Aa		SURVEY
2	Td1	SURVEY MAP	
3	A31	AS-BUILT FLOOR PLANS	ARCHITECTURAL
4	A32	AS-BUILT ELEVATIONS	
5	A31	ARCHITECTURAL SITE PLAN	
6	A32	LANDSCAPE PLAN	
7	A11	LOWER LEVEL PLAN	
8	A12	MAIN LEVEL PLAN	
9	A13	ENTRY LEVEL PLAN	
10	A14	LOFT LEVEL PLAN	
11	A15	ROOF AND GARDEN	
12	A21	WEST AND NORTH ELEVATIONS	
13	A22	SOUTH AND EAST ELEVATIONS	
14	A31	BUILDING SECTION	
15	A61	DOOR, WINDOW AND ROOM SCHEDULES	

[illegible]

7. ALL WORK SHALL BE INSPECTED BY GOVERNING AGENCIES IN ACCORDANCE WITH THEIR REQUIREMENTS. INSPECTIONAL APPROVAL SHALL BE SECURED BEFORE PROCEEDING WITH WORK.
8. BUILDING DESIGN IS GENERALLY PRECIPITATED UPON PROVISIONS OF THE 2015 IRC AND AMENDMENTS AS MAY HAVE BEEN LOCALLY ENACTED. ALL REQUIREMENTS OF THE PROFESSIONAL FEE CONTRACTOR SHALL BE COMPLETED PRIOR TO COMMENCEMENT BY THE DESIGN AND THE SYSTEM CONSTRUCTION.
9. ALL 2015 IRC GAS PIPE INSTALLATION SETS REQUIRING PERMITS SHALL BE SUBMITTED TO THE LOCAL PERMITTING AGENCY FROM QUINCY APPROVING SYSTEM.
10. ALL DESIGN WORK DONE ON WORKER WORK WILL REQUIRE A SEPARATE PERMIT FROM PERMIT FROM TO BEGINNING WORK. B.C 106.6.11
5. IN THE EVENT OF CONFLICT BETWEEN THE DESIGN DOCUMENTS FROM THE STANDPOINT OF SAFETY AND PHYSICAL SECURITY SHALL APPLY.
6. ANY INSTALLATION, FINISH, OR COMPONENT INTERFERED TO PROVIDE ENCLOSURE, WEATHER ABILITY OR APPROPRIATE QUALITY SHALL BE PROVIDED AS A REPRESENTATIVE SAMPLE PRIOR TO THE COMMENCEMENT OF THE PROJECT. ALL SAMPLES MUST BE WRITTEN APPROVAL OF SUCH SAMPLE BY THE ARCHITECT/ENGINEER SHALL BE DONE AT THE END OF THE CONTRACT. A MINIMUM OF TWO (2) WORKING DAYS NOTICE
7. THIS DESIGN IS AN ORIGINAL DESIGN AND MAY NOT BE REPRODUCED, COPIED, OR OTHERWISE USED WITHOUT THE WRITTEN CONSENT OF THE ARCHITECT/ENGINEER.
8. THESE SHEETS - LIMITED BY DRAWING INDEX, ALL ACCOUNTING NOTATIONS FOR MATERIALS, WORKMANSHIP QUALITY, AND NOTATIONS HAVE BEEN PROVIDED SOLELY FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE CLIENT. THE CLIENT IS RESPONSIBLE FOR OBTAINING ALL NECESSARY PERMITS, APPROVALS, AND INSURANCE. THE ARCHITECT/ENGINEER SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR OBTAINING ALL NECESSARY PERMITS, APPROVALS, AND INSURANCE. ANY CONFLICT BETWEEN DESIGN AND REQUIREMENT SHALL BE REPORTED TO THE ARCHITECT/ENGINEER BEFORE PROCEEDING.
9. ANY AND ALL PROPOSED CHANGE, MODIFICATIONS AND/OR ADDITIONS SHALL BE REPORTED TO THE ARCHITECT/ENGINEER BEFORE PROCEEDING.

An aerial photograph of a residential neighborhood. A street runs diagonally from the top left towards the bottom right, labeled '24 WOODS DR AVE'. The street is lined with houses of various styles, including some with dark roofs and others with lighter roofs. There are many trees and green spaces between the houses. In the bottom right corner, there is a small body of water, possibly a pond or a lake. The overall scene is a typical suburban residential area.

424 WOODSIDE AVENUE RECORD OF SURVEY
LOTS 25, 27, and 28, BLOCK 4, PARK CITY SURVEY, TOWN OF BUTTE, COUNTY OF BUTTE, MONTANA



TAC: Top Back of Curb.
T.O.C.: Top of Concrete.
F.F.: Finish Floor.
B.O.W.: Bottom of Wall.
T.O.W.: Top of wall.
G.: Ground.


5. The Diarrhoea, herd license number 187881 as prescribed by the laws of the State of Utah, and hereby that I have made a survey of the property shown herein and as described in the survey notes and legal description below.

SURVEY NOTES:

1. The purpose of this survey is for property records, close friends and leaders of the African Imperatives.
2. This survey was requested by Tim Beahm.
3. All surveys and distances shown were measured and are subject to the bearings and distances.
4. On the recorded map of Block 2, that City Survey.
5. The barrow entered in this sheet.
6. A correction of about survey date without this surveying constant makes this survey invalid.

Leleia 3434-3437 (cont.)
all at Lts 26, 27, and 28, Block 4, Post City Survey, also being treated in Eastern No. 1 Township
2 South, Range 4 East, Salt Lake Meridian and Meridian County, Utah. The area of
Lts 26, 27, and 28 together encompass about square feet, on 28 acres.






KEY NOTES

- 1 NEW STANDING SEAM METAL ROOF ON 5" PLT WOOD BEAMING ON HISTORIC 1/4" SYP. PLANK ON HISTORIC 2" X 8" SYP. PLANK @ 24" O.C. TRUSS HAS 2nd BOTTOM CHORD W/ 1/4" KICKER.
- 2 NEW STANDING SEAM METAL ROOF ON 5" PLT WOOD BEAMING ON 2X12 JOISTS @ 24" O.C.
- 3 NEW 1/2" HORIZONTAL PLK SIDING ON HISTORIC 1/4" VERTICAL PLANK ON 2nd STUDS @ 24" O.C.
- 4 NEW INSULATED WOOD CLAD ALUMINUM WINDOW.
- 5 NEW 1/2" HORIZONTAL PLK SIDING ON 5" PLT WOOD BEAMING ON 2nd STUDS @ 24" O.C.
- 6 NEW INSULATED WOOD CLAD ALUMINUM WINDOW.

2 SILT FENCE SECTION
ALL STATE DIVISION OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION
REGULATIONS.



LANDSCAPE PLAN
SCALE 1/4" = 1'-0"

- PLANTING NOTES**
1. CONTRACTOR TO VERIFY LOCATION OF ALL UTILITIES PRIOR TO INSTALLATION OF PLANTING. CONTRACTOR SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR OBTAINING ALL NECESSARY PERMITS AND APPROVALS FROM THE CITY OF SALT LAKE COUNTY AND THE UTAH DEPARTMENT OF HERITAGE AND ARTS.
 2. ALL PLANT MATERIAL SHALL CONFORM TO CURRENT AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF NURSERYMANS STANDARD SPECIFICATIONS.
 3. ALL PLANT MATERIAL SHALL BE INSTALLED AS PER THE DETAIL, DETAIL, AND SPECIFICATION.
 4. CONTRACTOR SHALL VERIFY ALL QUANTITIES. IN CASE OF A DISCREPANCY, THE CONTRACTOR SHALL CONTACT THE ARCHITECT IMMEDIATELY.
 5. CONTRACTOR SHALL MAINTAIN ALL PLANTING WITH REGULARITY THROUGHOUT THE PROJECT.
 6. ALL PLANTING SHALL BE PLANTED WITHIN THE SPECIFIED LOCATIONS.
 7. NO PLANTING SHALL BE PLANTED WITHOUT WRITTEN PERMISSION OF THE ARCHITECT OR OWNER.
 8. BIRDS SHALL BE PLANTED AS PER THE DETAIL, DETAIL, AND SPECIFICATION.
 9. ALL BIRDS SHALL BE PLANTED AS PER THE DETAIL, DETAIL, AND SPECIFICATION.
 10. BIRDS SHALL BE PLANTED AS PER THE DETAIL, DETAIL, AND SPECIFICATION.
 11. ALL PLANTS AND ALL PLANTING SHALL BE SET PLANTING.
 12. ALL PLANTING MATERIALS SHALL BE SET PLANTING.
 13. NO PLANTING SHALL BE SET PLANTING.

PLANT SCHEDULE			
TREES AND SHRUBS			
SYMBOL	SET #	QTY	COMMENTS
(A)	1	1	1.0000
(B)	2	1	1.0000
(C)	3	1	1.0000
(D)	4	1	1.0000
(E)	5	1	1.0000
(F)	6	1	1.0000
(G)	7	1	1.0000
(H)	8	1	1.0000
(I)	9	1	1.0000
(J)	10	1	1.0000
(K)	11	1	1.0000
(L)	12	1	1.0000
(M)	13	1	1.0000
(N)	14	1	1.0000
(O)	15	1	1.0000
(P)	16	1	1.0000
(Q)	17	1	1.0000
(R)	18	1	1.0000
(S)	19	1	1.0000
(T)	20	1	1.0000
(U)	21	1	1.0000
(V)	22	1	1.0000
(W)	23	1	1.0000
(X)	24	1	1.0000
(Y)	25	1	1.0000
(Z)	26	1	1.0000
(AA)	27	1	1.0000
(AB)	28	1	1.0000
(AC)	29	1	1.0000
(AD)	30	1	1.0000
(AE)	31	1	1.0000
(AF)	32	1	1.0000
(AG)	33	1	1.0000
(AH)	34	1	1.0000
(AI)	35	1	1.0000
(AJ)	36	1	1.0000
(AK)	37	1	1.0000
(AL)	38	1	1.0000
(AM)	39	1	1.0000
(AN)	40	1	1.0000
(AO)	41	1	1.0000
(AP)	42	1	1.0000
(AQ)	43	1	1.0000
(AR)	44	1	1.0000
(AS)	45	1	1.0000
(AT)	46	1	1.0000
(AU)	47	1	1.0000
(AV)	48	1	1.0000
(AW)	49	1	1.0000
(AX)	50	1	1.0000
(AY)	51	1	1.0000
(AZ)	52	1	1.0000
(BA)	53	1	1.0000
(BB)	54	1	1.0000
(BC)	55	1	1.0000
(BD)	56	1	1.0000
(BE)	57	1	1.0000
(BF)	58	1	1.0000
(BG)	59	1	1.0000
(BH)	60	1	1.0000
(BI)	61	1	1.0000
(BJ)	62	1	1.0000
(BK)	63	1	1.0000
(BL)	64	1	1.0000
(BM)	65	1	1.0000
(BN)	66	1	1.0000
(BO)	67	1	1.0000
(BP)	68	1	1.0000
(BQ)	69	1	1.0000
(BR)	70	1	1.0000
(BS)	71	1	1.0000
(BT)	72	1	1.0000
(BU)	73	1	1.0000
(BV)	74	1	1.0000
(BW)	75	1	1.0000
(BX)	76	1	1.0000
(BY)	77	1	1.0000
(BZ)	78	1	1.0000
(CA)	79	1	1.0000
(CB)	80	1	1.0000
(CC)	81	1	1.0000
(CD)	82	1	1.0000
(CE)	83	1	1.0000
(CF)	84	1	1.0000
(CG)	85	1	1.0000
(CH)	86	1	1.0000
(CI)	87	1	1.0000
(CJ)	88	1	1.0000
(CK)	89	1	1.0000
(CL)	90	1	1.0000
(CM)	91	1	1.0000
(CN)	92	1	1.0000
(CO)	93	1	1.0000
(CP)	94	1	1.0000
(CQ)	95	1	1.0000
(CR)	96	1	1.0000
(CS)	97	1	1.0000
(CT)	98	1	1.0000
(CU)	99	1	1.0000
(CV)	100	1	1.0000

PERENNIAL PLANTING & HYDROSEEDING			
SYMBOL	SET #	QTY	COMMENTS
(A)	1	1	1.0000
(B)	2	1	1.0000
(C)	3	1	1.0000
(D)	4	1	1.0000
(E)	5	1	1.0000
(F)	6	1	1.0000
(G)	7	1	1.0000
(H)	8	1	1.0000
(I)	9	1	1.0000
(J)	10	1	1.0000
(K)	11	1	1.0000
(L)	12	1	1.0000
(M)	13	1	1.0000
(N)	14	1	1.0000
(O)	15	1	1.0000
(P)	16	1	1.0000
(Q)	17	1	1.0000
(R)	18	1	1.0000
(S)	19	1	1.0000
(T)	20	1	1.0000
(U)	21	1	1.0000
(V)	22	1	1.0000
(W)	23	1	1.0000
(X)	24	1	1.0000
(Y)	25	1	1.0000
(Z)	26	1	1.0000
(AA)	27	1	1.0000
(AB)	28	1	1.0000
(AC)	29	1	1.0000
(AD)	30	1	1.0000
(AE)	31	1	1.0000
(AF)	32	1	1.0000
(AG)	33	1	1.0000
(AH)	34	1	1.0000
(AI)	35	1	1.0000
(AJ)	36	1	1.0000
(AK)	37	1	1.0000
(AL)	38	1	1.0000
(AM)	39	1	1.0000
(AN)	40	1	1.0000
(AO)	41	1	1.0000
(AP)	42	1	1.0000
(AQ)	43	1	1.0000
(AR)	44	1	1.0000
(AS)	45	1	1.0000
(AT)	46	1	1.0000
(AU)	47	1	1.0000
(AV)	48	1	1.0000
(AW)	49	1	1.0000
(AX)	50	1	1.0000
(AY)	51	1	1.0000
(AZ)	52	1	1.0000
(BA)	53	1	1.0000
(BB)	54	1	1.0000
(BC)	55	1	1.0000
(BD)	56	1	1.0000
(BE)	57	1	1.0000
(BF)	58	1	1.0000
(BG)	59	1	1.0000
(BH)	60	1	1.0000
(BI)	61	1	1.0000
(BJ)	62	1	1.0000
(BK)	63	1	1.0000
(BL)	64	1	1.0000
(BM)	65	1	1.0000
(BN)	66	1	1.0000
(BO)	67	1	1.0000
(BP)	68	1	1.0000
(BQ)	69	1	1.0000
(BR)	70	1	1.0000
(BS)	71	1	1.0000
(BT)	72	1	1.0000
(BU)	73	1	1.0000
(BV)	74	1	1.0000
(BW)	75	1	1.0000
(BX)	76	1	1.0000
(BY)	77	1	1.0000
(BZ)	78	1	1.0000
(CA)	79	1	1.0000
(CB)	80	1	1.0000
(CC)	81	1	1.0000
(CD)	82	1	1.0000
(CE)	83	1	1.0000
(CF)	84	1	1.0000
(CG)	85	1	1.0000
(CH)	86	1	1.0000
(CI)	87	1	1.0000
(CJ)	88	1	1.0000
(CK)	89	1	1.0000
(CL)	90	1	1.0000
(CM)	91	1	1.0000
(CN)	92	1	1.0000
(CO)	93	1	1.0000
(CP)	94	1	1.0000
(CQ)	95	1	1.0000
(CR)	96	1	1.0000
(CS)	97	1	1.0000
(CT)	98	1	1.0000
(CU)	99	1	1.0000
(CV)	100	1	1.0000

THE BIRD SEED SHALL BE UTILIZED IN SEED BROADCASTING METHODS. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR OBTAINING ALL NECESSARY PERMITS AND APPROVALS FROM THE CITY OF SALT LAKE COUNTY AND THE UTAH DEPARTMENT OF HERITAGE AND ARTS.

*HYDROSEEDING SHALL BE UTILIZED IN SEED BROADCASTING METHODS. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR OBTAINING ALL NECESSARY PERMITS AND APPROVALS FROM THE CITY OF SALT LAKE COUNTY AND THE UTAH DEPARTMENT OF HERITAGE AND ARTS.

THE CONTRACTOR SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR OBTAINING ALL NECESSARY PERMITS AND APPROVALS FROM THE CITY OF SALT LAKE COUNTY AND THE UTAH DEPARTMENT OF HERITAGE AND ARTS.

A1.1


LOWER LEVEL PLAN
SCALE: 1/8" = 1'-0"

DATE: FEBRUARY 15, 2017
PROJECT NUMBER: 101141

LOWER LEVEL PLAN

BERKLEY RESIDENCE - HDR SET
424 WOODSIDE AVENUE
PARK CITY, UTAH 84060

Jonathan Degray
Architect
P.O. Box 1674, 614 Main Street, Suite 302, Park City, Utah 84060
Tel: 435-649-7263, E-mail: degrayarchitect@comcast.net



KEY NOTES


1. ALL DIMENSIONS ARE APPROXIMATE AND ARE TO BE USED FOR GENERAL REFERENCE ONLY.
2. THESE SPECIFICATIONS TO BE ON THE DRAWING OF THE PROJECT.
3. THESE SPECIFICATIONS TO BE ON THE DRAWING OF THE PROJECT.
4. THESE SPECIFICATIONS TO BE ON THE DRAWING OF THE PROJECT.
5. THESE SPECIFICATIONS TO BE ON THE DRAWING OF THE PROJECT.
6. THESE SPECIFICATIONS TO BE ON THE DRAWING OF THE PROJECT.
7. THESE SPECIFICATIONS TO BE ON THE DRAWING OF THE PROJECT.
8. THESE SPECIFICATIONS TO BE ON THE DRAWING OF THE PROJECT.
9. THESE SPECIFICATIONS TO BE ON THE DRAWING OF THE PROJECT.
10. THESE SPECIFICATIONS TO BE ON THE DRAWING OF THE PROJECT.
11. THESE SPECIFICATIONS TO BE ON THE DRAWING OF THE PROJECT.
12. THESE SPECIFICATIONS TO BE ON THE DRAWING OF THE PROJECT.
13. THESE SPECIFICATIONS TO BE ON THE DRAWING OF THE PROJECT.
14. THESE SPECIFICATIONS TO BE ON THE DRAWING OF THE PROJECT.
15. THESE SPECIFICATIONS TO BE ON THE DRAWING OF THE PROJECT.
16. THESE SPECIFICATIONS TO BE ON THE DRAWING OF THE PROJECT.
17. THESE SPECIFICATIONS TO BE ON THE DRAWING OF THE PROJECT.
18. THESE SPECIFICATIONS TO BE ON THE DRAWING OF THE PROJECT.
19. THESE SPECIFICATIONS TO BE ON THE DRAWING OF THE PROJECT.
20. THESE SPECIFICATIONS TO BE ON THE DRAWING OF THE PROJECT.
21. THESE SPECIFICATIONS TO BE ON THE DRAWING OF THE PROJECT.
22. THESE SPECIFICATIONS TO BE ON THE DRAWING OF THE PROJECT.
23. THESE SPECIFICATIONS TO BE ON THE DRAWING OF THE PROJECT.
24. THESE SPECIFICATIONS TO BE ON THE DRAWING OF THE PROJECT.
25. THESE SPECIFICATIONS TO BE ON THE DRAWING OF THE PROJECT.
26. THESE SPECIFICATIONS TO BE ON THE DRAWING OF THE PROJECT.
27. THESE SPECIFICATIONS TO BE ON THE DRAWING OF THE PROJECT.
28. THESE SPECIFICATIONS TO BE ON THE DRAWING OF THE PROJECT.
29. THESE SPECIFICATIONS TO BE ON THE DRAWING OF THE PROJECT.
30. THESE SPECIFICATIONS TO BE ON THE DRAWING OF THE PROJECT.
31. THESE SPECIFICATIONS TO BE ON THE DRAWING OF THE PROJECT.
32. THESE SPECIFICATIONS TO BE ON THE DRAWING OF THE PROJECT.
33. THESE SPECIFICATIONS TO BE ON THE DRAWING OF THE PROJECT.
34. THESE SPECIFICATIONS TO BE ON THE DRAWING OF THE PROJECT.
35. THESE SPECIFICATIONS TO BE ON THE DRAWING OF THE PROJECT.
36. THESE SPECIFICATIONS TO BE ON THE DRAWING OF THE PROJECT.
37. THESE SPECIFICATIONS TO BE ON THE DRAWING OF THE PROJECT.
38. THESE SPECIFICATIONS TO BE ON THE DRAWING OF THE PROJECT.
39. THESE SPECIFICATIONS TO BE ON THE DRAWING OF THE PROJECT.
40. THESE SPECIFICATIONS TO BE ON THE DRAWING OF THE PROJECT.
41. THESE SPECIFICATIONS TO BE ON THE DRAWING OF THE PROJECT.
42. THESE SPECIFICATIONS TO BE ON THE DRAWING OF THE PROJECT.
43. THESE SPECIFICATIONS TO BE ON THE DRAWING OF THE PROJECT.
44. THESE SPECIFICATIONS TO BE ON THE DRAWING OF THE PROJECT.
45. THESE SPECIFICATIONS TO BE ON THE DRAWING OF THE PROJECT.
46. THESE SPECIFICATIONS TO BE ON THE DRAWING OF THE PROJECT.
47. THESE SPECIFICATIONS TO BE ON THE DRAWING OF THE PROJECT.
48. THESE SPECIFICATIONS TO BE ON THE DRAWING OF THE PROJECT.
49. THESE SPECIFICATIONS TO BE ON THE DRAWING OF THE PROJECT.
50. THESE SPECIFICATIONS TO BE ON THE DRAWING OF THE PROJECT.
51. THESE SPECIFICATIONS TO BE ON THE DRAWING OF THE PROJECT.
52. THESE SPECIFICATIONS TO BE ON THE DRAWING OF THE PROJECT.
53. THESE SPECIFICATIONS TO BE ON THE DRAWING OF THE PROJECT.
54. THESE SPECIFICATIONS TO BE ON THE DRAWING OF THE PROJECT.
55. THESE SPECIFICATIONS TO BE ON THE DRAWING OF THE PROJECT.
56. THESE SPECIFICATIONS TO BE ON THE DRAWING OF THE PROJECT.
57. THESE SPECIFICATIONS TO BE ON THE DRAWING OF THE PROJECT.
58. THESE SPECIFICATIONS TO BE ON THE DRAWING OF THE PROJECT.
59. THESE SPECIFICATIONS TO BE ON THE DRAWING OF THE PROJECT.
60. THESE SPECIFICATIONS TO BE ON THE DRAWING OF THE PROJECT.
61. THESE SPECIFICATIONS TO BE ON THE DRAWING OF THE PROJECT.
62. THESE SPECIFICATIONS TO BE ON THE DRAWING OF THE PROJECT.
63. THESE SPECIFICATIONS TO BE ON THE DRAWING OF THE PROJECT.
64. THESE SPECIFICATIONS TO BE ON THE DRAWING OF THE PROJECT.
65. THESE SPECIFICATIONS TO BE ON THE DRAWING OF THE PROJECT.
66. THESE SPECIFICATIONS TO BE ON THE DRAWING OF THE PROJECT.
67. THESE SPECIFICATIONS TO BE ON THE DRAWING OF THE PROJECT.
68. THESE SPECIFICATIONS TO BE ON THE DRAWING OF THE PROJECT.
69. THESE SPECIFICATIONS TO BE ON THE DRAWING OF THE PROJECT.
70. THESE SPECIFICATIONS TO BE ON THE DRAWING OF THE PROJECT.
71. THESE SPECIFICATIONS TO BE ON THE DRAWING OF THE PROJECT.
72. THESE SPECIFICATIONS TO BE ON THE DRAWING OF THE PROJECT.
73. THESE SPECIFICATIONS TO BE ON THE DRAWING OF THE PROJECT.
74. THESE SPECIFICATIONS TO BE ON THE DRAWING OF THE PROJECT.
75. THESE SPECIFICATIONS TO BE ON THE DRAWING OF THE PROJECT.
76. THESE SPECIFICATIONS TO BE ON THE DRAWING OF THE PROJECT.
77. THESE SPECIFICATIONS TO BE ON THE DRAWING OF THE PROJECT.
78. THESE SPECIFICATIONS TO BE ON THE DRAWING OF THE PROJECT.
79. THESE SPECIFICATIONS TO BE ON THE DRAWING OF THE PROJECT.
80. THESE SPECIFICATIONS TO BE ON THE DRAWING OF THE PROJECT.
81. THESE SPECIFICATIONS TO BE ON THE DRAWING OF THE PROJECT.
82. THESE SPECIFICATIONS TO BE ON THE DRAWING OF THE PROJECT.
83. THESE SPECIFICATIONS TO BE ON THE DRAWING OF THE PROJECT.
84. THESE SPECIFICATIONS TO BE ON THE DRAWING OF THE PROJECT.
85. THESE SPECIFICATIONS TO BE ON THE DRAWING OF THE PROJECT.
86. THESE SPECIFICATIONS TO BE ON THE DRAWING OF THE PROJECT.
87. THESE SPECIFICATIONS TO BE ON THE DRAWING OF THE PROJECT.
88. THESE SPECIFICATIONS TO BE ON THE DRAWING OF THE PROJECT.
89. THESE SPECIFICATIONS TO BE ON THE DRAWING OF THE PROJECT.
90. THESE SPECIFICATIONS TO BE ON THE DRAWING OF THE PROJECT.
91. THESE SPECIFICATIONS TO BE ON THE DRAWING OF THE PROJECT.
92. THESE SPECIFICATIONS TO BE ON THE DRAWING OF THE PROJECT.
93. THESE SPECIFICATIONS TO BE ON THE DRAWING OF THE PROJECT.
94. THESE SPECIFICATIONS TO BE ON THE DRAWING OF THE PROJECT.
95. THESE SPECIFICATIONS TO BE ON THE DRAWING OF THE PROJECT.
96. THESE SPECIFICATIONS TO BE ON THE DRAWING OF THE PROJECT.
97. THESE SPECIFICATIONS TO BE ON THE DRAWING OF THE PROJECT.
98. THESE SPECIFICATIONS TO BE ON THE DRAWING OF THE PROJECT.
99. THESE SPECIFICATIONS TO BE ON THE DRAWING OF THE PROJECT.
100. THESE SPECIFICATIONS TO BE ON THE DRAWING OF THE PROJECT.

GENERAL NOTES

1. EXISTING CONCRETE WALL.
2. EXISTING CONCRETE WALL.
3. EXISTING CONCRETE WALL.
4. EXISTING CONCRETE WALL.
5. EXISTING CONCRETE WALL.
6. EXISTING CONCRETE WALL.
7. EXISTING CONCRETE WALL.
8. EXISTING CONCRETE WALL.
9. EXISTING CONCRETE WALL.
10. EXISTING CONCRETE WALL.
11. EXISTING CONCRETE WALL.
12. EXISTING CONCRETE WALL.
13. EXISTING CONCRETE WALL.
14. EXISTING CONCRETE WALL.
15. EXISTING CONCRETE WALL.
16. EXISTING CONCRETE WALL.
17. EXISTING CONCRETE WALL.
18. EXISTING CONCRETE WALL.
19. EXISTING CONCRETE WALL.
20. EXISTING CONCRETE WALL.
21. EXISTING CONCRETE WALL.
22. EXISTING CONCRETE WALL.
23. EXISTING CONCRETE WALL.
24. EXISTING CONCRETE WALL.
25. EXISTING CONCRETE WALL.
26. EXISTING CONCRETE WALL.
27. EXISTING CONCRETE WALL.
28. EXISTING CONCRETE WALL.
29. EXISTING CONCRETE WALL.
30. EXISTING CONCRETE WALL.
31. EXISTING CONCRETE WALL.
32. EXISTING CONCRETE WALL.
33. EXISTING CONCRETE WALL.
34. EXISTING CONCRETE WALL.
35. EXISTING CONCRETE WALL.
36. EXISTING CONCRETE WALL.
37. EXISTING CONCRETE WALL.
38. EXISTING CONCRETE WALL.
39. EXISTING CONCRETE WALL.
40. EXISTING CONCRETE WALL.
41. EXISTING CONCRETE WALL.
42. EXISTING CONCRETE WALL.
43. EXISTING CONCRETE WALL.
44. EXISTING CONCRETE WALL.
45. EXISTING CONCRETE WALL.
46. EXISTING CONCRETE WALL.
47. EXISTING CONCRETE WALL.
48. EXISTING CONCRETE WALL.
49. EXISTING CONCRETE WALL.
50. EXISTING CONCRETE WALL.
51. EXISTING CONCRETE WALL.
52. EXISTING CONCRETE WALL.
53. EXISTING CONCRETE WALL.
54. EXISTING CONCRETE WALL.
55. EXISTING CONCRETE WALL.
56. EXISTING CONCRETE WALL.
57. EXISTING CONCRETE WALL.
58. EXISTING CONCRETE WALL.
59. EXISTING CONCRETE WALL.
60. EXISTING CONCRETE WALL.
61. EXISTING CONCRETE WALL.
62. EXISTING CONCRETE WALL.
63. EXISTING CONCRETE WALL.
64. EXISTING CONCRETE WALL.
65. EXISTING CONCRETE WALL.
66. EXISTING CONCRETE WALL.
67. EXISTING CONCRETE WALL.
68. EXISTING CONCRETE WALL.
69. EXISTING CONCRETE WALL.
70. EXISTING CONCRETE WALL.
71. EXISTING CONCRETE WALL.
72. EXISTING CONCRETE WALL.
73. EXISTING CONCRETE WALL.
74. EXISTING CONCRETE WALL.
75. EXISTING CONCRETE WALL.
76. EXISTING CONCRETE WALL.
77. EXISTING CONCRETE WALL.
78. EXISTING CONCRETE WALL.
79. EXISTING CONCRETE WALL.
80. EXISTING CONCRETE WALL.
81. EXISTING CONCRETE WALL.
82. EXISTING CONCRETE WALL.
83. EXISTING CONCRETE WALL.
84. EXISTING CONCRETE WALL.
85. EXISTING CONCRETE WALL.
86. EXISTING CONCRETE WALL.
87. EXISTING CONCRETE WALL.
88. EXISTING CONCRETE WALL.
89. EXISTING CONCRETE WALL.
90. EXISTING CONCRETE WALL.
91. EXISTING CONCRETE WALL.
92. EXISTING CONCRETE WALL.
93. EXISTING CONCRETE WALL.
94. EXISTING CONCRETE WALL.
95. EXISTING CONCRETE WALL.
96. EXISTING CONCRETE WALL.
97. EXISTING CONCRETE WALL.
98. EXISTING CONCRETE WALL.
99. EXISTING CONCRETE WALL.
100. EXISTING CONCRETE WALL.

BERKLEY RESIDENCE - HDR SET
REMODEL/ADDITION
424 WOODSIDE AVENUE
PARK CITY, UTAH 84060

Jonathan DeGray
Architect
P.O. Box 1674, 614 Main Street, Suite 302, Park City, Utah 84060
Tel. 435-649-7263 E-mail: jon@architect.com



EXISTING CONCRETE WALL

EXISTING CONCRETE WALL


A1.3

DATE: FEBRUARY 15, 2017
PROJECT NUMBER: 101101

ENTRY LEVEL PLAN

BERKLEY RESIDENCE - HDR SET
424 WOODSIDE AVENUE
PARK CITY, UTAH 84060

Jonathan Degray
Architect
P.O. Box 1674, 614 Main Street, Suite 302, Park City, Utah 84060
Tel: 435-649-7263, E-mail: degrayarchitect@comcast.net




ENTRY LEVEL PLAN
SCALE: 1/8" = 1'-0"

KEY NOTES

- 1. ALL DIMENSIONS ARE APPROXIMATE AND ARE TO BE VERIFIED BY THE FIELD ENGINEER.
- 2. FINE SPENCERS TO BE ON THE WARM SIDE OF THE EXTERIOR WALLS.
- 3. FINE SPENCERS TO BE ON THE WARM SIDE OF THE EXTERIOR WALLS.
- 4. FINE SPENCERS TO BE ON THE WARM SIDE OF THE EXTERIOR WALLS.
- 5. FINE SPENCERS TO BE ON THE WARM SIDE OF THE EXTERIOR WALLS.
- 6. FINE SPENCERS TO BE ON THE WARM SIDE OF THE EXTERIOR WALLS.
- 7. FINE SPENCERS TO BE ON THE WARM SIDE OF THE EXTERIOR WALLS.
- 8. FINE SPENCERS TO BE ON THE WARM SIDE OF THE EXTERIOR WALLS.
- 9. FINE SPENCERS TO BE ON THE WARM SIDE OF THE EXTERIOR WALLS.
- 10. FINE SPENCERS TO BE ON THE WARM SIDE OF THE EXTERIOR WALLS.



GENERAL NOTES


GENERAL NOTE



KEY NOTES

- [illegible]





KEY NOTES

- 1. COMPOSITE ROOF: TREX, CEDAR OR EQUAL
- 2. 1/2\"/>
- 3. 1/2\"/>
- 4. 1/2\"/>
- 5. 1/2\"/>
- 6. 1/2\"/>
- 7. 1/2\"/>
- 8. 1/2\"/>
- 9. 1/2\"/>
- 10. 1/2\"/>
- 11. 1/2\"/>
- 12. 1/2\"/>
- 13. 1/2\"/>
- 14. 1/2\"/>
- 15. 1/2\"/>
- 16. 1/2\"/>
- 17. 1/2\"/>
- 18. 1/2\"/>
- 19. 1/2\"/>
- 20. 1/2\"/>
- 21. 1/2\"/>
- 22. 1/2\"/>
- 23. 1/2\"/>
- 24. 1/2\"/>
- 25. 1/2\"/>
- 26. 1/2\"/>
- 27. 1/2\"/>
- 28. 1/2\"/>
- 29. 1/2\"/>
- 30. 1/2\"/>
- 31. 1/2\"/>
- 32. 1/2\"/>
- 33. 1/2\"/>
- 34. 1/2\"/>
- 35. 1/2\"/>
- 36. 1/2\"/>
- 37. 1/2\"/>
- 38. 1/2\"/>
- 39. 1/2\"/>
- 40. 1/2\"/>
- 41. 1/2\"/>
- 42. 1/2\"/>
- 43. 1/2\"/>
- 44. 1/2\"/>
- 45. 1/2\"/>
- 46. 1/2\"/>
- 47. 1/2\"/>
- 48. 1/2\"/>
- 49. 1/2\"/>
- 50. 1/2\"/>
- 51. 1/2\"/>
- 52. 1/2\"/>
- 53. 1/2\"/>
- 54. 1/2\"/>
- 55. 1/2\"/>
- 56. 1/2\"/>
- 57. 1/2\"/>
- 58. 1/2\"/>
- 59. 1/2\"/>
- 60. 1/2\"/>
- 61. 1/2\"/>
- 62. 1/2\"/>
- 63. 1/2\"/>
- 64. 1/2\"/>
- 65. 1/2\"/>
- 66. 1/2\"/>
- 67. 1/2\"/>
- 68. 1/2\"/>
- 69. 1/2\"/>
- 70. 1/2\"/>
- 71. 1/2\"/>
- 72. 1/2\"/>
- 73. 1/2\"/>
- 74. 1/2\"/>
- 75. 1/2\"/>
- 76. 1/2\"/>
- 77. 1/2\"/>
- 78. 1/2\"/>
- 79. 1/2\"/>
- 80. 1/2\"/>
- 81. 1/2\"/>
- 82. 1/2\"/>
- 83. 1/2\"/>
- 84. 1/2\"/>
- 85. 1/2\"/>
- 86. 1/2\"/>
- 87. 1/2\"/>
- 88. 1/2\"/>
- 89. 1/2\"/>
- 90. 1/2\"/>
- 91. 1/2\"/>
- 92. 1/2\"/>
- 93. 1/2\"/>
- 94. 1/2\"/>
- 95. 1/2\"/>
- 96. 1/2\"/>
- 97. 1/2\"/>
- 98. 1/2\"/>
- 99. 1/2\"/>
- 100. 1/2\"/>

BUILDING SECTION

BERKLEY RESIDENCE - HDR SET
424 WOODSIDE AVENUE
PARK CITY, UTAH 84060

Jonathan Degray
Architect
P.O. Box 1674, 614 Main Street, Suite 302, Park City, Utah 84060
Tel: 435-939-7263, E-mail: degray@jonathandegray.com

DATE: FEBRUARY 15, 2017
PROJECT NAME: BERKLEY
SHEET NAME: A3.1

EXTERIOR	INTERIOR	GLAZING
----------	----------	---------

LOW'S OPENINGS TO BE FIELD VERIFIED DRY CONTRACT

DOOR	DOOR	FRAME	FRAME	HIT
------	------	-------	-------	-----

0000	12500
------	-------

WOOD	WATER
------	-------

Findings to be Field Verified by Contractors

LOOR	WALLS	CEILING

८	८
---	---

८	८
---	---

TV/VIDEO:

TY RESIDENCE - HD
REMODEL/ADDITION
424 WOODSIDE AVENUE
PARK CITY, UTAH 84060

Jonathan DeGray
A r c h i t e c t
P.O. Box 1674, 614 Main Street, Suite 302, Park City, Utah 84060
Tel. 435-649-7263, E-mail: degrayarch@questoffice.net

A6.1

EXHIBIT J
Applicant's Analysis for Reorientation

Jonathan DeGray - Architect

May 19, 2017

Park City Municipal Corporation
442 Marsac Avenue
Park City, Utah

Attn: Bruce Erickson, Planning Director
Hannah Taylor, Planner

Re: Berkley Residence, 424 Woodside

Dear Bruce and Hannah,

Please find attached; Historic Site Analysis and Code Compliance Response for the purpose of determining "Unique Conditions" as they relate to the lifting and reorientation of the significant historic home at 424 Woodside Avenue.

Please let me know if you have any questions or would like additional information.

Sincerely,



Jonathan DeGray – Architect

614 Main Street, Suite 302
P.O. Box 1674, Park City, Utah 84060 Tel./Fax 435-649-7263
Email: degrayarch@qwestoffice.net Web: www.degrayarchitect.com



424 Woodside, Historic Site Analysis

424 Woodside sits in an area between Park Avenue and Woodside Avenue that has experienced great change in both building types and access over the past 120 years. The following analysis will discuss the unique conditions that surround this property and why re-orientation of the building to face Woodside Avenue is warranted in this situation.

Historic Context

424 Woodside is a single-story hall parlor that has been modified significantly over the years. The Historic Sites Inventory notes the date of construction as 1900 but Sanborn maps indicate it dates to 1889. The original form on the Sanborn's show a simple rectangle with attached smaller form to the rear. By 1907 the rear add on form has changed location and size and a front porch appears. By 1941 The front porch is gone but the rear additions have grown. Sometime after this period a front porch was added again and has since been enclosed and included in to the main building as living area. In the early 1990 a large addition with two car garage was added to the south side of the existing home.

The home at 424 Woodside was constructed with its primary front façade facing east towards Park Avenue. This is a similar orientation to a number of adjacent homes built in the same period but that have since been demolished. Area photo dated 1907 and 1930 provided by the Park City Museum, (see attached Exhibits A, B, C & D), clearly shows 424 Woodside as well as homes to the south, at what are now 400, 402, 408 Woodside, and to the north, at what is now 426 Woodside, with their front facades facing east towards Park Avenue. Closer examination of the photo shows access to the east side of these Woodside properties via a stair case and foot path entering from Park Avenue just south of the home at 421 Park Avenue, (see Exhibit A & B). In the early 1900, during the mining period and pre-automobile, transportation in town was primarily by foot with some residents having horse and wagon.

It is also interesting to note that 4th street is actually a street at this point in time with a stair/sidewalk running along its north side, (see Exhibit B). The roadway at 4th street is now gone and in its place a public stair.

In 1907 Woodside Avenue was no more than a narrow path used for wagons and foot traffic, primary access to Main Street was by foot from the front of these homes via the footpaths and stair access. By 1930 this access seems to be diminished or no longer exists. Review of the attached 1930 area photo shows the orientation of the homes shown in the 1907 photo remains but it is unclear if the path access remains, (see Exhibits C & D). With the access from the front of the home to Park Avenue lost and with the development of Woodside Avenue to accommodate automobiles Woodside Avenue becomes the primary access to 424 Woodside.

From the 1930's forward the rear, or Woodside Avenue side, of 424 Woodside becomes the main access point to the home and the rear porch side entry becomes the primary entry door.



As time has progressed the surrounding homes that appeared in the 1907 and 1930 photo have been demolished and replaced with newer, larger homes that orient to Woodside Avenue. The redevelopment of the area has caused the loss of the historic mining period access to the front, east facing side of 424 Woodside.

The home at 424 Woodside along Woodside Avenue, west side of the property, has always been below the street elevation. Street improvements by the city along Woodside Avenue over the years has raised the grade and widened Woodside Avenue. (see Exhibit E & F for comparison). These improvements to the street have placed the home approx. 10' below the roadway elevation, (see 424 Woodside Record of Survey, dated 8-8-2004). These factors add up to a situation where the historic mining period context that 424 Woodside was originally built is lost and the home as it sits today is lost among the newer and larger redeveloped residential properties that face Woodside Avenue, (see Exhibit G).

Code Compliance

Land Management Code, Section 15-11-13, Relocation and/or Reorientation of Historic Buildings or Historic Structures, Section A, Item #3c, The Historic Preservation Board, with input from the planning director and chief building official, determines that unique conditions warrant the proposed relocation and or reorientation on the existing site. Unique conditions shall include all of the following:

- (1) The historic context of the historic building and or structure has been so radically altered that the proposed relocation will enhance the ability to interpret the historic character of the historic building and/or structure and the Historic District or its present setting. *The following finding apply.*
 - a. *The historic front yard access to the home has been lost*
 - b. *The surrounding homes of the same era and orientation have been replaced with larger contemporary homes with different orientation*
 - c. *The scale of the adjacent structures dwarf 424 Woodside and creates a visual disconnect in the street scape.*
 - d. *The street has been widened and elevation raised.*
 - e. *The existing home is 10' below street level*
 - f. *By raising and rotating the home the historic front elevation will face the street and be at street level. This will enhance the visibility of the home and It will allow the character of the historic home to be viewed from the street. This will also infill and add to the street scape, (see exhibit G).*



- (2) The propose relocation will not diminish the overall physical integrity of the Historic District or diminish the historical associations used to define the boundaries of the district. *The following findings apply:*
- a. The historic front yard, east side, access has been lost.*
 - b. At present, due to the buildings orientation the form and character of the historic home are lost behind a non-descript roof form located well below the roadway elevation.*
 - c. The building is dwarfed by the surrounding newer buildings and its own 1990's addition.*
 - d. By lifting and rotating the home to face Woodside Avenue the historic homes form and character will be presented to the public.*
 - e. By having the building face the street, the street scape will be filled in with this historic building and the physical integrity of the historic district will be increased, (see Exhibit G).*
 - f. The building is presently listed as significant. The proposed relocation and reorientation will not change that listing.*
- (3) The historic integrity and significance of the historic building and or structure will not be diminished by relocation and or reorientation. *The following findings apply:*
- a. The building is presently listed as significant. The proposed relocation and reorientation will not change that listing.*
- (4) The potential to preserve the historic building and or structure will be enhanced by its relocation. *The following findings apply:*
- a. Currently the home located 10' below street level*
 - b. The home is surrounded by larger contemporary homes and its own 1990's addition.*
 - c. Lifting and rotating the home will bring it to street level and will allow the home to be seen and appreciated by the public as a historic structure. It will also greatly improve its livability and put it in line with the livability of the contemporary homes that surround it.*
 - d. If the home is required to remain where it is, it will always be considered a substandard property. Motivation to invest in a substandard property that cannot be improved in any meaningful way will be limited and ultimately detrimental to its long-term preservation.*



Summary:

The Historic Context discussion presented here details the evolution of this site and clearly shows how the mining period site context has irreversible been lost. By applying these fact to the Code Compliance section, it is further made clear that lifting and reorienting the home is the best possible solution going forward to insure the historic form is preserved in a meaning full way for years to come.

Attachments:

Exhibit A, 1907 Photo

Exhibit B, 1907 Photo, Enlarged Area

Exhibit C, 1930, Photo

Exhibit D, 1930 Photo, Enlarged Area


Exhibit E, 1940 Tax Photo

Exhibit F, 2010 Photo

Exhibit G, Street Scape



424 WOODSIDE



RECEIVED


MAY 24 2017

PARK CITY
PLANNING DEPT.

EXHIBIT A
1907 PHOTO

FOOT PATH

424 WOODSIDE



4TH ST.

STAIR


RECEIVED


MAY 24 2017

PARK CITY
PLANNING DEPT.

EXHIBIT B
1907 PHOTO

Page 140





MAY 24 2017


PARK CITY
PLANNING DEPT.

EXHIBIT D
1930 PHOTO





EXHIBIT F
2010 PHOTO
Page 144



454 1950+196

STREET SCAPES - EXISTING
NO SCALE



454 1950+196

STREET SCAPES - PROPOSED
NO SCALE



EXHIBIT G

EXHIBIT K

Park City Municipal Corporation's Historic Preservation
Consultant, Anne Oliver, SWCA - Assessment of Proposed
Reorientation

Memorandum

To: Planning Department, Park City Municipal Corporation, Utah
From: Anne Oliver, Principal Investigator, SWCA Environmental Consultants
Date: June 20, 2017
Re: Assessment of Proposed Reorientation of Significant Site at 424 Woodside Avenue

Introduction

The property at 424 Woodside Avenue in Park City, Utah, is listed on the Park City Municipal Corporation (PCMC) Historic Sites Inventory (HSI) as a Significant Site. The building on the property comprises a historic one-story residence built ca. 1886 and a large two-and-one-half story addition abutting it on the south, which was built in 1993.¹ Presently the historic house and the addition do not have an interior connection and the property is used as a duplex. The original principal façade of the historic house faced east but it is currently accessed via a staircase leading down from Woodside to an older secondary door on the north side. The addition faces west onto Woodside Avenue and includes a driveway and two-car garage.

The property owners wish to rehabilitate the property and convert the duplex into a single-family home. Toward this end, proposed work on the historic house includes the following: demolish smaller non-historic additions, identify any extant historic features and materials, panelize the house, reorient it so that the historic façade faces Woodside Avenue, lift it by 9 feet to align the historic main floor with the garage level of the south addition (bringing the historic house up to street level), add a foundation and basement-level addition, and construct a two-story addition on the east side. Additional work is proposed for the 1993 south addition.

The Planning Department has requested a formal assessment of the proposed reorientation of the historic house, its degree of compliance with PCMC's Historic District Design Guidelines and Land Management Code, the effects that reorientation will have on the historic significance and integrity of the house, and ultimately whether the property will remain eligible for listing on the HSI as a Significant Site and contributing resource in the HR-1 Zone. The nature and effects of other proposed work will not be considered here.

Background information on the property includes a Utah State Historical Society Structure/Site Information Form (Notarianni 1978); a PCMC HSI form (Blaes 2008) with associated ca. 1940 tax photograph and Utah State Tax Commission appraisal cards; a Utah Historic Preservation Office Historic Site Form (Carmen 2015) with associated Sanborn Fire Insurance Company maps from 1889, 1900, 1907, 1929, and 1941; a Historic Preservation Plan (HPP) and Physical Conditions Report prepared by the applicant's representative Jonathan DeGray (2016); updated Historic District Design Review (HDDR)

¹ Title research indicates that several mortgages were taken out on the property in 1886, likely for the construction of a house, and the building is shown on the 1889 Sanborn map (Carmen 2015).

drawings for the proposed remodel and addition to the property (2017a); and a historic site analysis prepared by DeGray (2017b) with associated historic photographs and as-built drawings.

Property History and Description

Originally, the historic building was a hall-parlor type single-family dwelling with a side-gabled roof; it was built on a relatively steep slope that was terraced toward the rear of the house (the Woodside Avenue side) to provide a more level building lot. Information from historic photographs, Sanborn maps, and current as-built drawings documents the following:

- The wood-framed and wood-sided house originally faced east, providing a view over Main Street. Physical evidence and the 1889 Sanborn map indicate that it had a small shed-roofed wing on the south end of the rear (west) side but no front porch (see 1889 Sanborn in Figure 1).
- As visible in historic photographs, the principal façade was composed of a central doorway flanked by a window on each side (Figures 2 and 3). Woodside Avenue was present to the west but, in the pedestrian-oriented city of the time, access to the house was also via a footpath leading north from Fourth Street behind the Park Avenue houses, and then a short staircase leading up to the east façade (obscured by houses in the foreground). The orientation of houses along the uphill (west) side of Woodside was uniformly east-facing, while orientations along the downhill (east) side was mixed, with some facing the street and others the canyon.
- By 1900, the original shed-roofed wing had been extended across the rear (west) side (see 1900 Sanborn in Figure 1).
- In 1907, the Sanborn map indicates that a formal front porch was added to the east side, further defining it as the primary façade, at the same time that a secondary entry porch was added to the west side. The house retained this configuration through 1930 (Figure 4; see also Figure 1).
- By 1941, a second shed-roofed addition had been built across the west side, incorporating the 1907 rear screened porch and essentially filling the terrace between the rear wall of the house and the retaining wall so that the eave was nearly at grade (Figure 5; see also Figure 1). The front porch had been removed and asbestos shingles had been applied over the original wood siding by this time (see Figures 1 and 5).
- Asbestos shingle siding was also noted on the 1957 tax appraisal card, which also documents the absence of an east porch (Blaes 2008).
- The 1968 tax appraisal card indicates that a porch had been rebuilt across the east façade (Blaes 2008).
- Between 1978 and 1993, the east façade was modified by the addition of a sunroom across the north two-thirds (which likely was created by enclosing the ca. 1968 front porch), covering the original doorway and north window. The interior floor plan indicates that these historic openings were completely removed or covered at the time. As well, the south window on the east façade was enlarged to accommodate two one-over-one windows (see as-built drawings in DeGray 2016). The asbestos shingles were also removed during this period and replaced with new drop siding; on the west and north elevations this was applied over the original 1 x 12 vertical plank sheathing (Figure 6). It appears that all original windows and doors were replaced as well (DeGray 2016).

- The historic house was extensively rehabilitated and altered in 1993, when the large south addition was built. The south wall of the historic house (between the historic house and the addition) was completely rebuilt and no original materials remain in the east wall. The south addition was enlarged with an east-facing dormer in about 2005 (DeGray 2016).
- Through time, as Woodside Avenue has been paved, improved, and widened with curb, gutter, and sewer, the level of the road has risen higher above the rear (west) wall and terrace of the house at 424 Woodside. The change in width is uncertain, as is the change in historic grade, but it is likely to be a few feet in both cases (Figure 7).

Significance and Integrity

As defined by the National Park Service (1997), a resource may be significant and considered eligible for the NRHP if it:

- is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history (Criterion A); or
- is associated with the lives of persons significant in our past (Criterion B); or
- embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, or represents the work of a master, or possesses high artistic values, or represents a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction (Criterion C); or
- yields, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history (Criterion D).

A resource that meets one or more of these criteria must also be evaluated for integrity of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association. To be eligible for the NRHP, a resource must possess integrity of those elements directly related to the criterion or criteria under which it would be determined eligible.

In order to best preserve its historic resources and character, PCMC includes two types of sites on the HSI: Landmark and Significant. As noted in PCMC's "Design Guidelines for Historic Districts and Historic Sites," which are based closely on National Park Service standards, "Park City's Landmark Sites have structures that possess the highest level of historic integrity" and that meet the NRHP criteria for both significance and integrity. "Significant Sites have structures that retain their essential historical form, meaning that [a building] must retain the physical characteristics that make it identifiable as existing in or relating to an important era in Park City's past" but that it does not retain enough integrity to make it eligible for the NRHP (PCMC 2009:5). However, a Significant Site must still retain one or a few aspects of integrity in order to convey its significance.

The significance and integrity of the property at 424 Woodside have been evaluated four times over the years:

- In 1978, only minor alterations had been made to the property and it was considered "Contributory" to the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) as part of a potential historic district or thematic nomination on the Structure/Site Information Form. In the Statement of Historical Significance it was noted, "This structure is also contributory to the Park City residential district; but in addition helps to illustrate how early housing was constructed to adapt to the steep terrain that exists in the area" (Notarianni 1978).

- In 1984, the property was listed on the NRHP as a contributing eligible resource under the “Residences of Mining Boom Era, Park City – Thematic Nomination” prepared by Roger Roper and Deborah Randall. Significance criteria were not noted, but the property would have been eligible under Criteria A and C.
- In 2008, due to the large south addition and other modifications made to the property, 424 Woodside was recommended ineligible for the NRHP but was listed as a Significant Site at the local level and was included in PCMC’s HSI. The Site Form noted that the building retained integrity in the component aspects of location and workmanship but that integrity had been diminished in the aspects of design, setting, feeling, and association (Blaes 2008).
- In 2015, the property was again noted as ineligible for the NRHP but remained a Significant Site on the HSI (Carmen 2015).

Today the house at 424 Woodside continues to retain integrity in enough aspects to convey its historic significance; applicable aspects include location, setting, workmanship, and design, and these are discussed further below. The National Park Service notes the following:

Location is the place where the historic property was constructed or the place where the historic event occurred. The relationship between the property and its location is often important to understanding why the property was created or why something happened. The actual location of a historic property, complemented by its setting, is particularly important in recapturing the sense of historic events and persons. Except in rare cases, the relationship between a property and its historic associations is destroyed if the property is moved. (National Park Service 1997)

Setting, while highly diminished at 424 Woodside, is an important complement to location and is defined by the NPS as follows:

Setting is the physical environment of a historic property. Whereas location refers to the specific place where a property was built... setting refers to the character of the place in which the property played its historic role. It involves how, not just where, the property is situated and its relationship to surrounding features and open space. (National Park Service 1997)

The house at 424 Woodside remains in its original location and therefore retains that aspect of integrity, including its original orientation to the east and its siting on a small terrace below the street. And although much of the original setting has been lost, including adjacent historic houses, footpaths, staircases, and open space, the house at 424 Woodside retains its relationship to that earlier setting through its orientation and position on a shallow terrace below street level. The property is one of the few reminders of the historic development pattern on a part of the street where much of it has been lost, and is thus important in maintaining a district-wide sense of the historic setting.

Previous evaluations have indicated that the house retains integrity in the component aspect of workmanship:

Workmanship is the physical evidence of the crafts of a particular culture or people during any given period in history or prehistory. It is evidence of artisans’ labor and skill in constructing or altering a building. Workmanship can apply to the property as a whole or to its individual components. It can be expressed in vernacular methods of construction and plain finishes or in highly sophisticated configurations and ornamental detailing. It can be based on common traditions or innovative period techniques. (National Park Service 1997)

However, as noted in the Physical Conditions Report prepared by DeGray (2106), all exterior materials including siding, roofing, windows and doors have been replaced since 1978. Therefore the property lacks integrity in terms of materials, but it does retain sufficient integrity in the aspect of design to reflect its original form.

Design is the combination of elements that create the form, plan, space, structure, and style of a property... Design includes such elements as organization of space, proportion, scale, technology, ornamentation, and materials. (National Park Service 1997)

On the exterior, the house retains much of its original form especially as viewed from Woodside Avenue, including its 28' x 28' footprint (minus the east and south additions), roof form, and fenestration pattern on the north and west walls. And although exterior materials have been replaced, they continue to reflect the simple style of the historic period. Finally, the house's placement on a man-made terrace below street level and with the primary façade facing east is another important aspect of property design.

In summary the house at 424 Woodside retains integrity in the component aspect of location, as well as diminished but significant integrity in the aspects of setting and design. Because the property has already been so altered, it will be critical to preserve these aspects if 424 Woodside is to remain a Significant Site on the HSI and a contributing resource in the historic district.

Application of Land Management Code and Historic District Design Guidelines

Park City's historic preservation ordinances are contained in Chapter 15-11 of the Land Management Code (LMC); the criteria for relocating and/or reorienting historic buildings on existing Landmark and Significant Sites are contained in Section 13. Pertinent sections of Chapter 15-11-13 are excerpted here (in italics) and discussed in relation to the property at 424 Woodside (in regular font).

1. **CRITERIA FOR THE RELOCATION AND/OR REORIENTATION OF THE HISTORIC BUILDING(S) AND/OR STRUCTURE(S) ON ITS EXISTING LANDMARK OR SIGNIFICANT SITE.** *In approving a Historic District or Historic Site design review Application involving relocation and/or reorientation of the Historic Building(s) and/or Structure(s) on a Landmark Site or a Significant Site, the Historic Preservation Board shall find the project complies with the following criteria.*
 - ~~1. For either a Landmark or Significant Site all the following shall be met:~~
 - ~~1. A licensed structural engineer has certified that the Historic Building(s) and/or Structure(s) can successfully be relocated and the applicant has demonstrated that a professional building mover will move the building and protect it while being stored; and~~
 - ~~2. The proposed relocation will not have a detrimental effect on the structural soundness of the building or structure;~~
 - ~~2. Landmark structures shall only be permitted to be relocated on its existing site if:~~
 - ~~1. the relocation will abate demolition; or~~
 - ~~2. the Planning Director and Chief Building Official find that the relocation will abate a hazardous condition at the present setting and enhance the preservation of the structure.~~
 3. For Significant sites, at least one of the following shall be met:
 1. The proposed relocation and/or reorientation will abate demolition of the Historic Building(s) and/or Structure(s) on the Site; or

- ~~2. The Planning Director and Chief Building Official determine that the building is threatened in its present setting because of hazardous conditions and the preservation of the building will be enhanced by relocating it; or~~
3. The Historic Preservation Board, with input from the Planning Director and the Chief Building Official, determines that unique conditions warrant the proposed relocation and/or reorientation on the existing Site. Unique conditions shall include all of the following:
 1. The historic context of the Historic Building(s) and/or Structure(s) has been so radically altered that the proposed relocation will enhance the ability to interpret the historic character of the Historic Building(s) and/or Structure(s) and the Historic District or its present setting;

The historic context of 424 Woodside has been radically altered through the construction of additions to the historic house and associated development of non-historic residential infill along the street and on surrounding lots. However, reorienting the building will destroy its remaining integrity, which lies solely in the aspects of location, setting, and design. Reorientation will render the property incapable of conveying its significance in the history of Park City and make it impossible to interpret its historic character.

2. The proposed relocation will not diminish the overall physical integrity of the Historic District or diminish the historical associations used to define the boundaries of the district;

The proposed reorientation of the house at 424 Woodside will result in a loss of integrity and significance to the extent that the property is no longer eligible as a Significant Site. Therefore its reorientation will diminish the overall physical integrity of the Historic District because this will result in the loss of a contributing Significant Site. The historical associations used to define the boundaries of the district, which are formed by the integrity of the component Landmark and Significant Sites, will also be diminished by the loss of this contributing property.

3. The historical integrity and significance of the Historic Building(s) and/or Structure(s) will not be diminished by relocation and/or reorientation;

As discussed in the "Significance and Integrity" section above, the remaining integrity of this property lies solely in the aspects of location, setting, and design. Reorientation will diminish integrity to such an extent that the property will no longer convey any historic significance.

4. The potential to preserve the Historic Building(s) and/or Structure(s) will be enhanced by its relocation.

The historic house at 424 Woodside is not currently threatened by demolition and its *in situ* preservation can be enhanced through existing and less detrimental means outlined in the LMC and the Historic District

Design Guidelines, which are incorporated into the code by reference (see below).

Conclusions and Recommendations

The reorientation of the historic house at 424 Woodside Avenue will have a significant effect on its integrity, which has already been compromised by an addition and alterations on the east side and the large addition on the south side. In fact reorientation will diminish integrity to the degree that the property can no longer be considered a Significant Site as defined in PCMC's LMC and Design Guidelines.

An option consistent with PCMC's LMC and Historic District Design Guidelines would be to raise the house two feet while maintaining its original orientation (see Section B.3. Foundations). This will allow for the addition of a modern foundation, promote material preservation of the house, and improve visibility from Woodside, thereby counteracting the adverse effects of the raised and widened roadbed to a significant degree. Raising the historic house two feet is also encouraged because it will improve the relationship with the south addition by making the historic house less visually and physically subordinate and increasing general compatibility, as discussed in Section D (Additions to Historic Structures) of the Design Guidelines.

References

Blaes, Dina

2008 Historic Site Form – Historic Sites Inventory form for 424 Woodside Avenue, Park City, Summit County, Utah. On file at Planning Department, Park City Municipal Corporation, Park City, Utah.

Carmen, Daniel

2015 Historic Site Form for William T. Backus House, 424 Woodside Avenue, Park City, Summit County, Utah. Utah State Historic Preservation Office, Salt Lake City.

DeGray, Jonathan

2016 Historic District/Site Design Review Application No. PL-16-03379 (November 16, 2016). Includes Historic Preservation Plan and Physical Conditions Report. On file at Planning Department, Park City Municipal Corporation, Park City, Utah.

2017a 424 Woodside, Historic Site Analysis. Letter to Bruce Erickson, Planning Director, and Hannah Tyler, Planner, 19 May 2017. On file at Planning Department, Park City Municipal Corporation, Park City, Utah.

2017b Berkley Residence – HDDR Set. Plans for remodel and addition at 424 Woodside Avenue, Park City, Utah, 15 February 2017. On file at Planning Department, Park City Municipal Corporation, Park City, Utah.

National Park Service

1997 National Register Bulletin: How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation. U.S. Department of the Interior, Washington, DC.

Notarianni, Philip F.

1978 Utah State Historical Society Structure/Site Information form for 424 Woodside Ave., Park City, Utah. Utah State Historic Preservation Office, Salt Lake City, Utah.

Park City Municipal Corporation

2009 Design Guidelines for Historic Districts and Historic Sites. On file at Planning Department, Park City Municipal Corporation, Park City, Utah.







Figure 1. Sanborn Fire Insurance maps showing property at 424 Woodside 1889-1941 (from Carmen 2015).



Figure 2. View of property at 424 Woodside ca. 1905-1907, facing west-northwest. Note retention of simple hall-parlor form and continued absence of front porch on east side. Photograph no. 1985-6-001.



Figure 3. View of property at 424 Woodside in 1907, facing west-northwest. Note simple hall-parlor form, east-facing aspect with a view across canyon, and access via a footpath leading north from Fourth Street behind the Park Avenue houses. Note the absence of a front porch on east side, although according to the 1907 Sanborn map a porch was added in this year. Also note the mix of house orientations along the downhill (east) side of Woodside, with some facing the street and others the canyon. Photograph provided by Jonathan DeGray.



Figure 4. View of property at 424 Woodside in 1930, facing northwest. Note the retention of the simple hall-parlor form and addition of hip-roofed front porch, which was removed by 1941 according to the Sanborn map. Photograph no. 1987-2-134.



Figure 5. Tax appraisal photograph of property at 424 Woodside dating to ca. 1941, facing southeast.



Figure 6. North and west sides of historic house at 424 Woodside, facing east-southeast, 2015.



Figure 7. West side of historic house at 424 Woodside, facing south, 2015. South addition dating to 1993 is visible at upper left.

EXHIBIT L
Public Comment

424 WOODSIDE - HISTORIC PRESERVATION PLAN - COMMENTS

Site Design

"The existing historic form is oriented so that the front of the building faces the back yard, or rear of the site."

(Comment # 1.) *It would be difficult to define which elevation of this particular historic structure is actually the 'front'. In the PHYSICAL CONDITIONS REPORT the north elevation is indicated as the Primary Façade, probably because the primary entrance is located on the north elevation. It could be concluded that from 1889 to 1900 (and possibly to 1907) the location of the primary entrance would have had to be on the west 'end' of the structure, similar to where it is now, because of its relationship to grade. If there was an entrance on the east 'end' of the structure during these years it would have been indicated on the Sanborn maps because it would have had to be above grade. It would be difficult to assume that the only entrance to the structure would be defined as the 'back door'. The primary entrance would define the front of structure. To say that the structure is oriented to the 'back yard' is not necessarily accurate; homes on the hillsides (in particular, as opposed to areas of less steep terrain) were predominately oriented toward Town. Even structures on the uphill side of Woodside were oriented similarly: the uphill homes were oriented toward 'Town' and not necessarily toward the street, or Woodside Avenue.*

HDDG - SPECIFIC GUIDELINES

A. SITE DESIGN

A.1.2 Preserve the original location of the main entry, if extant.

A.1.3 Maintain the original path or steps leading to the main entry, if extant.

"The historic form is a full story below the street level of Woodside Avenue so the only thing visible of the historic form from the street is the metal roof. This condition along with the scale of the addition to the south places the historic form in a hole."

(Comment # 2.) *There are still several historic structures on Upper Woodside that are below street level: 664 Woodside is close to a story and a half below street level "in a hole", 564 Woodside is about 2/3 of a story below street level, 332 Woodside is far below the connecting street-level garage and the adjacent homes, 316 Woodside is well below street level looking down on the roof, 232 Woodside has a second-story gable to almost to street level, but the front entrance is at least a story below street level and is not facing the street. The 1978 Utah State Historical Society Structure/Site Information Form states about 424 Woodside, "This structure . . . helps to illustrate how early housing was constructed to adapt to the steep terrain that exists in the area." Development on particularly steep slopes in Old Town was quite different from the development on the relatively flat areas especially on the downhill side of streets. This difference on the downhill side of a street manifested in irregular access (entrances) to structures, unique and irregular relationships of structures to streets, irregular rhythm of streetscape, unique front yard setbacks. More examples of these downhill very steep-slope-development characteristics, like looking down onto the roofs (at times not being able to see any of the structure façades at all) can be seen on Ontario Avenue (317, 323, 341, 413, 417).*

Addressing the relationship of the current addition (garage and duplex) to the south of the 424 Woodside historic structure, this 'high/low' relationship can be compared to a somewhat similar historic juxtaposition of 424 Woodside to an adjoining garage. In 1957, a 10' x 18' garage was listed on the 424 Woodside tax card valued at \$37 (the house was valued at \$1,917) and was assigned an age of 26 years (The garage does not appear on the 1941 Sanborn map so perhaps the garage was closer to 16 years old in 1957.). This simple single-walled gabled garage can be seen in the 1977 Utah State Historic Society photo where it sits, in order to be accessible at street level, a floor higher and proud toward the street by about 14' from, and attached to, the historic home. This historic notable shift in height from one structure to another is another example of the irregular rhythm unique to the historic steep-slope development in Old Town. When walking north downhill on Woodside in the 40s, the street-level garage would obscure the view of (or 'hide') the 424 Woodside home more than the current garage-duplex addition does when walking down Woodside today.

HDDG - SPECIFIC GUIDELINES

B. PRIMARY STRUCTURES

B.3 Foundations

B.3.2 The original placement, orientation, and grade of the historic building should be retained.

"Per the Site Inventory 424 Woodside Ave. has been extensively modified creating a situation where the historic form is dwarfed by surrounding structures and is a full level below street level."

(Comment # 3.) *This reference to the HISTORIC SITE FORM is somewhat misleading and definitely out of context. The HISTORIC SITE FORM does state that the historic structure has been modified significantly (not "extensively"), but goes on to qualify this statement saying "The changes to the original house are minor but the construction of such a large side addition diminishes the site's original character." It can be argued that historic character of the site, not the historic character of the structure, has been diminished (but not lost). The HISTORIC SITE FORM goes on to say "the physical evidence from the period that defines this as a typical Park City mining-era house . . . remain on original part of the house."*

As to the historic form being "dwarfed" by surrounding structures, see the above comments with regard to the south addition and with regard to unique conditions of historic development on particularly steep hillsides and the resulting historic 'high-and-low rhythm' of these streetscapes in Old Town. The current below-street position of 424 Woodside explicitly conveys the historic character of Old Town living on the steep hillside regardless of the large structure to the north.

"By raising and rotating the historic form we will establish it as a visually prominent element along the street. The proposed addition, located below the historic form, will not be visible from the street. The proposed changes outlined here are all intended to improve the appearance of the historic form and reestablish its presence along Woodside Avenue making it once again a valuable asset to the district for years to come."


(Comment # 4.) *The "historic form", as it is currently situated in its historic location, historic orientation, and historic relationship to (a story below) Woodside Avenue is astonishingly "a visually prominent element along the street" (A rare day passes that a pedestrian -- tourist, skier just off the mountain -- does not hesitate at 424 Woodside to photograph the structure.). There are less invasive*

*measures than "raising [to the proposed 9'] and rotating the historic form" that could **better** "improve the appearance of the historic form" (Raising the structure the recommended 2' -- in its historic location and orientation -- would "improve the appearance of the historic form"). The "presence [of historic 424 Woodside] along Woodside Avenue" does not need to be "reestablished" because its presence has, in fact, been solidly established since 1889. 424 Woodside does not need to be made "once again a valuable asset to the district" because the historic structure, as it currently stands, strongly relays historic life on a steep hillside of a booming mining town.*

Structural

"It is our intention to strip the existing historic form building down, removing all the contemporary material and then see what we have. We anticipate not finding any historic material other than 1 x 12 exterior wall sheathing attached to new stud walls. If this is the case we would propose to proceed as follows."

(Comment # 5.) *See 'PHYSICAL CONDITIONS REPORT, 2016 (2011) COMMENTS' for analysis of existing historic material. Considering that the 1889 single cell roof form still exists entirely and unaltered, the 1889 single cell form still exists with no changes to the north façade other than superficial, minimal changes to the 1889 west façade (inside the newer west façade), some removal of the 1889 east façade, and with the possibility that south-façade historic material may still exist as a portion of the wall between the historic structure and the new addition (After soliciting the opinion of two local historic-preservation experienced contractors and one local project manager with prolific similar experience, the consensus is that south façade historic material probably still exists between the historic structure and the addition.), there may be a considerable amount of extant historic material. See the two images below that exhibit the current presence of the 1889 single cell form and the possibility of currently existing historic material.*





"1. Panelize the exterior north and east walls."

(Comment # 6.) *Should the north wall be panelized, the historic form, the history material, and the historic character of the north façade can be saved only if it is replaced in its original location. If the north wall is reoriented 180 degrees, the wall, the form, the historic window placement, and the historic material will be completely lost; the panelized north façade would be discarded because it would be redundant as a south wall between the historic structure and the addition.*

The minimal historic material of the east façade (partially enclosed in a circa 1991 enclosure and then removed to create interior space) need not be saved if the structure is not reoriented 180 degrees and the new construction is added to the east elevation. However, the extant 1889 exterior west façade (enclosed within the newer west façade) historic material and structure could be panelized and saved; if the structure is reoriented 180 degrees this 1889 west façade wall and historic material will be lost.

HDDG - SPECIFIC GUIDELINES

B. PRIMARY STRUCTURES

B.2 Exterior Walls

B.2.1 Primary and secondary façade components, such as window/door configuration, wall planes, steps, porches, and entryways should be maintained in their original location on the façade.

"2. Change the orientation of the building so that it faces Woodside Avenue and is raised to the street level, 9' from its existing location, so the front of the historic building faces the street, not the back yard."

(Comment # 7.) *Raising the structure 9' to the street level would be historically inaccurate in the context of the unique character (streetscape rhythm, front yard setback, orientation to town) of residential structures on very steep hillsides on the downhill side of Old Town streets. The level at which the historic structure sits now gives it an expressly historically accurate prominence from the street. Raising the structure 2' would give the structure a 'boost' of presence and removing the 1929 to 1941 west façade enclosure would reduce the mass of the west-running shed roof to give the prominently-seen-from-the-street roof a more pleasing, yet historically accurate, proportion. Reorienting the historic form would be inconsistent with the predominately Town-oriented nature of residential structures on very steep hillside sites on the downhill side of the streets.*

HDDG - SPECIFIC GUIDELINES

B. PRIMARY STRUCTURES

B.3 Foundations

B.3.1 A new foundation should not raise the historic structure generally more than two (2) feet from its original floor elevation.

"4. Through the renovation and addition of this residence we will:

b. Re-orient the building so the front faces the street and is elevated to have a relationship to the street that is currently not present. The structure reoriented to have a porch."

(Comment # 8.) *The structure should not be changed to the point that it has a relationship to the street that it never had in history and that most structures on very steep downhill-from-the-street sites did not have historically. Historic structures on steep downhill lots were predominately oriented to Town, not to the street. A (possible) porch on the east façade that looks (on Sanborn maps) as though it existed for sometime between 21 to 41 years (appearing on the 1907 Sanborn map but not on the 1900 Sanborn map, still showing on the 1929 map but not on the 1941 map) was not a front entrance, not a primary entrance, and therefore not a front porch because the structure was without the porch for at least as many or perhaps more years (38 to 48 years) than it was with the porch (the east elevation porch was not present from 1889 through 1900 possibly up to 1907 and not present in 1941 and possibly any time after 1929). A 'front porch' would be a front entrance or primary entrance to the structure and would be significant and critical to the function of the structure. The lack of a porch on the east façade of the structure for so many years shows that it was at most a secondary but evidently a non-essential entrance, and not an entrance at all when there was no porch because the living level was too far from grade on the east elevation oriented toward Town. Historically, the structure had only a 6' by 8' front porch on the north end of the west façade so should have no more than the same location and dimensions for a primary entrance porch when the structure is renovated.*

HDDG - SPECIFIC GUIDELINES

A. SITE DESIGN

A.4.1 Maintain historic hillside steps that may be an integral part of the landscape.

Roof

"The roof will be rebuilt to meet the structural requirements of code and retain the historic form and appearance."

(Comment # 9.) *The current design proposal shows the historic roof form altered to the point where it barely resembles the historic roof form as it exists now and has existed for 127 years.*

HDDG - SPECIFIC GUIDELINES

B. PRIMARY STRUCTURES

B.1 Roofs

B.1.1 Maintain the original roof form.

Exterior Walls

"8. Through the renovation and addition of this residence we will:

e. Replace the non-historic windows with period correct units Replace/repair siding"

(Comment # 10.) *Reorienting the structure 180 degrees would eliminate any possibility of preserving the structure's only remaining original, historically placed window openings on the north façade that is viewable from the street. It would also result in a loss all historic material except the small portion of east elevation wall, a wall that shows no evidence of historic window placement.*

HDDG - UNIVERSAL GUIDELINES

3. The exterior features of a building should be retained and preserved.

Porches

"The front porch, currently facing the rear of the site, has been walled in to create more interior living space. We would propose to bring the porch back to its historic appearance and use."

(Comment # 11.) *The porch that now exists on the east façade first appeared sometime after 1978 so is not historic. There must be documented evidence in order to 'bring back' a historic element to a structure. There is no evidence of window or door placement to recreate "its historical appearance". The only possible historic use would be as a secondary entrance, not a primary or front entrance.*

HDDG - UNIVERSAL GUIDELINES

4. Physical or photographic evidence should be used to substantiate the reproduction of missing features.

Doors

"All historic doors have been replaced, see physical condition report. All new doors will be historic in appearance."

(Comment # 12.) *The interior west façade (the 1889 west façade) has a door that appears to be historic in proportion. This door (opening) could have been the original entrance to the structure and could be preserved and used as it was historically.*

HDDG - SPECIFIC GUIDELINES

B. PRIMARY STRUCTURES

B.4. Doors

B.4.1 Maintain historic door openings.

Windows

All historic windows have been replaced, see physical condition report. All new windows will be historic in appearance.

(Comment # 13.) *The historically located, proportioned, and oriented window openings on the north façade should be maintained.*

HDDG - SPECIFIC GUIDELINES

B. PRIMARY STRUCTURES

B.4. Windows

B.4.1 Maintain historic window openings.

Ruth Meintsma
305 Woodside Avenue
Park City 84060
ruthworldwide@gmail.com

424 WOODSIDE - UNIQUE CONDITIONS FOR REORIENTATION COMMENTS

November 7, 2016

Per the Preservation Plan we are proposing to disassemble and reorient 424 Woodside. Per 15-11-13 (A) we are requesting approval to reorient the home. We are proposing this base on the information in the Preservation Plan and the following:

1. The building has been significantly altered over the years and **little historic material remains.**

See: [424 WOODSIDE - HISTORIC PRESERVATION PLAN - COMMENTS](#)
[424 Woodside HDDR.COMMENTS.Physical Conditions Report 2011, 2016](#)
[424 Woodside TIMELINE](#)

2. As part of the 1993 addition work the floor and **roof systems of the existing historic form have been rebuilt.**

See: [424 WOODSIDE - HISTORIC PRESERVATION PLAN - COMMENTS](#)
[424 Woodside HDDR.COMMENTS.Physical Conditions Report 2011, 2016](#)
[424 Woodside TIMELINE](#)

3. The **existing home faces the rear yard.**

See: [424 WOODSIDE - HISTORIC PRESERVATION PLAN - COMMENTS](#)

4. The existing home is 11' below the existing street elevation of Woodside Avenue

See: [424 WOODSIDE - HISTORIC PRESERVATION PLAN - COMMENTS](#)

5. The **historic form is surrounded by larger homes that dwarf the historic form.**

See: [424 WOODSIDE - HISTORIC PRESERVATION PLAN - COMMENTS](#)

6. By **raising and rotating the historic form the building will be raised up out of the hole it is in and will face Woodside.** This will provide for a greatly **improved presence on the street and fit in to the existing rhythm of buildings along Woodside Avenue.**

See: [424 WOODSIDE - HISTORIC PRESERVATION PLAN - COMMENTS](#)

7. Due to the **constraints of the site**, the desire to lift the home and rotate the home, and **the limited historic material** present on the existing home, the only feasible method to accomplish the reorientation is to disassemble the building. Lifting the building as a single element is not possible.

There are no unique constraints associated with this site:

The site consists of three Old Town lots (75' x 75') allowing a larger area to accomplish creative design for two residences. The historic structure is on a zero lot line front yard and a reduced side yard setback by 3' allowing a larger area for the Building Pad.

The steep sloped lot is similar to or less steep than many steep sloped lots in Old Town. The historic structure still retains a notable amount of historic material.

Per LMC 15-11-13, (A), (3), There are **unique conditions** associated to this property; the fact that **the home faces the rear yard** and is **not visible from Woodside Avenue**, the fact that **the home is 11' below the existing street level**, and the fact that the building has been remodeled and improved to the extent that **little historic material is present**. These facts add up to a unique condition that could be vastly improved with the implementation of the proposed Preservation Plan and reorientation of the building.

The home faces, or is oriented toward Town, which is a common characteristic of historic structures on steep sloped hillside sites downhill from the street. ***This is not a unique condition.***

The home ***is*** visible from Woodside Avenue. It is visible enough to draw the attention of pedestrians, skiers coming off the mountain, bikers, and tourists who pause to photograph the structure. The historic structure is visible in a way different from contemporary infill structures therefore providing an anchor for historic character in the neighborhood. The roof, obviously historic, is a primary feature that speaks to the historic character of life in a turn-of-the-century mountainside boomtown. The north façade is also visible from the street and conveys the simple vernacular form that was typical to the mining era. There are several steep slope downhill-from-the-street historic structures on Upper Woodside that have similar visibility from the street and more historic structures in the steep slope areas of Old Town that are less visible (a few structures where only the roofs, no façades, are visible) from the street. ***This is not a unique condition.*** The visibility of 424 Woodside could be augmented by raising the structure 2' and by removing the later (1941 Sanborn, not 1929 Sanborn) west (Woodside façade) elevation to reveal the 1889 west façade, thereby reducing the mass of the west-running shed roof and increasing the height and therefore the presence of the west façade.

There are many homes in the steep sloped areas of Old Town, and several on Upper Woodside, that sit below (some less than 11', some much more than 11') street level where the roof is a primary visible element. ***This is not a unique condition.***

There is enough historic material remaining to justify the effort to preserve the historic material that still exists. ***This is not a unique condition.***

Allowing this 424 Woodside structure to be reoriented, to be relocated as a result of the reorientation, and to be raised more than 2' would set a precedent for the many other historic structures that have similar site and structure conditions, possibly creating a run on moving all the randomly Town-oriented and hillside-situation historic structures to be turned and lifted to the street and as a result erasing the distinct historic character that these hillside structures now possess.

Ruth Meintsma
305 Woodside Avenue
Park City 84060
ruthworldwide@gmail.com

PHYSICAL CONDITIONS REPORT, 2016 (2011)
COMMENTS

-----**2. Structure, 2016**
(MAIN BUILDING, 2011)

(B.9. ADDITIONS, 2011) - The REPORT is inaccurate in stating there were "No changes were made through 1941; a large addition was removed from the east elevation and an enclosure was added to the west elevation between 1929 and 1941. (see: 424 Woodside Avenue TIMELINE for detailed information of additions and removal of additions to the single cell form from 1889 to 1993)

-----**3. Roof, 2016**

(B.1. ROOF, 2011) - The REPORT description of the original simple gable (probably built in 1889 according to the 1889 Sanborn map, not about 1900 as stated in the REPORT) states that the roof still consists of historic 1" x 8" skip plank over 2" x 4", 24" on center truss, and wood shake material.

The REPORT also states that 2.5:12 shed roof running west off the main gable was updated after 1978 with metal roofing over 5/8" plywood decking over 2" x 12", 24" on-center joists.

The roof was actually updated ten years after 1978. A 1989 HISTORIC MATCHING GRANT APPLICATION shows that a new metal roof was applied to the structure at the end of that year, and while there are no 2" x 12" joists in the materials list or in the work description for the roof there is a description of how bent rafters were straightened in the process of re-roofing.

When the structure was being re-roof in 1989, the description of any work and materials needed for replacing or reinforcing old roof rafters with new 2" x 12" joists on the west-running shed roof probably would have been included in the application because the structure was being re-roofed with matching funds. And there would have been no need for bent rafters to be straightened if new 2" x 12" joists were used for roof support. Also, the REPORT states that the new roof decking is 5/8" thick, where a low-sloped roof that requires strength for a heavy snow load would usually require a thicker 3/4" plywood decking. Therefore, there may still be some historic material in the west-running shed roof as well as the main gable. There could possibly be some historic rafters and some 1" x 8" planks (additional load support to the 5/8" decking).

The roof description does not include the fact that the 4:12 east-running shed roof covers only the north half of the east façade.

-----**5. Exterior Walls 2016**

(B.2. EXTERIOR WALL - PRIMARY FAÇADE, 2011) - The north elevation is the primary façade, is un-altered from the historic form, and according to the REPORT is composed of historic 1" x 12" vertical planks on 2" x 4" studs at 24" on center.

The REPORT has no description of the number, location, and orientation of the historic window placement on the historic north façade. The 1977, UTAH STATE HISTORICAL SOCIETY photo shows the two vertically oriented windows in the same locations of the current window locations, and states under 5. ARCHITECTURE that "Window placements appear to have changed little. The 1993 HISTORIC DISTRICT REVIEW states under IV. COMPLIANCE WITH DESIGN GUIDELINES that "The project demonstrates substantial compliance with the following guidelines: 52. Avoid Changing the Position of the Windows". The small square window at the top of the gable is not historic (see: 1977, UTAH STATE HISTORICAL SOCIETY photo).

The REPORT has no description of the door (historic material or historic-sized opening?) on the north elevation portion of the screened-in porch.

(B.3. EXTERIOR WALL - SECONDARY FAÇADE 1, 2011) - The REPORT states that the west (Woodside façade) elevation is composed of historic 1" x 12" vertical planks on 2" x 4" studs at 24" on center.

The south 20' of the west (Woodside façade) elevation was roofed (6-foot extension of the west-running shed roof) and enclosed between 1929 and 1941 (SANBORN MAPS). The 1977, UTAH STATE HISTORICAL SOCIETY photo shows the screened-in 6' x 8' porch on the north end of the west elevation. The 1989 HISTORIC MATCHING GRANT APPLICATION show an image where the 6' x 8' porch is still screened-in and not yet 'windowed'. The interior west wall, 6' east from and parallel to the exterior west Woodside façade elevation, may still be composed of the historic 1989-1900 material that was the exterior west façade before enclosed between 1929 and 1941.

The REPORT has no description of the number, location, and orientation of any historic window placement on the west elevation façade. It appears that the screened-in portion of the 6' x 8' porch on the north end has been replaced with small square windows since 1977 and the other small windows may have no historic significance.

(B.4. EXTERIOR WALL - SECONDARY FAÇADE 2, 2011) - The south elevation of the historic structure has either been eliminated or enclosed inside the new addition. There is no information in the REPORT as to whether the historic south-elevation wall or any south-elevation wall historic material still exists.

(B.5. EXTERIOR WALL - REAR FAÇADE, 2011) - The REPORT does not mention that the historic east (Town façade) elevation still exists as it did in 1889 on the south third of the east elevation. Historic material may still exist on this portion of the east elevation.

The REPORT also does not mention that the double-wide, double-hung vertically-oriented window on this historic portion of the east elevation may not be historic in size or placement. A photo of the east elevation in the 1989 HISTORIC MATCHING GRANT APPLICATION shows a contemporary, non-vertically oriented window in a similar location.

The enclosed shed-roof extension on the north two-thirds of the east elevation allowed for the removal of that section of the 1889 east (Town façade) elevation.

-----7. Porches, 2016

(B.7. PORCHES, 2011) - The REPORT states that the rear porch on the east (Town façade) elevation was *enclosed* after 1978, when actually an open, covered porch was added after 1977 (see: 1977, UTAH STATE HISTORICAL SOCIETY photo) and was enclosed in 1991 (see: 1989, HISTORIC MATCHING GRANT APPLICATION photo, and Building Permit Number 5683 for porch enclosure 3/12/91).

(B.9. ADDITIONS, 2011) - The REPORT is inaccurate in stating there were "No changes were made through 1941; a large addition was removed from the east elevation and an enclosure was added to the west elevation between 1929 and 1941. (see: 424 Woodside Avenue TIMELINE for detailed information of additions and removal of additions to the single cell form from 1889 to 1993)

(MAIN BUILDING – DETAILS, 2011)

-----9. Door Survey, 2016

(C.2. DOORS, 2011) - The REPORT does not mention exterior historic door placement or dimensions. The door at the north elevation porch entrance may be of historic placement and dimensions and the interior (exterior historically) west elevation entrance door may also be of historic placement and dimension.

-----10. Window Survey, 2016

(C.1. WINDOWS, 2011) - The REPORT states that no historic windows remain, but historic window placement, historic dimensions and orientation, historic configuration of panes, and types evidence is still extant, relevant, and should be included (see: **B. EXTERIOR WALLS** comments on this document).

424 Woodside SANBORN HISTORY

KEY



historic single cell form



enclosed space




open porch




enclosed addition to *single cell*


1889




1900




1900




1907




1907




1929



1929



1941



424 Woodside Avenue TIMELINE

1889 SANBORN

- *Single cell form*, one story, wood-shingle roof, PLUS
 - *enclosed extension* on south half of west (Woodside façade) elevation

1890s (early) Utah State Historical Society, Site Information Form

- owned by C. W. Allen

1896 - Utah State Historical Society, Site Information Form

- sold to Chesley C. Barker, engineer for Daly-West Mine for more than twenty-five years, versed in mine hoists and pumps, member of the Park City lodge Knight of Pythias

1900 SANBORN

- *1889 Single cell form*, one story, wood-shingle roof
 - **REMOVED**, *enclosed extension* on south half of west (Woodside façade) elevation (NOTE: west, street property line moved east, closer to structure)

1900s - Utah State Historical Society, Site Information Form

- sold to William T. Backus

1907 SANBORN

- *1889 Single cell form*, one story, wood-shingle roof, PLUS
 - **ADDED**, *open porch* on north two-fifths (2/5) of west (Woodside façade) elevation
 - **ADDED**, *open porch* on full width of east (Town façade) elevation

1914 - Utah State Historical Society, Site Information Form

- sold to Frasier Buck (of 'Welsh, Driscoll and Buck'), local author

1916 - Utah State Historical Society, Site Information Form

- sold to Erick Anderson

1929 SANBORN

- 1889 *Single cell form*, one story, wood-shingle roof, PLUS
 - 1907 west (Woodside façade) elevation *open porch*
 - 1907 east (Town façade) elevation *open porch*

1941 SANBORN

- 1889 *Single cell form*, one story, **composition roof**, PLUS
 - *enclosed extension ADDED* to south two-fifths (2/5) of west (Woodside façade) elevation
 - 1907 west (Woodside façade) elevation *open porch*
 - **REMOVED**, 1907 east (Town façade) elevation *open porch*

1957 TAX CARD

- 1889 *Single cell form* (measuring 22' x 28') with 1941 SANBORN 6' x 20' enclosed extension on west elevation (736 total sq. ft.)
- TAX VALUE of \$48 given to "Porch - Front 48" sq. ft. (6' x 8') on west elevation (NO porch value on east elevation)
- TAX VALUE of \$37 given to "Garage, Single-car, Wood floor, single gable roof, Doors one (1), 10' x 18', Age: 26 (1931)"
- TAX VALUE of \$50 given to "Cellar with concrete floor"

1958 - 1962 TAX CARD

- TAX VALUE of \$37 given to Garage

1968 TAX CARD

- TAX VALUE of \$48 given to "Porch - Front 48" sq. ft., (6' x 8') on west elevation
- East elevation porch roughly drawn in (different ink color) on footprint grid page - NO value given or description included regarding porch on east elevation.

1977 PHOTO

- west (Woodside façade) elevation screened porch
- no east (Town façade) elevation porch

1978 UTAH STATE HISTORICAL SOCIETY - STRUCTURE/SITE INFORMATION FORM

- "2. Building Condition: Good"
- "2. Integrity: Minor Alterations"
- "5. Description of physical appearance & significant architectural features: Window placements appear to have changed little."
- "6. Statement of Historical Significance: This structure... helps to illustrate how early housing was constructed to adapt to the steep terrain that exists in the area."

1989 HISTORIC GRANT APPLICATION - MATCHING FUNDS - BUILDING PERMIT NUMBER 4344, 6/30/89

- exterior **re-sided** with wood lap siding, metal chimney removed, siding trimmed along eaves, eaves boxed, cornice moulding installed, fascia replaced, porch ceiling sheeted, underside of porch closed in with same siding as house, replace edge boards and window trim
- east window restored to vertical emphasis with double-wide double hung sash, two (2) south windows restored to vertical emphasis with double hung sash, two (2) north windows **original single-wide vertical** replaced with new double hung sash
- structure re-roofed with metal roofing, bent rafters straightened
- steps to street repaired
- electrical wiring and fixtures replaced
- exterior re-painted

1991 BUILDING PERMIT NUMBER 5683, 3/12/91

- porch enclosure

1993 ADDITION TO HISTORIC STRUCTURE

HISTORIC DISTRICT REVIEW / HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION (6 JULY 1993)

I. PROJECT STATISTICS

Project Name: 424 Woodside addition
Proposal: Addition to historic house

II. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

The structure is orientated with the front away from the street, overlooking Old Town.

III. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The architect) has stepped the connection between the two houses so that there are breaks in the roof and wall planes to visually separate the historic from the new.

IV. COMPLIANCE WITH DESIGN GUIDELINES

The project demonstrates substantial compliance with the following guidelines:

- 50. Maintain Front Porch (6' x 8' *entry porch*) as an Important Façade Element.
- 51. Preserve the Original Shape of the Roof
- 52. Avoid Changing the Position of the Windows.
- 53. Maintain Original Window Proportions
- 34. Maintain the Original Position of Main Entrance.

V. STAFF ANALYSIS

ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT OF A CONNECTED ADDITION. There are several valid arguments in favor of the addition as proposed. The roof (*of the historic house*) is the prominent elevation when viewed from Woodside Avenue. The visual impact to the house from off-site would therefore be minimal compared with other cases.

2007 HISTORIC SITE FORM

- "Additions: major"
- "Alterations: minor"
- "General Condition of Exterior Materials: Good (Well maintained with no serious problems apparent.) of Good, Fair, Poor, Ruin"
- "Essential Historical Form: Retains"
- "Location: Original Location"
- "Design: 1978 Structure/Site form indicates possible minor additions to the original house. The changes to the original house are minor but the construction of such a large side addition diminishes the site's original character."
- "Workmanship: Though the physical evidence from the period defines this as a typical Park City mining era house--the simple methods of construction, the use of non-beveled (drop-novelty) wood siding, the plan type, the simple roof form, the restrained ornamentation, and the plain finishes -- remain on the original part of the house."