



**PARK CITY MUNICIPAL CORPORATION
HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD
MINUTES OF JUNE 2, 2021**

BOARD MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE: Chair Randy Scott, Puggy Holmgren, Jack Hodgkins, John Hutchings, Douglas Stephens, Tana Toly

EX OFFICIO MEMBERS: Gretchen Milliken, Planning Director; Rebecca Ward, City Planner; Brendan Conboy, City Planner; Aiden Lillie, City Planner; Mark Harrington, City Attorney; Jessica Nelson, Planning Analyst

The Historic Preservation Board meeting was conducted virtually via Zoom.

The public was able to submit eComments during the meeting.

The Board Chair has determined that conducting a meeting with an anchor location presents a substantial risk to the health and safety of those who may be present at the anchor location. This determination is based on the ongoing risks and infection rates statewide and in Summit County. For these reasons, this meeting will be an electronic meeting without an anchor location.

The Historic Preservation Board Members will connect electronically. Public comments will be accepted virtually as described. To comment virtually, raise your hand on Zoom. Written comments submitted before or during the meeting will be entered into the public record but not read aloud. For more information on participating virtually and to listen live, please go to www.parkcity.org/public-meetings

Dated June 2, 2021.

1. ROLL CALL

Chair Scott called the meeting to order at 5:10 p.m. and conducted a roll call. Chair Scott noted that there was a quorum.

2. MINUTES APPROVAL

A. Consideration to Approve the Historic Preservation Board Meeting Minutes from May 5, 2021.

MOTION: Board Member Holmgren moved to APPROVE the Minutes of May 5, 2021, as written. Board Member Stephens seconded the motion. The motion passed

unanimously. Board Members Toly and Hodgkins abstained as they were not present at the May 5 meeting.

3. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS

No ecomments were submitted and no hands were raised on Zoom.

4. STAFF/BOARD COMMUNICATIONS AND DISCLOSURES

Planning Director, Gretchen Milliken raised the subject of conducting hybrid meetings going forward. She recalled from the last meeting that the Board was in favor of going to a hybrid format and proposed the hybrid format be instituted at the next meeting on July 7, 2021.

Planning Analyst, Jessica Nelson reported that the hybrid format means that the Members who are able will meet in person in the Council chambers. Members who are not able to attend personally can attend virtually. They can allow the public to see both the in-person members and those that attend virtually. The intent behind this model is that if a Board Member can attend in person, they will do so.

Each Board Member expressed their approval of proceeding with the hybrid meetings beginning at the next meeting on July 7, 2021.

A question was raised regarding the status of looking for a new Historic Preservation Planner. Director Milliken stated that they have not received any qualified applicants for the position. City Planner, Aiden Lillie, who has a lot of historic preservation experience, had taken on that role for the time being. She has been taking the lead with the grants program, the awards program, and many of the historic preservation planning projects.

Director Milliken stated that Ms. Lillie is learning quickly and may be moved into the role of Historic Preservation Planner. The job was not currently posted.

5. CONTINUATIONS

There were no continuations from the prior meeting.

6. WORK SESSION

A. Discussion on Meeting Format Moving Forward.

Chair Scott noted that they addressed the above agenda with the Staff Communications.

7. REGULAR AGENDA

A. 1129 Park Avenue – Historic District Design Review Historic Preservation Board Review for Material Deconstruction of a Significant Historic Site – The Applicant is Proposing Material Deconstruction Consisting of Removal of Historic Material for the Proposed Restoration of the Hall-Parlor House and Construction of a New Addition. PL-21-04817.

City Planner, Rebecca Ward presented photographs of the two historic homes on the agenda. She noted that the homes share a common wall. The home located at 1129 Park Avenue is the smaller home to the north and is a hall-parlor type home built sometime before 1901. It is designated a Significant Historic Structure.

Planner Ward reported that the original structure was built on stacked stone and has no foundation. There is also a non-functioning masonry chimney. Sometime after 1949, there was a rear addition to the home that included a concrete foundation, as well as the addition of a covered entry porch on the front façade.

The applicant is proposing to construct a duplex addition. The address at 1129 Park Avenue will be accessed from Park Avenue and the rear duplex addition will be accessed off of Woodside Avenue.

She reported that on May 13, 2021, the City Council approved a plat amendment that created the larger lot to accommodate the duplex use. The applicant has also applied for a Conditional Use Permit (“CUP”), which is required for approval of the duplex. The Planning Commission was scheduled to review the application for the CUP on June 9, 2021. Approval of the application by the Historic Preservation Board would be contingent upon the approval of the CUP by the Planning Commission.

Planner Ward stated that the applicant is proposing to lift the structure to accommodate the new foundation and remove the 1949 addition. The applicant wants to retain the front entry porch constructed after 1949. She presented maps showing that the overall footprint of the building over the years has remained consistent. The applicant’s proposal seeks to remove the 1949 additions and return the site to the smaller footprint from 1941.

Planner Ward highlighted the historical material that will remain and what was proposed for removal. She noted that the applicant seeks to keep the front entry porch. She explained that the standards for a “contributing object” include a portion of the building that contributes to the historical significance of the building if it reflects the architectural character of the site as designated by the Board. She stated that the historic integrity of the site is based on the ability of the site to retain its identity and convey its significance based on seven qualities outlined in the staff report.

She noted that the qualities relative to the porch include the design, workmanship, and feeling of the home. She presented photographs of the home in context with other historic properties in the neighborhood. Many of the other homes have porches of a different design. Staff recommended that the Board conduct a public hearing and consider approving the request to lift the structure for the new foundation, the material deconstruction of the rear façade, and make a determination on whether the applicant could retain the non-historic covered front entry porch.

Planner Ward introduced the applicant, Wendy Smith, and the Architect, Jonathan DeGray, AIA. Mr. DeGray reported that the summary provided by Planner Ward adequately reflects the applicant's request. He recalled a walk-through with the Board during a prior work session to obtain clarity on the material deconstruction. They would like to remove the rear addition and bring the structure back into its original form. He stated that the front porch adds a greater sense of entry to the home. The interior walls of the front cabin remain, so once the addition is demolished, they will restore the interior walls. Planner Ward stated in response to an inquiry that the next agenda item will address the 1929 addition to the 1125 Park Avenue home and whether it can be removed. The removal of that addition would result in a separation of the two homes.

Chair Scott referenced the minutes from the November 4, 2020 work meeting and site walk-through.

Board Member Hodgkins objected to retaining the front porch, citing the removal of the rear addition to bring the property back into a historic condition. Mr. DeGray recalled discussions about the home across the street that settled on bringing the property to a time period on the recorded Sanborn Insurance Map. Board Member Hodgkins recalled that discussion as being related to the adjacent property but noted that the same discussion could apply to any property. Board Member Hodgkins objected to keeping different styles simply because it is convenient for the proposed addition.

There was discussion on photographs depicting the home at varying times. The current home not only has the front porch but windows that are more mid-Century in appearance. Board Member Hodgkins stated that he does not dislike the mid-Century look but objected to combining the two historical looks of the home.

The Board discussed the windows proposed by the applicant. Mr. DeGray stated that the intent was to bring back windows that are more historically accurate. In response to an inquiry, Mr. DeGray stated that the photographs show windows with two divided lights. It was noted that the applicant proposed a double window on the left-hand side, which Mr. DeGray explained had to do with the width of the opening from the 1929 form. In response to an inquiry from Board Member Hodgkins about the original configuration of the windows, Mr. DeGray stated that since they have not yet done an interior demo, the window sizes and locations would ultimately be subject to what they would verify during the interior demolition.

Board Member Stephens inquired about horizontal siding. Mr. DeGray stated that during limited demolition of the addition, they determined that the rear wall was clad with siding. Board Member Stephens added that on the front, they could install one window on each side and use salvaged material from the rear of the property to correct the opening at the front. Mr. DeGray confirmed that would be a potential option.

Chair Scott commented that the photograph showing the window located on the right side has a siding patch and appears to be consistent with the size being proposed, which is a ratio of 2:1. It was noted that the proposal includes a more appropriate design for the door than what exists currently.

Chair Scott opened the matter up for public comment. As there was no public comment or input. The public comment period was closed.

Board Member Hutchings agreed with prior comments about the varying historical time periods proposed in this application. He noted that if the applicant wanted to return the house to pre-1940's architecture, the addition on the back could be removed. If the intent was to keep a similar window structure in the front and the awning, the rear addition from the same era should be restored.

Board Member Stephens echoed the comments from other Board Members and noted that if the front porch was retained it would need to be able to read differently from the rest of the home so that there is no question that it is a more recent addition. He stated that to be consistent, if they approve the removal of the back porch, the front porch should also be removed to keep it consistent in design and time period.

Board Member Holmgren did not realize that the porch was not part of the original. She agreed with the prior comments but also stated it is a good-looking home as it currently exists. Board Member Hodgkins agreed that he likes the mid-Century look but disagreed with prior comments about needing to remove the front porch if the back porch is removed because the house is so close to the adjoining house and property lines. He stated that he could go either way on the rear addition. It was recommended that the front and back porch additions were likely built at or around the same time because they are of similar mid-Century design.

Board Member Toly agreed with the comments of the other Board Members. She addressed the Sanborn Insurance Maps, which Board Member Hodgkins stated confirms that the additions were not present in the late-1930's. He also pointed out the inaccuracy of the Sanborn Maps and the variances they saw in the maps as they considered the home across the street. It was suggested by Board Member Hutchings that there might have been page issues that appear as variances in the maps, however, he commented that there are likely variances caused by different artistic interpretations as they moved from period to period.

Chair Scott agreed with the comments of the Board. He liked the look of a front porch; however, it is all about consistency and not their personal preferences.

Mr. DeGray commented that their focus is on the addition off the back; so removing the post-1949 addition is paramount. If approval was based on bringing the front porch back to a pre-1949 appearance, the applicant would be willing to move forward with that condition.

Chair Scott stated that the draft included as Exhibit F would need to be modified to include the front porch as discussed. City Attorney, Mark Harrington confirmed that he sent a recommendation for a motion. Planner Ward read the revised recommendation, stating that the recommendation is that the Findings of Fact be amended to reflect that the front covered porch is inconsistent with Historic District guidelines contained in Land Management Code Section 15-13-2(b)2(G)(6) and an additional condition of approval would include the removal of the front porch in conjunction with the material deconstruction of the rear addition.

Chair Scott confirmed that they are looking at approving lifting the historic structure located at 1125 Park Avenue for a new foundation, approving the material deconstruction of the rear façade to accommodate the addition of the garage, and approving the removal of the non-historic front. It was confirmed by Mr. DeGray that they would be lifting the structure 12 inches.

MOTION: Board Member John Hudgins moved to APPROVE the proposed Material Deconstruction Consisting of Removal of Historic Material for the Proposed Restoration of the Hall-Parlor House and Construction of a New Addition, PL-21-04817, subject to the changes as read by Planner Ward and the following:

Findings of Fact

1. 1129 Park Avenue was built sometime before 1901 and appears on the 1889 Sanborn Insurance map, which was the first map for this area.
2. On May 13, 2021, the City Council enacted Ordinance No. 2021-23, approving the Jupiter Moons Plat Amendment to create a 4,699.50-square-foot Lot for 1129 Park Avenue to accommodate a Duplex, with access from Woodside Avenue.
3. A Duplex is a Conditional Use in the Historic Residential – 1 Zoning District. The Planning Commission is scheduled to conduct a public hearing on the Conditional Use Application on June 9, 2021.
4. The Applicant submitted a Historic District Design Review (HDDR) application to lift the Significant Historic Structure to accommodate a new

foundation, to remove a portion of the rear façade for an addition, and to retain the covered front entry porch, constructed after 1949.

5. Based on the Historic Site Form, 1129 Park is a hall-parlor type house with minor changes. The hall parlor is one of the main three house types built during the historic Park City mining era, and was the earliest of those three, usually occurring towards the beginning of that time period. The side gable roof is sheathed with standing seam metal, which replaced the aluminum material mentioned on the tax cards. A gabled porch extends from the center of the roof; this element was not present in the c. 1940 tax photo and does not appear on any Sanborn maps up to 1941. The house is clad with drop-novelty wood siding. The windows on the front façade were originally two six-over-six double-hung sash windows arranged symmetrically with the door in the center as shown on the c. 1940 tax photo, but are currently aluminum picture windows, with the window on the left being wider than the nearly square window on the right. The door is an out-of-period wood door with several lites and has a metal screen door in front of it. The foundation is not visible and its material is unknown. The lot is very narrow, with the house touching its neighbor to the left. Although the form remains legible, the cumulative formal and material changes have diminished its historic value.
6. The house appears on the 1889 Sanborn Insurance map, which was the first map for this area.
7. The following summarizes the features of 1129 Park Avenue:
 - a. It is estimated the Historic hall-parlor form with a simple 10:12 pitch gable roof was built in 1895.
 - i. The Significant Historic Structure was built on stacked stone and soil and has no foundation.
 - ii. An original masonry chimney no longer functions as a smoke flue and terminates before the roof.
 - b. A rear addition with a concrete foundation was built after 1949.
 - c. A covered entry porch was added to the front façade after 1949.
 - d. The windows are aluminum framed with insulated glass and the exterior trim and entry door were replaced after 1949.
 - e. The front door was replaced after 1949.

- f. The mechanical and electrical systems are not code compliant.
- 8. The Historic Preservation Board reviews Material Deconstruction to remove Historic Material to accommodate new additions, new construction, and structural upgrades.
- 9. Additions to Historic Structures shall be considered only on non-character defining facades, usually tertiary facades.
- 10. The Applicant will be required to comply with LMC § 15-11-9, Preservation Policy before the City issues a building permit.
- 11. The Applicant proposes removing all construction post-1949, except for the covered front entry porch.
- 12. The Design Guidelines For Historic Residential Sites states that changes to a building that have acquired historic significance in their own right should be retained and preserved.
- 13. A Contributing object is a “portion of an existing building, an Accessory Building, Structure, or object . . . considered contributory to the historical significance of a Building or Site if it reflects the Historical architectural character of the site or district as designated by the Historic Preservation Board.”
- 14. The Land Management Code defines Historic Integrity as the ability of a Site to retain its identity and, therefore, convey its Significance in the history of Park City. Within the concept of Historic Integrity, Park City Municipal Corporation recognizes seven (7) aspects or qualities as defined by the National Park Service, that in various combinations define integrity.
- 15. The qualities relevant to the porch include:
 - a. Design. The combination of physical elements that create the form, plan, space, structure, and style of a Site. Design includes such considerations as the structural system, massing, arrangement of spaces, pattern of fenestration, textures, and colors of surface materials, type, amount, and style of ornamental detailing, and arrangement and type of plantings in the designed landscape.
 - b. Workmanship. The physical evidence of the crafts of a particular culture or people during any given period of history, including methods of construction, plain or decorative finishes, painting, carving, joinery, tooling, and turning.

- c. Feeling. A Site's expression of the aesthetic of Historic sense of a particular period of time. Feeling results from the presence of physical features that, taken together, convey the Property's Historic character.
16. Additions like porches to Historic Structures were sometimes added over time as property owners were able to afford new construction.
17. The Design Guidelines for new residential infill in the Historic Districts encourages porches to define front entrances that are respectful of the scale and proportions found on Historic Structures in the area "in a way that follows the predominant pattern of historic porches along the street, maintaining traditional setbacks, the orientation of entrances, and alignment along the Streetscape or character area to reinforce the visual rhythm of the buildings and site elements."
18. The three Historic Structures to the north and the two Historic Structures to the south have covered front entry porches.
19. The front covered porch is inconsistent with Historic District guidelines contained in Land Management Code Section 15-13-2(b)2(G)(6).

Conclusions of Law

1. The proposal complies with Land Management Code § 15-11-12.5, Historic Preservation Board Review For Material Deconstruction; § 15-11-9, Preservation Policy; and § 15-13-2, Design Guidelines For Historic Residential Sites.

Conditions of Approval

1. The applicant is responsible for notifying the Building Department prior to proposing any changes to this approval. LMC § 15-15-1.
2. The Applicant shall submit in writing any changes, modifications, or deviations from the approved scope of work for Planning Director review and approval/denial in accordance with the applicable standards prior to construction.
3. Where the Historic exterior materials cannot be repaired, they shall be replaced with materials that match the original in all respects: scale, dimension, texture, profile, material, and finish. Prior to removing and replacing Historic materials, the applicant shall demonstrate to the Planning Director and Historic Preservation Planner that the materials are

no longer safe and/or serviceable and cannot be repaired to a safe and/or serviceable condition. No Historic materials may be disposed of prior to advance approval by the Planning Director and Historic Preservation Planner.

4. An encroachment agreement may be required prior to issuance of a building permit for projects utilizing soils nails that encroach onto neighboring properties.
5. A Soils Report completed by a geotechnical engineer as well as a temporary shoring plan, if applicable, will be required at the time of building permit application.
6. The Historic Structure shall be returned to original grade following construction of a foundation.
7. When the original grade cannot be achieved, generally no more than six inches (6") of the new foundation shall be visible above final grade on the primary and secondary facades.
8. The site shall be re-graded so that all water drains away from the Structure and does not enter the foundation. A plinth, or trim board at the base of the Historic Structure, shall be added to visually anchor the Historic Structure to the new foundation.
9. A plinth or trim board at the base of the Historic Structure shall be added to visually anchor the Historic Structure to the new foundation.
10. The form, material, and detailing of a new foundation shall be similar to foundations of nearby historic structures.
11. Historic foundations shall not be concealed with masonry, block, plywood panels, corrugated metal, or wood shingles.
12. The applicant shall submit a cribbing and excavation stabilization shoring plan reviewed and stamped by a State of Utah licensed and registered structural engineer prior to issuance of a building permit. Cribbing or shoring must be of engineer-specified materials. Screw-type jacks for raising and lowering the building are not allowed as primary supports once the building is lifted.
13. Historic Structures which are lifted off the foundation must be returned to the completed foundation within 45 days of the date the building permit was issued.

14. The Planning Director may make a written determination to extend this period up to 30 additional days if, after consultation with the Historic Preservation Planner, Chief Building Official, and City Engineer, he determines that it is necessary. This would be based upon the need to immediately stabilize an existing Historic property, or specific site conditions such as access, or lack thereof, exist, or in an effort to reduce impacts on adjacent properties. The applicant is responsible for notifying the Building Department if changes are made. If the cribbing and/or shoring plan(s) are to be altered at any time during the construction of the foundation by the contractor, the structural engineer shall submit a new cribbing and/or shoring plan for review. The structural engineer shall be required to re-inspect and approve the cribbing and/or shoring alterations within five (5) days of any relocation or alteration to the cribbing and/or shoring.
15. The applicant shall also request an inspection through the Building Department following the modification to the cribbing and/or shoring. Failure to request the inspection will be a violation of the Preservation Plan and enforcement action through the Historic Preservation Financial Guarantee or ACE could take place.
16. The applicant shall remove the front porch in conjunction with the material deconstruction of the rear addition.
17. The Applicant shall complete a Historic Preservation Plan—subject to Chief Building Official and Planning Director approval—prior to issuance of a building permit.
18. The Applicant shall provide the City with a financial Guarantee to ensure compliance with the conditions and terms of the Historic Preservation Plan prior to issuance of a building permit.
19. The addition shall be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future the essential form and integrity of the Landmark Historic Structure could be restored.
20. The addition shall be visually subordinate to Historic Structures when viewed from the Right-of-Way.
21. The Applicant shall complete Historic District Design Review and approval prior to issuance of a building permit.
22. Where the addition abuts the Historic Structure, a clear transitional element between the old and new should be designed and constructed.

23. In-line additions shall be avoided.
24. If the Landmark Historic Structure requires panelization, the Applicant shall return to the Historic Preservation Board for an amendment to this approval.
25. This approval is contingent upon Planning Commission approval of a Conditional Use Permit for a Duplex Use.

Board Member Holmgren seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Board.

B. 1125 Park Avenue – Historic District Review Historic Preservation Board Review for Material Deconstruction of a Significant Historic Site – The Applicant is Proposing Material Deconstruction Consisting of Removal of Historic Material for the Proposed Restoration of the Original T-Footprint and Construction of a New Addition. PL-20-04689.

Planner Ward presented the staff report and state that the structure is a cross-wing home built that was around 1901 and is a designated landmark. There was an addition of a kitchen in 1907 and a rear addition in 1929. The 1929 addition created a common wall with 1129 Park Avenue to the north. On May 13, 2021, the City Council approved a plat amendment for the lots that subdivides them so that their unique configuration can be preserved while addressing Building Code requirements. The applicant seeks to restore the home to the early 1900 cross-wing footprint. The Board previously conducted a work session and site visit to evaluate the additions. She stated that restoring the home to the 1900 cross-wing footprint accommodates a garage addition at the back and removes the 1929 addition that created the common wall.

She reported that during the prior work session, the Board requested information on whether anyone of historical significance had lived in the home. Planner Ward explained that under the Land Management Code, property can be designated if persons significant to the history of the community lived in the home. The National Register criteria also establishes that the Board could look at major achievements of an individual, the role of the individual in promoting distinctive culture, religion, or philosophy throughout the area, or the entirety of the individual's career is reflected in the historic property. The record of ownership for this home demonstrates that while prior owners have been important contributing members to Park City, they would not meet the requirements outlined above.

Planner Ward presented the applicant's proposal to the Board. The applicant proposes to restore the structure to the 1900 building footprint. In response to an inquiry, she expressed her understanding that the building was constructed before 1901, although there are contradictory timelines in the historical records. Board Member Hodgkins

noted that this home seems old for the area but recalled that they learned that the home across the street was built in the 1880s as well. Planner Ward presented an image showing the footprint the applicant would like to achieve. She highlighted the 1907 kitchen addition that juts out approximately four feet to the south of the property. The issue before the Board is whether the additions contribute to the landmark historic structure. She highlighted the evergreen in the images presented to the Board and stated that it is the most significant feature at the front of the property.

Planner Ward referenced the seven qualities defined by the National Park Service that show that little alteration to the form of this structure is evident from photographic evidence. She also referenced that the materials, workmanship, and feeling are specific to the cross-wing structure, which was one of the three most common house types built in Park City during the mining era.

Staff recommended that the Board conduct a public hearing and determine the contributory status of the property, including the lifting of the structure and the material deconstruction to accommodate the rear addition.

Board Member Hodgkins asked if there was anyone of significance living in the home after 1907. Board Member Holmgren identified a prior resident named Mabel who she described as a wonderful addition to the neighborhood. She further commented that the 1907 addition did not touch the smaller home and expressed her belief that it was the 1929 addition that did that. Planner Ward confirmed that to be correct. Board Member Holmgren clarified that the 1907 addition was a small addition that extended out the south side. It was noted that popular additions at the time were the addition of kitchens.

Mr. DeGray commented that they would like to bring the home back to the 1900 footprint and unlike the home at 1129 Park Avenue, there are no aspects of this that they are trying to preserve or dilute with other period architecture. The 1900 footprint works well as far as the definition of the true historic contributory cross-wing form as viewed from the public way, and it helps with the development of the addition and separation of the addition from the historic form. Board Member Hodgkins was supportive of the 1890s restoration, provided that the transitional element lets it read as such.

Board Member Toly asked about the evergreen tree. It was noted that if the tree were removed, they would have to mitigate the loss of the tree under the Code. Board Member Holmgren suggested that the applicant could bring in something more in line with Old Town Park City such as apple or plum trees. Board Member Toly referenced some trees next to her home that were planted in 1915 and referenced the historic nature of the planting of such trees. There was further discussion regarding the potential age of the tree on the subject property.

Chair Scott opened the matter up for public comment. There was no public comment or input. The public comment period was closed.

Board Member Hodgkins asked if the transitional element is set back. Mr. DeGray responded that the transitional element is attached to the area that would remain as part of the Historic form so that the area where the kitchen currently exists would become a courtyard. It was also noted that there is a setback from the addition on both the north and west walls.

It was confirmed that the applicant owns the lot behind the property. The applicant, Wendy Smith, reported that she owns these properties with a group of female investors. They have worked with the architect and utilized the Sanborn Maps to arrive at a creative solution for the properties. She stated that they were excited about what they can eventually do with the barn.

The Board expressed support for the application. Chair Scott remarked that the design makes the home stand out nicely.

Planner Ward commented that staff recommended that the Board determine that the 1907 and 1929 additions do not contribute to the landmark status and can be removed. They also recommended that the Board approve lifting the structure for a new foundation and the material deconstruction of the rear façade to accommodate the addition, subject to the standard conditions of approval set forth in the draft Final Action Letter. They will update the draft Final Action Letter to reflect the determination that the 1907 and 1929 additions do not contribute to the historic significance of the site.

MOTION: Board Member Holmgren moved to APPROVE the proposed material deconstruction consisting of removal of historic material for the proposed restoration of the original T-footprint and construction of a new addition, PL-20-04689, subject to the following:

Findings of Fact

1. 1125 Park Avenue is a cross-wing Landmark Historic Structure constructed circa 1901.
2. On November 3, 2020, the Historic Preservation Board visited 1125 Park Avenue.
3. On November 4, 2020, the Historic Preservation Board conducted a work session to discuss the contributing status of the 1907 and 1929 rear additions to 1125 Park Avenue.
4. Based on the meeting minutes, the Project Architect:
 - a. Views the circa 1900 footprint as the original Historic form.

- b. Notes that the 1929 addition abuts the adjacent home at 1129 Park Avenue and this creates issues, including building code concerns.
 - c. Removal of the 1907 addition will accommodate a garage at the back of the lot
5. Based on the Historic Site Form, 1125 Park Avenue is a cross-wing home with few modifications. The cross-wing Structure is one of the three main house types built during the historic Park City mining era. The rear section of the house extends past the main part of the stem wing, but this appears to be original and shows up on the 1907 Sanborn map. The cross-gable roof is sheathed with standing seam metal, which replaced the shingle material shown in the circa 1940 photo. A brick chimney is on the rear of the roof and is tall enough to be seen from the front of the house. The walls are clad with drop-novelty wood siding. There is a pair of one-over-one double-hung sash windows in the front gable end and a single window of the same type is next to the door in the porch area. The door is a wood door with an upper lite and a screen door is present as well. The porch is in the L of the house and is covered by a shed-roofed extension of the main roof. The porch is supported by lathe-turned wood posts. A decorative trim surrounds both the door and the windows. The foundation is not visible and its materials are unknown. A wood picket fence surrounds the yard. The overall form and materiality of the building remains intact and the building retains its historic value.
6. The house was built between 1900 and 1907 and was owned by mine promoter Edwin Kidder until 1902, W.H. Richardson from 1902 – 1904, and blacksmith Charles Workman from 1904 – 1921.
7. Silvermine machinist Alexander Gibson, his wife, and their three children lived in the home through the 1940s and the family sold the property to Russell and Ruth Green upon Gibson's death in 1964. In 1976, Josef Buehler purchased the property and retained ownership until the current Applicant.
8. The Applicant completed exploratory interior demolition in 2020.
9. There are two (2) Historic additions, documented in the Sanborn maps. The first addition appears in the 1907 Sanborn map, where the kitchen is currently located. The second addition appears in the 1929 map where a rear bedroom is currently located.
10. While the 1907 kitchen addition preliminarily qualifies as historically contributing due to its age, the essential physical feature for this overall property in the context of Park Avenue is the original T-shape which forms

the frontage that faces Park Ave including the original front door, the porch, the windows, the roofline, and shape. The Applicant proposes restoring to the pre-1907 original form. Viewed from Park Avenue, the kitchen addition bumps out four feet to the south of the building, and it is not a predominant feature. The Board [agrees/disagrees] with the owner's assertion that the property retains its identity and integrity better without the four-foot bump out.

11. Land Management Code (LMC) § 15-15-1 defines a Contributing Building, Structure, Site/Area or Object as Contributing Building, Structure, Site/Area Or Object as a portion of an existing building may also be considered contributory to the Historical significance of a Building or Site if it reflects the Historical or architectural character of the Site or District as designated by the Historic Preservation Board.
12. LMC § 15-15-1 defines Historic Integrity as the ability of a Site to retain its identity and, therefore, convey its Significance in the history of Park City. Within the concept of Historic Integrity, Park City Municipal Corporation recognizes seven (7) aspects or qualities as defined by the National Park Service, that in various combinations define integrity. They are as follows and are discussed below: location; design; setting; materials; workmanship; feeling; and association.
13. Pursuant to the seven (7) aspects or qualities defined by the National Park Service, that in various combinations define integrity, the italics below show the analysis from the Park City Historic Site Form – Historic Sites Inventory:
 - a. Location. The place where the Historic Site was constructed or the Historical event took place.
 - i. Original location.
 - b. Design. The combination of physical elements that create the form, plan, space, structure, and style of a Site. Design includes such considerations as the structural system, massing, arrangement of spaces, pattern of fenestration, textures, and colors of surface materials, type, amount, and style of ornamental detailing, and arrangement and type of plantings in the designed landscape.
 - i. Little alteration is evident to the form of this structure based on photographic evidence provided, other than roofing materials and paint color. The changes are minor and do not affect the site's historic character.

- c. Setting. The physical environment, either natural or manmade, of a Historic Site, including vegetation, topographic features, manmade features (paths, fences, walls), and the relationship between Structures and other features or open space.
 - i. Narrow building lot on fairly flat terrain. House is recessed 15 – 20 feet from city roadway separated by a white picket fence directly abutting the property line. A prominent evergreen tree on the right of the front elevation, and other grasses and shrubs cover the well-managed landscape.
- d. Materials. The physical elements that were combined or deposited during a particular period of time in a particular pattern or configuration to form a Historic Site.
 - i. Wooden picket fence; drop-novelty wood siding and trim; metal roof; double-hung windows with wood casings.
- e. Workmanship. The physical evidence of the crafts of a particular culture or people during any given period of history, including methods of construction, plain or decorative finishes, painting, carving, joinery, tooling, and turning.
 - i. The distinctive elements that define this as a typical Park City mining era house are 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.
- f. Feeling. A Site's expression of the aesthetic of Historic sense of a particular period of time. Feeling results from the presence of physical features that, taken together, convey the Property's Historic character.
 - i. The physical elements of the site, in combination, convey a sense of life in a western mining town of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.
- g. Association. The direct link between an important historic era or Person and a Historic Site. A Site retains association if it is in the place where the activity occurred and is sufficiently intact to convey that relationship to an observer.

- i. The “T” or “L” cottage (also known as a “cross-wing”) is one of the earliest and one of the three most common house types built in Park City during the mining era.
14. The Park City Historic Site Form – Historic Sites Inventory evaluates the Landmark Historic Structure holistically. However, it is the cross-wing form that categorizes this as one of the three most common house types, and not the 1907 addition.
15. The 1907 kitchen addition [does/does not] contribute to the Historic Integrity of the Landmark Historic Structure.
16. The 1929 rear addition [does/does not] contribute to the Historic Integrity of the Landmark Historic Structure.

Conclusions of Law

1. The proposal complies with Land Management Code § 15-11-12.5, Historic Preservation Board Review For Material Deconstruction; § 15-11-9, Preservation Policy; and § 15-13-2, Design Guidelines For Historic Residential Sites.

Conditions of Approval

1. The applicant is responsible for notifying the Building Department prior to proposing any changes to this approval.
2. The Applicant shall submit in writing any changes, modifications, or deviations from the approved scope of work for Planning Director review and approval/denial in accordance with the applicable standards prior to construction.
3. Where the Historic exterior materials cannot be repaired, they shall be replaced with materials that match the original in all respects: scale, dimension, texture, profile, material, and finish. Prior to removing and replacing Historic materials, the applicant shall demonstrate to the Planning Director and Historic Preservation Planner that the materials are no longer safe and/or serviceable and cannot be repaired to a safe and/or serviceable condition. No Historic materials may be disposed of prior to advance approval by the Planning Director and Historic Preservation Planner.

4. An encroachment agreement may be required prior to the issuance of a building permit for projects utilizing soils nails that encroach onto neighboring properties.
5. A Soils Report completed by a geotechnical engineer as well as a temporary shoring plan, if applicable, will be required at the time of building permit application.
6. The Historic Structure shall be returned to original grade following construction of a foundation.
7. When the original grade cannot be achieved, generally no more than six inches (6") of the new foundation shall be visible above final grade on the primary and secondary facades.
8. The site shall be re-graded so that all water drains away from the Structure and does not enter the foundation. A plinth, or trim board at the base of the Historic Structure, shall be added to visually anchor the Historic Structure to the new foundation.
9. A plinth or trim board at the base of the Historic Structure shall be added to visually anchor the Historic Structure to the new foundation.
10. The form, material, and detailing of a new foundation shall be similar to foundations of nearby historic structures.
11. Historic foundations shall not be concealed with masonry, block, plywood panels, corrugated metal, or wood shingles.
12. The applicant shall submit a cribbing and excavation stabilization shoring plan reviewed and stamped by a State of Utah licensed and registered structural engineer prior to issuance of a building permit. Cribbing or shoring must be of engineer-specified materials. Screw-type jacks for raising and lowering the building are not allowed as primary supports once the building is lifted.
13. Historic Structures which are lifted off the foundation must be returned to the completed foundation within 45 days of the date the building permit was issued.
14. The Planning Director may make a written determination to extend this period up to 30 additional days if, after consultation with the Historic Preservation Planner, Chief Building Official, and City Engineer, he determines that it is necessary. This would be based upon the need to immediately stabilize an existing Historic property, or specific site

conditions such as access, or lack thereof, exist, or in an effort to reduce impacts on adjacent properties. The applicant is responsible for notifying the Building Department if changes are made. If the cribbing and/or shoring plan(s) are to be altered at any time during the construction of the foundation by the contractor, the structural engineer shall submit a new cribbing and/or shoring plan for review. The structural engineer shall be required to re-inspect and approve the cribbing and/or shoring alterations within five (5) days of any relocation or alteration to the cribbing and/or shoring.

15. The applicant shall also request an inspection through the Building Department following the modification to the cribbing and/or shoring. Failure to request the inspection will be a violation of the Preservation Plan and enforcement action through the Historic Preservation Financial Guarantee or ACE could take place.
16. The Applicant shall complete a Historic Preservation Plan—subject to Chief Building Official and Planning Director approval—prior to issuance of a building permit.
17. The Applicant shall provide the City with a financial Guarantee to ensure compliance with the conditions and terms of the Historic Preservation Plan prior to issuance of a building permit.
18. The addition shall be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future the essential form and integrity of the Landmark Historic Structure could be restored.
19. The addition shall be visually subordinate to Historic Structures when viewed from the Right-of-Way.
20. The Applicant shall complete Historic District Design Review and approval prior to issuance of a building permit.
21. Where the addition abuts the Historic Structure, a clear transitional element between the old and new should be designed and constructed.
22. In-line additions shall be avoided.
23. If the Landmark Historic Structure requires panelization, the Applicant shall return to the Historic Preservation Board for an amendment to this approval.
24. This approval is contingent upon Planning Commission approval of a Conditional Use Permit for a Duplex Use.

Board Member Hodgkins seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Board.

8. ADJOURN

Board Member Hutchings requested a photograph of his son with the property prior to demolition as he is the sixth generation of the Gibson family that owned this home.

MOTION: Board Member Hodgkins moved to ADJOURN. Board Member Hudgins seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Board.

The Historic Preservation Board Meeting adjourned at 6:25 p.m.

Approved by _____
Randy Scott, Chair
Historic Preservation Board