## PARK CITY MUNICIPAL CORPORATION HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS

April 5, 2017

# AGENDA

SITE VISIT – 4:30 – 5:00 PM - No discussion or action will be taken on site 1302 Norfolk Avenue – Cancelled 732 Crescent Tram – Please meet at the lobby of City Hall at 4:15 PM. Site 4:30 PM MEETING CALLED TO ORDER AT 5:00 PM ROLL CALL ADOPTION OF MINUTES OF March 1, 2017 PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS – Items not scheduled on the regular agenda STAFF/BOARD COMMUNICATIONS AND DISCLOSURES CONTINUATIONS	e visit will be a	t
1302 Norfolk Avenue – Determination of Significance on house Public hearing and continuation to date uncertain	PL-16-03181 Planner Grahn	45
<b>REGULAR AGENDA</b> – Discussion and possible action as outlined below 732 Crescent Tram – Determination of Significance on Additions to the historic house Public hearing and possible action	<b>PL-16-03370</b> Planner Grahn	47
1141 Park Avenue – Historic District Design Review – Material Deconstruction on Landmark Site. The applicant is proposing to impact the following: non-historic concrete patios and courtyards; non-historic	<b>PL-16-03214</b> Planner Grahn	81

the following: non-historic concrete patios and courtyards; non-historic wood fences; remove non-historic c.2000 rear addition, non-historic wood doors, and non-historic windows on the historic house; and remove non-historic doors and non-historic windows on the historic shed.

Public Hearing & Possible Action

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; GI-13-00222 229 Planner Grahn

PARK CI

Pursuant to the Americans with Disabilities Act, individuals needing special accommodations during the meeting should notify the Park City Planning Department at (435) 615-5060 24 hours prior to the meeting.

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.

The Board will provide specific amendments to be made to the document if necessary; and make a recommendation to City Council (Council review will be after the entire Guidelines are reviewed by the HPB)

#### **Work Session** – *Discussion item only, not action taken* Historic District Grant Program Policy Discussion

GI-17-00353 273

Planner Grahn

ADJOURN

PARK CITY MUNICPAL CORPORATION HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD MINUTES OF MARCH 1, 2017

BOARD MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE: Douglas Stephens, Lola Beatlebrox, Cheryl Hewett, Puggy Holmgren, Jack Hodgkins, Randy Scott, David White

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

ROLL CALL Chair White called the meeting to order at 5:00 p.m. and noted that all Board Members were present.

PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS There were no comments.

ADOPTION OF MINUTES

February 1, 2017

Board Member Holmgren referred to page 3 and changed <u>Douglas Stephen</u> to correctly read Douglas **Stephens.** On page 20, she changed <u>Stephen Douglas</u> to correctly read, **Douglas Stephens**.

MOTION: Board Member Holmgren moved to APPROVE the minutes of February 1, 2017 as corrected. Board Member Scott seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

#### STAFF/BOARD COMMUNICATIONS AND DISCLOSURES

Planner Anya Grahn reported that at their February meeting the Board of Adjustment reviewed and denied a variance for a height exception in the Historic District. They also reviewed an appeal of the Determination of Significance for the Star Hotel and found that it should remain listed as significant.

Planner Grahn announced that the request for proposal for the artist selection had closed on Friday. They received three proposals and the Staff would review the proposals and provide an update at the next meeting.

REGULAR AGENDA – Discussion, Public Hearing and Possible Action

1. <u>732 Crescent Tram – Determination of Significance on Additions to the</u> <u>historic house</u> (Application PL-16-03370)

Planner Grahn stated that 732 Crescent Tram is currently listed as a Landmark Structure, and it is eligible for the National Register of Historic Places.

Planner Grahn reported that the owner had submitted a Determination of Significance application. The HPB would only be looking at the additions to the house this evening and trying to determine whether or not the additions are historically significant and should remain. The applicant understands that should they choose to move forward and demolish those additions if the HPB determines that they are no historically significant, they would have come back for a Historic District Design Review. As part of the material deconstruction the HPB could approve removing the additions.

Planner Grahn reiterated that the building is listed as Landmark on the HSI. It was found to be National Register Eligible with the sum of its parts, which included the additions being reviewed this evening.

Planner Grahn commented on the options for review and determination of the additions. One, is to say that it is associated with the Mature Mining Era, which makes the additions historically significant. They could say the additions are historically significant because they are associated with Carl Winters, a person of interest in the community. If they find that is true, the question is whether the additions are important because of their association with Carl Winters, or whether other buildings in town better reflect the contributions Carl Winters made to the community. She named the Park City High School as an example. Planner Grahn remarked that a third option would be to find that the additions are historically significant because of their design and construction.

Planner Grahn reviewed the development history. Based on the physical evidence that was found inside the building, as well as the age of the materials and how they were constructed, it is evident that one-room building was built on this site in 1904. By 1907 the building was expanded into a hall-parlor rectangular form that faced north. The addition that created an L was added about the same time. The L-shape remained through 1929.

Planner Grahn stated that Carl Winters purchased the house in the 1920s. His daughter remembers that at the time of the purchase it contained a kitchen, bathroom, a dining room, front room and one bedroom. Mr. Winters rebuilt the kitchen, but it is unclear whether it was renovated or if it was torn down and rebuilt. Regardless, the kitchen area kept the original footprint of the hall-parlor. She presented a photo from 1941, which is similar to what the house looks like today. The Staff believes the gable is part of the original single-cell. She pointed

to L-shape that was added in 1907, and the additions that were added by Carl Winters in the 1920s. Planner Grahn stated that Carl Winters also added another extension off the back, the stairwell to access the upstairs addition, a bathroom area, and a cellar. The Staff was unsure when the porch showing in the 1941 photograph was added. Planner Grahn noted that the porch did not show up in the Sanborn maps; however, as they have experienced with other projects, the Sanborn maps are not always accurate.

Board Member Hodgkins wanted to know how they could tell that the original house was a single-cell. Planner Grahn replied that it was based on the materials they could see walking through the house versus the series of additions.

Planner Grahn presented the front elevations and the side elevation as seen from Crescent Tram. The green color was the area of the single-cell, the red was the kitchen area, the yellow were the areas they believe Carl Winters added. She pointed to the extension to the 1907 L, and the upstairs addition.

Planner Grahn stated that the HPB needed to review all the information and determine whether or not the additions meet the criteria for Landmark or Significant. She noted that the applicant was considering demolishing the additions. Planner Grahn requested that the Board provided specific feedback on the kitchen because it was difficult to determine when it was built.

Tom Peek, the property owner, stated that a full interior demo was done to look at the framing, the newer wood versus the traditional, and where the walls are new and where the floor carries through. He remarked that the hillside crushed down and he was unsure when that occurred. A lot of things had fallen off the hill and crushed the C-section. The E piece, which was a root cellar, has a lot of rock on the roof. Mr. Peek was motivated to stabilize the building. A major concern is that the structure is uninsurable because the building has not been able to be occupied for over 15 years. That was his motivation for the timeliness of this determination.

Jonathan DeGray, the architect, stated that the different sections are very apparent from the interior demo. It meshes well with the Sanborn maps and the idea that Carl Winters added the additions during his ownership. Mr. DeGray referred to page 49 of the Staff report that was on the screen and noted that it was from the 1912 photo of town. It showed the form of the house in its mining era appearance. The owner would like to take the house back to that appearance, realizing that the Mining Era ended in 1930. Carl Winters moved into the house in 1926 and by 1941 the additions had occurred. Mr. DeGray took the position that the additions were not contributory to the Mining Era. They were a hodgepodge of additions, particularly the addition to the roof. He thought the roofline was an abomination to the 1917 and earlier historic form. Mr. DeGray believed that was true of additions D and B. They would like to see those additions removed because of their condition and the way they interact with the building. He clarified that the owner had no dispute with addition C, the main body of the building, that was shown in green and blue colors, because they reflect the historic form. Mr. DeGray pointed out that there was no porch in the photograph he had shown, and he assumed that Carl Winters had added the porch.

Mr. DeGray stated that there was no dispute that Carl Winters is an important figure. He lived in the house for 12 years. He is noted as an educator; however, he should not be noted as a carpenter. It is not good throughout and he encouraged the Board members to visit the building if they had any questions. Mr. DeGray pointed out that it does not reflect the Mining Era, which is the main focus. He thought the Winters School and Library Building was a great monument to his Mr. Winters contribution to the town.

Board Member Hodgkins asked for the purpose of this determination, since the applicant would have to come back to the HPB to get the demolition approved. He wanted to know the benefit of determining whether or not the portions identified as A, B, C and D are historic and should be part of the listing.

Planner Grahn explained that the applicant had requested the determination of significance so the HPB could decide whether or not the additions are historically significant. The determination will help the applicant make decisions as they move forward with their plans to rehab the house. They do not want to spend time and energy developing plans and moving forward with redevelopment of the site without knowing what portions of the house are significant and would remain.

Mr. DeGray commented on the determination of whether the house would remain Landmark or Significant. The house is Landmark now, and according to the Staff report, even if the additions are removed the structure would still remain Landmark. He clarified that the owner was comfortable with the Landmark designation and whatever they propose to do, it would still remain a Landmark structure.

Planner Grahn suggested that the Board review each addition separately. She noted that A was the addition that Carl Winters built sometime between the 1920s and 1940. The Board needed to determine whether or not that particular addition meets the criteria for Landmark designation. Planner Grahn stated that the house is at least 50 years old. It maintains its original location, design, setting, materials and workmanship. It has not been altered or modified. However, the challenge is whether it is considered to be historically significant; and whether the additions contribute to an era or person of significance in the community. Another consideration is whether it maintains the distinct characteristics reflective of the time period or method of construction of a notable architect or master craftsman. Planner Grahn explained that Park City did not have notable architects or master craftsman. Therefore, they should look at whether or not it reflects the construction methods of the time period it was built.

The Staff requested that the HPB discuss these issues because it has been a challenge for Staff.

Board Member Beatlebrox asked about the actual construction in portion A. Mr. DeGray replied that it was a  $2' \times 4'$ . The original single cell is a flat  $1' \times 12'$ .

Chair Stephens stated that there was no question that the structure is over 50 years old. He asked the Board to address the Carl Winters issue and whether the fact that it was Mr. Winters' home is a significant issue.

Board Member Beatlebrox believed there was no doubt that Mr. Winters is an important, historic figure in Park City. The photo on page 49 was taken before additions A and E. Planner Grahn replied that looking at it from another direction, it was before A, B, D, E and the porch.

Board Member Hodgkins understood that the photo shown was what the house looked like when Mr. Winters purchased it. Planner Grahn answered yes.

Board Member Beatlebrox stated that if that was the only part remaining, it would still be a Landmark building.

Board Member Hewett stated that Carl Winters would not be a consideration in her decision making.

Board Member Holmgren stated that the building behind her carries his name and she believed that was a better tribute to Mr. Winters than this house.

Board Member White stated that Carl Winters was not part of his decision.

Board Member Hodgkins thought the association with Carl Winters added to the history but it was not significant. The original house remains with or without the additions Mr. Winters had added. Mr. Hodgkins did not believe the additions contribute to the reason why Mr. Winters is significant to Park City.

Chair Stephens called for comments on whether Addition A is significant and meets the criteria.

Board Member Hewett assumed that if the Board was only looking at the house that was built in 1926, they would probably think it was Significant because it is over 50 years old and it was built with the methodology that was current at that time. For her personally, that piece is important.

Chair Stephens understood that when this house was put on the HSI as a Landmark site, it was put on as it currently exists. Planner Grahn replied that he was correct.

Board Member Hodgkins had two issues with Portion A. One is that it was typical for these types of additions to be added to these buildings. This addition was done over 50 years ago and it was done in the Mining Era as well. Secondly, this part of the addition can be viewed from a public right-of-way. He did not believe that was true of the other two pieces. Planner Grahn agreed. The other two pieces are tucked behind the house and are less visible.

Board Member Holmgren thought the portions colored in purple, green, and red were the basic house. Board Member Hewett asked if Board Member Holmgren was saying that Addition A was not important. Board Holmgren clarified that she did not believe it was important.

Board Member Hodgkins asked if the goal was to bring all houses back to the original two-room form. He was concerned that determining the addition as insignificant would be setting a precedent of not caring about anything that is added beyond the original house. Aside from this particular house, it relates to what they are trying to establish as a Board.

Board Member Hewett agreed. Based on Mr. Hodgkins' comment, Board Member Holmgren reconsidered and agreed with him.

Board Member Scott asked if Addition A changed the house to a typical hallparlor style, and whether the addition changed it from a typical structure that would be considered historic. Planner Grahn replied that in this case the addition would not change it in the sense that it was first expanded from a hall-parlor from this area into Addition D, and the back L-wing was added. She believed it was an extension of the back L rear addition.

Chair Stephens noted that historic structures are not defined by architectural type. Planner Grahn replied that it was still important to understand the form and the developer to see how different pieces contribute.

Chair White asked if Mr. DeGray had said that the construction of Portion A was not the same construction as the original house; and that was built of studs, plywood and siding. Mr. DeGray replied that there is no plywood, but there are studs and siding was applied. He stated that the framing of the roof was improved over the years and there is plywood in places on the roof.

Board Member Beatlebrox thought this was a difficult situation. She thought the Staff did a good job showing compliance with the Criteria; however, the

photographs show the original house from 1907, and other photographs show later dates which are over 50 years old. She thought it was similar to the Star Hotel. The question is whether to take it as the façade that exists today, or whether to take it back to the earlier façade because both are historic. Ms. Beatlebrox noted that this applicant could not take the house back to its original because the additions are also Landmark. She understood Mr. Hodgkins comment about setting precedent for additions, but it was a difficult decision.

Mr. DeGray stated that the applicant was looking at the Mining Era form as being the most important. In terms of being over 50 years old, over time that does not mean as much. He thought it was the Mining Era form that makes the most important statement about the house. Some of the additions that blend in seamlessly are what people are used to seeing. However, the roof is an abomination to the historic form and it needs to be removed.

Chair Stephens asked if the stairs going up and the roof addition were the most recent additions. Mr. DeGray replied that it appears to be about the same time period of the 1930s. The photo shows the additions existing between 1930 and 1941. Additions A, B, the staircase going up, and E all seem to be of the same vintage and construction. The joints in the building are not tied in at all.

Director Erickson suggested that the Board remove the pieces that may not be significant, which would be E, the root cellar; F, the second roof; and portion C. If the Board does not feel that these portions meet the criteria of significance, they should remove them from their discussion.

Chair Stephens stated that where portion A seems to be a typical addition to a historic home in the Mining Era, the roof (F) and the stairs up to it appear to be atypical. But if the construction was done at the same time, even though portion F does not fit in with the architecture of what they would typically see in town, he was unsure how they could treat portion A different than F. He understood that the applicant was anxious to move forward, but it was a difficult decision for the Board without actually seeing the house.

Mr. Peek preferred that no one go inside the house because of the liability issue and the lack of insurability of the building. However, it is easy to see the distinct different materials walking through the building. Chair Stephens pointed out that Mr. Peek and Mr. DeGray had the ability to see those things firsthand, but the Board has not had that benefit. He thought they might be going down a path where the construction is typical for Mining Era homes, it is over 50 years old and it meets all the criteria. Without evidence to the contrary, he was leaning in that direction. Chair Stephens understood the concern about the building being unsafe. Mr. Peek suggested that maybe the Board members should walk through the house to see things for themselves; but he was concerned about the stability of the building. Mr. Peek clarified that he was anxious to move forward because the building is failing on the uphill side and C and E had a rock slide that had blown in the wall on the west side of the house.

Board Member Hewett asked if the roof cellar is considered part of the house. She was not opposed to removing the root cellar.

Board Member Hodgkins thought the front facing area was the most critical. He thought they should be the most concerned about Areas A and F. In his opinion C and E were add-ons on the back structure. Board Member Hodgkins recalled another property that had a root cellar and the Board was comfortable removing it. He thought the primary goal is to preserve the look from the street view. The LMC recommendation for additions is that they pull back separate and apart and they are not seen as part of the original building; and that the original building can be viewed as it would have been viewed historically.

Board Member Beatlebrox asked if the damage done by the rock slide was repairable. Mr. DeGray replied that the wall is gone. It would have to be a replication.

The Board concurred with removing the root cellar.

Chair Stephens called for comments on the roof addition (F), the stairs up to it (B), and addition A. He thought it appeared that the easiest additions came first, which included addition A. He assumed the roof and the stairs were a later addition. If that were the case, he was more likely to say that addition A was historic and significant; whereas, the stairs, addition B, and the roof addition is not. Chair Stephens clarified that he did not have any evidence to support his assumption.

Board Member Beatlebrox remarked that it still meets the criteria. She was sympathetic with wanting to go back to the original 1907 form, but if they pick and choose the additions, they would not have a pure form. Chair Stephens did not believe the Board was being asked to go back to a certain time. They were being asked to determine if the additions are significant and meet the criteria.

Board Member Hodgkins pointed out that even if the additions meet the criteria, the applicant still has the ability to request demolition. Planner Grahn stated that if it meets the criteria it would be treated the same as all Landmark sites, which means it cannot be demolished without being reconstructed.

Board Member Hewett believed it was a matter of interpretation and she suggested that they vote on it piece by piece and see the results.

Mr. Peek thought it would be beneficial for the Board members to visit the property so they would have a better understanding. Chair Stephens agreed. In

the meantime, it would be important to know if the roof addition and the stairs were more recent additions. If that information could be provided it would be very helpful. Mr. DeGray offered to work with the Staff to schedule a field trip. He believed that would answer a lot of their questions.

Planner Grahn suggested that the Board conduct a public hearing and continue this item to April 5<sup>th</sup>.

Chair Stephens opened the public hearing.

Ruth Meintsma, a resident at 305 Woodside, was pleased to hear the Board consider the difference between the original cell and the original Mature Mining structure, and referencing the after 1930 to 1941 because there has been a little bit of this discussion in previous projects, but it has been ignored in some cases. She was frustrated because her impression of the way people lived in this town is that when the Mature Mining Era ended in 1930 people did not leave town. When additions were made after 1930, it was still the Mining Era, but it was the Declining Mining Era and there were still plenty of miners in town. In her opinion, based on what she has learned about the history of this town, reflected not only how people lived in town, but they took what they had and added on to make it work for them. Ms. Meintsma stated that it was how the town survived. She believed that so many of the additions are essential and are important to show how the town evolved to what they have now. She stated that in the Mature Mining Era it was single-wall construction, but in the late 1920s she has seen houses where there were stud walls as opposed to single-wall construction. A stud wall construction does not mean the addition is not relevant or historic. Stud walls were the best way to add on to single-wall construction.

Chair Stephens closed the public hearing.

MOTION: Board Member Holmgren moved to CONTINUE this item to April 5, 2017. Board Member Beatlebrox seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

<u>1323 Woodside Avenue (historic location), 1353 Park Avenue (proposed location) – HDDR – Relocation to a New Site and Material Deconstruction Relocation of the deconstructed Significant single-family dwelling at 1323 Woodside Avenue to a new site at 1353 Park Avenue. The deconstruction of 1323 Woodside Avenue was approved in 2009. Material Deconstruction of a portion of the rear (west) façade. (Application PL-16-03376)</u>

Board Member Scott disclosed that he lives next door to this project; however, he did not believe it would affect his decision.

The project Team introduced themselves for the record. Jonathan Weidenhamer, Economic Development Manager for the City, and the applicant for the City. Craig Elliott with Elliott Workgroup Architecture, the project architect.

Planner Hannah Tyler stated that this item was a review of the relocation of 1323 Woodside to 1323 Park Avenue. The HPB would also be looking at the material deconstruction of 1323 Woodside Avenue this evening.

Planner Tyler noted that this site is listed as Significant on the Historic Sites Inventory. The site is currently vacant. The historic structure was removed from the site in 2009. In 2009 a Notice and Order was issued by the Chief Building Official after finding that this was a dangerous building as defined by the Building Code. Planner Tyler remarked that the Notice and Order stated that the final location of the structure is to be determined as part of the Development Plan with Park City approval. It goes on to define it as the Planning Director or his designee.

Planner Tyler stated that in 2009 a demolition permit was issued for that Significant site and the building was removed from the site. Due to unforeseen circumstances, including the decline in the real estate market, that building was never reconstructed. What currently exists is a vacant site at 1323 Woodside Avenue, but that building is to be reconstructed before anything else can occur at that site.

Planner Tyler noted that in 2013 the Park City Redevelopment Agency ended up purchasing the property. The City is the applicant because it is the owner of 1323 Woodside Avenue. The City is also the owner of 1353 Park Avenue, which is the location of the non-historic fire station.

Planner Tyler reviewed a map to orient the Board members. She overlaid the historic building footprint. She had circled where 1323 Woodside was proposed to be relocated to give some context of what the site would look like if it were to be relocated.

Planner Tyler provided development history on the Woodside Avenue site. She stated that 1323 Woodside Avenue was built in approximately 1925. It does not show up in the Sanborn map until 1929, and it remains unchanged in the 1941 Sanborn map. She indicated a circa 1940 tax photograph, as well as the 2009 photo prior to demolition. She noted that the porch was ultimately enclosed and a portico was added above the front door. However, most of the form remained.

Planner Tyler provided a basic overview of the relocation proposal looking at the Sanborn maps on a larger scale, which enabled the HPB to look at it from the new site as well as the original site. The new site is approximately 220 feet north-northeast of the existing site. It is not being located too far from the original

site, but she thought it was important to note that the current site is located in the Recreation Commercial zone; and not the Historic District. That allows for commercial and recreation oriented development such as condominiums. Planner Tyler stated that 1353 Park Avenue is located in the Historic District.

Planner Tyler reviewed the 1929 Sanborn Fire Insurance Map, which showed that 1323 was originally part of a series of three single-family dwellings. It was also located next to the Mining Era railroad. In looking at Park Avenue, he indicated a series of single-family dwellings that establish a rhythm and scale on the streetscape. Those building were also located near less density development in the Mining Era railroad location.

Planner Tyler noted that the 1941 Sanborn map remained unchanged. It showed that the original location still had the three single-family dwellings. The proposed location was located in the center of the Mining Era railroad. Planner Tyler presented the 2016 Satellite Image, which showed significant changes overall in both the original and the proposed site. She pointed out that there are zero single-family dwellings on the west side of Woodside Avenue. She stated that 1323 will be one of those dwellings, but currently it was deconstructed. The two dwellings to the south were demolished and replaced with a three or four story condominium. To the north of 1323 Woodside Avenue is the Senior Center. Planner Tyler clarified that because this is in the RC zone, denser development is allowed and there will be denser development located at the Senior Center. The City was proposing affordable housing on that side, which is allowed by Code. Planner Tyler remarked that the non-historic fire station at 1353 Park Avenue does not contribute to the streetscape. Therefore, any redevelopment that occurs, including the demolition, would allow for more compatible infill. She pointed out that the traditional rhythm and scale of the streetscape has been maintained, and most of the structures are single-family dwellings. Planner Tyler indicated an open space in front of 1323 Park Avenue, which was the Miners Hospital and City Park location, and noted that this maintained the historic, open, less dense area that was once the location of the railroad.

Planner Tyler presented an aerial view taken from Park Avenue that was prepared by Elliott Workgroup to show in more context what the relocation would look like. By relocating the single-family dwelling, it would not only be put back into a series of three single-family dwellings as part of the affordable housing project, but it would also be back in a location that is more comparable to its original site.

Planner Tyler reviewed the criteria outlined in the Staff report. Criteria 1 was not applicable because this site is not in the historic District, it is not a Landmark site, or it was already removed from the site. Criteria 2 did not apply because it only pertained to Landmark structures. Criteria 3 was not applicable because the proposed relocation would not abate demolition because the structure was

already removed. The Planning Director and Chief Building Official already found hazardous conditions.

Planner Tyler remarked that the first applicable criteria is that relocation will not negatively affect the historic integrity of the Historic District nor the area of the receiving site. She met with the Design Review Team which included the Consultant and the Historic Preservation Planner. The Staff and the Design Review team found that this would not have a negative effect on the overall integrity of the Historic District. In fact, it will revitalize Park Avenue by replacing an incompatible fire station with a single family dwelling that maintains a historic designation. It will also keep the rhythm and scale moving north on Park Avenue where it has currently been lost, and extend some of that compatibility of the District towards the boundaries.

Planner Tyler noted that the next criteria was not applicable because it is located outside of the District. She stated that for historic buildings located outside of the historic district and its historic context and setting have been so radically altered that the building may be enhanced by a new setting. In doing their analysis, the Staff identified that the original site has lost its context because of that out-of-scale peripheral development. It is no longer associated with the series of single-family dwellings, it is no longer near less dense development and there is no rhythm and scale to the streetscape due to the condos and larger buildings. Planner Tyler remarked that by allowing the building to be moved, it would be placing it in a site that would restore those three items; and it would also allow for more compatible infill at the new site, which would help the District as a whole.

Planner Tyler read the next criteria, "The City Council, with input from the Historic Preservation Board, find that this is a major improvement program outside the Historic District with a substantial benefit. The Staff found compliance with this criteria. Planner Tyler read the definition of substantial benefit. "A substantial benefit is a significant improvement or positive effect that will fill a community need and/or meet a specified City Council goal, and provide considerable economic, financial, or environmental benefits to the community that does not currently exist. She noted that this is a City-owned project and the City Council has given direction for the Economic Development Director to pursue this project as proposed, which includes relocating this historic structure to Park Avenue.

Planner Tyler reiterated that the original site and the proposed site will become affordable housing. This allows the City to create that substantial benefit through affordable housing. In addition, it would be a substantial benefit to the overall district to restore the historic rhythm and scale of Park Avenue by removing the fire station and allowing a historic structure in that location.

Planner Tyler continued with the criteria. "The relocation will result in the restoration of the house, both interior and exterior, in compliance with the

Secretary of the Interior Standards". She explained that the reconstruction will be executed in a way that will match the historic structure to the best of their abilities based on the documentation they have. They do not have documentation of the interior layout as it was historically. However, based on historic photographs and documentation that the Elliott Workgroup did prior to the demolition, the building will be reconstructed to the Secretary of the Interior Standards on the exterior. The Staff finds compliance with this criterion to the best of their ability because they do not know what the interior layout was historically.

Planner Tyler read the next criteria, "The relocation will result in the revitalization of the receiving neighborhood due to the relocation". She pointed out that as previously stated, currently the fire station is an out-of-scale structure, and that will be demolished and replaced with a single-family dwelling on that site. It will result in affordable housing and overall revitalization of that section of the streetscape.

The last criteria, "The relocation will result in affordable housing". The Staff found compliance with this criterion because it will be affordable housing.

Planner Tyler requested that the HPB talk specifically about the relocation before they moved into the materials deconstruction.

Board Member Hodgkins stated that if they allow the reconstruction to occur in the new location, he wanted to know what would prevent the current owner of the site on Woodside to build whatever they want to build on that side. He was concerned that there was nothing to prevent them from ever reconstructing the building.

Jonathan Weidenhamer pointed out that the City owns both sites. There is an approved concept plan and a construction contract to finish the project. In addition, \$40 million was pledged in the Capital Budget to begin the project. He stated that it is one of the City Council's three top priorities, and the City Council has given direction to proceed.

Board Member Hodgkins clarified that he was not questioning the intent. His question was what would legally prevent the City from carrying out the project. Planner Grahn explained that the structure was demolished a while back and the policies have since changed. Under the new policy, whenever a project is proposed that involves a historic building, a financial guarantee is put in place, and the financial guarantee allows 18 months to complete the work and obtain a certificate of occupancy. Mr. Hodgkins asked if a financial guarantee would be put in place to make sure this new building would be built within 18 months. Assistant City Attorney McLean recalled that when the house was taken down with the intent to be reconstructed, the Staff measured it and did everything

required to make sure it was reconstructed exactly. She pointed out that a structure on the HSI cannot be demolished without a promise to put it back.

Mr. Elliott explained that the land was purchased with an RDA loan with the intent to master plan that whole area. When the demolition was done, Elliott Workgroup provided a preservation plan for the historic building with the intent that it would be reconstructed at a location to be determined in the future. He stated that it was part of the overall master plan that the City Council was moving towards for the entire site. There was a requirement to reconstruct the structure but not a specific date. Mr. Elliott stated that the City eventually purchased that land instead of doing a public/private partnership, and they were executing that plan based on the requirements that were placed on it when the preservation plan was created prior to removal of the building.

Chair Stephens clarified that when the City acquired the property it also acquired the contractual obligations to rebuild the house. Mr. Hodgkins understood that the contractual obligations were on both sides combined. Mr. Elliott replied that both sites are owned by the City. Mr. Weidenhamer explained that the City master planned the entire site together, and the plan was to rebuilt 1323 somewhere in that master plan on one of those two sites. Through the course of that master planning exercise the same side of the street was always conveyed. In every public meeting and master planning exercise, the building always ended up on the east side of Woodside.

Board Member Hodgkins stated that if the requirement was initially to build it on Woodside Avenue, he questioned why they were talking about it now. Director Erickson explained that the requirement is to build it in a location approved by the Planning Director. He understood that Mr. Hodgkins wanted to know if there was a mechanism to ensure that the City tears down the fires station and actually builds the house and affordable housing as opposed to using that money for another another project. Chair Stephens thought that was one of the options the City has as the property owner because the contractual obligation does not have a specific date. He did not believe the Board could consider that issue because they were only being asked to look at relocating the house. Assistant City Attorney McLean stated that if the Board decided that it was appropriate and met the criteria for relocation, they could add a condition of approval stating that no building permit could be issued for the first site without plans for rebuilding the house in the second location. She pointed out that if the Board votes to approve the relocation, there would be a financial guarantee to rebuild the house within a specific time period.

Board Member Beatlebrox stated that if they were looking at affordable housing planning on both sites, she questioned why they would not reconstruct the house in its initial location and put another type of affordable housing where the fire station is located. Assistant City Attorney McLean replied that it would be at the

owner's discretion. Another issue is whether this home is more appropriate on Park Avenue. Mr. Elliott explained that the context of the site as a historic location is compromised by the large condominium projects on either side. That area was zoned RC because of the size of the development around that property. When the City made the original decision, the intent was to rebuild the building in the historic zone and keep it in a scale that is compatible with the existing building. Mr. Elliott clarified that this was the intent from the discussions at that time; however, the City did not identify a specific site at that time.

Board Member Beatlebrox understood that there was a potential to see larger affordable homes on Woodside. Mr. Elliott replied that the RC zoning allows for greater density and height; which is consistent with the condominiums that are already built. Ms. Beatlebrox remarked that moving the house to the proposed area of Park Avenue would make more sense because of the scale and density.

Chair Stephens opened the public hearing.

There were no comments.

Chair Stephens closed the public hearing.

Board Member Holmgren stated that she sits on HPCA and she has had the privilege to hear part of the agenda that is coming forward. She lives at 1209 Park Avenue and she thought it was a good project. She felt very positive about it.

Board Member Beatlebrox had no problems with the relocation as proposed.

Board Member Hewett stated that she had no problems with the relocation; however, she recalled another situation where a property owner made the case that they were being surrounded by condominiums and wanted some relief from that. At that time the Board did not allow the change in designation. She suggested a mechanism in the future that would allow the Board to approve moving other houses if it was appropriate.

Chair Stephens remarked that the difference between this situation and the situation Ms. Hewett referenced is that this house is not in the Historic District. Board Member Hodgkins pointed out that another factor is that the house in this situation no longer exists.

Board Member White was comfortable with the relocation. Park Avenue is the Main entry to the historic district and the house would be located within the historic district in an area where the surrounding structures will be more compatible. In his opinion, another benefit would be eliminating the eyesore of fire station.

Board Member Scott supported the relocation. He echoed Board Member White. The City Park area is one of the main entryways to Park City. He thought eliminating the fire station was additive to what they were trying to accomplish.

Board Member Hodgkins had no problems with the relocation. However, he preferred to see this house rebuilt before anything could be built on the Woodside Avenue lot.

Chair Stephens agreed with his fellow Board Members. He thought the corner of Park Avenue and Deer Valley Drive makes a statement about their commitment to the historic District. Replacing the fire station with a historic home is a positive addition and supports their commitment to the Park, the recreation area, the Miners Hospital, and the restoration on the left.

Planner Grahn asked if the Board wanted to add a condition of approval about reconstructing the house. Board Member Hodgkins requested that they add the condition of approval. Chair Stephens stated that if they were going to place that condition on the approval, it should also have some flexibility because it is a big project with many parts. He thought the applicant should have the ability to request an extension if necessary.

Planner Grahn drafted a condition of approval to read, "No building permit will be issued for 1323 Woodside Avenue until a building permit has been issued to reconstruct the historic house at 1353 Park Avenue location". The Board was comfortable with the condition as drafted.

MOTION: Board Member Hodgkins moved to approve the Relocation of the Significant single-family dwelling at 1323 Woodside Avenue to a new vacant site at 1353 Park Avenue, based on the Findings of Fact, Conclusions of law, and Conditions of Approval as amended. Board Member Scott seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

#### 1323 Woodside Avenue – Material Deconstruction

Planner Tyler reported that the applicant was proposing to remove a non-historic shed addition, as well as a portion of the rear wall. She pointed out that the Board should look at this as a reconstructed building in its historic form.

The Staff supported the requested removal because it was not visible from the public right-of-way, and the applicant was removing a non-historic addition.

The Board had no questions or comments regarding the non-historic shed addition and the rear wall.

Planner Tyler stated that the applicant was also requesting to remove a chimney. She noted that typically they do not allow the material deconstruction of the chimney because it is a character defining feature of many of the roofs. Oftentimes the Staff requests that the applicant reconstruct a faux because it does not have to be an active chimney. Planner Tyler clarified that in this case the Staff was only asking the applicant to reconstruct the brick portion of the chimney, but not the large stovepipe shown in the tax photo. Mr. Elliott stated that there was evidence of a fireplace in there but it was a flu and it obviously failed in some way and the piece was added on top. When they did the documentation, the brick chimney was there but in reconstructed pieces. The top half was a different piece, and at the time was determined not be of any importance. However, he was not opposed to putting it back on if the Board preferred.

Chair Stephens opened the public hearing.

Ruth Meintsma, a resident at 305 Woodside, was happy about the chimney. It was mentioned in the finding of fact and all the pictures said it was non-historic and would be removed. She stated that chimneys disappear on houses because it is difficult to reproduce a chimney in a house that is redesigned. She could not imagine working around or removing a historic chimney while trying to replace the roof. She referred to the images on page 68 of the Staff report and stated that if the chimney was not there it would look like the house was missing an element. Ms. Meintsma thought the applicant's efforts to keep the chimney was admirable and exceptional.

Chair Stephens closed the public hearing.

MOTION: Board Member Beatlebrox moved to APPROVE the material deconstruction of the non-historic shed addition and a portion of the rear west façade of the Significant single-family dwelling. Board Member Scott seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

#### Findings of Fact - 1323 Woodside Avenue - Relocation

1. The applicant, Park City Municipal Corporation, is proposing to relocate and reconstruct the "Significant" single-family dwelling at 1323 Woodside Avenue to the new vacant site of 1353 Park Avenue as a part of Phase I of the larger Woodside Park Affordable Housing Project.

2. The proposed vacant relocation site at 1353 Park Avenue is located in the Historic Residential Medium-Density (HR-M) Zoning District.

3. The original site at 1323 Woodside Avenue is located in the Recreation Commercial (RC) Zoning District.

4. This new site (1353 Park Avenue) is approximately 200 feet north-northeast from the original site (1323 Woodside Avenue).

5. The Historic single-family dwelling located at 1323 Woodside Avenue is listed as "Significant" on the Historic Sites Inventory (HSI). According to Summit County records, the single-family dwelling was constructed ca. 1925. According to the Park City HSI, the single-family dwelling is significant to the Mature Mining Era (1894-1930).

6. The single-family dwelling at 1323 Woodside Avenue first appears on the 1929 Sanborn Fire Insurance Map. The single-family dwelling remained unchanged in the 1941 Sanborn Fire Insurance Map.

7. The first known image of the property at 1323 Woodside Avenue is a tax assessment photograph taken ca. 1940 (Figure 2).

8. On November 15, 2016, the Planning Department received a Historic District Design Review (HDDR) application for the property at 1333 Park Avenue. After working with the applicant on the materials of their submittal, the application was deemed complete on January 25, 2017. The HDDR application is still under review by the Planning Department.

9. The former non-historic Fire Station will be demolished (currently located at 1353 Park Avenue), thus making 1353 Park Avenue a vacant site.

10. On January 29, 2009, a Notice and Order to vacate and remove the Historic single-family dwelling located at 1323 Woodside Avenue was issued by the Park City Chief Building Official and recorded at the Summit County Recorder's Office. The Park City Chief Building Official found that the single-family dwelling at 1323 Woodside Avenue was a dangerous building as defined in Section 302 of the Uniform Code for the Abatement of Dangerous Buildings.

11. On April 29, 2009, a Demolition Permit was issued by the Park City Building Department after the architectural documentation had been completed and submitted. The Demolition Permit was for the removal of the single-family dwelling from the site in order to fulfill the reconstruction.

12. Due to unforeseen circumstances, including the 2009 real estate/stock market decline, the single-family dwelling has not yet been reconstructed.

13. In 2013, the Park City Municipal Corporation Redevelopment Agency purchased the property at 1323 Woodside Avenue with the intent of fulfilling the requirements of the Notice and Order for reconstruction of the single-family dwelling.

14. The Historic structure will retain its use as a single-family dwelling and there would be a total of three (3) single-family dwellings in a row abutting Park Avenue within Phase I of the Woodside Park Affordable Housing Project.

15. The reconstruction will be based on measured drawings that were drafted prior to the removal of the "Significant" single-family dwelling in accordance with the 2009 Notice and Order.

16. The relocation will comply with the required fifteen foot (15') Front Yard Setback and five foot (5') Side Yard Setback, as dictated by the Historic Residential (HR-M) zoning district, described in Land Management Code (LMC) 15-2.4-4.

17. The Notice and Order states "Final location of the structure is to be determined, as part of the development plan, with Park City approval by the Park City Planning Director and/or his designee."

18. Based on the language in the Notice and Order and the context of the original site, the relocation will not negatively impact the designation of the Historic District as a whole and will maintain a compatible setting with the historic setting, as the original site's context has been altered by peripheral non-historic and out-of-scale development.

19. The historic context of the building has been so radically altered that if the building were to be reconstructed at its original site, the setting would not appropriately convey its history because of incompatible infill on the west side of Woodside Avenue within the contextual area which has compromised the density and scale of the site.

20. Woodside Avenue within the contextual area lacks historic rhythm and scale of the streetscape.

21. The present setting on Woodside Avenue within the contextual area does not appropriately convey the history of the site as the historic single-family dwellings that were once located on the west side of Woodside Avenue have been demolished and replaced with a large condominium building.

22. There are zero (0) single-family dwellings located on the west side of Woodside Avenue within the contextual area.

23. The proposed location on Park Avenue conveys a character similar to that of the historic site, in terms of scale of neighboring buildings, materials, architecture, style, period, height, mass, volume, use, geography, and location of the structure on the lot as well as neighborhood features.

24. The proposed location on Park Avenue maintains a relationship with a pocket of less dense development located at Miner's Hospital and City Park which was once the site of the mining era railroad. The relationship between the proposed site and the lack of density on the east side of Park Avenue creates an association with the history of the historic structure at its original site because the mining era railroad also ran just north of 1323 Woodside Avenue.

25. Because this is a City-owned project, City Council has provided direction to pursue the development as proposed. On October 20, 2016, staff (the Woodside Park Affordable Housing Project Team) requested and was given direction by City Council to pursue the Historic District Design Review and supplemental applications for the affordable housing development including the relocation of 1323 Woodside Avenue to 1353 Park Avenue as proposed.

26. Affordable housing is a Substantial Benefit to the community.

27. The exterior of the structure will be reconstructed in compliance with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Reconstruction.

28. The addition of two (2) single-family dwellings at 1353 Park Avenue will revitalize the streetscape and create a cohesive development within the Historic District.

29. If the single-family dwelling were relocated to 1353 Park Avenue, the vacant site at 1323 Woodside Avenue would become a future affordable housing development location and the new site at 1353 Park Avenue would become an affordable housing development location.

30. The relocation will result in the reconstruction of the single-family dwelling in the Historic Residential-Medium Density (HR-M) Zoning District while allowing for denser development to occur at 1323 Woodside Avenue in the Recreation Commercial (RC) Zoning District for affordable housing.

31. The proposal to relocate the historic single-family dwelling complies with LMC 15-11-13 Relocation and/or Reorientation of a Historic Building or Historic Structure. There are unique conditions that warrant the relocation of the historic single-family dwelling to the new site as the context of the building's setting has been so altered that its present setting does not conveys its history.

### Conclusions of Law – 1323 Woodside Avenue - Relocation

1. The proposal meets the criteria for relocation pursuant to LMC 15-11-13 and/or Reorientation of a Historic Building or Historic Structure.

#### Findings of Fact – Material Deconstruction

1. The applicant, Park City Municipal Corporation, is proposing to relocate and reconstruct the "Significant" single-family dwelling at 1323 Woodside Avenue to the new vacant site of 1353 Park Avenue as a part of Phase I of the larger Woodside Park Affordable Housing Project.

2. 1353 Park Avenue is located in the Historic Residential Medium-Density (HR-M) Zoning District.

3. The original site at 1323 Woodside Avenue is located in the Recreation Commercial (RC) Zoning District.

4. The Historic single-family dwelling located at 1323 Woodside Avenue is listed as "Significant" on the Historic Sites Inventory (HSI). According to Summit County records, the single-family dwelling was constructed ca. 1925. According to the Park City HSI, the single-family dwelling is significant to the Mature Mining Era (1894-1930).

5. The single-family dwelling at 1323 Woodside Avenue first appears on the 1929 Sanborn Fire Insurance Map. The single-family dwelling remained unchanged in the 1941 Sanborn Fire Insurance Map.

6. The first known image of the property at 1323 Woodside Avenue is a tax assessment photograph taken ca. 1940 (Figure 2).

7. On November 15, 2016, the Planning Department received a Historic District Design Review (HDDR) application for the property at 1333 Park Avenue. After working with the applicant on the materials of their submittal, the application was deemed complete on January 25, 2017. The HDDR application is still under review by the Planning Department.

8. The applicant is proposing to remove a non-historic shed roof addition on the rear (west) façade. The shed roof addition does not appear on the 1929 or 1941 Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps and based on physical material evidence was constructed outside the Historic period.

9. The applicant is proposing to remove a portion of the rear (west) façade to accommodate the new approximately 167 square foot addition. The rear (west)

façade is Historic, except for where the non-historic shed roof addition is attached.

10. The applicant is proposing to remove the chimney which the applicant states is non-historic. The ca. 1940 tax photograph shows a central chimney with stovepipe; however, the stovepipe was not present prior to the removal in 2009.

11. Staff finds that the removal of the proposed non-historic shed roof addition and a portion of the rear (west) façade will not have a negative impact on the historic structure because the rear (west) façade of the structure is not visible from the Public Right-of-Way; the original Historic form of the structure will still be clearly interpreted after the removal of the proposed materials; and the removal of the non-historic shed addition will enable a clear delineation between the rear of the Historic structure and the new approximately 167 square foot addition because the new addition will not encompass the southwest corner of the Historic form.

12. Staff finds that the removal of the chimney is not appropriate as this is visible from the Right-of-Way and is a character defining feature of the historic roof form.

#### Conclusions of Law – Material Deconstruction

2. The proposal complies with the Land Management Code requirements pursuant to the HR-M District and regarding material deconstruction.

#### <u>Conditions of Approval – 1323 Woodside Avenue Relocation and Material</u> <u>Deconstruction</u>

1. Final building plans and construction details shall reflect substantial compliance with the HDDR proposal stamped in on November 15, 2016 and December 1, 2016. Any changes, modifications, or deviations from the approved design that have not been approved by the Planning and Building Departments may result in a stop work order.

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

3. Any deviation from approved Material Deconstruction will require review by the

Historic Preservation Board.

4. No building permit will be issued for 1323 Woodside Avenue until a building permit has been issued to reconstruct the historic house at 1353 Park Avenue location.

 <u>1333 Park Avenue – HDDR Material Deconstruction - Removal of nonhistoric materials on the Significant single-family dwelling</u>. (Application PL-16-03378)

Planner Tyler stated that this item was just for the material deconstruction of nonhistoric material, as well as repairs to the foundation at 1333 Park Avenue. This was the same City project that was discussed for affordable housing. The structure is designated as Significant on the Historic Sites Inventory.

Planner Tyler noted that the structure first appears on the 1907 Sanborn map; and it was much different than how it appeared in 1929. When CRSA conducted the intensive level survey, they believed that it was reconstructed between that time frame. They also believe there is a chance that the historic form is still in the core of the building. However, the 1929 Sanborn map reflects more of what is seen today.

Planner Tyler reviewed the materials deconstruction for the east/front elevation. She stated that in the 1990's this single family dwelling was rehabilitated, and the windows were removed and replaced in the original openings with non-historic windows. The applicant was proposing to remove the windows and put in historically accurate windows in terms of materials. The applicant also needs to make repairs to the foundation and remove the non-historic porch concrete landing. She asked if the Board had any issues with the east/front elevation. The Board had no questions or comments.

Planner Tyler reviewed the north elevation and noted that the windows would be removed from the window openings and replaced with compatible windows in terms of material. The foundation on the north elevation needed to be repaired as well. The Board had no comments or questions.

Planner Tyler reviewed the south elevation, which included window removal and repairs to the foundation. On the west elevation, the applicant was proposing to remove a non-historic railing for the back porch, remove the non-historic door and non-historic window, and make repairs to the foundation.

The Board had no comments or questions. Chair Stephens opened the public hearing. There were no comments.

Chair Stephens closed the public hearing.

MOTION: Board Member Beatlebrox moved to APPROVE the material deconstruction of non-historic materials and repairs to the Significant single-family dwelling at 1333 Park Avenue, pursuant to the Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Conditions of Approval outlined in the Staff report. Board Member White seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

Assistant City Attorney McLean disclosed that the Legal Department worked out of that house for about a year while the Marsac Building was being renovated.

#### Finding of Fact – 1333 Park Avenue

1. The property is located at 1333 Park Avenue. The property is located in the Historic Residential Medium-Density (HR-M) Zoning District.

2. The historic site is listed as Significant on the Historic Sites Inventory (HSI).

3. According to Summit County records, the single-family dwelling was constructed ca. 1905.

4. According to the Park City HSI, the single-family dwelling is significant to the Mature Mining Era (1894-1930).

5. The single-family dwelling first appears on the 1907 Sanborn Fire Insurance Map as a simple hall-parlor type house with a rear addition, which was likely a shed addition.

6. The 1929 Sanborn Fire Insurance Map show additions to the south and west of the structure. These additions occurred sometime between 1907 and 1929 (during the Mature Mining Era).

7. The single-family dwelling remained unchanged in the 1941 Sanborn Fire Insurance Map.

8. There is no tax photograph for this property from ca. 1940.

9. According to the Intensive Level Survey, the overall form and materiality remains intact, and the structure retains its Historic form. Though alterations to the original form and style have been made, such alterations occurred during the Period of Significance, the Mature Mining Era (1894-1930).

10. On November 15, 2016, the Planning Department received a Historic District Design Review (HDDR) application for the property at 1333 Park Avenue. After working with the applicant on the materials of their submittal, the application was deemed complete on January 25, 2017. The HDDR application is still under review by the Planning Department.

11. The applicant is proposing to remove the non-historic windows, the nonhistoric rear metal railing, the non-historic concrete porch landing and stairs, and make repairs to the structurally compromised foundation.

12. Staff finds that the removal of the proposed non-historic materials will assist in restoring the single-family dwelling to its Historic Form because the existing non-historic materials are incompatible and/or beyond repair.

#### Conclusions of Law – 1333 Park Avenue

1. The proposal complies with the Land Management Code requirements pursuant to the HR-M District and regarding material deconstruction.

#### Conditions of Approval – 1333 Park Avenue

1. Final building plans and construction details shall reflect substantial compliance with the HDDR proposal stamped in on November 15, 2016 and December 1, 2016. Any changes, modifications, or deviations from the approved design that have not been approved by the Planning and Building Departments may result in a stop work order.

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

3. Any deviation from approved Material Deconstruction will require review by the Historic Preservation Board.

4. A structural engineer shall be responsible for creating a cribbing plan prior to the house being supported from the interior for the installation of the new concrete foundation. Within five (5) days of installation, the structural engineer will inspect and approve the cribbing as constructed. If the cribbing is to be relocated or altered at any time during the construction of the foundation, the

structural engineer shall create and approve a new cribbing plan. The structural engineer shall re-inspect and re-approve the cribbing within five (5) days of any relocation or alteration to the cribbing.

5. Historic buildings which are lifted must be returned to the completed foundation within 45 days of lifting the building. Failure to do so will be a violation of the Preservation Plan and enforcement action through the financial guarantee for historic preservation could take place. 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 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.

6. The Preservation Plan must include a review and stamp by a licensed and registered structural engineer on the proposed cribbing or shoring methods. If the contractor makes a revision to the cribbing or shoring plan, the structural engineer must approve the change in writing. Cribbing or shoring must be of engineered materials. Screw-type jacks for raising and lowering the building are not allowed. The owner (or through its agent or the contractor) is responsible for notifying the Planning Department if changes are made.

4. <u>422 Ontario Ave – Material Deconstruction –Significant designation. The applicant is proposing panelization of the historic house and the following material deconstruction: c.2008 concrete retaining wall and non-historic boulder wall; non-historic wood fence; 1950s concrete walls and exterior staircases; c.1941 steel pole and horizontal wood board retaining wall; non-historic barbed wire fence; c.1941-1949 additions to the original c.1906 cross wing; c.1941-1949 roof forms and original c.1906 roof form; post-1950s asbestos and cement shingle siding; c.1906 floor structure and rubble stone foundation; c.1941-1949 porches; c.1970s doors; and c.1970s and 1980s window openings and replacement windows. (Application PL-15-02819)</u>

Planner Grahn believed this was the first time the HPB had reviewed a panelization project. She pointed out that 422 Ontario is the mint green house with aluminum siding. The house evolved and remained primarily the same through 1941. There was evidence of fires at this site, and by 1907 the cross wing was constructed. There was a one-story addition off the back. Based on the physical evidence found in the building, the Staff believes it was a porch rather than an addition, or possibly a porch that was enclosed into an addition. Planner Grahn stated that a number of additions were made by the Sorensen's after 1941, which created the appearance that exists today. And addition was

put on the north side of the house between 1941 and 1949. The porch, or possibly the one-story addition off the back, was enclosed in the 1970s. A new roof was put on, and there was also asbestos shingle siding and later cement shingle siding. There were metal handrails and porch posts, and a metal roof was first documented in the 1958 tax card.

Planner Grahn stated that Hamilton Easter was the current owner they were proposing to restore the house more to its historic appearance as seen in the Sanborn maps. Planner Grahn outlined the Engineers report. The house is typical of old town. The roof joists and floor joists are failing. She remarked that the single-wall construction buildings consist of plank and horizontal siding. Removing one of the elements creates a loss of rigidity of the structure. The building does not have footings or foundation.

Planner Grahn stated that the Chief Building Official has looked at this and the concern is mostly based on the location of the building. It is at the top of the hill, and if the house is lifted and raised it would sit higher on the hill with the street below. In the event of a strong wind it could fall into the street, which would not only damage the historic house but also creates a health and safety issue. Planner Grahn reported that the applicant was proposing to panelize the building, and they believe they could panelize all eight panels of the original house.

Planner Grahn reviewed the criteria for disassembly and reassembly. The first is that the structural engineer has to certify that the house cannot be reasonably moved intact. The structural engineer has confirmed that if the building is lifted it would be wobbly and structurally unsound, and it would create a dangerous situation. The second is that it must comply with at least one of the following: a) the proposed disassembly and reassembly will abate demolition. In this case, the applicant finds that they can preserve all eight panels of that original T-shape cottage, which is rarely seen with panelization projects. b) The Chief Building Official has found it to be a hazardous or dangerous building. Planner Grahn noted that the house was gutted in 2015 in an effort to do exploratory demolition. The house is not habitable and meets the definition of a hazardous building. c) The Historic Preservation Board must determine, with input from the Planning Director and Chief Building Official, that there are unique conditions. Planner Grahn stated that in this case, one of the greatest unique conditions is the problematic site. She pointed out that there were also physical conditions in terms of temporarily lifting or moving the building. The structural engineer found that this would be difficult because the house is in poor condition. It is a compact site and moving a building around is difficult during the construction phase.

Planner Grahn stated that the applicant had looked at other alternatives, but in the end they found that this was the best way to preserve the greatest amount of material.

Planner Grahn requested that the Board make a determination on the panelization before moving forward on the material deconstruction.

Bill Mammen, the project architect, stated that the owners want to preserve the history of this building, and this is the best way to do that.

Board Member Hodgkins asked if the City has inspected the site. Planner Grahn answered yes. When the applicant first approached the City in 2015, she and Chad Root, the Chief Building Official, walked around the building with the applicant and the preservation consultant. She recalled that they visited the site again when the building was gutted to really look at the systems and how it all went together. Planner Grahn stated that it is typical Old Town single-wall construction. The location on the site and where the house is perched on the hillside was very concerning to the Chief Building Official. Mr. Hodgkins understood that the intent is to restore the house and not to change windows or add other dimensions. Mr. Mammen replied that there were no historic windows left.

Planner Grahn suggested that they wait to talk about the specific changes when they talk about the deconstruction.

Chair Stephens recalled that there was original siding, and laid over that siding was the brick asphalt siding, which was covered by vinyl siding. In the process of putting on the brick or vinyl siding, he assumed the corner boards and trim pieces were removed around the windows and casings. Mr. Mammen replied that they had not yet taken it back. Chair Stephens was not concerned with the panelization itself, but when the panels are put back the details are usually lost. Even though the corners are probably already gone, he would like to see it replaced with what would have been put up in that historic period.

Mr. Mammen stated that they had only exposed the southwest corner, and the corner trim is gone. He suspected that was true everywhere. Mr. Mammen remarked that all the window trim is gone as well. They would have to historically recreate window trim, corner trim, and the porch trim. He pointed out that any material decoration on the house was gone.

Board Member White asked if the applicant had considered reconstruction rather than panelization. Mr. Mammen replied that it was talked about, but the Staff pushed them in the direction of panelization. Mr. White assumed they would remove the non-historic material before they panelize. Mr. Mammen replied that he was correct. Mr. White commented on the importance of protecting the panels once they are removed.

Board Member Holmgren clarified that this was a Significant site and not Landmark. Planner Grahn replied that it was not Landmark primarily because of

the changes to the house. Mr. Holmgren agreed with Mr. White and questioned why replication would not be better than panelization since it is not Landmark. Planner Grahn stated that the goal is to save as much of the historic material as possible. She pointed out that after further deconstruction and exploratory demo they may change their mind and come back to the HPB. However, at this time the Staff is confident that the non-historic siding materials could be removed and the panels could be stabilized and stored.

Board Member Beatlebrox felt positive about the proposal.

Chair Stephens opened the public hearing.

There were no comments.

Chair Stephens closed the public hearing.

Planner Grahn reviewed the material deconstruction. She noted that a number of non-historic site improvements were made sometime after the 1940s. Concrete steps in the backyard lead up to the parking area where the Sorensen's used to park. There were barbed wire fences, wood fences, and layers and layers of repairs and site work. Planner Grahn noted that the stacked stone retaining wall is historic and the applicant proposed to maintain that wall.

Planner Grahn commented on the non-historic additions. She reiterated that the Sorensen's made a number of additions between 1941 and 1949, which was outside of the Mature Mining Era that ended in 1930. The additions modified the shape and form of the house. She presented photos showing the changes and how they evolved. She pointed out the additions that the applicant was proposing to remove.

The Staff found that the additions do not contribute to the historic integrity of the house. They were built after the Mature Mining Era and detract from the historic house, which is partially why it was designated Significant and no Landmark.

Planner Grahn stated that the existing roof is corrugated galvanized metal roof panels. The roof is in poor condition and the joists have been compromised. Because the house will be panelized and taken down, the roof will be rebuilt using the existing measurements and what they find underneath. Planner Grahn pointed out the additions and changes that occurred to the roof over time.

The Staff found that taking down the roofing is necessary in order to restore the 1906 roof form.

Planner Grahn noted that the exterior walls have a number of siding materials covering them and those will be removed. They will try to restore as much of the

wood siding as possible. Planner Grahn remarked that a condition of approval was added stating that the applicant would work with Staff to make sure they were not discarding any historic materials that could be reused.

Planner Grahn noted that there was stacked stone but not a foundation. The floors are warped. That would all be rebuilt. A new structure would be built as well and the panels will go on top of it. There are two front porches on this house. One is on the 1941 and 1949 addition. That addition is not historic and can be removed, and the porch would be removed with it. The second porch is located on the 1906 cross wing. The materials are no longer there and the porch floor is concrete. A number of alterations were likely made at the same time the addition went in. The applicant will restore what they believe is the original appearance of the porch with wood posts, wood decking and railings.

Planner Grahn noted that there are two door openings on the house and pointed to what she believed was the original door opening. None of the doors have the original doors. Windows are in the same location. Most of the original window openings on the original cross wing have been altered. A lot of the window dimensions have changed to accommodate new windows. The applicant will be relying on ghost lines to make sure those windows are restored as they were historically.

Planner Grahn pointed to a shed that was not designated as historic. It is covered in the same non-historic materials as the house. The applicant believed there may be wood siding beneath it, and they were proposing to rehab the shed as well. Planner Grahn clarified that the Board did not need to make a determination on the shed since it was not historic.

The Staff recommended that the HPB conduct a public hearing and move to approve the material deconstruction at 422 Ontario Avenue.

Board Member Beatlebrox asked if the determination that an addition is nonhistoric is based on the materials that were used. Planner Grahn replied that it is based on when they believe it was built, which is outside of the Mature Mining Era. The house was designated as Significant for contributing to the Mature Mining Era, and they could argue that the additions and modifications detract from the original building that has gained historical significance.

Chair Stephens opened the public hearing.

Ruth Meintsma referred to a statement in the Staff report about the south side yard on the stacked stone retaining wall. The last sentence reads, "The Staff finds that any material deconstruction of the wall is necessary."

Planner Grahn explained that if there is any temporary deconstruction of the wall, it will be necessary in order to stabilize the wall and put it back together. She clarified that it would not be removed permanently.

Ms. Meintsma thought better wording would be "...finds that no material deconstruction is necessary". Planner Grahn replied that the Staff considers material deconstruction as everything in Exhibit A, which sometimes means temporarily taking things apart. She offered to revise the Finding of Fact to say that fixing the wall is more routine maintenance. Ms. Meintsma did not think they needed to change the Finding. She just wanted clarification.

Ms. Meintsma referred to Condition of Approval #2 and noted that in the past a lot of historic material was lost when it could have been repaired because it was left to the discretion of the contractor. That was a weak point in preservation and now it must be reviewed by the Planner. Ms. Meintsma noted that the Condition says "...prior to replacement" and she wondered how that compared to the same statement saying "...prior to removal". She commented on times when historic material has been removed before the Planner had a chance to review it. She asked if it meant the same thing, or whether the language should be revised to say "prior to removal".

Planner Grahn agreed that "prior to removal" was better wording.

Regarding Condition #2, Ms. Meintsma asked if the Planners have the power to make the determination and put it in writing. For example, in details such as siding, could the Planner be specific on what portions could be removed.

Planner Grahn believed the Planner would have that power; but if not, it would go to the Planning Director.

Chair Stephens closed the public hearing.

Chair Stephens supported Ms. Meintsma's comments about changing "prior to replacement" to "prior to removal".

MOTION: Board Member Holmgren moved to APPROVE the panelization of 422 Ontario Avenue, and the material deconstruction of non-historic and noncontributory materials at 422 Ontario Avenue, pursuant to the following Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Conditions of Approval as amended by revising Condition #2 to say "prior to removal". Board Member White seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

Findings of Fact - 422 Ontario Avenue

1. The property is located at 422 Ontario Avenue.

2. The site is designated as Significant on the Historic Sites Inventory.

3. Based on Sanborn Fire Insurance maps and historic research analysis, the house was likely constructed c.1906 by Amelia and Theodore Neimuth. The house first appears on the 1907 Sanborn Fire Insurance Map as a cross-wing with partial-width front porch and rear addition. This rear addition may have originally served as an open porch, but was enclosed by 1907. The overall form of the house remained unchanged through 1941.

4. Elden —Shortyll (1907-1998) and Ella Sorensen (1918-2009) purchased the house in 1941. Between 1941 and 1949, they constructed a side-gable addition to the north half of the historic cross-wing and relocated the front door from the north-south stem wing of the historic house to the addition. When the addition was constructed, a new roof form was built over the addition and historic house, so that only the gables of the historic c.1906 cross-wing were visible. The Sorensen's also clad the house first in asbestos shingle siding (prior to 1958) and then later cement shingle siding, rebuilt the porches with concrete foundations and metal and wood handrails, and installed the metal roof.

5. On July 20, 2016, the Planning Department received a Historic District Design Review (HDDR) application for the renovation of the historic house and construction of a new addition at 422 Ontario Avenue; the application was deemed complete on October 17, 2016. The HDDR application is still under review by the Planning Department.

6. The Historic Preservation Board (HPB) approved a request for an exterior exploratory demolition permit under the August 2015 pending ordinance on October 21, 2015.

7. On June 21, 2016, the Board of Adjustment (BOA) granted variances to (1) LMC Section 15-2.2-3 (E), to the required twelve foot (12') side yard setbacks to allow a zero foot (0') setback to the front property line, is hereby granted; (2) LMC Section 15-2.2-3 (H), to the required five foot (5') side yard setbacks to allow a three foot (3') setback to the north property lines, is hereby granted; and (3) LMC Section 15-2.2-5 (A) to the required maximum height of thirty five feet (35') to allow a maximum height of forty-one feet (41') measured from the lowest finish floor plane to the point of the highest wall top plate that supports the ceiling joists or roof rafters is hereby granted.

8. On February 11, 2016, the Planning Commission approved a Steep Slope Conditional Use Permit (SS-CUP) for this project.

9. The proposal to panelize the historic c.1906 cross-wing house complies with LMC 15-11-14 Disassembly and Reassembly of a Historic Building or Structure. Structural Engineer Henry Shen has reported that the house, as existing, would not survive temporary lifting as the exterior walls will not withhold wind, seismic, and gravity loads and the roof and floor joists are operating below capacity; there is no laterial diaphragm for the house. The proposal will prevent the demolition of the historic house and the applicant will preserve eight (8) original wall panels of the historic c.1906 cross-wing form. The Chief Building Official has found that the building is hazardous and dangerous pursuant to Section 116.1 of the International Building Code. Additionally, the Planning Director and Chief Building Official have found that there are problematic or structural conditions preclude temporarily lifting or moving a building as a single unit; the physical conditions of the existing materials

prevent temporarily lifting or moving the building and the disassembly and reassembly will preserve a greater amount of historic materials; and all other alternatives have shown to result in additional damage or loss of historic materials.

10. The applicant proposes to remove a c.2008 boulder and concrete retaining wall in the front yard in order to rebuild it as the front wall of the new basement-level garage; staff finds that this wall is non-contributory to the historic integrity and significance of the site. The applicant will repoint an existing stacked stone retaining wall along the south property line that curves behind the house and into the backyard; any material deconstruction associated with the wall is necessary for its restoration. The applicant also proposes to remove a non-historic wood fence in the side yard as well as concrete and board form retaining walls, two sets of stairs, and a barbed wire fence in the backyard that are not historic and do not contribute to the historic integrity or significance of the site.

11. The applicant proposes to remove alterations made by the Sorensen's after 1941 including the 1941-1949 addition to the north of the original cross-wing, an enclosed porch along the rear wall of the historic house, and the roof that was constructed during the 1941-1949 remodel. These additions do not contribute to the historic integrity or historic significance of the structure or site. The material deconstruction is necessary in order to restore the c.1906 cross-wing form.

12. The existing roof consists of a non-historic 1941-1949 roof form that was constructed over the original cross-wing form. The roof consists of corrugated galvanized metal roof panels over plywood sheathing. The structural engineer has found that the roof joists are at 16% capacity of the code. The applicant will use the original roof structure and historic gables to reconstruct the porch. The proposed material deconstruction is necessary for the restoration of the original c.1906 roof form.

13. The original cross-wing house was built using single-wall construction. The exterior of the house is covered in both asbestos siding added in the 1950s and then cement shingles. As part of the disassembly, the applicant will brace the interior of the wall panels with new structure, remove the panels, and then reinstall them atop the new structure. The applicant will remove two layers of non-historic siding and restore the original wood siding. New siding will be milled to match the historic and replaced as necessary. The removal of the non-historic siding materials is appropriate as these do not contribute to the historic integrity or historic significance of the structure and their removal is necessary in order to restore the c.1906 cross-wing's original appearance.

14. The house has no foundation and the floor joists sit directly on dirt and stacks of sandstone. The floor joists have rotted due to slumping, warping, bowing, and their irregular shape. They are only operating at 22% capacity of the required floor load. There is no shear capacity to the floor. The applicant is proposing to reconstruct the existing floor structure and construct a new poured concrete basement foundation. The proposed material deconstruction of the foundation elements is required for the rehabilitation of the building.

15. The front porch on the north half of the house was constructed as part of the addition between 1941-1949. The porch is not historic and the proposed material deconstruction is acceptable as the porch does not contribute to the historic integrity or historical significance of the structure or site.

16. The historic front porch was reconstructed between 1941-1949 as part of the larger renovation of the house. Though it maintains its original location, the materials of the original porch have been replaced by a non-historic concrete slab, wood posts, and even new porch rails. The applicant will reconstruct the original c.1906 wood front porch. The proposed material deconstruction is appropriate as these materials do not contribute to the historic integrity or historical significance of the structure and their removal is necessary to restore the front porch to its original c.1906 appearance.

17. There are two existing door openings on the house—one on the non-historic 1941-1949 addition and the other on the historic house. The door on the north half of the house will be demolished along with the non-historic addition as it is non-contributory to the historic integrity or historic significance of the structure. The door opening on the original cross-wing house will be restored and a new door installed that is consistent with the Design Guidelines. The material demolition of the non-historic door opening and door is appropriate as these modifications do not contribute to the historic integrity or historic significance of the structure of the structure and the material deconstruction is required for the restoration of the building.
18. There is a third door opening on the rear elevation of the original cross-wing that was uncovered as part of the applicant's exploratory demolition. The applicant is proposing to restore this door opening and introduce a window-door configuration that is similar to what may have existed historically. The changes will not damage or destroy the exterior architectural features of the subject property which are compatible with the character of the historic site. The proposed scope of work will not impact the visual character of the neighborhood where the material deconstruction is proposed to occur or impact the architectural integrity of the building.

19. There are a total of ten (10) non-historic windows currently in the house. These windows are in fair to poor conditions. The historic wood windows have been lost and the openings have been altered, likely during the 1941-1949 renovation. Staff finds that is appropriate to remove the non-historic windows on the 1941-1949 addition was these windows do not contribute to the historic integrity or historic significance of the structure. The material deconstruction of the non-historic window openings on the historic house is necessary in order to restore the original c.1906 window configuration.

20. There is a non-historic shed on the northeast corner of the property. This shed is not designated as historic on the City's Historic Sites Inventory. The applicant proposes to remove layers of non-historic siding and restore the original wood siding on the shed. The proposed work will not damage or destroy the exterior architectural features of the subject property that are compatible with the overall character of the historic site.

#### Conclusions of Law - 422 Ontario Avenue

1. The proposal complies with the Land Management Code requirements pursuant to

the HR-M District and regarding historic structure deconstruction and reconstruction.

2. The proposal meets the criteria for relocation pursuant to LMC 15-11-14 Disassembly and Reassembly of the Historic Building(s) and/or Structure(s) on a Landmark or Significant Site.

#### Conditions of Approval – 422 Ontario Avenue

1. Final building plans and construction details shall reflect substantial compliance with the HDDR proposal stamped in on October 14, 2016. Any changes, modifications, or deviations from the approved design that have not been approved by the Planning and Building Departments may result in a stop work order.

2. Where the historic exterior materials cannot be repaired, they will be replaced with materials that match the original in all respects: scale, dimension, texture, profile, material and finish. Prior to removal, the applicant shall demonstrate to the Historic Preservation Planner that the materials are no longer safe and/or serviceable and cannot be repaired to a safe and/or serviceable condition. The Historic Preservation Planner shall approve the replacement in writing.

3. Should the applicant uncover historic window and door openings that were not documented at the time of the Historic Preservation Board's review, the applicant shall schedule a site visit with the Planning Department and determine if the window or door opening should be restored. Any physical evidence of lost historic window and door openings shall be documented to the satisfaction of the Preservation Planner, regardless of plans for restoration.

5. <u>Consideration of an ordinance amending the Land Management Code</u> <u>Section 15, Chapters 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, and 2.5 regarding roof pitches and</u> <u>limiting the use of flat roofs to 30% of the total length of the streetscape</u> <u>facade</u>. (Application PL-16-03352)

Planner Grahn assumed the Board had read the Staff report and understood the background and the reason for proposing the ordinance. She stated that the intent is to find a balance between green roofs, rooftop decks, and flat roofs in Old Town. It is important to preserve the Historic District and to maintain the look and feel.

Planner Grahn recalled that the last time this came before the HPB they directed the Staff to look at the National Trust; which was not as helpful as they had hoped. The Staff report contained links to articles that the Board could read if they were interested.

Planner Grahn stated that one of the goals was to maintain the streetscape. One of the character defining features of the streetscape as it existed historically and as it exists today. The prominent feature are usually the gables.

Planner Grahn commented on the benefits of flat roofs, which includes snow storage, being sustainable, maintaining water runoff, etc. However, they need to look at the design and how it fits with the context of the neighborhood. Planner Grahn remarked that the Staff looked at options. For example, maybe a portion of the house has to have a gabled roof at the street front. That would provide an opportunity for the other portion of the street front to have a flat roof if necessary. The back could also have a flat roof because it would not be visible from the street.

Planner Tyler presented three images showing the gabled roof options. The first was a front facing gable and the second was a side facing gable. She pointed out that these structures have less mass than a traditional 27' flat roof. Planner Tyler noted that House C has a flat roof, and it overpowers the single-family dwellings on either side that are 1-1/2 to two stories. She noted that the Planning Department often sees this proposal and it is allowed by the LMC. The Design Guidelines can help reduce some of the mass, but the Staff finds that it is not contributory to the District.

Planner Grahn stated that the Staff looked at definitions on what a rooftop deck could look like. They also looked at the existing Design Guidelines. The alteration they were proposing to the LMC was first of all to make sure that Green Roof is capitalized because it is a defined term that means the roof will be vegetated. She clarified that wording was added to reference that definition. They also said that if it is a green roof; hot tubs, outdoor cooking areas, or seating areas would not be allowed. The roof should only be vegetated and not used as active space. The intent of the flat roof is to promote sustainability. Putting in a green roof and using it as a yard, it becomes an extended living area and would probably be less vegetated.

Planner Grahn remarked that on the streetscape portion of the front façade, the flat roof may not exceed more than 30% of the total length of the front façade. The pitched roof has to extend from a minimum of 12' on the side elevation before becoming a flat roof so it maintains the pitched look from the street. Planner Grahn stated that roof deck was defined as hard surfaced living space. The deck should be located no more than 23 feet above existing grade, which is current with what the LMC currently says as far as where the step occurs on an uphill façade. That would include the height of any required parapets, railings or similar features. Planner Grahn remarked that the Staff limited it to 500 square feet, but they wanted to relook at the square footage and possibly make it a percentage calculation.

Planner Grahn stated that another change was to define a deck as an open structure at least 12" above the ground and can be located anywhere on the property. However, a rooftop deck is defined as an open structure located on the roof framing of a building and above enclosed gross floor area.

The Staff requested input from the HPB on the proposed changes to the LMC.

Chair Stephens commented on the 30% of the flat roof in the front, and asked if that was limited to being a roof, or if it could be a roof deck. Planner Grahn replied that the Staff had not defined it. It could be either, but there was a percentage and a limit on the amount of roof deck. If the primary roof form is flat, it has to be a green roof per Code, which means it must be vegetated. The roof deck could not be the entire roof form. Chair Stephens clarified that he could have a 10' flat roof front façade that could be a roof deck. Planner Grahn answered yes, as long as the flat area is not more than 30% of the total façade width. Director Erickson noted that it also had to stay below 23', including the deck railings.

Chair Stephens stated that if it is an active roof deck, he would have to put railings on it in order to meet the Building Code, and he thought that defeated the purpose of what they were trying to do. Chair Stephens thought they were making the architecture better in the front, but then compromising it by having an active roof deck with railings. He was less concerned about the back.

Board Member Beatlebrox asked if this proposed change was only for new construction. She was told that it could also apply to historic buildings. Planner Grahn clarified that it would have to be on the addition to a historic building.

Planner Grahn used the image of the front façade to explain how the percentages would be calculated. Director Erickson explained that they were trying to maintain some of the rhythm and scale by looking at the roof pitch dimensions of the historic homes; and assuming that the house may get larger by there is new construction or it is re-orientated to the street. He pointed out that the numbers were not precise because of the variability of the architecture. Director Erickson stated that if the HPB feels that the deck is too great on the street front façade for habitable space, they could direct the Staff to reconsider the calculation.

Director Erickson remarked that the Staff was trying to make the distinction between a Green Roof, capitalized, and a roof deck. A roof deck is designed for habitable space. Non-habitable space would be like the exceptions that are used on bell towers. Director Erickson clarified that green roofs are designed to be non-habitable space, except for maintenance.

Chair Stephens had an issue with the 23'. He pointed out that they could be above the top plate in the gabled part of the house; however, typically a house would not be constructed that way. Chair Stephens did not disagree with it, but he was concerned about unintended consequences. He suggested that if they put the flat roof at the height of the top plate it would have a different look and would probably function better. Chair Stephens asked if there was another way to look at the 23'.

Board Member White shared Chair Stephen's concern. In his opinion, if they put a gable and a flat roof side by side, it would not look right to have the level of the deck higher than the plate line.

Planner Grahn explained that the Staff put this together based on the math. However, the 23' also included the railing. If they subtract three feet, the remaining 20' foot line might actually be lower, and the rail might intersect with the gable. She offered to look into it further because Mr. Stephens and Mr. White raised a good point. Mr. Stephens suggested that they look at it without it being an active deck.

Mr. Hodgkins pointed out that it could be interior space rather than a deck, in which case the volume is greater. He asked if the railing on a second story is only 3 feet. Mr. White replied that it is 3' on a residential building and 3'6" on a commercial building.

Board Member Scott thought there were examples of homes similar to this on Woodside where a garage was built with an active deck on the front. Board Member Hewett pointed out that it would not be allowed now because the garage would not be allowed to be built that way. She understood that currently the garage must be receded back from the house. Planner Grahn replied that it is determined on a case by case basis.

Planner Grahn suggested that she and Planner Tyler could do a windshield survey of some of the flat roofs in town, and that might help with the discussion. Chair Stephens did not believe they were seeing a lot of resistance when the flat roof is used as a connecting piece between parts of architecture where it is not higher than the top plate of the highest plate on the structure. He was not saying that it could not be active, and he did not disagree with the 30% rule proposed by the Staff. Chair Stephens thought the Staff should double-check the rule to make sure it does not box them in as far as good design in the future.

Board Member Hodgkins was not pleased about seeing roof decks from the street. However, he was not opposed to a second story deck that someone could walk out to. He believed that was different than a roof deck and should not be defined as a roof deck. It is much lower and does not reach 23'.

Chair Stephens used the example of a roof deck that is basically at grade from the street, but because it is a roof over a lower level on a downhill sloping lot, it would be defined as a roof deck. It would have to be measured out to make sure it was not over the 30%, but it would have had no visual impact from the street because it just looks like a deck. Planner Grahn agreed that they need to make sure they do not disallow those kind of designs. Board Member White thought they should be reviewed on a case by case basis.

Chair Stephens opened the public hearing.

Ruth Meintsma thought this was a good start on addressing flat roofs. She believed the Staff was in the right direction, but to get a better understanding, she suggested that they put additions on the historic images on page 312 of the Staff report to make it more realistic. Ms. Meintsma thought the shading of the flat roof showed the illustration well, but suggested different shading to help make the

point. Ms. Meintsma stated that she was in favor of flat roofs and green roofs for the good reasons, but she understood there needed to be a compromise. She believed the Staff was doing a good job of finding that compromise. Ms. Meintsma referred to page 315, and noted that the language was the Code as it stands. She was always confused because she reads it as the primary roof pitch must be between the primary roof. Therefore, the primary roof has to be at least 7:12 or 12:12. It also says, "A roof that is not part of the primary roof may be below. She always read that as not being able to have a flat roof house. There must be a gable at least 7:12, and the flat roof is secondary. Ms. Meintsma stated that there is a huge house across the canyon from her that is all flat, and she did not understand how the Code was misinterpreted. She thought it needed to be clarified.

Ms. Meintsma had a question on the front façade, "The pitched roof shall stand for a minimum length of 12" on the side elevation". She did not believe the language was clear. She thought it should be 12' from the façade or the right-ofway. Ms. Meintsma commented on a house that was passed a few months ago on Upper Park Avenue. She noted that the Code now requires a 10' stepback at 23', and that automatically creates a deck. She thought the 23' works because it is consistent with the Code, except it allows for railings above and beyond. Ms. Meintsma thought the Code was conflicted.

Planner Grahn was certain that 23' was the hard deadline. If someone needs to go above that for a railing, then the floor has to drop. Planner Tyler agreed that there is no exception for railings in height.

On the square footage issue, Ms. Meintsma thought the square footage should be based on a ratio of the lot size. Regarding the definition of decks, Ms. Meintsma suggested adding language clarifying that a rooftop deck is not a green roof.

Board Member White clarified that green roofs can be usable. Some of the green roofs have portions that can be sitting areas with green all around.

Ms. Meintsma understood that this ordinance was trying to change that. She thought it was a confusion that needed to be cleared up.

Chair Stephens agreed. It was what the HPB was trying to do, which is why this item would be continued for further discussion.

Sean Kelleher, a resident at 409 Echo Spur, stated that he was the biggest user of the flat roof. If the Board members wanted to visit his property and walk around the building to see how it all lays out, he would be happy to shovel his roof to expose what is up there. Mr. Kelleher thought the Staff did a good job of trying to mesh the issues that have prevented themselves. He thought it was important to understand that his houses from the front façade have less mass in the front than they would have otherwise. It would be different if it was a flat lot, but there are very few flat lots left in Old Town. Mr. Kelleher noted that the above grade mass for a steep slope lot, whether it is up or down, will be less for a flat roof house as opposed to the stepping strategy. His concern with the proposed ordinance is that the railing was being considered as part of the overall height. For example, a flat roof like his at 27' above the third floor, and a 3' railing as required by Building Code, which is included in the overall height and requires dropping the third floor ceiling by three feet, it would discourage anyone from doing a green roof because no one will replace three feet of interior space with a green roof. He thought a 3' high railing should be included in the list of exceptions.

Mr. Kelleher thanked Director Erickson and Planners Tyler and Grahn for bringing people in to talk about this.

Chair Stephens asked if this applied only to the HR zone. Planner Grahn answered yes. It would apply to HR-1 and HR-2. Chair Stephens clarified that it did not apply to Main Street. Planner Grahn replied that he was correct.

Planner Grahn requested that the Board continue this item to a date uncertain to allow the Staff time to complete the necessary studies.

MOTION: Board Member Holmgren moved to CONTINUE this item to a date uncertain. Board Member White seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

The meeting adjourned at 7:00 p.m.

Approved by \_\_\_\_\_

Stephen Douglas, Chair Historic Preservation Board



### Historic Preservation Board Staff Report

Subject:	1302 Norfolk Avenue- DOS
Project Number:	PL-16-03181
Author:	Anya Grahn, Historic Preservation Planner
Date:	April 5, 2017
Type of Item:	Administrative – Determination of Significance

#### **Summary Recommendations**

Staff recommends the Historic Preservation Board conduct a public hearing and continue the item to a date uncertain. Staff has received a request from the applicant that they were unavailable on April 5<sup>th</sup>; however, staff anticipates rescheduling this item in the near future.

#### **Description**

Applicant:	Park City Planning Department
Location:	1302 Norfolk Avenue
Zoning:	Recreation Commercial (RC)
Reason for Review:	Determination of Significance applications require Historic
	Preservation Board review and approval



### Memo to the Historic Preservation Board

Subject:	732 Crescent Tram
Project Number:	PL-16-03370
Author:	Anya Grahn, Historic Preservation Planner
Date:	April 5, 2017
Type of Item:	Administrative – Determination of Significance

#### **Summary Recommendations**

Staff recommends the Historic Preservation Board review the application, conduct a public hearing, and determine whether the additions to 732 Crescent Tram, designated a Landmark structure on the Park City Historic Sites Inventory (HSI), are historic in accordance with the attached findings of fact and conclusions of law.

#### Topic:

Project Name:	732 Crescent Tram
Applicant:	Old Town Lands, LLC (Represented by Tom Peek)
Owners:	Old Town Lands, LLC
Proposal:	Determination of Significance for Additions

#### Analysis & Discussion:

The Historic Preservation Board (HPB) reviewed this Determination of Significance (DOS) application on March 1, 2017 (Exhibit A). The house at 732 Crescent Tram was designated as Landmark in 2009 as part of the adopted Historic Sites Inventory (HSI); the designation included both the house and its additions. This application is requesting the HPB to reevaluate the designation of the additions and either:

- 1. Ratify the previous determination that the additions were historic, or
- 2. Find that the additions are not historic.

During the March 1<sup>st</sup> meeting, the HPB found that the additions' association with Carl Winters was not what made the additions significant. The HPB requested a site visit to walk through the house in order to determine if the materials and craftsmanship are distinctive characteristics of type, period, or method of construction typical of the Mature Mining Era.

The reevaluation of this site is <u>only</u> for the additions to the historic house. Land Management Code (LMC) <u>15-11-10(A)</u> provides the criteria for Landmark and Significant designation. Landmark sites are eligible for the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP). While the HPB does not use the NRHP criteria to evaluate the historical significance of Park City's historic sites, our LMC criteria are based on the NRHP criteria.

This building, including its additions, has been listed as Landmark because the site contributes to the City's Mining Era Residences Thematic District. The house was

found to contribute to the Mature Mining Era (1894-1930); however, further analysis has found that the building was modified several times during this 35-year period.

The HPB may choose to use the NRHP's seven (7) aspects of integrity to aid in determining whether or not the additions being reviewed contribute to the historic integrity of the house:

- **Location**—the place where the historic property was constructed or the place where the historic event occurred.
- **Design**—the combination of elements that create the form, plan, space, structure, and style of a property. Design is the conscious decisions made for planning significant alterations, such as the additions under review. It includes the organization of space, proportion, scale, technology, ornamentation, and materials.
- **Setting**—*the physical environment of a historic property.* The setting is the character of the place defined by how the property is situated, its relationship to surrounding features, and the basic physical conditions under which a property was built.
- **Materials**—the physical elements that were combined or deposited during a particular period of time and in a particular pattern or configuration to form a historic property. The conscious choice and combination of materials that reflect the preferences of the builder and the technology available at the time of construction.
- Workmanship—the physical evidence of the crafts of a particular culture or people during any given period in history or prehistory. This refers to evidence of the artisans' labor and skill in constructing or altering the building, such as vernacular methods of construction, finishes, and detailing. Workmanship relates to the individual, local, regional, or national applications of both technological practices and aesthetic principles.
- **Feeling**—the property's expression of the aesthetic or historic sense of a particular period of time. These include the physical features that, taken together, convey the property's historic character.
- **Association**—the direct link between an important historic event or person and a historic property. This is the presence of physical features that convey a property's historic character.

Using these criteria to assess the integrity, consider the following:

- Define the essential physical features that must be present for a property to represent its significance. Are the additions essential physical features that contribute to the historic integrity of the structure?
- Determine whether the essential physical features are visible enough to convey their significance. When looking at the house, are the additions visible enough to convey their significance?

- Determine whether the property needs to be compared with similar properties. Are these additions typical to the Mature Mining Era based on our knowledge of how the mining cabins were expanded during the era of significance?
- Determine, based on the significance and essential physical features, which aspects of integrity are particularly vital to the property being nominated and if they are present. Do the additions contribute to the integrity of the property?

Further analysis was provided in the March 1, 2017 HPB packet (Exhibit A).

#### Exhibits:

Exhibit A – HPB Packet, 3.1.17





**Planning Department** 

Author:Anya Grahn, Historic Preservation PlannerSubject:Historic Sites InventoryAddress:732 Crescent TramProject Number:PL-16-03370Date:March 1, 2017Type of Item:Administrative – Determination of Significance for Additions

#### **Summary Recommendation:**

Staff recommends the Historic Preservation Board review the application, conduct a public hearing, and determine whether the additions to 732 Crescent Tram, designated as a Landmark structure on the Park City Historic Sites Inventory (HSI), are historic in accordance with the attached findings of fact and conclusions of law.

#### Topic:

Project Name:	732 Crescent Tram
Applicant:	Old Town Lands, LLC (Represented by Tom Peek)
Owners:	Old Town Lands, LLC
Proposal:	Determination of Significance for Additions

#### Background:

The Park City Historic Sites Inventory (HSI), adopted February 4, 2009, currently 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. Since 2009, staff has reviewed Determination of Significance (DOS) applications with the HPB on a case-by-case basis in order to keep the Historic Sites Inventory (HSI) current. The existing structure at 732 Crescent Tram was added to the Inventory as a Landmark Structure based on a reconnaissance level survey by then-Historic Preservation Consultant Dina Blaes in 2009.

On August 23, 2015, Staff received an HDDR pre-application to discuss the historical significance of some of the structure's rear additions. The property owner would like to remove the non-historic additions, mothball<sup>1</sup> the structure, and then move forward with a plat amendment to create two lots of record at this site. The historic house would be renovated following recordation of a future plat amendment and an addition may be constructed at that time.

The applicant received a non-structural interior exploratory demolition permit in 2015. The exploratory demolition has afforded greater understanding of the development of this house, and has allowed staff to determine approximate dates of construction for the additions based on materials and construction methods. Site visits have been made by

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Mothballing is the act of closing the building temporarily to protect it from weather as well as securing it from vandalism.

former Chief Building Official Chad Root, Historic Preservation Consultant Anne Oliver, and Planning Department staff.

The Planning Department received a Determination of Significance (DOS) application for the additions on the historic house on November 14, 2016; it was deemed complete on November 17, 2016. Because of the limited information available on the Historic Site Form, staff has conducted additional research to determine the developmental history of this Landmark house and the historic significance of the rear additions. The purpose of this staff report is to have the HPB review the criteria to determine the historical significance of the rear additions on the west and south sides of the house.

The applicant is aware that this DOS application only determines the historical significance of the additions. The Historic Preservation Board (HPB) will have to review and approve the removal of these additions and/or any additional historic materials as part of a larger rehabilitation project through the Material Deconstruction process.

#### History of the Structure:

According to the Summit County Recorder's Office, this house was constructed c.1904. Physical evidence confirms that the house was originally constructed as a one-room single-cell house, facing north. Single cell houses, common in Utah between 1847 and 1910, generally consisted of single square or rectangular unit that created a single room. Single cells were often constructed with the intent to expand in the future and their simple design facilitated the addition of a second cell to the original to create a hall-parlor or even a second level.

By the 1907 Sanborn Fire Insurance Map, the single-cell house at 732 Crescent Tram had been expanded to the west, to create a more traditional rectangular hall-parlor form. Additionally, a rear addition had been constructed on the eastern half of the rear (south) elevation. At the time of its construction, the site was located outside of the Townsite survey and adjacent to the Crescent Mining Company's Tramway (Crescent Tramway). The house was also only 8 feet from the neighboring structure at 736 Crescent Tram (now demolished).

The house was likely expanded by Archie Wilson who took out a mortgage on August 6, 1906. Not much is known about Archie Wilson, but he did transfer ownership to his wife Mary Wilson in 1919. It is unclear when the Wilsons sold the house. The house remained largely unchanged from 1904 through 1929.

What is unusual about this house is that the hall-parlor form is facing north, with its side elevation facing the public footpath and 8<sup>th</sup> Street to the north. The north-facing orientation likely originated with the c.1904 single-cell house. At the time of its construction, the original builder may not have anticipated how the house would be expanded and so it did not matter that the house faced north towards its neighbor. Over time, the house was expanded to the west in order to create the hall-parlor form and the north-facing entry remained. The two cells on the west side were living areas and the c.1907 addition that created the "L" was a bedroom. Had the builder expanded the

living areas to the south of the original single cell, the building would have become a cross-wing and the entrance would have had to be relocated to the east façade, facing Crescent Tram.



In 1926, Carl Winters took a job at the Park City High School. Winters lived in the house with his wife and three daughters for twelve years. His daughter Marie remembered the house only consisting of "a kitchen, bathroom, dining room, front room, and one bedroom." This is consistent with the Sanborn Maps that show the original hall-parlor form along with a rear addition to the south.

During the Winters' ownership of the house, Marie remembers her father making a number of improvements. She recalls that he "tore off the kitchen and bathroom and made them new." It is unclear if the kitchen was simply renovated or if it was completely demolished and rebuilt. Per the applicant's analysis, this kitchen addition to the west of the original single cell has newer building materials; however, it maintained the original footprint that was evident in the Sanborn Fire Insurance Map of 1907. Winters also constructed a new stairway along the west wall of the c.1907 rear addition for access to the second level he built. It appears that Carl Winters also added an extension to the c.1907 rear addition and constructed a root cellar at the far front end of the kitchen extension. The porch seems to have been constructed by 1941 as well as seen in the c.1941 tax photograph.



This 1941 Sanborn Fire Insurance Map does not depict the rear addition to the south of the original ell, nor does it show the second story addition and porch.

The Sanborn Fire Insurance maps were originally used to assess fire insurance liability. They became popular in the U.S. following the Civil War when population growth led to a construction boom in an effort to rebuild the South and settle the West. As staff and the HPB have discovered in Park City's Sanborn Fire Insurance Map Collection, the maps were often updated following 1907 with trace paper. As firefighting capabilities improved, less attention was paid to accurately updating the maps. For that reason, the changes to 732 Crescent Tram seen in the historic tax photograph may not have been documented in the 1941 Sanborn map.



c.1941 Tax Photograph shows the rear in-line addition as well as the rooftop expansion Carl Winters added between 1926 and 1938.

Carl Winters was a prominent Parkite. Winters taught mathematics at the <u>Park City</u> <u>High School</u> (1255 Park Avenue) until he was promoted to principal in 1936. Two years later, he became the Park City School District Superintendent, a position he held for 27 years; he retired in 1965. When the Park City High School moved to its new location on Kearns Boulevard in 1977, the building became the Carl Winters Middle School, named in honor of the long-time superintendent.

Due to the location of the house outside of the Townsite survey and its proximity to Crescent Tramway, it is difficult to document the history of ownership for this property. It is unclear who resided in the home after the Winters family sold it; however, the Sweeney Land Company gave a quit claim deed to G. Leo and Margaret Rodgers in 1985. It is unknown if they lived in the house or in Park City in general as there is little record of the couple. The Planning Department records show that the City awarded the Rodgers a Historic District Grant in 1988 for painting, a new roof, and fixing a wall (see Analysis for further discussion); it is unclear which wall was repaired but staff assumes the painting and new roof covered both the historic hall-parlor as well as the additions made by Winters.

Mrs. Rodgers then deeded the house to the Salt Lake Exchange Accom. in 2002. It was purchased by current owner Thomas Peek in 2002; however, it was transferred to Old Town Lands LLC, of which Peek is a representative, in 2005.



The following analysis documents the development of the historic house:

The green shaded room represents the original c.1904 one room single cell house. The purple shaded area reflects the addition that was constructed early on, sometime between 1900-1907 based on Sanborn Map Analysis. Addition A does not appear in the Sanborn

Fire Insurance Maps, but does appear in the c.1941 tax photograph; it is likely that this addition was added by Carl Winters. Addition B is the bathroom wing and stairs, and Addition D is the root cellar that were also likely constructed by Winters. The red shading reflects the kitchen addition that was reconstructed by Winters and maintained the original dimensions of the c.1907 hall-parlor form (Addition C). Winters also added the second level (Addition E). The Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps do not show a full-width front porch; however, it appears in the c.1941 tax photograph. It's likely that the porch was also constructed by Winters when the other improvements were made.

The elevations further clarify the number of alterations that were made between 1926 to 1941:



The green shaded form shows the original single cell form. The orange shading represents the modifications made by Carl Winters between 1926-1938, which included adding a root cellar on the east side of the house and a second level addition. The red shading reflects the kitchen addition that Winters reconstructed and that maintained the original form of the c.1907 hall-parlor as shown in the Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps. The porch was likely constructed under the Winters ownership as well.



The green shaded area shows the side of the original single cell form. The purple shading shows the first addition that was constructed before 1907 and appears throughout the Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps. The orange shading shows the changes that were likely made between 1926-1938. They are not shown on the Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps, but they are depicted in the c.1941 tax photograph.





The green shaded form shows the south elevation of the original hall-parlor. The remainder of the rear elevation was built by Winters between 1926-1938.

The orange shaded areas represent what was built by the Winters between 1926-1938.

The house has remained largely unchanged since Winters' improvements were constructed between 1926 and 1938. The interior was gutted as part of an exploratory demolition permit in 2015.



Photos from 2013

#### Analysis and Discussion:

The Historic Preservation Board is authorized by Title 15-11-5(I) to review and take action on the designation of sites within the Historic Sites Inventory (HSI). The Historic Preservation Board may designate sites to the Historic Sites Inventory as a means of providing recognition to and encouraging the preservation of historic sites in the community (LMC 15-11-10). Land Management Code Section 15-11-10(A) sets forth the criteria for designating sites to the Park City Historic Sites Inventory (HSI). The structure is currently identified as "Landmark" on the Historic Site Form. It is not listed on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) but is eligible for listing.

#### Evaluating Historical Significance

To be listed on the NRHP, the building must presently reflect those characteristics that tell the story or convey its importance in American history, architecture, archeology, engineering, and/or culture. It must possess integrity of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association. In Park City, individual buildings make up our Mining Boom Era Residences Thematic National Register District, which was listed on the NRHP due to its architectural and historical significance.

The Land Management Code provides criteria in which to evaluate the historical significance of this historic house and its additions that is based off of the NRHP criteria. Like a district, the house was designated as a Landmark structure on the city's HSI due to the sum of its parts. As detailed further in the analysis below, the house could be deemed significant for (1) its association with an event, the Mature Mining Era, (2) its association with a person of significance in the community, Carl Winters, and/or (3) its Design/Construction which includes its hall-parlor form, single-wall construction, and possibly the developmental history of this site.

The applicant has requested that the HPB make a determination of significance on the additions to the historic house. If the HPB finds that the additions are not historic, the applicant will submit an HDDR application to remove them in the future. The HPB will then review the material deconstruction associated with removing these additions. Should the HPB find that the additions are historic and should remain, they will not be permitted to be permanently removed from the historic house.

The HPB will need to determine what period of development is historically significant in order to determine whether or not these additions are historically significant. Staff has provided more detail in the following analysis.



- Addition A is the in-line addition that was likely constructed by Carl Winters; it is not reflected in the Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps, but does appear in the 1941 tax photograph. The applicant believes this addition is not historic.
- Addition B is the stairs that were likely constructed when the second level was added (Addition F).
- Addition C is the bathroom addition that was constructed by Carl Winters; it, too, does not appear in the Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps. The applicant believes this addition is not historic.
- Addition D is the kitchen addition that was reconstructed by Carl Winters. Though it was constructed between 1926 and 1938, it did maintain the original footprint of the c.1907 hall-parlor form as depicted by the Sanborn Fire Insurance maps.
- Addition E is the root cellar that was also likely constructed by Carl Winters. The applicant believes this addition is not historic.
- Addition F is the second level addition that was built by Carl Winters. It is depicted in the c.1941 historic tax photograph, but was not original to the c.1907 house. The applicant believes this addition is not historic.

Staff requests that the HPB find whether or not these additions would meet the criteria for Landmark designation, based on the following:

LANDMARK SITE. Any Buildings (main, attached, detached, or public), Accessory Buildings, and/or Structures may be designated to the Historic Sites Inventory as a Landmark Site if the Planning Department finds it meets all the criteria listed below:

### (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.** The additions being reviewed were constructed by Carl Winters during his ownership of the house (1926 to 1938), making these additions between 91 and 79 years old.

# (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

**Complies.** As previously described, this building is eligible for the NRHP, though it is not listed. The building is eligible as it currently exists, with these additions, as it contributes to the historical and architectural significance of the district overall. As documented by staff, the building has largely remained the same since the end of the Mature Mining Era, with the additions in question being over 50 years old. These additions do not detract from the historic building. While the overall form was modified at the end of the Mature Mining Era or a short time after it, the Historic Site Form finds that "much of the original integrity and composition is intact in form."

## (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.

#### HPB Discussion Requested.

With its additions, the building as it exists today contributes to the broad patterns of our local history because it possesses sufficient integrity to reflect the time period of the Mature Mining Era. The c.1907 hall-parlor form was one of the three most popular building forms seen during the Mature Mining Era, and its simple folk Victorian architecture reflects that same era.

The overall development of this property reflects the changing needs of Park City's mining boom era. The initial single-cell house was built c.1904 to meet the housing demand created by the mining boom. As Park City matured from a mining camp into a permanent settlement, it was common to expand houses to accommodate growing families. The single cell house at 732 Crescent Drive was expanded to the west to create a hall-parlor form and a bedroom addition was constructed to the south of the single-cell as well. By the 1920s, Park City was an established

community and permanent residents required more space for growing families; the Winters' alterations to the house again reflected the need to meet the changing needs of permanent residents and their families.

For those buildings deemed historically significant because of their association with a person, the building must reflect the time period when he or she gained significance due to his/her important achievements. This LMC provision is based on Criterion B of the NRHP, and Criterion B states that sites should be compared to other associated properties to identify those that best represent the person's historic contributions. In the case of 732 Crescent Tram, the HPB may find:

- 1. The additions under review are historically significant because of their association with Carl Winters and should be maintained
- 2. The additions under review are not significant because of their association with Carl Winters as there are better properties that represent Carl Winters' contributions to the community, such as the Park City High School (now Library).

As described earlier, Winters was significant to the history of Park City. From 1926 to 1936, he taught mathematics at the Park City High School and then served as principal for two years. From 1938 through 1965, he was the Park City School District Superintendent.

The single-cell house was initially built c.1904 but expanded by 1907 into a hallparlor with rear addition. This early form consisted of single-wall construction, a simple building technique that allowed for buildings to be quickly constructed in an effort to meet the housing demands created by the mining boom and Great Fire.

The additions to the house reflect the distinctive characteristics of the period and methods of construction typical to the Mature Mining Era. It was not uncommon for houses to be expanded as families permanently settled in Park City, and Carl Winters added these additions between 1926 and 1938 so that the house could accommodate his family of six. The additions were constructed of simple materials and single-wall construction, echoing the construction of the original house. The second level addition was built upon the original roof, a staircase was haphazardly constructed to the west side of the c.1907 addition, and a bathroom was dug out and built into the hillside. This expansion made use of any available space on this hillside lot, which was typical of construction during the early twentieth century.

These additions lack individual distinction; however, the HPB will need to determine if they contribute to the Landmark status of the house overall.

Should the HPB find that the additions do not meet the criteria for Landmark status, the HPB may find that these additions meet the criteria for Significant status as outlined below:

SIGNIFICANT SITE. Any Buildings (main, attached, detached or public), Accessory Buildings and/or Structures may be designated to the Historic Sites Inventory as a Significant Site if the Planning Department finds it meets all the criteria listed below:

(a) It is at least fifty (50) years old or the Site is of exceptional importance to the community; and

**Complies.** As previously outlined, the additions that the applicant found to be nonhistoric were constructed by Carl Winters between 1926 and 1938. The additions are between 91 and 79 years old.

## (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; or

**Complies.** The Essential Historical Form is defined as the physical characteristics of a Structure that make it identifiable as existing in or relating to an important era in the past. As previously noted, the form of this house remains largely unchanged since c.1941. The additions under review today were constructed by Carl Winters between 1926 and 1938. The HPB shall determine whether these additions are historic and make up the Historical Form.

In 1988, the property received a grant of \$3,770 for painting, a new roof, and fixing a wall. It is unclear which wall was repaired. Staff can only assume that the paint was for both the historic house and any additions as the house has always been painted a single color. Additionally, the new roof likely covered the entire structure as it appears that the age of the asphalt shingles is consistent throughout.

The house is currently designated as a Landmark structure on the City's Historic Sites Inventory, adopted in 2009. The house was identified as historic in the 1982 reconnaissance level survey of Old Town and was rated "B" in a 2007 NRHP eligibility survey; B sites were found to be potentially eligible/slightly less significant and/or intact.

(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; and (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; or **Complies.** The house retains its historic scale, context, and material which allow the original c.1907 hall-parlor and rear addition to be restored, despite the additions made to the rear (south) elevation, stairway, bathroom addition, root cellar, and second level addition between 1926 and 1938. The house reflects the Historical and Architectural character of the district due to its mass, scale, composition, materials, treatment, and other architectural features that are visually compatible with the Mining Era Residences National Register District.

### (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.

**HPB Discussion Requested.** The hall-parlor form and rear addition were constructed by c.1907. The hall-parlor form was one of the earliest types to be built in Park City and was one of the three most common house types built during the Mature Mining Era (1894-1930). These additions were constructed at the end of the Mature Mining Era or even after 1930.

As discussed earlier, the HPB will need to determine whether the house is significant due to its association with Carl Winters, a prominent historic figure in Park City. The HPB may also find that there is a better example—the Park City High School—that is more significant to Carl Winter's contributions to our community.

Additionally, the single-wall construction of these additions is a typical method of construction and craftsmanship that was utilized during the Historic Period to address housing shortages due to the mining boom as well as the Great Fire.

#### Process:

The HPB will hear testimony from the applicant and the public and will review the Application for compliance with the "Criteria for Designating Historic Sites to the Park City Historic Sites Inventory." 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 February 11, 2017, Legal Notice of this public hearing was published in the Park Record, according to the requirements of the Land Management Code. Staff also sent

a mailing notice to the property owner and property owners within 100 feet on February 15, 2017 and posted the property on February 15, 2017.

#### Public Input:

A public hearing, conducted by the Historic Preservation Board, is required prior to adding sites to or removing sites from the Historic Sites Inventory. The public hearing for the recommended action was properly and legally noticed as required by the Land Management Code. No public input was received at the time of writing this report.

#### **Alternatives:**

- Conduct a public hearing and find the additions from the HSI meet the criteria for Landmark or Significant and do contribute to the Site's listing on the Historic Sites Inventory, based on the findings of fact and conclusions of law set forth in the staff report
- Conduct a public hearing on the additions described herein and find the additions are non-historic and do not contribute to the Site's listing on the Historic Sites Inventory based on the findings of fact and conclusions of law set forth in the staff report.
- Continue the action to a date certain.

#### Significant Impacts:

The house at 732 Crescent Tram is currently listed on the Historic Sites Inventory (HSI). If it continues to be designated as "Landmark" on the HSI, any alterations must comply with the Design Guidelines for Historic Sites; the site will be eligible for the Historic District Grant Program. Should the additions be found to be non-historic and non-contributing to the historical significance of the landmark house, they may be removed in the future; the house will remain listed on the HSI as Landmark.

#### **Recommendation:**

Staff recommends the Historic Preservation Board review the application, conduct a public hearing, and determine whether the rear additions to 732 Crescent Tram, designated a Landmark structure on the Park City Historic Sites Inventory (HSI), are historic in accordance with the attached findings of fact and conclusions of law.

#### <u>Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law Supporting the Historic Designation of</u> <u>the Additions:</u>

#### Finding of Fact:

- 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. The house at 732 Crescent Tram is within the Historic Residential (HR-1) zoning district.
- 3. The historic house at 732 Crescent Tram is identified as "Landmark" on the Historic Sites Inventory (HSI). It is eligible for the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP), but is not currently listed.

- In December 2015, City Council amended the Land Management Code to expand the criteria for what structures qualify to be landmark and significant sites.
- 5. A single-cell house was initially built on this site c.1904.
- 6. Analysis of the 1900, 1907, and 1929 Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps demonstrates that a second room was added to the west of the single-cell to create a hall-parlor form by 1907. A third in-line addition was also added to the south of the single-cell to create an L-shape. This is further supported by physical evidence found inside the house.
- 7. Carl Winters purchased the house in 1926. His daughter Marie remembers the house only consisting of "a kitchen, bathroom, dining room, front room, and one bedroom." This is supported by the 1941 Sanborn Fire Insurance Map that shows the L-shaped cottage.
- 8. During Winters ownership of the house (1926-1938) several additions were made that are documented by the c.1941 tax photograph. An in-line addition was constructed to expand the c.1907 rear addition; a staircase addition was constructed along the west wall of the c.1907 rear addition; a bathroom addition was built to the south of the original kitchen, or c.1907 west addition to the single cell; a root cellar was built west of the original kitchen, and a second story was added to the house.
- 9. Carl Winters' daughter also remembers that her father "tore off the kitchen and bathroom and made them new." It's unclear if he demolished and rebuilt the kitchen and bathroom or simply renovated them. New construction materials are found in the kitchen wing; however, it maintained the footprint of the original c.1907 addition that was made to the west side of the single-cell and that created the original hall-parlor form.
- 10. The house has remained largely unchanged since Winters' improvements were constructed between 1926 and 1938.
- 11. G. Leo and Margaret Rodgers purchased the house in 1985; in 1988, they received \$3,770 in grant funds for painting, a new roof, and fixing a wall.
- 12. The applicant has documented the developmental history of this building and finds that the additions made by Carl Winters are not historic.
- 13. The additions constructed by Carl Winters are between 79 and 91 years old.
- 14. The building is eligible for the NRHP because it retains its historic integrity in terms of design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association as defined by the National Park Service for the National Register of Historic Places. The additions under review do not detract from the historic building. Park City's Historic Site Form finds that "much of the original integrity and composition is intact in form" which includes these additions.
- 15. The building as it exists today contributes to the broad patterns of Park City's history because it possesses sufficient integrity to reflect the time period of the Mature Mining Era.
- 16. The hall-parlor form was one of the three most popular building forms seen during the Mature Mining Era and the house at 732 Crescent Tram reflects the folk Victorian architecture seen during that era.

- 17. The overall development of this property reflects the changing needs of Park City's mining boom era. As Park City became an established community, permanent residents expanded the early miners' cabins in order to accommodate growing families.
- 18. Carl Winters is a person of historical significance in the community and the additions he made to the house at 732 Crescent Tram between 1926 and 1938 are significant because of their association with him.
- 19. The additions reflect the distinctive characteristics of the period and methods of construction typical to the Mature Mining Era. The additions were constructed of simple materials and single-wall construction. The staircase was haphazardly constructed to the west side of the c.1907 addition and a bathroom was built into the hillside. The expansion was typical of Park City during this period as it made use of any available space on this hillside lot.
- 20. The house, with its additions, was designated as a Landmark Structure in 2009 by the Historic Sites Inventory.
- 21. In 1982, the house was identified as historic on a reconnaissance level survey of Old Town.
- 22. The house was rated "B" in a 2007 NRHP eligibility survey; B sites were found to be potentially eligible for the NRHP or slightly less significant and/or intact.
- 23. The house retains its historic scale, context, and material which allow the original c.1907 hall-parlor and rear addition to be restored, despite the later additions made by Carl Winters. The house reflects the historical and architectural character of the district due to its mass, scale, composition, materials, treatment, and other architectural features that are visually compatible with the Mining Era Residences National Register District.

#### Conclusions of Law:

- 1. The existing house located at 732 Crescent Tram meets 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 **Complies.**
  - 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 located at 732 Crescent Tram 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; or

#### 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; and

(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; or

#### 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.

# Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law Removing the Historic Designation of the Additions:

Finding of Fact:

- 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. The house at 732 Crescent Tram is within the Historic Residential (HR-1) zoning district.
- 3. The historic house at 732 Crescent Tram is identified as "Landmark" on the Historic Sites Inventory (HSI). It is eligible for the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP), but is not currently listed.
- 4. In December 2015, City Council amended the Land Management Code to expand the criteria for what structures qualify to be landmark and significant sites.
- 5. A single-cell house was initially built on this site c.1904.
- 6. Analysis of the 1900, 1907, and 1929 Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps demonstrates that a second room was added to the west of the single-cell to create a hall-parlor form by 1907. A third in-line addition was also added to the

south of the single-cell to create an L-shape. This is further supported by physical evidence found inside the house.

- 7. Carl Winters purchased the house in 1926. His daughter Marie remembers the house only consisting of "a kitchen, bathroom, dining room, front room, and one bedroom." This is supported by the 1941 Sanborn Fire Insurance Map that shows the L-shaped cottage.
- 8. During Winters ownership of the house (1926-1938) several additions were made that are documented by the c.1941 tax photograph. An in-line addition was constructed to expand the c.1907 rear addition; a staircase addition was constructed along the west wall of the c.1907 rear addition; a bathroom addition was built to the south of the original kitchen, or c.1907 west addition to the single cell; a root cellar was built west of the original kitchen, and a second story was added to the house.
- 9. Carl Winters' daughter also remembers that her father "tore off the kitchen and bathroom and made them new." It's unclear if he demolished and rebuilt the kitchen and bathroom or simply renovated them. New construction materials are found in the kitchen wing; however, it maintained the footprint of the original c.1907 addition that was made to the west side of the single-cell and that created the original hall-parlor form.
- 10. The house has remained largely unchanged since Winters' improvements were constructed between 1926 and 1938.
- 11. G. Leo and Margaret Rodgers purchased the house in 1985; in 1988, they received \$3,770 in grant funds for painting, a new roof, and fixing a wall.
- 12. The applicant has documented the developmental history of this building and finds that the additions made by Carl Winters are not historic.
- 13. The additions constructed by Carl Winters are between 79 and 91 years old.
- 14. The building is eligible for the NRHP because it retains its historic integrity in terms of design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association as defined by the National Park Service for the National Register of Historic Places. The additions under review do not detract from the historic building. Park City's Historic Site Form finds that "much of the original integrity and composition is intact in form" which includes these additions.
- 15. The building as it exists today contributes to the broad patterns of Park City's history because it possesses sufficient integrity to reflect the time period of the Mature Mining Era.
- 16. The hall-parlor form was one of the three most popular building forms seen during the Mature Mining Era and the house at 732 Crescent Tram reflects the folk Victorian architecture seen during that era.
- 17. The additions constructed to the house between 1926 and 1938 <u>do not</u> reflect the Mature Mining Era and <u>do not</u> contribute to our understanding of the broad patterns of our history.
- 18. Carl Winters is a person of historical significance in the community; however, the additions he made to the house at 732 Crescent Tram between 1926 and 1938 are <u>not</u> significant because of their association with Carl Winters as there are better properties that represent Carl Winters' contributions to the community, including the historic Park City High School at 1255 Park Avenue.

- 19. The additions do not reflect the Mature Mining Era's characteristic building types or methods of construction.
- 20. The house, with its additions, was designated as a Landmark Structure in 2009 by the Historic Sites Inventory.
- 21. In 1982, the house was identified as historic on a reconnaissance level survey of Old Town.
- 22. The house was rated "B" in a 2007 NRHP eligibility survey; B sites were found to be potentially eligible for the NRHP or slightly less significant and/or intact.
- 23. The house retains its historic scale, context, and material which allow the original c.1907 hall-parlor and rear addition to be restored, despite the later additions made by Carl Winters. The house reflects the historical and architectural character of the district due to its mass, scale, composition, materials, treatment, and other architectural features that are visually compatible with the Mining Era Residences National Register District.
- 24. The additions do not contribute to the historical significance of this house.

Conclusions of Law:

- 1. The additions to the existing house located at 732 Crescent Tram does not meet all of the criteria for designating sites to the Park City Historic Sites Inventory as a Landmark Site including:
  - d. 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.**
  - e. 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 **Complies.**
  - f. It is significant in local, regional or national history, architecture, engineering or culture associated with at least one (1) of the following:
    - *iv.* An era that has made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history;
    - v. The lives of Persons significant in the history of the community, state, region, or nation; or
    - vi. The distinctive characteristics of type, period, or method of construction or the work of a notable architect or master craftsman. **Does not comply.**
- 2. The additions to the existing house located at 732 Crescent Tram 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; or

#### 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; and

(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; or

#### Complies.

(d) It is important in local or regional history architecture, engineering, or culture associated with at least one (1) of the following:

(i) An era of Historic Importance to the community, or

(ii) Lives of Persons who were of Historic importance to the community, or (iii) Noteworthy methods of construction, materials, or craftsmanship used during the Historic period.

#### Does not comply.

#### Exhibits:

Exhibit A – Applicant's Analysis

Exhibit B - Carl Winters' Obituary, Park Record, 1/16/1975

Exhibit C – Sanborn Map Analysis

#### 732 Crescent Tramway



Ever wondered who Carl Winters was, memorialized in the old high school/Library building on Park Ave? To start he lived here.

Carl Winters graduated from the University of Utah in 1924 and taught in Helper and Upton. In 1926, he took a job teaching at the Park City High School. According to their daughter Marie, "My mother didn't want to come because it was a lusty mining town."

The Winters purchased this home and lived here for twelve years with their three daughters. "A kitchen, bathroom, dining room, front room and one bedroom," as Marie remembered, "Daddy later built an upstairs to it. Tore off the kitchen and bathroom and made them new. The house was small, one bedroom for all the five of us – until he built the upstairs. But everyone had a dining room, whether they had just one bedroom."

Carl Winters taught mathematics until 1936, then became high school principal for two years before being appointed Park City School District Superintendent, a position he held for twenty seven years (until 1965).

The homes subsequent owners were Matthew Rodgers who married Ida Richardson on July 30, 1914. Matt was born in County Down, Ireland in 1888 and came to the US in 1906. He was employed as a hoisting engineer for the Silver King Coalition Mines Company until his retirement. The Rodgers loved their home and garden and lived here with their two sons Matt and Leo.












**REAR (SOUTH) ELEVATION** 





# **RIGHT (WEST) ELEVATION**



732 Crescent Tram, Park City, Summit County, Utah Intensive Level Survey—Biographical and Historical Research Materials



c. 1941 (Summit County)

# 732 Crescent Tram, Park City, Summit County, Utah Intensive Level Survey—Biographical and Historical Research Materials



1912 (Utah State Historical Society), detail below



### Exhibit B

732 Crescent Tram, Park City, Summit County, Utah Intensive Level Survey—Biographical and Historical Research Materials

### **Carl Winters**

Carl Winters, 78, Orem, died Jan. 12, 1975 in an Orem nursing home of a liver ailment.

He was born Nov. 7, 1896 Hoytsville, to Alonzo S. and Elizabeth Ann Wilkinson Winters. He married Ruby Willoughby June 28, 1922, Salt Lake LDS Temple.

Mr. Winters was a school teacher in Wyoming and Park City. He was former superintendent of schools, Park City District. A member of the American Association of School Administrators; NEA; Kiwanis Club; American Legion; Utah Society for the Physically Handicapped.

Surviors: wife, daughters, Mrs. Russell (Marie) Horan, Mrs. Clyde (Beth) Fritch, both Orem; 10 grandchildren; 4 great grandchildren; sisters, Mrs. Reed (Lone) Brooks, Hoytsville; Mrs. Vern (Beulah) Willoughby, Coalville.

Funeral services are being held Thursday 1 p.m., Park City LDS Ward Chapel. Friends call at Olpin Mortuary, Park City, Thursday 2 hours before services.

Burial, Park City Cemetery.

# Exhibit C

732 Crescent Tram, Park City, Summit County, Utah Intensive Level Survey—Sanborn Map history

(outside of 1889 map boundary)



1889









# Historic Preservation Board Staff Report

**Planning Department** 

Author:	Anya Grahn, Historic Preservation Planner
Subject:	Material Deconstruction Review
Address:	1141 Park Avenue
Project Number:	PL-16-03214
Date:	April 5, 2017
Type of Item:	Administrative – Material Deconstruction and Reconstruction

### **Summary Recommendation:**

Staff recommends the Historic Preservation Board review and discuss the application, conduct a public hearing, and approve the material deconstruction of non-historic and non-contributory materials at 1141 Park Avenue pursuant to the following findings of fact, conclusions of law, and conditions of approval. This site is listed as Landmark on the City's Historic Sites Inventory (HSI). It is eligible, but not currently listed, on the National Register of Historic Places.

### Topic:

Address: Designation: Applicant:	1141 Park Avenue Landmark Samantha and Jim Oppolaar (architaat Todd Droppon)
Proposal:	Samantha and Jim Osselaer (architect Todd Drennan) Material Deconstruction of non-historic concrete patios and courtyards; non-historic wood fences; remove non-historic c.2000 rear addition,
	non-historic wood doors, and non-historic windows on the historic house; and remove non-historic doors and non-historic windows on the historic shed.

### Background:

On January 30, 2017, the Planning Department received a Historic District Design Review (HDDR) application for the property at 1141 Park Avenue. The application was deemed complete on February 21, 2017. The Historic District Design Review (HDDR) application has not yet been approved, as it is dependent on HPB's Review for Material Deconstruction approval.

The property is located at 1141 Park Avenue on a developed lot. The site is designated as Landmark on the City's Historic Sites Inventory (HSI) (See <u>Historic Site Form</u>). It is eligible for the National Register of Historic Places, but is not currently listed.

### History of Development on this Site

The house was constructed by Cornelius Cottrell in 1885. Not much is known about Cottrell, but we do know he married Annie Keith on March 31, 1887. It is unknown whether or not they resided in this house.

The house was sold to Richard Hales in 1891. Hales was born in Peterson, Morgan County, Utah on January 13, 1871, and moved to Park City when he was 18 years old.

Hales worked as a mill hand for a concentrating mill, possibly at the Anchor Mine. He later became superintendent of the Daly and Judge Mill. The 1900 census shows he lived on Daly Avenue with wife Lizzie and their son. Hales was elected to the Park City Council in 1913, but by 1914 he had purchased a bungalow in Salt Lake City. It seems he and his family split their time between Salt Lake City and Park City. The Park Record reported Hales purchasing several houses in town, so it is likely that he never lived here but used it as rental property. Hales died at Miner's Hospital of pneumonia and the age of 71 on January 15, 1942.

In 1925, Hales sold the house to Lloyd Stanley. The 1930 census shows he lived in this house with his wife Hannah and their three children. Stanley worked as a laborer for a mine and later became custodian for the school district. He owned the house through 1952; however, the census shows it was vacant in 1940. Because this house was the Stanley's permanent residence, staff finds that the changes to create the bungalow appearance likely occurred under his ownership.

The Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps document the evolution of this structure. The south half of the structure first appears in the 1889 Sanborn; while we cannot discern the overall shape of the building, it appears that it was wood frame and one story in height. By 1900, the entire house is depicted. Staff finds that the house was likely an L- or T-shaped cross-wing with a partial-width front porch tucked in next to the projecting ell. There is also a box bay window on the front of the house. Curiously, the 1907 Sanborn map tries to draw out the original shape of the house. Based on this drawing, staff finds that the house was a T-shaped cottage with box bay on the front projecting gable and a sizeable addition on the west (rear) elevation.





By 1929, the house had become squarer in shape and had a small rear addition. A close-up of the map shows that trace paper has covered the original T-shaped house and the square follows the footprint depicted in the 1907 Sanborn Map. The house does not change shape in the 1941 Sanborn map.



Based on staff's analysis of this house, staff finds that this house was likely constructed as a cross-wing and then "bungalow-ized" in the 1920s when the style became popular. The c.1941 tax photograph shows ghost lines of original box bay, evident in the 1900 and 1907 Sanborn maps. The hip roof appears to have been constructed at the top of the wall plate, perhaps where a gable was removed. The following image shows staff's interpretation of the approximate shape of the original cross-wing.



Using roughly the same wall heights that are seen in the tax photograph, staff put together this outline of the approximate form of the original cross-wing shape.

By the time of the c. 1941 tax photograph, the house already displayed a number of modifications reflective of bungalow architecture including:

- Hip roof that extends over the L-shaped form of the house and front porch
- Exposed rafter tails beneath the eaves of the hip roof
- Tapered porch columns
- The Chicago bay windows that appear to have replaced a narrower, longer window based on the ghost lines in the photos

The 1949 tax card notes that the house has a gabled, shingled roof and front porch; however, by 1958, it shows a hip roof with aluminum roofing. The 1948 tax card is incorrect as the c.1941 tax photograph shows that the house already had a hip roof. The tax card did not accurately show the current conditions in 1948; however, perhaps it had not been updated from a previous tax card when the cross-wing would have existed.

Based on staff's analysis of the tax cards, several changes were made to the house after 1948. The 1958 tax card shows that the house has a crawlspace, though it appears that there is a concrete foundation or decking below the main form. By 1968, the tax card shows that a wrap-around porch has been constructed.



1968 Tax Card. This tax card is more reflective of the shape that was depicted in the 1941 Sanborn Fire Insurance Map. By 1968, it appears that a second addition was constructed on the west (rear) elevation of the house. A wrap around porch has also been constructed along the full width of the south elevation.

By the 1980s photographs, the wood siding has been covered with Bricktex and there is a solid railing constructed in front of the tapered columns. The windows have been replaced with aluminum or vinyl windows and the front door has an aluminum screen door.



1982 Historic District Architecture Survey by Ellen Beasley. This photograph shows that the windows have been covered with aluminum storm windows.



This photograph was likely taken in 1995. By that time, a solid bricktex or fauxstacked stone railing had been constructed across the front of the house.

In the late 1990s, then-owner Susan W. Kooring proposed to renovate the historic house once again. The house was in fair condition as seen in the photographs below:



This photograph shows the aluminum windows, concrete porch and foundation.



This photograph of the north side elevation shows the Chicago-style windows that had been installed in the 1920s. The ghost lines remain of the original double-hung windows that would have been used on the earlier cross-wing.





These photographs of the west (rear) elevation of the house shows that the addition extended the hipped roof form that was added in the 1920s, rather than adding a new roof form to the existing form. Note that there are no breaks in the roof form, though we know from the tax cards that this rear addition did not appear until 1941-1968.



This picture of the south (side) elevation shows the wrap-around porch that was constructed prior to the 1968 tax card.

Prior to the renovation, the Park City Council approved the Kooring Lot Line Adjustment Plat Subdivision on January 27, 2000. The Board of Adjustment (BOA) also granted a decreased front yard setback from the required 15 feet to 5 feet in order for the applicant to construct a new two-car garage along Woodside Avenue on January 4, 2000.

The Historic District Commission (HDC) approved a one-story, 536 square foot addition to the back of the house in 2000. The approval included demolishing a non-historic two-car garage and replacing it with a new wood-framed two-car garage along Woodside Avenue; the garage triggered the need for the 2000 variance. Additionally, the HDC approved the new garage and addition to the historic house to consist of painted hardiboard siding, wood trim, wood windows, and an asphalt roof. The owner received a Historic District Grant in 1999 for the renovation of the historic house.

The plans below show the renovation that continues to exist today:



These elevation drawings are from the 2000 remodel.

The current owners, Samantha and Jim Osselaer, purchased the property in 2016. The owners submitted a Historic District Design Review (HDDR) application for this property on January 30, 2017. They are proposing to remove the non-historic c.2000 one-story addition to the historic house and replace it with a new three-story addition. They are also proposing to remodel the historic backyard shed to create a studio. As part of the renovation of the historic house, the applicant has requested minor alterations to the existing historic house and shed as outlined below.

### A. Material Deconstruction: House

Because the house was extensively renovated in 2000, many of the issues that would typically need to be addressed have already been remedied. A new basement and crawlspace were constructed and the historic floor system was stabilized with new wood structural members; no additional work is needed except to make some minor patches and repairs as part of this remodel. The interior of the house was completely gutted and a new framed wall system was installed. On the exterior, the historic wood siding was restored and damaged pieces were replaced in kind. The exterior remains in good conditions with minimal repairs needed. Structural upgrades were also made to the roof

in 2000 to bring the roof framing up to code and a new asphalt shingle roof was constructed at that time.

Staff finds that the proposed scope of work on these elements as part of this renovation is minor. Patching the concrete foundation as well as repairing and repainting the historic wood siding is routine maintenance and does not require HPB review.

Staff has analyzed the specific scope of work for the material deconstruction below:

### 1. SITE DESIGN

The site was largely redone in 2000. The site improvements included creating a small lawn area to the east, patios and courtyards to the south, and a new driveway to the west. The patios are covered by a trellis and there are multiple planters with various elevation changes. There is a stone courtyard with planters between the garage and the shed and a synthetic wood deck that extends south from the front porch. There is also a number of non-historic wood fences on the site. Much of the masonry used to create the terraces throughout the property have cracked and heaved due to poor drainage.

The applicant is proposing to remove these deteriorated patios. They will remove the trellis and replace the existing pavement and synthetic wood deck with new concrete or stone pavers. The raised wood planters will be reconstructed with new stone or steel planters. Fences will be rebuilt.



The red shaded areas show the areas to be removed and renovated:

Staff finds that the proposed material deconstruction is appropriate as these improvements were introduced c.2000 as part of the redevelopment of the site.

They do not contribute to the historic integrity or historical significance of the structure or site. The proposed exterior changes will not damage or destroy the exterior architectural features of the subject property which are compatible with the character of the historic site.

## 2. ADDITION

As previously described, a one-story addition was constructed on the west (rear) elevation of the house c.2000. The applicant is proposing to expand this addition to create a three-story addition on the back of the house. The footprint of the existing addition will not change.

The red shaded areas show the non-historic addition that is to be altered:

Because the addition was constructed c.2000, it is not historic. It does not contribute to the historic integrity or historical significance of the structure, it may be removed.

### 3. <u>PORCH</u>

The porch has largely evolved as changes were made to the structure over time. It was initially a partial-width front porch and then evolved into a wrap-around porch that extended across the front and south elevations. A second hipped roof porch was added to extend the depth of the wrap-around porch on the back half of the south side elevation by 1968.

The porches are structurally sound, with minor defects. Portions of the ceiling soffit are warped and there are significant layers of paint. The applicant is proposing to strip the layers of paint and replace any deteriorated wood. The porch, its trim and soffits, rafters, beams, and columns, will be repainted. The applicant will maintain and repair any failings in the concrete porch floor.

Staff finds that the proposed scope of work on the porch is routine maintenance. The applicant will be repairing and replacing materials only when they are deteriorated beyond repair. No changes in the design, materials, or general appearance of the elements is needed. No HPB review is required for this work.

### 4. DOORS

There are four (4) existing doors on the house. Three (3) are in excellent condition and are reconstructions that appear historic; one (1) door is not historic. The applicant is proposing to replace all the existing doors with new doors that mimic historic styles. On the west (rear) elevation of the historic house, the applicant is proposing to remove a single door and expand it to install a patio door with sidelight.

As part of the plan to change the doors, the applicant is proposing to expand the historic door dimensions in order to accommodate new doors with larger, modern door dimensions. The Design Guidelines say:

*B.4.1 Maintain historic door openings, doors, and door surrounds. B.4.2 New doors should be allowed only if the historic door cannot be repaired. Replacement doors should exactly match the historic door in size, material, profile, and style.* 

Staff finds that modifying the dimensions of the historic door openings to accommodate the contemporary doors is in appropriate as it does not comply with the Design Guidelines. **H Discussion e ueste .** 

The red shaded area shows the doors to be replaced. The blue shading shows the door that is to be expanded to add a patio door:



Staff finds that replacing the doors—and not modifying the openings—shall not damage or destroy the exterior architectural features of the subject property. The existing doors are not historic. The proposed doors will be typical of historic styles and will not deter from the historic character of the landmark house and its historic site. The replacement of a single door with a patio door on the west (rear) elevation does not impact the visual character of the neighborhood and will not impact the historical significance of the property as it is located on the west (rear) elevation and is largely not visible from the public rights-of-way on Park and Woodside Avenues.

Should the HPB agree with staff that the original door dimensions should not be modified to accommodate the new doors, staff has added Condition of Approval #3 which states that the applicant shall maintain the dimensions of the extant historic door openings.

### 5. WINDOWS

The existing window openings on the historic house are significant to the bungalow era of the house. There are no historic windows on the house. These were removed and replaced with new aluminum-clad wood windows as part of the c.2000 remodel.

The applicant is proposing to remove two (2) of the sliding window units on the back of the house and fill in the openings with new siding matching the historic siding. A

third window will be expanded to create a larger window opening. The sill height will be raised on these three (3) windows in order to match the windows on the south side.



The windows to be removed are shadowed in red and the expanded window in blue:

Staff finds that the modifications to the windows are acceptable. These are not original window openings and were likely added in the c.2000 renovation. The proposed exterior changes are beyond the midpoint of the historic house and will not be visible from the primary public rights-of-way along Park and Woodside Avenues. These changes will not damage or destroy the exterior architectural features of the subject property which are compatible with the character of the historic site.

6. <u>ROOF</u>

Prior to 2000, the roof had wood-framed rafters with dropped wood framed ceiling joists. The ceiling joists were removed and the roof structure was reinforced during the c.2000 renovation. The original exposed rafters are still visible on the exterior eaves of the historic house's hipped roof. The roof is currently covered with asphalt shingles that are now 17 years old.

The applicant is not proposing to modify the existing roof. They will be replacing the asphalt shingles with a new standing seam metal roof. Per the 2009 Design Guidelines, the standing seam metal roof must be muted, neutral in color, and non-reflective. This house does shed a significant amount of snow; the applicant understands that they will need to retain snow on their site and must mitigate the

snow shedding from the roof with heat tape, cleats, and/or rails. As part of the roof repairs, the applicant will repaint the eaves and exposed rafters.

Staff finds that the proposed work is routine maintenance that will not change the design, materials, or general appearance of the roof structure. It does not require HPB review.

### . Material Deconstruction: e

The shed is located in the backyard, between the house and the c.2000 garage. It has a shed roof, sloping to the north. It was renovated in c.2000 to create habitable space. The applicants are proposing to renovate the shed once again to add a bathroom and bedroom to the space. Should the applicants choose to use this space as a nightly rental, a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) will be required.





Historic Shed

### 1. FOUNDATION

The shed was temporarily raised and a new concrete foundation poured during the c.2000 remodel. It is in excellent condition and the applicant anticipates only minor patching and repairs.

Staff finds that the scope of work is minor routine maintenance and does not require HPB review.

### 2. EXTERIOR WALLS

The structure is wood-framed. The exterior walls consist of historic 2x4 framing reinforced with new 2x4 framing. The original horizontal wood siding is largely intact with some replacement pieces added in 2000. Overall, the building is in good

shape. The applicant proposes to strip the layers of paint off the wood siding, repair any defects, and repaint.

Staff finds that this scope of work is minor routine maintenance and does not require HPB review.

### 3. DOORS

There are two existing doors on the shed. The door openings are not original to the structure and appear to have been modified during the c.2000 remodel. Neither of the doors is historic. The applicant anticipates replacing one of the doors with a new door that matches historic door styles.

Staff finds that the proposed exterior changes will not damage or destroy the exterior architectural features of the subject property which are compatible with the character of the historic site.

### 4. WINDOWS

There are four (4) historic window openings. The windows were replaced during the c.2000 renovation. The applicant is requesting to replace one window on the existing shed that was introduced as part of the c.2000 renovation.

Staff finds that the proposed exterior changes will not damage or destroy the exterior architectural features of the subject property which are compatible with the character of the historic site.

### 5. ROOF

The current roof is a shed roof with asphalt shingles. Prior to the 2000 remodel, the eaves had exposed rafters with no fascia or gutters. In 2000, rain gutters and downspouts were added. The roof is in excellent shape, but the asphalt shingles are now over 17 years old. The applicant is proposing to replace the asphalt shingles with a new standing seam metal roof. They will also be repainting the shed.

Staff finds that the scope of work is minor routine maintenance and does not require HPB review.

### eco en ation:

Staff recommends the Historic Preservation Board review and discuss the application, conduct a public hearing, and approve the material deconstruction of non-historic and non-contributory materials at 1141 Park Avenue pursuant to the following findings of fact, conclusions of law, and conditions of approval. This site is listed as Landmark on the City's Historic Sites Inventory (HSI). It is eligible, but not currently listed, on the National Register of Historic Places.

### in in o act:

1. The property is located at 1141 Park Avenue

2. The site is designated as Landmark on the Historic Sites Inventory.

- 3. Based on Sanborn Fire Insurance maps and historic research analysis, the house was likely constructed c.1885 by Cornelius Cottrell as a cross wing. There was a partial-width front porch across the front of the house and the projecting ell had a box bay window. There was also a rear addition across the length of the west (rear) elevation.
- 4. Based on Sanborn Fire Insurance maps, it appears that by 1929 the house had been renovated under the ownership of Lloyd Stanley. The overall shape of the house had become squarer and there was a rear addition off the west elevation. The shape does not change in the 1941 Sanborn Map and the c.1941 tax photograph shows that the house has been renovated to reflect the bungalow style that was popular at the time. Bungalow-inspired elements included the hip roof with exposed rafter tails, tapered porch columns, and Chicago bay windows.
- 5. By the time of the 1968 tax card, a wrap-around porch had been constructed that extended from the east (front) façade of the house to the south elevation.
- 6. By the 1980s photographs, the wood siding had been covered with Bricktex and a solid porch railing had been constructed. The windows had been replaced with aluminum or vinyl windows.
- 7. The site was renovated between 2000-2001. As part of the renovation, a new twocar garage was constructed along Woodside Avenue. The historic shed was renovated to create an office/studio space, and a one-story addition was constructed on the west (rear) elevation of the house. The yard was landscaped with planters as well as concrete and stone patios.
- 8. On January 30, 2017, the Planning Department received a Historic District Design Review (HDDR) application for the renovation of the historic house and construction of a new addition at 1141 Park Avenue as well as renovation of the historic shed; the application was deemed complete on February 21, 2017. The HDDR application is still under review by the Planning Department.
- 9. The applicant proposes to make a number of site improvements as part of this renovation. They will remove the c.2000 trellis, planters, stone and concrete patios, and a synthetic wood deck. Much of the masonry that was introduced in c.2000 has cracked and heaved due to poor drainage. These improvements are not historic and do not contribute to the historic integrity or historical significance of the structure or site.
- 10. The applicant intends to remove the one-story addition that was introduced on the west (rear) elevation of the historic house in c.2000. It will be replaced with a new three-story addition with the same footprint. Because the addition is not historic, it does not contribute to the historic integrity or historical significance of the structure.
- 11. The porch is structurally sound with minor defects. Portions of the ceiling soffit are warped and there are significant layers of paint. The applicant proposes to strip the layers of paint and replace any deteriorated wood. The proposed scope of work on the porch is routine maintenance. The applicant will be repairing and replacing materials only when they are deteriorated beyond repair. No changes in the design, materials, or general appearance of the elements is needed. There are four (4) existing doors on the house. Three (3) are in excellent condition and one (1) is not historic. The applicant proposes to replace all the existing doors with new doors that mimic historic styles. On the west (rear) elevation, the applicant is proposing to remove a single door and expand it to install a patio door with sidelight.

- 12. The existing window openings on the historic house are significant to the bungalow era of the house. There are no historic windows. These were removed and replaced with new aluminum clad wood windows c.2000. The applicant is proposing to remove two (2) of the sliding window units on the back of the house, infill the openings with matching siding, and expand a third window to create a larger window opening. The sill height will be raised three (3) window in order to match the windows on the south side. The windows to be changed are not original window openings and were likely added as part of the c.2000 renovation. The proposed exterior changes are beyond the midpoint of the historic house and will not be visible from the primary public rights-of-way. These changes will not damage or destroy the exterior architectural features of the subject property which are compatible with the character of the historic site.
- 13. The roof of the historic house was structurally upgraded as part of the c.2000 renovation. The applicant is proposing to replace the existing asphalt shingles with a new standing seam metal roof. The proposed scope of work is routine maintenance and will not change the design, materials, or general appearance of the roof structure.
- 14. The foundation of the historic shed was poured during the c.2000 remodel. It is in excellent condition and requires only minor patching and repairs. The scope of work is minor routine maintenance.
- 15. The exterior walls of the shed were structurally upgraded in c.2000. The applicant proposes to remove layers of paint from the wood siding, repair, and defects and repaint. The scope of work is minor routine maintenance.
- 16. There are two (2) existing doors on the shed. The door openings are not original to the structure and appear to have been modified during the c.2000 remodel. Neither of the doors is historic. The applicant will replace one of the doors with a new door that matches historic styles. The proposed exterior changes will not damage or destroy the exterior architectural features of the subject property which are compatible with the character of the historic site.
- 17. There are four (4) historic window openings on the shed. The windows were all replaced during the c.2000 renovation. The applicant is requesting to replace one window on the existing shed that was introduced in c.2000. The proposed exterior changes will not damage or destroy the exterior architectural features of the subject property that are compatible with the character of the historic site.
- 18. The historic shed's roof is currently covered with asphalt shingles. The applicant is proposing to remove these and apply a new standing seam metal roof. The proposed scope of work is minor routine maintenance.

### onclusions o a :

- 1. The proposal complies with the Land Management Code requirements pursuant to the HR-M District and regarding historic structure deconstruction and reconstruction.
- 2. The proposal meets the criteria for relocation pursuant to LMC 15-11-14 Disassembly and Reassembly of the Historic Building(s) and/or Structure(s) on a Landmark or Significant Site.

### on itions o A ro al:

- 1. Final building plans and construction details shall reflect substantial compliance with the HDDR proposal stamped in on January 30, 2017. Any changes, modifications, or deviations from the approved design that have not been approved by the Planning and Building Departments may result in a stop work order.
- 2. Where the historic exterior materials cannot be repaired, they will be replaced with materials that match the original in all respects: scale, dimension, texture, profile, material and finish. Prior to replacement, the applicant shall demonstrate to the Historic Preservation Planner that the materials are no longer safe and/or serviceable and cannot be repaired to a safe and/or serviceable condition.
- 3. The applicant shall maintain the dimensions of the extant historic door openings.

# i its:

Exhibit A – HPB Checklist for Material Deconstruction

Exhibit B – HDDR Plans

Exhibit C – Physical Conditions Report & Historic Preservation Plan

### Historic reser ation oar Material Deconstruction e ie ec list:

- 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.




































											<u>]</u> [	_		<u>)</u>					• [		MANK DATE						NAVA	DESIGNER: EPIC BEVIEWED: EPIC		PROJECT#	00-00-00	<u>) </u>				<u>][</u>	OCOTI A TO DISIDITION	J	PROJECT LO CATION:	-	PARK CITY. UT 84060	 J	SHEET TITLE	DOOR AND WINDOW		
	DESCRIPTION	NUN - HISTORIC, ZUULAUD HISTORIC	HISTORIC, NEW SILL HGT	HISTORIC, SILL HGT 2000, NEW SILL HGT HISTORIC BEDI ACED 2000	HISTORIC, REPLACED 2000	HISTORIC, REPLACED 2000	HISTORIC, REPLACED 2000	HISTORIC, KEPLACEU 2000 HISTORIC			NON HISTODIC PEDIACEMENT 2000	HISTORIC, REPLACED 2000	HISTORIC, REPLACED 2000	NON - HISTORIC, 2000 ADD						• •	+;						• •		DESCRIPTION	HISTORIC, REPLACED 2000, NEW HEAD HGT	HISTORIC, REPLACED 2000, NEW HEAD HGT	HISTORIC, NEW SILL HGT														
	MATERIAL	WOUNAL CLAU	WOOD/AL CLAD	WOOD/AL CLAD	WOOD/AL CLAD	WOOD/AL CLAD	WOOD/AL CLAD	would clau	STEEL	STEEL			WOOD/AL CLAD		WOOD/AL CLAD	WOOD/ALCLAD	WOOD/AL CLAD		MATERIAL		MOOD	MOOD CI N	WUUUVAL GLAU	WOODIAL CLAD	WOOD/AL CLAD																					
	ACTION DEDIACE	INFILL	REPLACE	FXISTING	EXISTING	EXISTING	EXISTING	INFILL	NEW	NEW	NEW REPLACE	EXISTING	EXISTING	REPLACE	NEW	NEW	NEW	NEW	NEW	NEW	NEW		ACTION	REPLACE	REPLACE	REPLACE	FXISTING	NEW	NEW																	
SCHEDULE	TYPE	, c		8 <	< <	в		- ·	7	~	0 4		ш	ш с	י ד	υ	т	σ-	-	т	0 1	c (C	-				-	HEDULE	TYPE	8	8			< C												
WINDOW	TAG	70W	W03	W04	90M	W07	W08	W10	W12	W13	W14 W15	W16	W17	W18	W20 W21	W22	W23	W24	W26	W31	W32	W34	W35	W36	W3/	W39	W40	DOOR SI	TAG	D01	D02	D03	506	000	D33											







Historic Preservation Board 4.5.17

----- Page 120 of 276







	PHYSICAL CONDITIONS REPORT For Use with the <i>Historic District Design Review (HDDR)</i> Application
PLANNER:	or cial se nl APPLICATION #: DATE RECEIVED:
NAME: ADDRESS:	MA Osselaer Residence : Main Historic House 1141 Park Ave. Park City, UT 84060
TAX ID: SUBDIVISION: SURVEY: HISTORIC DES	Koor-1, Accessor parcel SA-52       OR         Snyders Addition, Kooring lot adjustment (later)       OR         LOT #:       11 & 22       BLOCK #:       5         GNATION:       LANDMARK       SIGNIFICANT       NOT HISTORIC
A A NAME: MAILING ADDRESS:	MA Jim and Samantha Osselaer PO Box 129 Park City, UT 84060
PHONE #: EMAIL:	(415)518 - 8721 FAX #: () - sam.osselaer@gmail.com
A A NAME: PHONE #: EMAIL:	AMATodd Drennan(435) 503 - 4905tdrennan@epiceng.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.

# A D M

This is to certify that I am making an application for the described action by the City and that I am responsible for complying with all City requirements with regard to this request. This application should be processed in my name and I am a party whom the City should contact regarding any matter pertaining to this application.

I have read and understood the instructions supplied by Park City for processing this application. The documents and/or information I have submitted are true and correct to the best of my knowledge. I understand that my application is not deemed complete until a Project Planner has reviewed the application and has notified me that it has been deemed complete.

I will keep myself informed of the deadlines for submission of material and the progress of this application. I understand that a staff report will be made available for my review three days prior to any public hearings or public meetings. This report will be on file and available at the Planning Department in the Marsac Building.

I further understand that additional fees may be charged for the City's review of the proposal. Any additional analysis required would be processed through the City's consultants with an estimate of time/expense provided prior to an authorization with the study.

Signature of Applicant:	Alln	$\sim$				
Name of Applicant:	Samantha Ose	selaer				
Mailing	PO Box 129					
Address:	Park City, UT	84060				
Phone #:	(415)518	- 8721	Fax #: (	)	-	
Email:	sam.osselaer@	@gmail.com				
Type of Application:	HDDR/Physica	al Conditions Rep	port			

## A MA

I hereby affirm that I am the fee title owner of the below described property or that I have written authorization from the owner to pursue the described action. I further affirm that I am aware of the City policy that no application will be accepted nor work performed for properties that are tax delinquent.

Name of Owner:	Samantha & Jim Osselaer
Mailing Address:	PO Box 129
0	Park City, UT 84060
Street Address/ Legal	1141 Park Ave.
Description of Subject Property:	Residential Home

Signature:

Date: \_1/27/17

- 1. If you are not the fee owner attach a copy of your authorization to pursue this action provided by the fee owner.
- 2. If a corporation is fee titleholder, attach copy of the resolution of the Board of Directors authorizing the action.
- 3. If a joint venture or partnership is the fee owner, attach a copy of agreement authorizing this action on behalf of the joint venture or partnership
- 4. If a Home Owner's Association is the applicant than the representative/president must attaché a notarized letter stating they have notified the owners of the proposed application. A vote should be taken prior to the submittal and a statement of the outcome provided to the City along with the statement that the vote meets the requirements set forth in the CC&Rs.

Please note that this affirmation is not submitted in lieu of sufficient title evidence. You will be required to submit a title opinion, certificate of title, or title insurance policy showing your interest in the property prior to Final Action.

# PHYSICAL CONDITIONS REPORT

Detaile Descri tion o istin **on itions.** Use this page to describe all existing conditions. Number items consecutively to describe all conditions, including building exterior, additions, site work, landscaping, and new construction. Provide supplemental pages of descriptions as necessary for those items not specifically outlined below.

#### 1. Site Design

This section should address 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 as many boxes as necessary to describe the physical features of the site. Supplemental pages should be used to describe additional elements and features.

Element/Feature:	Entire Site		
This involves:	□ An original part of the building		2000
	A later addition	Estimated date of construction:	2000

Describe existing feature:

The site was completely redone in 2000; images ST-01 to 07 are site images prior to the complete remodel that took place at that time. Currently, the site has a small lawn area to the east, patios and courtyards to the south, and a driveway to the west. The patios are covered or under a trellis, and have multiple planters with various elevation changes. In between the studio (once a rat shed/habitat) and the garage there is a paver stone courtyard with planters. The garage, studio and main house have little north side yard. The existing addition to the main house has a north setback from the property line of 3'-8" where yard storage is kept between the house and fence. The entire property is fenced with multiple unmatching, non-historic fences. See photos St-10 to 18, 20 to 26 for property overview and neighborhood.

Describe any deficiencies:

Existing Condition: Excellent Good Fair

1. Concrete patios and walks have multiple cracks, poor drainage, and have mismatched surface finishes--see photos ST-30,32,33,34.

2. A Synthetic decking plank is set near grade with likely structural deteriation below--see photo 31.

3. Fences around the property do not match and are in varying conditions of repairs--see photos ST-10,11,12,13,22,31,32,34,35,36.

4. Concrete pavers have in the south courtyard have heaved--see photos ST-14,15.

ST-01 to 07, ST-10 to 26, ST Photo Numbers: \_\_\_\_\_\_ Illustration Numbers: \_\_\_\_\_

If you have guestions 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.

Poor

## 2. Structure

Use this section to describe 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:	Roof, Floor, and Wall Structur	re	
	<ul><li>An original part of the building</li><li>A later addition</li></ul>	Estimated date of construction:	1904, 2000

Describe existing feature:

The entire structure is wood framed. The walls are cavity framed with wood cladding on the exterior and gypsum board on the interior. The exterior walls consist of historic 2x4 framing (no sheathing materail) with new 2x4 framing (including sheathing) at the interior face. The roof prior to 2000 had wood framed rafters (see MS-10) with dropped wood framed ceiling joists(see MS-12). During the 2000 remodel/restoration, the ceiling joists were removed and additional rafters were added to bring the roof to current structural codes (see MS-11). The ceilings are currently vaulted (see MS-01 to 05). Original exposed rafters are visible on the exterior (see MS-06). The floor has wood framed joists, reinforced in 2000, over a basement and crawlspace (see MS-07 and RC-01).

Describe any deficiencies:	Existing Condition:	Excellent	□ Good	🗌 Fair	Poor
Structure is in excellent conditio	n.				

Photo Numbers: \_\_\_\_\_ Illustration Numbers: \_\_\_\_\_

## 3. Roof

Use this section to describe the roofing system, flashing, drainage such as downspouts and gutters, skylights, chimneys, and other rooftop features. Supplemental pages should be used to describe additional elements and features.

Element/Feature:	Roof					
This involves:	<ul><li>An original part</li><li>A later addition</li></ul>	•	timated date of c	onstruction:	1904, roo	fing 200
Describe existing feat	ature:					
house had a gal and 1968 (see H photos). While t (see ST-07) that no fascia or gutt	is a hipped roof bbled roof with sl Historic Form - Hi he roof is hipped t remains. Prior ters (see ST-07, nspouts added in	hingles in 1949, istoric Sites Inve , an undated tax to the 2000 remo RC-13,14). Cur	and a hipped r ntory, Novemb record photo s odel, the eaves rently, rafters a	oof with all er 2008 fo shows a fla had expo re still exp	uminum in or records a at portion o osed rafters	1958 and on top s with
Describe any deficie	encies:	Existing Condition	Excellent	Good	🗌 Fair	Poor
	rs to be in good to s half, or more, o			e shingles	are now 1	7 years
D.	10 11 12 12 14					

RC-10,11,12,13,14, ST-07, P Photo Numbers: \_\_\_\_\_\_ Illustration Numbers: \_\_\_\_\_

# 4. Chimney

Use this section to describe 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:	Two Twin Chimneys		
This involves:	<ul><li>An original part of the building</li><li>A later addition</li></ul>	Estimated date of construction:	1904

Describe existing feature:

Two original twin chimneys are still present today and are exposed on the exterior and interior (see RC-01,02,03). In an undated tax photo (see ST-07) and in photos taken shortly before the 2000 remodel, the brick chimneys had detailed masonry work at the cap (see RC-13,14 and ST-04). Photos taken after 2000 show less detailed brick chimneys (see RC-04,10,11,12). The exterior brick was replaced in 2000 with a harder and blonder brick (compare ST-04 and RC-14). The east chimney currently serves no pragmatic purpose while the west chimney contains flues from the mechanical room (see RC-04,11).

Describe any deficiencies:	Existing Condition:	Excellent	Good	🗌 Fair	Poor
No apparent deficiencies.					

RC-01,02,03,04,10,11,12,13, Illustration Numbers: \_\_\_\_\_

#### 5. Exterior Walls

Use this section to describe exterior wall construction, finishes, and masonry. Be sure to also document other exterior elements such as porches and porticoes separately. Must include descriptions of decorative elements such as corner boards, fascia board, and trim. Supplemental pages should be used to describe additional elements and features.

AI Element/Feature:	I Exterior Walls		
This involves:	An original part of the building A later addition	Estimated date of construction:	1904, 2000
Describe existing featur	re:		
painted shiplap wo a 6" vertical surfac some replacement remodel. The unda	od cladding applied directly e and a .75" reveal. The m pieces added in 2000. The ated tax photo (ST-07) show	description in 2. Structure, p / to the original 2x4 framing ajority of the cladding is original e cladding was not removed ws the existing cladding in p compare ST-07 and EX-02).	The shiplap has gnal wood, with during the 2000 blace, including
Describe any deficienc	ies: Existing Condi	tion: 🗌 Excellent 🔳 Good	🗌 Fair 🗌 Poor
Cladding is in good been repainted sin		int evident. The surfaces h	ave likely not
EX-0 Photo Numbers:	1,02,03, ST-07	ustration Numbers:	

Element/Featur	e:						
This involves:	<ul><li>An original part of the building</li><li>A later addition</li></ul>	Estimated date of construction:					
Describe existing	Describe existing feature:						

Describe any deficiencies:	Existing Condition:	Excellent	□ Good	Fair	Poor

Element/Featu	re:	
This involves:	<ul><li>An original part of the building</li><li>A later addition</li></ul>	Estimated date of construction:
Describe existing	feature:	

Existing Condition:   Excellent	Good	🗌 Fair	Poor
	Existing Condition:   Excellent	Existing Condition:  Good	Existing Condition:  Excellent  Good  Fair

## 6. Foundation

Use this section to describe the foundation including its system, materials, perimeter foundation drainage, and other foundation-related features. Supplemental pages should be used to describe additional elements and features.

Element/Feature:	Concrete Founda	ation				
This involves:	<ul><li>An original part of</li><li>A later addition</li></ul>	of the building	Estimated date o	f construction:	1904, 2000	)
Describe existing fea	ture:					
basement depth added to the wes	ndation is concret at the west. In 2 st side of the strue of the foundation	000 at concre cture. Photo I	ete foundation, -01 shows the	with a craw e exposed fo	l space, was	
Describe any deficie	ncies:	Existing Conditi	on: 🗌 Excellen	E Good	🗌 Fair	Poor
concrete at the e	dation is in good s ast entry steps th e left and the 200 use patching.	hat lack crafts	manship. Pho	to F-03 sho	ws the histo	
F-( Photo Numbers:	01,02,03	Illus	stration Numbers:			

## 7. Porches

Use this section to describe the porches Address decorative features including porch posts, brackets, railing, and floor and ceiling materials. Supplemental pages should be used to describe additional elements and features.

Element/Feature:	Porches and Co	vered Patios			
This involves:	<ul><li>An original part</li><li>A later addition</li></ul>	of the building	Estimated date of	construction:	1904, 1950s ?
Describe existing fea	ature:				
Sanborn Maps from 1900 and 1907 show an east side porch (see image). The undated tax photo (see ST-07), likely post 1949, show the hipped roof with the east and south wrap around porch. Photos P-01,02,06 show an additional shed roof porch on the south side was added at a later date, but, prior to the 2000 remodel/restoration. It is believed this shed roof porch is not historic.					
Describe any deficie	encies:	Existing Condit	ion: 🗌 Excellent	Good	🗌 Fair 🗌 Poo
1 1	e structurally sour ered paint is evid		some ceiling sof	fit is warpe	d (see P-40, 05)
P-Photo Numbers:	01,02,03,04,05,0	6 Illu	stration Numbers:		

#### 8. Mechanical System, Utility Systems, Service Equipment & Electrical

Use this section to describe 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.

Element/Feature	Mechanical, Plu	mbing, Electric	al			
This involves:	<ul><li>An original part</li><li>A later addition</li></ul>	-	Estimated date of c	construction:	2000	
Describe existing fe	ature:					
All Mechanical, Electrical, and Plumbingboth rough and finished were replaced in the 2000 remodel (see SY-01 to 05). Except, the clawfoot tub that was present prior to 1998 was salvaged and refinished. The caption with photos SY-06,07 in the owner's photo album states, "Demolition Begins!! Spring - '98 - Save the tub".						
Describe any defici	encies:	Existing Condition	n: 🔳 Excellent	Good	🗌 Fair	Poor
No apparent de	eficiencies.					
Photo Numbers:	Y-01,02,03,04,05	,06,07 Illus	ration Numbers:			

#### . Door ur e

#### **Basic Requirements**

- 1. All door openings on the exterior of the structure should be assigned a number and described under the same number in the survey form. Doors in pairs or groupings should be assigned individual numbers. Even those not being replaced should be assigned a number corresponding to a photograph or drawing of the elevation, unless otherwise specified specifically by the planner.
- 2. Describe the issues and conditions of each exterior door in detail, referring to specific parts of the door. Photographs depicting existing conditions may be from the interior, exterior, or both. Additional close-up photos documenting the conditions should be provided to document specific problem areas.
- 3. The Planning Department's evaluation and recommendation is based on deterioration/damage to the door unit and associated trim. Broken glass and normal wear and tear are not necessarily grounds for approving replacement.
- 4. The condition of each door should be documented based on the same criteria used to evaluate the condition of specific elements and features of the historic structure or site: Good, Fair, Poor.

Don't forget to address service, utility, and garage doors where applicable.



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.

Door Survey Form
Total number of door openings on the exterior of the structure: <u>4</u> Number of historic doors on the structure: 0
Number of existing replacement/non-historic doors: 3 replicas yr 2000, 1 non-historic
Number of doors completely missing: 0

Please reference assigned door numbers based on the Physical Conditions Report.

Number of doors to be replaced: 4

Door #:	Existing Condition (Excellent, Good, Fair, Poor):	Describe any deficiencies:	Photo #:	Historic (50 years or older):
D01	Excellent	none	,04,05	B Replica
D02	Excellent	none	D-02,03,06 ,07	Replica
D03	Excellent	none	D-08	Replica
D04	Excellent	none	D-09	Non-historic
	Fair			

#### . in o ur e

#### **Basic Requirements**

- 1. All window openings on the structure should be assigned a number and described under the same number in the survey form. Windows in pairs or groupings should be assigned individual numbers. Even those not being replaced should be assigned a number corresponding to a photograph or drawing of the elevation, unless otherwise specified specifically by the planner.
- 2. Describe the issues and conditions of each window in detail, referring to specific parts of the window. Photographs depicting existing conditions may be from the interior, exterior, or both. Additional close-up photos documenting the conditions should be provided to document specific problem areas.
- 3. The Planning Department's evaluation and recommendation is based on deterioration/damage to the window unit and associated trim. Broken glass and windows that are painted shut alone are not grounds for approving replacement.



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.

Window Survey F	orm
Total number of window openings on the exterior of the structure:	10
Number of historic windows on the structure:	0
Number of existing replacement/non-historic windows	9 replica in 2000, 1 non-historic
Number of windows completely missing:	2 west, removed 2000, D-30,31

Please reference assigned window numbers based on the Physical Conditions Report. Number of windows to be replaced: 3, 2 to remove

Window #:	Existing Condition (Excellent, Good, Fair, Poor):	Describe any deficiencies:	Photo #:	Historic (50 years or older):
WQ	Good	none, to be replaced	D-12	Non-historic
WQ	Good	none, to be removed	D-12	Replica
WQ	Good	none, to be replaced, sill change	D-12	Replica
WQ	Good	none, to be replaced, sill change	D-13	Replica
WQ	Good	none	D-11	Replica
WQ	Good	none	D-10	Replica
WQ	Good	none	D-14	Replica
WQ	Good	none	D-18	Replica
W09	Good	none	D-17	Replica
W10	Good	none, to be removed	D-15	Replica
	Fair			
	Fair			
	Fair			

#### 11. Interior Photographs

Use this section to describe interior conditions. Provide photographs of the interior elevations of each room. (This can be done by standing in opposite corners of a square room and capturing two walls in each photo.)

·	, o 11			, 0		. ,
Element/Feature	Interior Walls e:	, Floors, Ceilings,	and all Finish	nes		
This involves:	<ul><li>An original p</li><li>A later additi</li></ul>	part of the building	stimated date c	of construction:	2000	
Describe existing f	eature:					
were removed. interior elemen MS-11). Photo condition of the	All interior finitions All interior finitions All interior finites that the second second second second second All interior finites and second s	gutted to the stud shes were remove d (see MS-10). No ustrate the current tely prior to the 200 s were reused.	ed. Two brick ew wood stud condition. P	<pre>c chimneys a d framing wa hotos IN-10 t</pre>	re the only s added (s to 12 illust	y see rate the
Describe any defic	ciencies:	Existing Condition	n: 🔳 Exceller	nt 🗌 Good	🗌 Fair	Poor
No apparent de	eficiencies.					

Photo Numbers: \_\_\_\_\_ IN-01 to 08, IN-10 to 12, MS-Illustration Numbers: \_\_\_\_\_

Element/Feature	:		
This involves:	<ul><li>An original part of the building</li><li>A later addition</li></ul>	Estimated date of construction:	
Describe existing fe	ature:		

Describe any deficiencies:	Existing Condition:   Excellent	□ Good	🗌 Fair	Poor

Element/Feature	:		
This involves:	<ul><li>An original part of the building</li><li>A later addition</li></ul>	Estimated date of construction:	
Describe existing fe	eature:		

Excellent	□ Good	🗌 Fair	Poor
	Excellent	Excellent Good	□ Excellent □ Good □ Fair

Element/Feature	:		
This involves:	<ul><li>An original part of the building</li><li>A later addition</li></ul>	Estimated date of construction:	
Describe existing fe	ature:		

Describe any deficiencies:	Existing Condition:   Excellent	□ Good	🗌 Fair	Poor

# Supplemental Sheets

#### Supplemental Page \_\_\_\_ of \_\_\_\_

Supplemental pages should be used to describe any additional elements and features not previously described in this packet.

Element/Feature:								
This involves:		An original part		<b>F</b> <i>i i</i>		:		
		A later addition		Estimated	date of c	onstruction:		
Describe existing fe	eatur	'e:						
Describe any defici	ienci	es:	Existing Condit	ion: 🗌 E	Excellent	□ Good	Fair	Poor

Photo Numbers: \_\_\_\_\_\_ Illustration Numbers: \_\_\_\_\_

Element/Feature:								
This involves:		An original part A later addition	of the building	Ectin	nated data of a			
Describe existing f				ESUN	nated date of c	Shstruction.		
Describe existing f	eatui	с.						
Describe any defic	cienci	es:	Existing Condit	ion:	Excellent	Good	🗌 Fair	Poor
Supplemental Page \_\_\_\_ of \_\_\_\_

Element/Featur	re:					
This involves:	<ul><li>An original  </li><li>A later addition</li></ul>	part of the building	Estimated date of	f construction:		
Describe existing f	feature:					
Describe any defic	ciencies:	Existing Cond	dition: 🗌 Excellent	t 🗌 Good	🗌 Fair	Poor
L						

Photo Numbers: \_\_\_\_\_ Illustration Numbers: \_\_\_\_\_

Supplemental Page \_\_\_\_ of \_\_\_\_

Element/Feature	e:							
This involves:		An original part A later addition	of the building	Ectimoto	d data of a	opotruction		
Describe existing f	eatur			Estimate		onstruction:		
	ionoi		Evicting Condit		Excellent	Good	🗌 Fair	Poor
Describe any defic	Jenci	65.	Existing Condit		Excellent			

Photo Numbers: \_\_\_\_\_ Illustration Numbers: \_\_\_\_\_

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	
PLANNER: PLANNING DIF APPROVAL DA	DATE RECEIVED:	
□ LANDMA NAME: ADDRESS:	MA RK I SIGNIFICANT DISTRICT: Osselaer Residence : Main House 1141 Park Ave. Park City, UT 84060	
TAX ID: SUBDIVISION: SURVEY:	Koor-1, Accessor parcel SA-52         Snyders Addition, Kooring lot adjustment (later)         LOT #:       11 & 22         BLOCK #:       5	
A A NAME: PHONE #: EMAIL:	MA         Jim and Samantha Osselaer         (415)846_5156         FAX #:       () -         sam.osselaer@gmail.com	

# INSTRUCTIONS FOR HISTORIC PRESERVATION PLAN

he purpose of the HISTORIC PRESERVATION PLAN is to provide a detailed description of the proposed project, including the scope of work, methods/techniques being considered, and the potential impacts and/or benefits to Park City's historic resources. The Planning Department is authorized to require a Historic Preservation Plan as a condition of approving an application for a building project that affects a historic structure, site or object. The Planning Director and the Chief Building Official, or their designees, must approve the Historic Preservation Plan.

It is important to address the condition of each element, feature, or space of a historic site and/or structure as identified by the Physical Conditions Report.

Please note the following:

- . **Multi le uil in s an or tructures.** For Historic District Design Reviews (HDDRs) that include more than one (1) structure, please complete an individual Physical Conditions Report for each structure on the site.
- . **co e o or**. Summarize the impacts the proposed project will have on each of the elements/features identified by th Physical Conditions Report. If the project proposes a negative impact on any character-defining feature, explain why it is unavoidable and what measures are proposed to mitigate the adverse affects.
- . **onstruction ssues.** Following the format of the Physical Condition Report, summarize the work being proposed for each feature. Provide reference to or excerpts from the Physical Condition Report if needed to supplement the work summaries. Address the treatments being considered and the methods and techniques being proposed.

According to the Design Guidelines for Historic Districts and Historic Sites the four treatments for historic sites include:

**reser ation**. If you want to stabilize a building or structure, retain most or all of its historic fabric, and keep it looking the way it does now, you will be preserving it. Preservation is the first treatment to consider and it emphasizes conservation, maintenance and repair.

**e** a ilitation. If you want to update a building for its current or a new use, you will be rehabilitating it. Rehabilitation, the second treatment, also emphasizes retention and repair of historic materials, though replacement is allowed because it is assumed that the condition of existing materials is poor.

**estoration**. If you want to take a building back to an earlier time by removing later features, you will be restoring it. Restoration, the third treatment, centers on retaining materials from the most significant period in the property's history. Because changes in a site convey important information about the development history of that site and its structures, restoration is less common than the previous treatments.

**econstruction**. If you want to bring back a building that no longer exists or cannot be repaired, you will be reconstructing it. Reconstruction, the fourth treatment, is used to recreate a non-surviving building or one that exists now, but is extremely deteriorated and unsalvageable. Reconstruction is rarely recommended.

- . on itions aluation. The scope of work for those features/elements identified as fair or poor in the Physical Conditions Report require a more comprehensive approach to its deteriorated condition. Please provide specific details outlining your scope of work.
- erences. Specific conditions should be addressed using recognized preservation methods. It may be helpful to reference the National Park Service's Preservation Briefs in order to specify

recognized preservation methods for features/elements such as wood windows, porches, and masonry chimneys. These and other features are described in the Preservation Briefs, available online at: http://www.nps.gov/tps/how-to-preserve/briefs.htm.

# 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	Entire Site	
This involves:	<ul><li>Preservation</li><li>Reconstruction</li></ul>	<ul><li>Restoration</li><li>Rehabilitation</li></ul>
Based on the condition and deficiencies outlined in the Physical Conditions Report, please describe in detail the proposed work:		

The entire site was new in 2000. We propose to completely redue the site:

- 1. Remove the trellis.
- 2. Replacing finished concrete walks and steps with new concrete or stone pavers.
- 3. Replace historic concrete patios/porches with new concrete or stone pavers at the same location.
- 4. Replace synthetic wood deck with concrete or stone pavers.
- 5. Replace raised wood planters with raised stone or plate steel planters.
- 5. Replace fences as listed on site plan.

# Structure

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:		tion and replace
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:

- 1. Non-historic addition to be removed and replaced.
- 2. New interior structural roof beams to be replaced.

# 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/Featur	Element/Feature:		
This involves:	<ul><li>Preservation</li><li>Reconstruction</li></ul>	<ul> <li>Restoration</li> <li>Rehabilitation</li> </ul>	
Based on the con the proposed wor		utlined in the Physical Conditions Report, please describe in detail	
Replace asphalt shingles with standing seam metal. Repaint eaves and exposed rafters.			

### 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:	No work	
This involves:	<ul><li>Preservation</li><li>Reconstruction</li></ul>	<ul><li>Restoration</li><li>Rehabilitation</li></ul>

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



# **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/Featur	e:
This involves:	<ul> <li>Preservation</li> <li>Reconstruction</li> <li>Rehabilitation</li> </ul>
Based on the cond the proposed work	dition and deficiencies outlined in the Physical Conditions Report, please describe in detail k:
Strip layers of	paint and repaint.
Element/Featur	e:
This involves:	<ul> <li>Preservation</li> <li>Restoration</li> <li>Reconstruction</li> <li>Rehabilitation</li> </ul>
Based on the cond the proposed work	dition and deficiencies outlined in the Physical Conditions Report, please describe in detail k:

Element/Feature	:	
This involves:	<ul><li>Preservation</li><li>Reconstruction</li></ul>	<ul> <li>Restoration</li> <li>Rehabilitation</li> </ul>

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

Element/Featu	ire:	
This involves:	Preservation	Restoration
	Reconstruction	Rehabilitation
Based on the cor the proposed wo		utlined in the Physical Conditions Report, please describe in detail

# 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:		
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:		
Minor patches and repair of the existing finish at required.		

### 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:	Ceiling/soffit, Beams, Columns	
This involves:	<ul><li>Preservation</li><li>Reconstruction</li></ul>	<ul><li>Restoration</li><li>Rehabilitation</li></ul>

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



# 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	Replace existing with replicas, D01,02,03		
This involves:	<ul> <li>Preservation</li> <li>Restoration</li> <li>Rehabilitation</li> </ul>		
Based on the cond the proposed work	lition and deficiencies outlined in the Physical Conditions Report, please describe in detail :		
· ·	sting exterior doors with replicas of slightly taller head height, otherwise to 5. The current doors were replicas in 2000.		
Replace D04			
This involves:	<ul> <li>Preservation</li> <li>Restoration</li> <li>Rehabilitation</li> </ul>		
Based on the cond the proposed work	ition and deficiencies outlined in the Physical Conditions Report, please describe in detail		
Replace door ir	nstalled in 2000 with new door and side lite.		

### 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	Replace W01,03,04		
This involves: Based on the condi the proposed work:	<ul> <li>Preservation</li> <li>Restoration</li> <li>Reconstruction</li> <li>Rehabilitation</li> <li>ition and deficiencies outlined in the Physical Conditions Report, please describe in detail</li> </ul>		
	non-historic. replica with new with raised sill height to match windows on south side replica with new with raised sill height to match windows on south side		
Remove W02, W10 Element/Feature:			
This involves:	<ul> <li>Preservation</li> <li>Restoration</li> <li>Reconstruction</li> <li>Rehabilitation</li> </ul>		
Based on the condition and deficiencies outlined in the Physical Conditions Report, please describe in detail the proposed work:			
	existing replica and infill wall, match historic cladding existing replica and infill wall, match historic cladding		

## 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.

Adjust mechanical, electrical, plumbing			
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:			

Adjust MEP system for new interior layout.		

### 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:	New 3 story addition	n on existing 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:

<ol> <li>Remove existing single story addition installed in 2000. Foundation</li> <li>Construct new 3 story addition on existing foundation.</li> </ol>	n to remain.

# AM

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.

# . н

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.

# . A A A A

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.

# .A D M

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:	fllm	Г	1/27/17 Date:
	0000		

Sam Osselaer





1141 Park Ave – Site







Historic Preservation Board 4.5.17

ST-10



ST-12



Historic Preservation Board 4.5.17

### 1141 Park Ave – Site



Historic Preservation Board 4.5.17

Page 165 of 276



Historic Preservation Board 4.5.17

Page 166 of 276





ST-19



ST-20

### 1141 Park Ave – Site









Historic Preservation Board 4.5.17

ST-26 Page 170 of 276



Historic Preservation Board 4.5.17

ST-31 Page 171 of 276

### 1141 Park Ave – Site







ST-34



#### 1141 Park Ave – Site



This home has only been owned by three families during its more than 115 year life. Gornehus Coirell purchased the lot in 1884 for \$200 and built the home. Seven years later, in '1891, he sold it for \$1,000 to Richard Hales, som of polygamist Henry William Hales, and his first wife Eliza Ann Ewing. The Hales family and their descendants owned this home for the next sixty seven years. Henry's great granddarghter Elia Button and her husband William sold it to Ray and Lillian Worley in 1953 for \$4,000. They left the home to their niece Susan Worley Kooring, the current owner of the home.

Though built in the mid 1880s, the home was remodeled during he mining boom era to resemble a pyramid house, popular in Park City around 1900. The windows on the front facade were replaced even later, probably around 1910. Their horizontal characteristic is more typical of a

bungalow. During the Hales family's ownership, the lot behind the home on Woodside was purchased and a garage constructed to house Lloyd Stanley's 1929 Model A. The shed in the middle of the property was built to raise rats for the University of Utah Medical School research. ST-36

# 1141 Park Ave.

CCTRELL/HALES HOUSE — OWNER — SUSAN WORTLEY KOORING — SPONSOR — LOWELL CONSTRUCTION

ST-IM-01

~ 5

#### 1141 Park Ave – Site



ST-IM-02





ST-IM-03



MS-01





MS-03





MS-05



MS-06



MS-07



MS-10 Page 180 of 276




RC-01



Historic Preservation Board 4.5.17

RC-02





RC-04



RC-10



Historic Preservation Board 4.5.17







RC-14

1141 Park Ave – Exterior



#### 1141 Park Ave – Exterior



#### 1141 Park Ave – Foundation



F-01







#### 1141 Park Ave – Porches



P-02

#### 1141 Park Ave – Porches



Historic Preservation Board 4.5.17

P-04



#### 1141 Park Ave – Systems





Historic Preservation Board 4.5.17

1141 Park Ave – Systems



<image>

SY-03

Page 195 of 276

## 1141 Park Ave – Systems



SY-05











<image><image>





D-07



Historic Preservation Board 4.5.17



































IN-07



Historic Preservation Board 4.5.17





IN-12

Historic Preservation Board 4.5.17



#### 1141 Park Ave – 27 Jan 2017 - Rat Shed Structure



1141 Park Ave – 27 Jan 2017 - Rat Shed Roof



Historic Preservation Board 4.5.17

RRC-01

### 1141 Park Ave – 27 Jan 2017 - Rat Shed Roof



RRC-02



RRC-03
## 1141 Park Ave – 27 Jan 2017 - Rat Shed Exterior





Historic Preservation Board 4.5.17

REX-01

Page 217 of 276

## 1141 Park Ave – 27 Jan 2017 - Rat Shed Roof



REX-04

1141 Park Ave – 27 Jan 2017 - Rat Shed Roof



Historic Preservation Board 4.5.17

Page 219 of 276

## 1141 Park Ave – 27 Jan 2017 - Rat Shed Foundation



RF-01



Historic Preservation Board 4.5.17

RF-02

# 1141 Park Ave – 27 Jan 2017 - Rat Shed Systems



RSY-01



Historic Preservation Board 4.5.17

RSY-02

1141 Park Ave – 27 Jan 2017 - Rat Shed Doors and Windows





1141 Park Ave - 27 Jan 2017 - Rat Shed Doors and Windows







#### 1141 Park Ave – 27 Jan 2017 - Rat Shed Doors and Windows



RD-05



Historic Preservation Board 4.5.17

RD-06



RIN-01



RIN-02



RIN-03



1141 Park Ave – 27 Jan 2017 - Rat Shed Doors and Windows



RIN-05

# **Historic Preservation Board**



Subject:	Design Guidelines
Author:	Anya Grahn, Historic Preservation Planner
	Hannah M. Tyler, Planner
Date:	April 5, 2017
Type of Item:	Legislative
Project #:	GI-13-00222

## **Summary Recommendations:**

Staff has committed to routinely reviewing the existing Design Guidelines for Historic Districts and Historic Sites. Staff recommends that the Historic Preservation Board (HPB) take public comment on the proposed changes to the Park City's Design Guidelines for Historic Districts and Historic Sites; provide specific amendments to be made to the document if necessary; and forward a positive recommendation to City Council.

#### **Background:**

During the January 6, 2016 HPB meeting, staff discussed the history of the City's preservation efforts, the purpose of the Design Guidelines and their role as a living document, as well as differences between Federal, State, and Local preservation regulations. Staff discussed that though our Design Guidelines are based on the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Preservation, Rehabilitation, Restoration, and Reconstruction, the City does not enforce the Secretary of the Interior's Standards; we rely solely on the Design Guidelines. Our Design Guidelines identify four (4) treatment methods: Preservation, Rehabilitation, Restoration, and Reconstruction, which are often used in tandem depending on the condition of the structure and work to be completed. These items are defined on page 6 of the Design Guidelines.

Staff began reviewing the Design Guidelines with the HPB in December 2014. Staff met with the HPB to discuss a potential outline for Design Guideline changes in December 2014. Following this discussion, staff brought forward a work session regarding the treatment of historic structures to discuss panelization and reconstruction in February 2015. In September and October 2015, the HPB discussed compatibility of new additions. Staff also led a discussion with the HPB regarding character zones on October 7, 2015, and November 18, 2015. Starting in January 2016 and going forward, staff began reviewing the Design Guidelines with the HPB on a monthly basis. The HPB completed the revisions on the Design Guidelines for Historic Residential and Commercial Structures in October 2016. In 2017, staff will be presenting revisions to the Design Guidelines for Residential and Commercial Infill buildings.

In addition to the Historic Preservation Board meetings, staff has also begun holding lunchtime work sessions and office hours to engage the public in these Design Guideline revisions. The first of these workshops was held on March 16<sup>th</sup>, 2016; 13 professionals in the Design, Development, and Building Community attended the

workshop. Staff has also developed a <u>webpage</u> in order to promote this work on the Design Guidelines. Staff anticipates future workshops as we begin to look at new infill design.

## Analysis:

The Design Guidelines for New Construction currently provide input on all new construction on undeveloped lots or for the renovation of existing non-historic buildings. The guidelines are meant to guide development both in the residential neighborhoods as well as commercial development along Main Street. Because the guidelines are meant for both residential and commercial infill, staff finds that the guidelines are often too broad and do not specifically address the concerns of these two very distinct building types. In our revisions, staff has broken this chapter up into New Residential Infill and New Commercial Infill.

Currently, the Design Guidelines for this section are for "new construction." Staff finds that it is better to refer to new development as "infill" construction for the following reasons:

A. Definitions. New construction refers to construction of an entirely new structure and/or significant extension to an existing structure whether or not the site was previously occupied; whereas, the <u>Sustainable Cities Institute</u> defines infill as new development that is sited on vacant or undeveloped land within an existing community that is enclosed by other types of development.

Staff found that the term "infill" was more conducive to achieving compatible new development within the H-Districts as it implies that the new development will be "filling in" the gaps (vacant or underutilized lots) within the neighborhood rather than creating something new that is not sensitive to the context of the neighborhood.

- B. Differentiated Yet Compatible. The <u>Preservation Alliance of Greater</u> <u>Philadelphia</u> sums it up best. They found that prior to the 1950s, new additions and infill buildings were likely to be designed in the same styles as their historic neighborhoods; however, as modernist architecture gained momentum, preservationists had to begin to "tame the ambitions of modernist architects and their penchant for setting off historic structures with contrasting ones." Since that time, preservationists have struggled with managing the relationship between historic buildings, their contemporary additions, and neighboring new development.
- **C. Protecting the Neighborhood.** For the reasons described above, staff finds that the term infill is more associated to context-sensitive design. New construction should support and enhance rather than detract from neighboring historic buildings. It needs to have its own identity but still be an integral part of the streetscape. According to the <u>Wisconsin Historical Society</u>, compatible infill "creates a visually seamless and cohesive streetscape."

complement and enhance the setting, reinforce historic development patterns, and promote vitality of historic neighborhoods.

Staff has found that infill development poses the greatest threat to our Mining Boom Era Residences National Register Thematic District. In recent years, staff has found greater demand for Mountain Modern and modernist structures that are in contrast to our historic vernacular Victorian residences. Another threat is the perceived size of new construction as lots are amended; volumes do not reflect those of the smaller miner's shacks. Two-car garages have also replaced pedestrian-oriented entrances, particularly on downhill lots. Staff is seeking to address these and other issues with our proposed revisions to the Design Guidelines for New Construction. Changes are reflected in red.

Staff is proposing the following:

## I. Universal Design Guidelines

Staff's revisions largely reflect those changes made to the Design Guidelines for Historic Residential and Commercial Buildings. The HPB had decided to use "shall" rather than "should" to emphasize the importance of following the Design Guidelines; however, in some places "should" was more appropriate as it allowed for flexibility. Staff has also added two new guidelines to emphasize the importance of designing compatible new infill and reinforcing the visual unity of the block.

Additionally, staff found that currently Universal Guideline #3 states that "styles that never appeared in Park City should be avoided. Styles that radically conflict with the character of Park City's Historic Sites should also be avoided." Staff has reviewed the compatibility of new construction in the Historic District with the HPB. New construction has generally not replicated historic house forms such as cross-wing, hall-parlor, or pyramid-roof four-squares; however, it has used architectural features of these forms to create a compatible design. In other instances, new Mountain Modern buildings have been constructed in the Historic District and the HPB has expressed concern that these are not compatible to the character of the Historic District.



Does the HPB wish to maintain the existing language in the Design Guidelines to require that new construction follow styles that were typical of Park City? Or, does the HPB prefer to allow more creativity and remove this sentence in the quideline?

Staff's recommendation is to maintain this sentence; however, it could be interpreted that we're limiting creativity in compatible design.

Should the guideline include the highlighted sentence? (based on staff's revisions):

A. #3. A style of architecture shall be selected and all elevations of the new infill building shall be designed in a manner consistent with a contemporary interpretation of the selected style. Stylistic elements shall not simply be applied to the exteriors.
Styles that never appeared in Park City shall be avoided. Styles that radically conflict with the character of Park City's Historic Sites shall also be avoided.

The following changes are recommended:

such as the projecting gable, large double-

hung windows, etc.

- 1. New <u>infill residential</u> buildings <u>should shall</u> reflect the historic character—simple building forms, unadorned materials, restrained ornamentation—of Park City's Historic Sites.
- New <u>infill residential</u> buildings <u>should shall</u> not directly imitate existing historic structures in Park City. Roof pitch, shape and configuration, as well as scale of building elements found on Historic Sites may be duplicated, but building elements such as moldings, cornice details, brackets, and porch supports <u>should shall</u> not be directly imitated. Reconstructions of non-<u>survivng-surviving</u> historic buildings <u>are is</u> allowed.
- A style of architecture should shall be selected and all elevations of the new infill residential building should-shall be designed in a manner consistent with a contemporary interpretation of the chosen selected style. Stylistic elements should shall not simply be applied to the exteriors. Styles that never appeared in Park City should shall be avoided.

Styles that radically conflict with the character of Park City's Historic Sites should shall also be avoided.

- 4. <u>New infill residential buildings shall differentiate from historic structures but be</u> <u>compatible with historic structures in materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and</u> <u>massing to protect the integrity of the Historic District as a whole.</u>
- Building and site design should shall respect the existing topography, the characterdefining site features, including existing trees and vegetation, and should shall minimize cut, fill, and the use of retaining walls.
- Exterior elements of the new development—roofs, entrances, eaves, chimneys, porches, windows, doors, steps, retaining walls, garages, etc.— of the new infill residential building should shall be of human scale and should shall be compatible with neighboring Historic Sites Structures.
- Scale and height of new <u>infill residential buildings</u> structures should shall follow the predominant pattern of the neighborhood with special consideration given to Historic Sites.
- The <u>S</u>ize and mass of the <u>a</u> structure <u>should shall</u> be compatible with the size of the property <u>site</u> so that lot coverage, building bulk, and mass are compatible with Historic Sites in the neighborhood.
- 9. New construction activity should shall not physically damage nearby Historic Sites.
- 10. New infill residential buildings shall reinforce visual unity within the context of the Historic District but also within the context of the block. 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, as one would see it when standing on the street viewing both sides of the street for the entire length of the block.

#### II. Site Design

In this section, staff found that there needed to be greater detail in how to maintain the historic streetscapes. We incorporated additional Design Guidelines to maintain and promote the rhythm and pattern of the streetscape, orientation of buildings, and pedestrian entrances. We also added new guidelines to promote sustainable landscaping, ensure the compatibility of new retaining walls and fences, and provide better guidance for parking and driveways. New sections were added for Paths, Steps, and Handrails as well as Gazebos, Pergolas, and Other Shade Structures.

Below are examples within the District of specific issues we have encountered:





This site at 1033 Empire Avenue is dominated by the driveway. Though there is landscaping on the side to soften the edges of the driveway, the majority of the front yard is paved.

Staff is proposing the following Revisions to the Design Guidelines:

#### SETBACK & ORIENTATION

A.2.1 Lot coverage of new buildings should shall be compatible with the surrounding Historic Sites.

A.1.1 Locate Structures shall be located on the a site in a way that follows the predominant pattern of historic buildings along the street, maintaining traditional setbacks, orientation of entrances, and alignment along the street, and open space.

A.1.2 Avoid designs that will cause snow shedding onto adjacent properties.<sup>4</sup>

The historic town grid shall be preserved by retaining the formal street pattern, maintaining historic lot sizes rather than aggregating historic-sized lots into larger lots, and preserving the regular rhythm and pattern of lot sizes in a way that reinforces the perception of the grid.

<u>A new building shall be oriented parallel to the site's lot lines similar to that of historic building orientations. When similar front yard setbacks are characteristic of the neighborhood, a new building's façade shall be aligned with neighboring building's facades. When a variety of building setbacks is part of the historic context, a new building shall be located within the range of setbacks seen historically.</u>

<u>New buildings shall have a clearly defined primary entrance oriented toward the street</u> consistent with historic buildings in the Historic District. Entrances on the rear or side of a building shall be clearly subordinate to the entrance on the primary façade.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Relocated to roofs.

Side yard setbacks similar to those seen historically in the neighborhood shall be established in order to reinforce the pattern of built and open space. The historic rhythm of building spacing in the immediate block shall be especially considered.

#### TOPOGRAPHY & GRADING

The natural topography and original grading of a site shall be maintained when feasible.

A.4.1 Building and site design should shall respond to natural features. New buildings should shall step down/ or up to follow the existing contours of steep slopes.

A.4.2 The <u>A new</u> site's natural slope should shall be respected in a new building design in order to minimize cuts into hillsides, minimize fill, and minimize retaining walls; excavation should generally not exceed one story in depth.

A.4.3 When retaining walls are necessary, the impact should be minimized by creating gradual steps or tiers, by using perennial plant materials to minimize visual impact, and by using forms and materials found on surrounding Historic Sites.

#### LANDSCAPING & VEGETATION

Existing landscape features that contribute to the character of the Historic District and existing landscape features that provide environmental sustainability benefits shall be respected and maintained.

Established on-site native plantings shall be maintained. During construction, established vegetation shall be protected to avoid damage. Damaged, aged, or diseased trees shall be replaced as necessary. Vegetation that may encroach upon or damage a new building may be removed, but shall be replaced with similar vegetation near the original location.

A detailed landscape plan, particularly for areas viewable from the primary public right-ofway which respects the manner and materials traditionally used in the Historic Districts shall be provided. When planning for the long-term sustainability of a landscape system, all landscape relationships on the site, including those between plantings and between the site and its structure(s) shall be considered.

A.5.1 Landscape plans should shall balance water efficient irrigation methods and drought tolerant and native plant materials with existing plant materials and site features that contribute to the character of the Historic District.

Storm water management features such as gutters and downspouts, site topography, and vegetation that can improve the environmental sustainability of a site shall be used to advantage.

The use of xeriscaping or permaculture strategies for landscape design shall be considered in order to maximize water efficiency. Where watering systems are necessary, systems that minimize water loss such as drip irrigation shall be used. These systems shall be designed to minimize their appearance from areas viewable from the primary public right-of-way.

A.5.2 Landscape plans should allow for snow storage from driveways.

A.5.3 Incorporate landscape treatments for driveways, walkways, paths, building and accessory structures in a comprehensive, complimentary and integrated design.

A.5.4 The character of the neighborhood and district should not be diminished by significantly reducing the proportion of built or paved area to open space.

A.5.5 Provide landscaped separations between parking areas, drives, service areas, vehicular access points and public use areas including walkways, plazas.

#### RETAINING WALLS

When feasible, a site shall be contoured in a way that reduces the need for retaining walls. When retaining walls are necessary, the visual impact shall be minimized by creating gradual steps or tiers and by using perennial plant material. When a fence is to be placed on the top of a retaining wall, the combined height shall be similar in scale to retaining walls and fences seen historically.

New retaining walls shall be consistent with historic retaining walls in terms of mass, scale, design, materials, and scale of materials. Simple board-formed concrete, stacked stone and other traditional materials are recommended over concrete block, asphalt, or other modern concrete treatments. Alternative materials may be considered but they shall convey the general scale, texture, and character of historic masonry walls.

Masonry shall be maintained in its natural finish. Applying paint, stain, or stucco over stone or concrete retaining walls is not appropriate.

Traditional height and setback of retaining walls along the street shall be maintained.

To abate retaining-wall failure, drainage behind retaining walls shall be maintained so water drains away from the walls.

#### FENCES

A.3.1 New fences should reflect the building's style, but solid wood fences in the front yard should be avoided.

<u>New fencing should reflect the style of the building to which fencing is associated when</u> viewable from the primary public right-of-way. New wood and metal fencing should reflect traditional designs and patterns. Split or horizontal rail, railroad tie, or timber fencing may be located where not visible from the primary public right-of-way but should be avoided where visible from the primary public right-of-way. Vinyl or plastic-coated fencing is not appropriate in the Historic District.

<u>New fencing should be designed to minimize its environmental impacts.</u> New fencing should use sustainable material and should take into account site characteristics such as natural topography and drainage.

Drought-tolerant shrubs should be considered in place of a fence or wall.

<u>Arbors emphasizing a fence gate or entry should be subordinate to the associated</u> <u>building(s) or structure(s) and should complement the design of the primary structure and</u> <u>fencing in material, features, size, scale and proportion.</u>

PATHS, STEPS, HANDRAILS, & RAILINGS (NOT ASSOCIATED WITH PORCHES)

New paths and walkways should have a modest unobtrusive appearance in order to support the sense of a natural setting.

New hillside stairs and any associated railings or handrails shall be visually subordinate to the associated building(s) or structure(s) in size, scale, and proportion, and shall complement the Historic District in material, size, scale and proportion, and massing. To break up the mass of longer-run stairs, changes in the materials of the stairs shall be considered.

## GAZEBOS, PERGOLAS, AND OTHER SHADE STRUCTURES

The installation of gazebos, pergolas, and other shade structures shall be limited to rear or side yards and shall have limited visibility when viewed from the primary public right-of-way.

<u>Gazebos</u>, pergolas, and other shade structures shall be visually subordinate to the associated building(s) or structure(s) and shall complement the design of the primary structure in material, features, size, scale and proportion.

## PARKING AREAS & DRIVEWAYS

D.1.1 Off-street parking areas should shall be located within the rear yard, and beyond the rear wall plane of the primary structure when feasible. D.1.2 If When locating a parking area in the <u>a</u> rear yard is infeasible not physically possible, the off street parking area and associated vehicles should be visually buffered from adjacent properties and the primary public right-of-way. Providing a driveway along the side yard of a site shall be considered when feasible.

**D.1.3** Parking areas and vehicular access should shall be visually subordinate to the character-defining streetscape elements of the neighborhood.

The visual impact of on-site parking shall be minimized by incorporating landscape treatments for driveways, walkways, paths, and structures in a comprehensive, complimentary and integrated design.

Landscaped separations shall be provided between parking areas, drives, service areas, and public use areas like walkways, plazas, and vehicular access points. When plant materials are used for screening, they shall be designed to function year-round.

When locating new off-street parking areas and driveways, the existing topography of a site and integral site features shall be minimally impacted.

When locating new off-street parking areas and driveways, the existing topography of a building site and significant site features shall be minimally impacted.

D.3.1 Driveways should not exceed twelve (12) feet in width. D.3.2 Shared vehicular approaches curb cuts and driveways should be used when feasible. 10 foot wide driveways are encouraged; however, new driveways shall not exceed 12 feet in width. Shared driveways shall be used when feasible.

Textured and poured paving materials other than smooth concrete shall be considered for driveways that are visible from the primary public right-of-way. Permeable paving shall be used when appropriate, to manage storm water. Permeable paving may not be appropriate for all driveways and parking areas.

Paving up to the building foundation shall be avoided in order to reduce heat-island effect, building temperature, damage to the foundation, and storm-water runoff problems.

Snow storage from driveways shall be provided on site.

#### III. Primary Structures Mass, Scale, and Height

Staff finds that this is one of the greatest challenges in Old Town. With applicant's maximizing their house size, it has been difficult even on single lots (25'x75') for the project to maintain the mass and scale of our historic folk Victorian miner's cottages. Houses often become "boxy" because they lack articulation and the overall volume has not been broken up to reflect those found on historic structures. Below are two (2) examples of this:



Staff is proposing the following Design Guideline revisions:

B.1.1 The size of a new building, The size and mass of a new residential infill building its mass in relation to open spaces, should shall be visually compatible with the adjacent historic buildings and historic structures in the surrounding Historic Sites District.

Buildings that utilize traditional buildings forms —rectangular, cross-wing, pyramid-roof—are encouraged.

Historic height, width, and depth proportions that are important in creating compatible infill and maintaining the historic mass and scale of the Historic District shall be maintained.

Building features such as upper story windows, porches, and first floor bays shall be aligned with similar historic building features in the neighborhood. Generally, these elements should align in relation to the topography allowing these elements to "step up" or "step down" the block.

The perceived scale of a new buildings shall respect the scale established by historic buildings in the character zone. Abrupt change of scale in the character zone is inappropriate, especially when a new, larger building would directly abut smaller historic buildings.

<u>A larger building shall be divided into 'modules' that reflect the mass, scale, proportions, and size of historic buildings in the Historic District.</u> Modules shall be clearly expressed throughout the entire building and a single form shall remain the dominant element so the overall mass does not become too fragmented. To minimize the scale perceived from the primary public right-of-way, stepping down the mass of a larger building shall be considered.

**B.1.3** Larger-scaled projects should shall also include variations in roof height in order to break up the form, mass and scale of the overall structure.

**B.1.8** Buildings constructed on lots greater than 25 feet wide should shall be designed so the facades visible from the primary public right-of-way reinforce the rhythm along the street in terms of historic building width, building-depth, and patterns within the façade.

B.1.7 Regardless of lot frontage, the primary façade should shall be compatible with the width of surrounding historic buildings. The greater width of the structure should a building shall be set back significantly from the plane of the primary façade. The width of a new building shall not appear to be appreciably greater than historic buildings in the neighborhood. Modules on a primary facade should generally not exceed 11 feet to 25 feet in width.

**B.1.2** When <u>the</u> overall length of a new structure is greater than <u>those that</u> seen historically, <u>it should the design shall</u> employ methods—changes in wall plane, roof heights, <u>use of</u> <u>modules</u>, etc.—\_\_\_to diminish the visual impact of the overall building mass, form and scale.

B.1.5 New buildings should shall not be significantly taller or shorter than surrounding historic buildings adjacent buildings with special consideration given to surrounding historic buildings.

Primary facades shall be limited to one to two stories in height. (Generally, historic residential facades are about 15 to 20 feet in height from the top of the foundation to the top of the gable.)

Variation in building height may be considered regarding topography. Hillsides for a backdrop for taller buildings, minimizing their perceived height, therefore it may be appropriate for taller building masses to be located on steeper slopes. The facades of taller buildings shall still express a human scale.

Beyond the primary façade, the average perceived scale of one-story to two-story buildings shall be maintained. As a means of minimizing the perceived mass of a project, breaking up the height of the building into a set of modules or components that relate to the height of buildings along the street front shall be considered.

Secondary and tertiary elevations may be taller than the established norm when the change in scale cannot be perceived from designated vantage points including the cross-canyon view. This may be appropriate when taller portions will not be seen from a primary public right-of-way.

B.1.4 Taller portions of buildings should shall be constructed so as to minimize obstruction of sunlight to adjacent yards and rooms windows.

B.1.6 Windows, balconies and decks should be located in order to respect the existing conditions of neighboring properties.

#### **Foundation**

The HPB provided input on foundations as part of our revisions for the Design Guidelines for Historic Residential Structures [See 5.4.15 <u>HPB Report</u> (page 81) and <u>Minutes</u> (page 22)]. Staff has used these revisions as the basis for the following:

B.2.1 Generally, no more than two (2) feet of the new foundation should be visible above finished grade when viewed from the primary public rightof-way. (Exception in the event the garage must be located under primary living space, as is often the case with standard 25'x75' lots).

Foundation materials shall be simple in form and minimally visible above grade when viewed from the primary public right-of-way. Acceptable foundation materials may include stone and concrete, wood lattice and vertical boards. Distinction between foundation and wall material shall be clearly defined. Clapboard siding shall not extend to the ground.

A site shall be returned to original grade following construction of a foundation. When 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 facade. No more than 2 feet of the new foundation shall be visible above final grade on secondary and tertiary facades.

A site shall be re-graded so as to blend with the grade of adjacent sites and not create the need for incompatible retaining walls.

A site shall be re-graded so all water drains away from the structure and does not enter the foundation.

#### **Doors and Windows**

Doors and windows are important elements of the design as these features contribute to the architectural style and period of the building, act as the "eyes" of the building, and define the character of each individual buildings and its relationship to the streetscape. Doors and windows contribute to the cohesiveness and architectural vocabulary of the neighborhood.

Staff has found that applicants often struggle with the proportion and scale of doors and windows. Because of current trends, there is greater demand for doors and windows that exceed standard sizes and are no longer of human scale. Requests for 8 to 10 foot

doors in Old Town are frequent, and many applicants want to capitalize on the views by introducing walls of glass or larger window openings.



Here are some examples:

Staff is proposing the following revisions:

#### DOORS

B.2.8 Ratios of openings-to-solid that are compatible with surrounding historic buildings should be used.

The historic pattern of principal doorways along the street shall be maintained. All buildings that face the street shall have a well-defined front entrance.

B.2.9 Windows and New doors shall be similar in location, size, and material to those seen traditionally in the Historic District. Doors should shall be proportional to the scale and style compatible with the style of both the new building and be and compatible with the historically buildings in the neighborhood Historic District.

Doors shall be designed and finished with trim elements similar to those used historically.

#### WINDOWS

B.2.8 Ratios of openings-to-solid solid-to-void that are compatible with surrounding historic buildings should shall be used. Large expanses of glazing are inappropriate on residential structures. Large glass surfaces shall be divided into smaller windows that are in scale with those seen historically. To maximize views, non-historic window patterns may be considered on tertiary facades; however, the overall ratio of solid-to-glass shall still be respected.

**B.2.9** Windows shall be historic size and shall relate to the human scale of the Historic District. Windows and doors should shall be proportional to the scale and style of the building and shall be compatible with the historically buildings in the neighborhood Historic District.

The placement and grouping of windows shall be similar to those seen historically.

Windows with vertical emphasis are encouraged. The general rule is the height shall be twice the dimension of the width (commonly referred to as 2:1 ratio). Double-hung, vertically proportioned windows similar to those used historically are particularly encouraged. Windows with traditional depth and trim are preferred.

The number of different window sizes and styles on a building or structure shall be limited.

Wood or metal windows similar to those used historically are preferred but aluminum-clad wood windows are also appropriate. Vinyl and aluminum windows are inappropriate.

New glazing shall match the appearance of historic glazing and/or shall be clear. Metallic, frosted, tinted, stained, textured and reflective finishes are generally inappropriate for glazing on the primary façade.

Window muntins shall be true divided lights or simulated divided lights on both sides of the glass. Snap-in muntins are inappropriate.

## <u>Roofs</u>

Roofs contribute to the overall shape and volume of the structure as well as the perceived mass, scale, and size of the building from the street. Roofs also add to the architectural style and character of the building. Staff found that we needed to add revisions that would further promote traditional roof forms in the historic district that are more compatible with our historic structures as well as encourage greater compatibility with the heights.

Staff is proposing the following:

B.2.2 Roofs of new buildings should shall be visually compatible with the roof shapes and orientation of surrounding Historic Sites and adjacent buildings that contribute to the character of the Historic District. Sloping roof forms, such as gable, hip and shed, should be the dominant roof shapes. Roofs composed of a combination of roof planes, but simple in form, are also encouraged. Roofs shall be in scale with those on historic structures. Flat roofs as the primary roof form along the street shall be avoided.

**B.2.3** Roof pitch should shall be consistent with the style of architecture chosen for the structure and with the surrounding Historic Sites adjacent buildings that contribute to the character of the Historic District, with special consideration given to Historic Sites.

The alignment that is created by similar heights of primary roofs and porches among historic buildings shall be maintained. This similarity of heights in building features contributes to the visual continuity along the streetscape.

B.2.4 Roofs should shall be designed to minimize snow shedding onto adjacent properties and/or pedestrian paths. <u>Crickets, saddles, or other snow-guard devices shall be placed so</u> they do not significantly alter the form of the roof as seen from the primary public right-of-way.

New roof features, such as photovoltaic panels (solar panels), skylights, ventilators, and mechanical or communication equipment shall be visually minimized from the primary public right-of-way so as not to compromise the architectural character of the structure. Roof-mounted features like photovoltaic panels (solar panels) and skylights should be installed parallel to the roof plane when feasible.

Roof materials should appear similar to those seen historically. Asphalt shingles may be considered. Metal sheeting or standing seam metal roofs with a baked-on paint finish and galvanized or rusted steel sheeting are generally appropriate. Roofs shall have matte finishes to minimize glare. B.1.4 Roof colors should shall be neutral and muted and materials should shall not be reflective.

## <u>Dormers</u>

Dormers are another character-defining feature of a building. When introduced correctly, they can break up the mass of a roof form, add architectural interest, and help define the architectural style of a building. If the dormer is not designed well, however, it can quickly overwhelm the building and become dominant to the overall roof form.

This dormer at 1234 Lowell Avenue is not compatible with the overall scale of the building and appears "applied" rather than integrated into the overall design of the house.
The dormers on this building at 210 Grant Avenue overwhelm the simple gable-front form of the house and detract from the primary roof form.



The dormers at 916 Empire Avenue have been integrated into the overall design of the house. The mass and scale are consistent with the overall mass and scale of the house and the dormers do not overwhelm the primary side-gable roof form.

Staff is proposing the following revisions:

The number and size of dormers shall be limited on a roof, such that the primary roof form remains prominent. Dormers shall be used with restraint, in keeping with the simple character of buildings in Park City.

Dormers shall be visually minimized from primary public right-of-way. Gabled, hipped, or shed dormers are appropriate for most structures and shall be in keeping with the character and scale of the structure.

# **Gutters & Downspouts**

Staff based the following revisions off of our Design Guidelines for Historic Residential Structures:

Downspouts shall be located away from architectural features and shall be visually minimized when viewed from the primary public right-of-way.

Water from gutters and downspouts shall drain away from the structure.

## **Chimneys & Stovepipes**

Here again, staff finds that most applicants struggle with the mass and scale of these roof features. Historically, chimneys were small, square brick masses at the ridgeline of the historic house or on an exterior wall. Today, we are seeing more demand for massive stone chimneys that are more reminiscent of ski chalets and Deer Valley lodges than simple miner's cottages.



Staff is proposing the following revisions: Chimneys shall not be covered with non-traditional materials.

Chimneys and stove pipes shall be of a size, scale, and design that are appropriate to the character and style similar to those found historically. Chimneys and stovepipes shall be visually minimized when viewed from primary public right-of-way.

Chimneys shall not be covered with non-traditional materials.

## Porches

In addition to providing shelter at an entry point in the building, porches are often a decorative character-defining feature. The porch provides a transition between the public street and the private interior of the home. Most historic dwelling were designed and constructed with at least one porch. These have become a prominent feature of the Historic District and front porches contribute to the streetscape. It is important that new buildings incorporate a pedestrian-oriented porch element to identify the primary entrance and contribute to the character of the district.



Staff is proposing the following revisions:

B.2.10 Porches should be incorporated into new construction when the Historic Sites in the neighborhood establish the pattern for this entry type. Porches shall be used to define front entrances. Over-scaled, monumental and under-scaled entries shall be avoided.

B.2.11 Porches <u>on primary and secondary facades</u> <u>should shall</u> be compatible with <u>the a</u> building's style and <u>should shall</u> respect the scale and proportions found on historic buildings in the neighborhood. Over-scaled, monumental and under-scaled entries should <u>be avoided</u>.

The height of porch decks shall be similar to those found on historic building(s) in the Historic District.

#### Architectural Features

Architectural features and details contribute to the architectural style of the building and add visual interest. Features such as lintels, brackets, porch posts, and other ornamentation can be character-defining features in their own right. Architectural features were often expressed as decorative ornamentation historically, so it is important that new infill construction avoid

incorporating decorative elements that confuse the history of Park City or detract from the historic structures. At the same time, new construction should maintain the overall mass and scale and simple character of the district as a whole.

Staff generally does not see much demand for new construction replicating overly ornate architectural styles such as <u>Queen Anne</u> or <u>Italianate</u> that incorporate rounded windows, roof eaves with brackets, and diverse siding materials. Rather, staff finds that there is a greater push towards 21<sup>st</sup>- Century Modern designs that are so simplified that they no longer contribute to the historic district. These houses typically are characterized by extensive use of glass, limited or no trim around windows and doors, and modern materials.

Staff recommends the following:

Simple ornamental trim and decoration is in character with historic architectural ornamentation and is encouraged. Traditional locations for architectural ornamentation are porches and eaves. Other details like eave depth, mullions, corner boards, and brackets that lend character to historic buildings shall be considered.

#### Mechanical Systems, Utility Systems, & Service Equipment:

Staff based the following revisions off of our Design Guidelines for Historic Residential Structures:

B.2.15 Equipment should not be located on the roof or primary façade (except as noted in Supplemental Guidelines main Street National Register Historic District). If equipment is located on a secondary façade it should be placed behind the midpoint or in a location that is not visible from the primary public right of way.

B.2.16 Ground-level equipment should be screened using landscape elements such as fences, low stone walls, or perennial plant materials.

-B.2.17 Loading docks should be located and designed in order to minimize their visual impact.

Mechanical and/or utility equipment, including heating and air conditioning units, meters, and exposed pipes, shall be located on the back of the building or in another inconspicuous location. When located on a secondary façade, the mechanical and/or utility equipment shall be located beyond the midpoint of the structure if feasible and visual impact of the equipment shall be minimized by incorporating it as an element of the building or landscape design.

<u>Ground-level equipment shall be screened from view using landscape elements such as</u> <u>fences, low stone walls, or perennial plant materials.</u>

Low-profile rooftop mechanical units and elevator penthouses that are not visible from the primary public right-of-way shall be used. When this is not possible, rooftop equipment shall be set back or screened from all views. Placement of rooftop equipment shall be sensitive to views from upper floors of neighboring buildings.

New communications equipment such as satellite dishes or antennae shall be visually minimized when viewed from the primary public right-of-way.

Service equipment and trash containers shall be screened. Solid wood or masonry partitions or hedges shall be used to enclose trash areas.

## **Materials**

The materials used on new infill project has a profound impact on the neighborhood and the Historic District as a whole. If materials are too traditional and historic in appearance, it can be misleading and cause the new structure to appear historic. If the materials are too modern, it can detract from the historic character of the neighborhood.

Staff has found that it is generally appropriate for new infill using traditional forms to incorporate modern materials to help differentiate them from their historic neighbors; new infill using modern forms should incorporate more traditional materials to help diminish the form and blend in better with the neighborhood.

Staff is proposing the following revisions:

B.2.5 Building materials should shall be compatible in scale, proportion, texture, finish and color to those materials used on Historic Sites in the neighborhood on Historic Structures in the Historic District. The dimensions of masonry units, wood siding, and other building materials shall be similar to those used historically

The primary siding material for new structures shall appear similar to those on historic structures in the neighborhood. Historically, the most common material on primary structures was painted horizontal lap siding with a reveal between 6 to 8 inches. Secondary structures such as barns and sheds typically had siding of unpainted wood (horizontal lap or vertical board and batten) or corrugated metal panels.

B.2.6 Building materials, especially stone and masonry, should be used shall be applied in the manner similar to that they were used historically. Typically, a 'hierarchy' of building materials should be used, with heavier, more durable materials for foundations and more refined materials above foundations. Building materials, especially masonry, shall be used in the manner they were used historically.

**B.2.7** Synthetic <u>building</u> materials such as fiber cement or plastic-wood composite siding, shingles, and trim should shall not be used unless 1) the materials are made of a minimum of 50% recycled and/or reclaimed materials and 2) the applicant can demonstrate that use of the materials will not diminish the historic character of the neighborhood. <u>Vinyl and aluminum siding are not appropriate in the Historic District.</u>

## Paint & Color

Staff based the following revisions off of our Design Guidelines for Historic Residential Structures:

Paint color is not regulated by the Design Guidelines.

B.2.12 Original material such as brick and stone that are was historically left unpainted shall not be painted. Exterior surfaces Materials, such as wood, that are traditionally painted should shall have an opaque rather than transparent finish.

B.2.13 Rustic unfinished wood siding is generally not appropriate on houses, but may be appropriate on accessory structures or additions to non-historic buildings. A transparent or translucent weather-protective finish shall be applied to wood surfaces that were not

historically painted. Provide a weather-protective finish to wood surfaces that were not historically painted.

B.2.14 When possible, Low-VOC (volatile organic compound) paints and finishes should be used <u>when possible</u>.

# IV. Garages:

It has been difficult finding a balance between preserving the historic character and pedestrian nature of our historic district while also balancing the needs of our autocentric 21<sup>st</sup> Century culture. With greater push for side-by-side two-car garage configurations, it has been difficult to maintain the pedestrian-oriented character of the street that was historically dominated by front porches and pedestrian entrances. In many cases, the side-by-side garage becomes the focal point of the façade and diminishes the pedestrian entrance to the house. On downhill lots, the garage is the most visible aspect of the design.





Staff is proposing the following revisions:

#### GARAGES: GENERAL COMPATIBILITY

D.2.2 If the lot size dictates that the garage must be located above, below, or adjacent to the primary living space, its visual impact should be minimized.

**D.2.3** Single-width tandem garages are <u>encouraged recommended</u>. Side-by-side parking configurations are strongly discouraged; if used, they should be visually minimized when viewed from the public right-of-way.

Garages featuring a side-by-side parking configuration shall maintain a 2 feet horizontal offset in the front wall plane.

D.2.4 Single vehicle garage doors that do not exceed 9'x9' are recommended not greater than 9 feet wide by 9 feet high shall be used to access the garage.

D.2.5 Carports should shall be avoided.

#### SCENARIO 1: DETACHED GARAGES

D.2.1 Garages-should-shall be constructed as detached or semi-detached-structures and located beyond the side-yard midpoint of the building in the side yard or within the rear yard when feasible.

D.2.3 Single-width tandem garages are <u>encouraged recommended</u>. Side-by-side parking configurations are strongly discouraged; <u>if when</u> used, they <u>should shall</u> be visually minimized when viewed from the <u>primary</u> public right-of-way.

Garages featuring a side-by-side parking configuration shall maintain a 2 feet horizontal offset in the front wall plane.

D.2.4 Single vehicle garage doors that do not exceed 9'x9' are recommended not greater than 9 feet wide and 9 feet high shall be used to access the garage.

D.2.5 Carports should be avoided.

Detached garages shall be subordinate to the pedestrian entrance of the house. Where excavation is required for access to the garage, the pedestrian entrance should still be clearly articulated.

#### SCENARIO 2: BASEMENT LEVEL ATTACHED OR DETACHED GARAGES

When construction of a detached garage is not feasible, a basement level garage may be considered, particularly on uphill lots.

<u>A basement garage shall not extend beyond the exterior wall planes of a structure's primary or secondary facades.</u>

In limited situations, site setbacks and topography may allow for a projecting garage without adversely affecting the historic character of the streetscape. In these cases, a stepped design with associated site grading and a landscaping plan may be considered.

The vertical facade of a basement garage that is visible from the primary public right-of-way shall be visually minimized. It is preferred that the garage opening be set back from the wall plane of the primary structure in order to diminish the presence of the garage.

Window or egress wells, when needed, shall not be located on the primary façade. Window or egress wells shall be located beyond the midpoint of the secondary façades, on the rear elevation, or in a location that is not visible from the primary public right-of-way.

After construction of a basement garage, a site shall be re-graded to approximate the grading prior to the new construction.

A single-vehicle garage door not greater than 9 feet wide and 9 feet high shall be used to access a basement garage addition.

Single-width tandem garages are recommended. Side-by-side parking configurations are strongly discouraged; if used, they shall be visually minimized when viewed from the public primary right-of-way.

Garages featuring a side-by-side parking configuration, at a minimum, shall maintain a two foot (2') horizontal offset in the wall plane between the two garage doors.

SCENARIO 3: ATTACHED GARAGES
When construction of a detached garage is not feasible, an attached garage may be considered.

A single-vehicle garage door not greater than 9 feet wide by 9 feet high shall be used to access a garage.

Single-width tandem garages are recommended. Side-by-side parking configurations are strongly discouraged; if used, they shall be visually minimized when viewed from the primary public right-of-way.

Garages featuring a side-by-side parking configuration shall maintain a 2 foot horizontal offset in the front wall plane.

Garages shall be subordinate to the pedestrian entrance of the house. Where excavation is required for access to the garage, the pedestrian entrance should still be clearly articulated. Where excavation is not required, the pedestrian entrance shall be proud of the garage wall plane.

# Decks:

Staff based the following revisions off of our Design Guidelines for Historic Residential Structures. In our previous revisions, the HPB was against allowing fiber cement or plastic-wood composite decking for historic structures. <u>Does the HPB want to allow</u> these synthetic materials on new infill development?

Staff is proposing the following:

Decks shall be constructed in inconspicuous areas where visually minimized from the primary public right-of-way, usually on the rear elevation. When built on a side elevation of a new structure, a deck should be screened from the primary public right-of-way with fencing and/or appropriate native landscaping.

The visual impact of a deck should be minimized by limiting its size and scale. Introducing a deck that visually detracts from a new structure, or substantially alters a site's proportion of built area to open space is not appropriate.

Decks and related steps and railings shall be constructed of materials and in styles that are compatible with the structure to which they are attached as well as with the character of the Historic District as a whole.

Decking materials such as fiber cement or plastic-wood composite floor boards shall not be used unless they are made of a minimum of 50% recycled and/or reclaimed materials.

Significant site features, such as mature trees, shall be protected from damage during the construction of a deck by minimizing ground disturbance and by limiting use of heavy construction equipment.

# Balcony & Roof Decks

Staff based the following revisions off of our Design Guidelines for Historic Residential Structures:

New balconies and roof decks shall be visually subordinate to the new building and shall be minimally visible from the primary public right-of-way.

A new balcony shall be simple in design and compatible with the character of the Historic District. Simple wood and metal designs are appropriate for residential structures. Heavy timber and plastics are inappropriate materials.

A roof deck shall be visually minimized when viewed from the primary public right-of-way.

## V. New Accessory Structures

Staff found that it was necessary to provide additional guidance on the placement of accessory structures based on the overall pattern of development established by the existing neighborhood. Additionally, accessory structures should read as a secondary use. Thus, staff found it was important for the accessory structure to be smaller in size compared to the primary structure or broken up into volumes so as to appear subordinate to the primary structure.

Staff proposes the following:

H.1 New accessory structures should generally be located at the rear of the lot. <u>New</u> accessory structures on flat or downhill sites shall generally be located in the rear yard, unless located in a character zone with similar development patterns.

New accessory structures may be located at the street front when a pattern of front yard historic accessory structures has been established along the street, and when the proposed placement of the accessory structure does not create a danger or hazard to traffic by obstructing the view on the street.

Accessory structures (such as sheds and detached garages) shall be subordinate in scale to the primary structure.

## VI. Additions to Existing Non-Historic Structures

Staff is seeing greater demands to rehab existing non-historic buildings. For this reason, staff thought it was important to create guidelines that specifically address constructing additions to non-historic buildings:

An addition shall complement the visual and physical qualities of the existing structure.

An addition shall be visually subordinate to the existing structure and shall be compatible with the scale of the historic buildings and structures in the neighborhood. When the combined effects of the addition's footprint, height, mass, and scale are such that the overall size of the addition is larger than the existing structure, the volume of the addition shall be broken into modules that reflect the scale of those components seen on the existing structure. Multiple modules are encouraged to add articulation and architectural interest.

Components and materials used on additions shall be similar in scale and size to those found on the existing structure.

Windows, doors, and other features on a new addition shall be designed to be compatible with the existing structure and surrounding historic sites. Windows, doors, and other openings shall be of sizes and proportions similar to those found on the building as well as those found on historic structures in the Historic District. When using new window patterns and designs, those elements shall respect the typical historic character and proportions of windows on adjacent historic structures. Also, the solid-to-void relationships and detailing of an addition shall be compatible with the existing structure and with historic buildings in the Historic District.

# VII. Reconstruction of Non-Surviving Structures

Staff had minimal changes to this section:

C.1 Reconstruction of a <u>documented but</u> non-surviving historic structure that <u>once</u> existed in Park City is allowed when no existing building in Park City with the same historical significance has survived.

C.2 Reconstruction may be allowed when documentary and physical evidence is available to facilitate an accurate re-creation reconstruction.

C.3 Reconstruction should shall not be based on conjectural designs or on a combination of different features from other historic buildings.

C.4 Reconstruction should shall include recreating the documented design of exterior features such as the roof shape, architectural detailing, windows, entrances and porches, steps and doors, and their historic spatial relationships.

C.5 A reconstructed building should shall accurately duplicate the appearance of the non-surviving historic property in materials, design, color, and texture.

C.6 A reconstructed building should shall duplicate the building, but also the setting, placement, and orientation of the non-surviving structure.

C.7 A <u>Reconstruction</u> should shall re-establish the historic relationship between the building(s) or buildings and historic site features.

C.8 A building may not be reconstructed on a location other than its original site.

## VIII. Sidebars for New Residential Sites & Structures

The HPB found that sidebars were useful to provide additional explanation to the Design Guidelines for Historic Residential and Commercial Buildings. Staff used the sidebars introduced in these sections to develop sidebars for Compatibility & Complementary as well as Retaining Walls and Fences for New Residential Infill Development.

Staff is proposing the following:

## **COMPATIBILITY & COMPLEMENTARY**

"Compatible" and "Complementary" are terms often used in historic preservation to describe the relationship between historic structures and new infill construction. Many characteristics and features contribute to compatible and complementary design, which helps to ensure the preservation of Park City's Historic Sites and Districts. These characteristics include:

- Form
- Mass and scale
- Roof shapes
- Building height
- Floor height
- Setbacks
- Materials

- Repetition or rhythm of solid-to-voids
- Rhythm of entrances and/or porches
- Window and door sizes, proportions, and patterns
- Orientation of entrances
- Landscaping

## MASONRY RETAINING WALLS

Retaining walls contribute to the context and rhythm of streetscapes in Old Town. Historically, retaining walls were a simple method for property owners to manage the steep and complex topography. In addition, retaining walls helped define property boundaries and create yards spaces where space was otherwise limited.

Historic retaining walls were stacked by hand using stones found at local quarries or on site. The stones were carried by hand, making them rather uniform and small in size. Retaining walls were either dry stacked or used mortar. After 1900, concrete retaining walls began to appear.

As new retaining walls are introduced to Old Town, the following should be considered:

- Materials for new retaining walls visible from the right-of-way should reflect the building's era and style.
- Stones in new retaining walls shall be no larger than stones that a miner would be capable of carrying. New stones shall be similar in type, color, texture, scale, and proportion to those used historically in the District. Large boulders are discouraged and are not in keeping with the character of the Historic District.
- Historically, retaining walls were no more than 3 to 5 feet in height. It is generally
  preferred that new retaining walls over 5 feet be terraced to prevent large vertical
  planes of retaining walls on the streetscape. The Design Review Team recognizes
  the need to retain more earth as development occurs in Old Town; however, the
  Design Review Team encourages retaining walls that are in keeping with the scale
  of those found historically throughout the Historic District. Terracing multiple walls
  of 3 to 5 feet in height is encouraged with vegetation in between each terrace.
- Board-formed concrete may be appropriate. New concrete retaining walls shall be textured. A smooth or polished concrete finish is inappropriate and not in keeping with the character of the District.
- New retaining walls shall be screened with vegetation where appropriate.
- Retaining walls of alternative designs and materials shall be reviewed on a case-bycase basis.

## FENCING

As with retaining walls, fences were typical historic site features found throughout Old Town. The repetition of these site features created a sense of continuity and rhythm along the street front. Wood and woven wire fences were common front yard enclosures that followed the site perimeter, most commonly along the street front. New fences visible from the rightof-way should reflect the period of significance of the historic primary structure.

Several styles of fencing that were common during the historic period and are appropriate for use in the Historic District:

- Picket fences. Historically, wood picket fences may have been the most common fence type used in front yards. These fences had flat, dog-eared, or pointed tops and were generally less than 3 feet high. Pickets were typically 3-1/2 inches wide with spacing of 1-3/4 inches between boards.
- Wire fences. Various types of wire, including woven wire, were stretched between wood or metal posts. This fence type was very common in Park City; however, many of these original wire fences have been lost.
- Simple wrought and cast iron fences.

Fences of alternative designs and materials will be reviewed on a case-by-case basis. Substitute materials such as fiber cement or plastic-wood composite materials should not be used unless they are made of a minimum of 50% recycled and/or reclaimed materials. Further, it must be demonstrated that the use of these materials will not diminish the historic character of the neighborhood. Vinyl and Trex-type fencing is generally not appropriate in the Historic District and will be reviewed on a case-by-case basis.

#### **Department Review:**

This staff report has been reviewed by the Planning and Legal Departments.

#### **Recommendation:**

Staff has committed to routinely reviewing the existing Design Guidelines for Historic Districts and Historic Sites. Staff recommends that the Historic Preservation Board (HPB) take public comment on the proposed changes to the Park City's Design Guidelines for Historic Districts and Historic Sites; provide specific amendments to be made to the document if necessary; and forward a positive recommendation to City Council.

## Exhibits:

Exhibit A — Design Guideline Revisions

## Exhibit A

## **UNIVERSAL GUIDELINES:**

New infill residential buildings shall reflect the historic character—simple building forms, unadorned materials, restrained ornamentation—of Park City's Historic Sites.

New infill residential buildings shall not directly imitate existing historic structures in Park City. Roof pitch, shape and configuration, as well as scale of building elements found on Historic Sites may be duplicated, but building elements such as moldings, cornice details, brackets, and porch supports shall not be directly imitated. Reconstruction of non–surviving historic buildings is allowed.

A style of architecture shall be selected and all elevations of the new infill residential building shall be designed in a manner consistent with a contemporary interpretation of the selected style. Stylistic elements shall not simply be applied to exteriors. Styles that never appeared in Park City shall be avoided. Styles that radically conflict with the character of Park City's Historic Sites shall also be avoided.

New infill residential buildings shall differentiate from historic structures but be compatible with historic structures in materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the Historic District as a whole.

Building and site design shall respect the existing topography, the character-defining site features including existing trees and vegetation, and shall minimize cut, fill, and the use of retaining walls.

Exterior elements—roofs, entrances, eaves, chimneys, porches, windows, doors, steps, retaining walls, garages, etc.— of the new infill residential building shall be of human scale and shall be compatible with neighboring Historic Structures.

Scale and height of new infill residential buildings shall follow the predominant pattern of the neighborhood with special consideration given to Historic Sites.

Size and mass of a structure shall be compatible with the size of the site so that lot coverage, building bulk, and mass are compatible with Historic Sites in the neighborhood.

New construction activity shall not physically damage nearby Historic Sites.

New infill residential buildings shall reinforce visual unity within the context of the Historic District but also within the context of the block. 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, as one would see it when standing on the street viewing both sides of the street for the entire length of the block.

#### SITE DESIGN

#### SETBACK & ORIENTATION

Lot coverage of new buildings shall be compatible with the surrounding Historic Sites.

Structures shall be located on a site in a way that follows the predominant pattern of historic buildings along the street, maintaining traditional setbacks, orientation of entrances, alignment along the street, and open space.

The historic town grid shall be preserved by retaining the formal street pattern, maintaining historic lot sizes rather than aggregating historic-sized lots into larger lots, and preserving the regular rhythm and pattern of lot sizes in a way that reinforces the perception of the grid.

A new building shall be oriented parallel to the site's lot lines similar to that of historic building orientations. When similar front yard setbacks are characteristic of the neighborhood, a new building's façade shall be aligned with neighboring building's facades. When a variety of building setbacks is part of the historic context, a new building shall be located within the range of setbacks seen historically.

New buildings shall have a clearly defined primary entrance oriented toward the street consistent with historic buildings in the Historic District. Entrances on the rear or side of a building shall be clearly subordinate to the entrance on the primary façade.

Side yard setbacks similar to those seen historically in the neighborhood shall be established in order to reinforce the pattern of built and open space. The historic rhythm of building spacing in the immediate block shall be especially considered.

#### TOPOGRAPHY & GRADING

The natural topography and original grading of a site shall be maintained when feasible.

Building and site design shall respond to natural features. New buildings shall step down or up to follow the existing contours of steep slopes.

A new site's natural slope shall be respected in a new building design in order to minimize cuts into hillsides, minimize fill, and minimize retaining walls.

#### LANDSCAPING & VEGETATION

Existing landscape features that contribute to the character of the Historic District and existing landscape features that provide environmental sustainability benefits shall be respected and maintained.

Established on-site native plantings shall be maintained. During construction, established vegetation shall be protected to avoid damage. Damaged, aged, or diseased trees shall be replaced as necessary. Vegetation that may encroach upon or damage a new building may be removed, but shall be replaced with similar vegetation near the original location.

A detailed landscape plan, particularly for areas viewable from the primary public right-of-way that respects the manner and materials traditionally used in the Historic Districts shall be provided. When planning for the long-term sustainability of a landscape system, all landscape relationships on the site, including those between plantings and between the site and its structure(s) shall be considered.

Landscape plans shall balance water efficient irrigation methods and drought tolerant and native plant material with existing plant material and site features that contribute to the character of the Historic District.

Storm water management features such as gutters and downspouts as well as site topography and vegetation that can improve the environmental sustainability of a site shall be used to advantage.

The use of xeriscaping or permaculture strategies for landscape design shall be considered in order to maximize water efficiency. Where watering systems are necessary, systems that minimize water loss such as drip irrigation shall be used. These systems shall be designed to minimize their appearance from areas viewable from the primary public right-of-way.

#### RETAINING WALLS

When feasible, a site shall be contoured in a way that reduces the need for retaining walls. When retaining walls are necessary, the visual impact shall be minimized by creating gradual steps or tiers and by using perennial plant material. When a fence is to be placed on the top of a retaining wall, the combined height shall be similar in scale to retaining walls and fences seen historically.

New retaining walls shall be consistent with historic retaining walls in terms of mass, scale, design, materials, and scale of materials. Simple board-formed concrete, stacked stone and other traditional materials are recommended over concrete block, asphalt, or other modern concrete treatments. Alternative materials may be considered but they shall convey the general scale, texture, and character of historic masonry walls.

Masonry shall be maintained in its natural finish. Applying paint, stain, or stucco over stone or concrete retaining walls is not appropriate.

Traditional height and setback of retaining walls along the street shall be maintained.

To abate retaining-wall failure, drainage behind retaining walls shall be maintained so water drains away from the walls.

## FENCES

New fencing should reflect the style of the building to which fencing is associated when viewable from the primary public right-of-way. New wood and metal fencing should reflect traditional designs and patterns. Split or horizontal rail, railroad tie, or timber fencing may be located where not visible from the primary public right-of-way but should be avoided where visible from the primary public right-of-way. Vinyl or plastic-coated fencing is not appropriate in the Historic District.

New fencing should be designed to minimize its environmental impacts. New fencing should use sustainable material and should take into account site characteristics such as natural topography and drainage.

Drought-tolerant shrubs should be considered in place of a fence or wall.

Arbors emphasizing a fence gate or entry should be subordinate to the associated building(s) or structure(s) and should complement the design of the primary structure and fencing in material, features, size, scale and proportion.

## PATHS, STEPS, HANDRAILS, & RAILINGS (NOT ASSOCIATED WITH PORCHES)

New paths and walkways should have a modest unobtrusive appearance in order to support the sense of a natural setting.

New hillside stairs and any associated railings or handrails shall be visually subordinate to the associated building(s) or structure(s) in size, scale, and proportion, and shall complement the Historic District in material, size, scale and proportion, and massing. To break up the mass of longer-run stairs, changes in the materials of the stairs shall be considered.

## GAZEBOS, PERGOLAS, AND OTHER SHADE STRUCTURES

The installation of gazebos, pergolas, and other shade structures shall be limited to rear or side yards and shall have limited visibility when viewed from the primary public right-of-way.

Gazebos, pergolas, and other shade structures shall be visually subordinate to the associated building(s) or structure(s) and shall complement the design of the primary structure in material, features, size, scale and proportion.

## PARKING AREAS & DRIVEWAYS

Off-street parking areas shall be located within the rear yard and beyond the rear wall plane of the primary structure when feasible. When locating a parking area in a rear yard is not physically possible, the off street parking area and associated vehicles should be visually buffered from adjacent properties and the primary public right-of-way. Providing a driveway along the side yard of a site shall be considered when feasible.

Parking areas and vehicular access shall be visually subordinate to character-defining streetscape elements of the neighborhood.

The visual impact of on-site parking shall be minimized by incorporating landscape treatments for driveways, walkways, paths, and structures in a comprehensive, complimentary and integrated design.

Landscaped separations shall be provided between parking areas, drives, service areas, and public use areas like walkways, plazas, and vehicular access points. When plant materials are used for screening, they shall be designed to function year-round.

When locating new off-street parking areas and driveways, the existing topography of a site and integral site features shall be minimally impacted.

When locating new off-street parking areas and driveways, the existing topography of a building site and significant site features shall be minimally impacted.

Ten foot (10') wide driveways are encouraged; however, new driveways shall not exceed 12 feet in width. Shared driveways shall be used when feasible.

Textured and poured paving materials other than smooth concrete shall be considered for driveways that are visible from the primary public right-of-way. Permeable paving shall be used when appropriate, to manage storm water. Permeable paving may not be appropriate for all driveways and parking areas.

Paving up to the building foundation shall be avoided in order to reduce heat-island effect, building temperature, damage to the foundation, and storm-water runoff problems.

Snow storage from driveways shall be provided on site.

#### PRIMARY STRUCTURES

#### MASS, SCALE, & HEIGHT

The size and mass of a new residential infill building in relation to open spaces shall be visually compatible with adjacent historic buildings and historic structures in the surrounding Historic District.

Buildings that utilize traditional buildings forms —rectangular, cross-wing, pyramid-roof—are encouraged.

Historic height, width, and depth proportions that are important in creating compatible infill and maintaining the historic mass and scale of the Historic District shall be maintained.

Building features such as upper story windows, porches, and first floor bays shall be aligned with similar historic building features in the neighborhood. Generally, these elements should align in relation to the topography allowing these elements to "step up" or "step down" the block.

The perceived scale of new buildings shall respect the scale established by historic buildings in the character zone. Abrupt change of scale in the character zone is inappropriate, especially when a new, larger building would directly abut smaller historic buildings.

A larger building shall be divided into 'modules' that reflect the mass, scale, proportions, and size of historic buildings in the Historic District. Modules shall be clearly expressed throughout the entire building and a single form shall remain the dominant element so the overall mass does not become too fragmented. To minimize the scale perceived from the primary public right-of-way, stepping down the mass of a larger building shall be considered.

Larger-scaled projects shall also include variations in roof height in order to break up the form, mass and scale of the overall structure.

Buildings constructed on lots greater than 25 feet wide shall be designed so the facades visible from the primary public right-of-way reinforce the rhythm along the street in terms of historic building width, depth, and patterns within the façade.

Regardless of lot frontage, the primary façade shall be compatible with the width of surrounding historic buildings. The greater width of a building shall be set back significantly from the plane of the primary façade. The width of a new building shall not appear to be appreciably greater than historic buildings in the neighborhood. Modules on a primary facade should generally not exceed 11 feet to 25 feet in width. When the overall length of a new structure is greater than that seen historically, the design shall employ methods—changes in wall plane, roof heights, use of modules, etc.-—to diminish the visual impact of the overall building mass, form and scale.

New buildings shall not be significantly taller or shorter than adjacent buildings with special consideration given to surrounding historic buildings.

Primary facades shall be limited to one to two stories in height. (Generally, historic residential facades are about 15 to 20 feet in height from the top of the foundation to the top of the gable.)

Variation in building height may be considered regarding topography. Hillsides for a backdrop for taller buildings, minimizing their perceived height, therefore it may be appropriate for taller building masses to be located on steeper slopes. The facades of taller buildings shall still express a human scale.

Beyond the primary façade, the average perceived scale of one-story to two-story buildings shall be maintained. As a means of minimizing the perceived mass of a project, breaking up the height of the building into a set of modules or components that relate to the height of buildings along the street front shall be considered.

Secondary and tertiary elevations may be taller than the established norm when the change in scale cannot be perceived from designated vantage points including the cross-canyon view. This may be appropriate when taller portions will not be seen from a primary public right-of-way.

Taller portions of buildings shall be constructed so as to minimize obstruction of sunlight to adjacent yards and windows.

## FOUNDATION

Foundation materials shall be simple in form and minimally visible above grade when viewed from the primary public right-of-way. Acceptable foundation materials may include stone and concrete, wood lattice and vertical boards. Distinction between foundation and wall material shall be clearly defined. Clapboard siding shall not extend to the ground.

A site shall be returned to original grade following construction of a foundation. When 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 facade. No more than 2 feet of the new foundation shall be visible above final grade on secondary and tertiary facades.

A site shall be re-graded so as to blend with the grade of adjacent sites and not create the need for incompatible retaining walls.

A site shall be re-graded so all water drains away from the structure and does not enter the foundation.

#### DOORS

The historic pattern of principal doorways along the street shall be maintained. All buildings that face the street shall have a well-defined front entrance.

New doors shall be similar in location, size, and material to those seen traditionally in the Historic District. Doors shall be compatible with the style of both the new building and historic buildings in the Historic District.

Doors shall be designed and finished with trim elements similar to those used historically.

#### WINDOWS

Ratios of solid-to-void that are compatible with surrounding historic buildings shall be used. Large expanses of glazing are inappropriate on residential structures. Large glass surfaces shall be divided into smaller windows that are in scale with those seen historically. To maximize views, non-historic window patterns may be considered on tertiary facades; however, the overall ratio of solid-to-glass shall still be respected.

Windows shall be historic size and shall relate to the human scale of the Historic District. Windows shall be proportional to the scale and style of the building and shall be compatible with the historic buildings in the-Historic District.

The placement and grouping of windows shall be similar to those seen historically.

Windows with vertical emphasis are encouraged. The general rule is the height shall be twice the dimension of the width (commonly referred to as 2:1 ratio). Double-hung, vertically proportioned windows similar to those used historically are particularly encouraged. Windows with traditional depth and trim are preferred.

The number of different window sizes and styles on a building or structure shall be limited.

Wood or metal windows similar to those used historically are preferred but aluminum-clad window wood windows are also appropriate. Vinyl and aluminum windows are inappropriate.

New glazing shall match the appearance of historic glazing and/or shall be clear. Metallic, frosted, tinted, stained, textured and reflective finishes are generally inappropriate for glazing on the primary façade.

Window muntins shall be true divided lights or simulated divided lights on both sides of the glass. Snap-in muntins are inappropriate.

#### ROOFS

Roofs of new buildings shall be visually compatible with roof shapes and orientation of surrounding Historic Sites and adjacent buildings that contribute to the character of the Historic District. Sloping roof forms, such as gable, hip and shed, should be the dominant roof shapes. Roofs composed of a combination of roof planes, but simple in form, are also encouraged. Roofs shall be in scale with those on historic structures. Flat roofs as the primary roof form along the street shall be avoided.

Roof pitch shall be consistent with the style of architecture chosen for the structure and with adjacent buildings that contribute to the character of the Historic District, with special consideration given to Historic Sites.

The alignment that is created by similar heights of primary roofs and porches among historic buildings shall be maintained. This similarity of heights in building features contributes to the visual continuity along the streetscape.

Roofs shall be designed to minimize snow shedding onto adjacent properties and/or pedestrian paths. Crickets, saddles, or other snow-guard devices shall be placed so they do not significantly alter the form of the roof as seen from the primary public right-of-way.

New roof features, such as photovoltaic panels (solar panels), skylights, ventilators, and mechanical or communication equipment shall be visually minimized from the primary public right-of-way so as not to compromise the architectural character of the structure. Roof-mounted features like photovoltaic panels (solar panels) and skylights should be installed parallel to the roof plane when feasible.

Roof materials should appear similar to those seen historically. Asphalt shingles may be considered. Metal sheeting or standing seam metal roofs with a baked-on paint finish and galvanized or rusted steel sheeting are generally appropriate. Roofs shall have matte finishes to minimize glare. Roof colors shall be neutral and muted and materials shall not be reflective.

#### DORMERS

The number and size of dormers shall be limited on a roof, such that the primary roof form remains prominent. Dormers shall be used with restraint, in keeping with the simple character of buildings in Park City.

Dormers shall be visually minimized from primary public right-of-way. Gabled, hipped, or shed dormers are appropriate for most structures and shall be in keeping with the character and scale of the structure.

#### **GUTTERS & DOWNSPOUTS**

Downspouts shall be located away from architectural features and shall be visually minimized when viewed from the primary public right-of-way.

Water from gutters and downspouts shall drain away from the structure.

## CHIMNEYS & STOVEPIPES

Chimneys shall not be covered with non-traditional materials.

Chimneys and stove pipes shall be of a size, scale, and design that are appropriate to the character and style similar to those found historically. Chimneys and stovepipes shall be visually minimized when viewed from primary public right-of-way.

#### PORCHES

Porches shall be used to define front entrances. Over-scaled, monumental and under-scaled entries shall be avoided.

Porches on primary and secondary facades shall be compatible with a building's style and shall respect the scale and proportions found on historic buildings in the neighborhood.

The height of porch decks shall be similar to those found on historic building(s) in the Historic District.

#### ARCHITECTURAL FEATURES

Simple ornamental trim and decoration is in character with historic architectural ornamentation and is encouraged. Traditional locations for architectural ornamentation are porches and eaves. Other details like eave depth, mullions, corner boards, and brackets that lend character to historic buildings shall be considered.

## MECHANICAL SYSTEMS, UTILITY SYSTEMS, & SERVICE EQUIPMENT:

Mechanical and/or utility equipment, including heating and air conditioning units, meters, and exposed pipes, shall be located on the back of the building or in another inconspicuous location. When located on a secondary façade, the mechanical and/or utility equipment shall be located beyond the midpoint of the structure if feasible and visual impact of the equipment shall be minimized by incorporating it as an element of the building or landscape design.

Ground-level equipment shall be screened from view using landscape elements such as fences, low stone walls, or perennial plant materials.

Low-profile rooftop mechanical units and elevator penthouses that are not visible from the primary public right-ofway shall be used. When this is not possible, rooftop equipment shall be set back or screened from all views. Placement of rooftop equipment shall be sensitive to views from upper floors of neighboring buildings.

New communications equipment such as satellite dishes or antennae shall be visually minimized when viewed from the primary public right-of-way.

Service equipment and trash containers shall be screened. Solid wood or masonry partitions or hedges shall be used to enclose trash areas.

#### MATERIALS

Building materials shall be compatible in scale, proportion, texture, finish and color to materials used on Historic Structures in the Historic District. The dimensions of masonry units, wood siding, and other building materials shall be similar to those used historically.

The primary siding material for new structures shall appear similar to those on historic structures in the neighborhood. Historically, the most common material on primary structures was painted horizontal lap siding with a reveal between 6 to 8 inches. Secondary structures such as barns and sheds typically had siding of unpainted wood (horizontal lap or vertical board and batten) or corrugated metal panels.

Building materials shall be applied in the manner similar to that used historically. Typically, a 'hierarchy' of building materials should be used, with heavier, more durable materials for foundations and more refined materials above foundations. Building materials, especially masonry, shall be used in the manner they were used historically.

Synthetic building materials such as fiber cement or plastic-wood composite siding, shingles, and trim shall not be used unless the materials are made of a minimum of 50% recycled and/or reclaimed material and the applicant can demonstrate that use of the materials will not diminish the historic character of the neighborhood. Vinyl and aluminum siding are not appropriate in the Historic District.

#### PAINT & COLOR

Paint color is not regulated by the Design Guidelines.

Original material such as brick and stone that <del>are</del> was historically left unpainted shall not be painted. Materials, such as wood, that are traditionally painted shall have an opaque rather than transparent finish.

Rustic unfinished wood siding is generally not appropriate on houses, but may be appropriate on accessory structures or additions to non-historic buildings. A transparent or translucent weather-protective finish shall be applied to wood surfaces that were not historically painted.

Low-VOC (volatile organic compound) paints and finishes should be used when possible.

#### GARAGES

#### GARAGES: GENERAL COMPATIBILITY

If the lot size dictates that the garage must be located above, below, or adjacent to the primary living space, its visual impact should be minimized.

Single-width tandem garages are recommended. Side-by-side parking configurations are strongly discouraged; if used, they should be visually minimized when viewed from the public right-of-way.

Garages featuring a side-by-side parking configuration shall maintain a 2 foot horizontal offset in the front wall plane.

Single vehicle garage doors not greater than 9 feet wide by 9 feet high shall be used to access the garage.

Carports shall be avoided.

## SCENARIO 1: DETACHED GARAGES

Garages shall be constructed as detached or semi-detached structures and located beyond the side-yard midpoint of the building or within the rear yard when feasible.

Single-width tandem garages are recommended. Side-by-side parking configurations are strongly discouraged; when used, they shall be visually minimized when viewed from the primary public right-of-way.

Garages featuring a side-by-side parking configuration shall maintain a 2 foot horizontal offset in the front wall plane.

Single vehicle garage doors not greater than nine feet (9') wide and nine feet (9') high shall be used to access the garage.

Carports should be avoided.

Detached garages shall be subordinate to the pedestrian entrance of the house. Where excavation is required for access to the garage, the pedestrian entrance should still be clearly articulated.

#### SCENARIO 2: BASEMENT LEVEL ATTACHED OR DETACHED GARAGES

When construction of a detached garage is not feasible, a basement level garage may be considered, particularly on uphill lots.

A basement garage shall not extend beyond the exterior wall planes of a structure's primary or secondary facades.

In limited situations, site setbacks and topography may allow for a projecting garage without adversely affecting the historic character of the streetscape. In these cases, a stepped design with associated site grading and a landscaping plan may be considered.

The vertical facade of a basement garage that is visible from the primary public right-of-way shall be visually minimized. It is preferred that the garage opening be set back from the wall plane of the primary structure in order to diminish the presence of the garage.

Window or egress wells, when needed, shall not be located on the primary façade. Window or egress wells shall be located beyond the midpoint of the secondary façades, on the rear elevation, or in a location that is not visible from the primary public right-of-way.

After construction of a basement garage, a site shall be re-graded to approximate the grading prior to the new construction.

A single-vehicle garage door not greater than 9 feet wide and 9 feet high shall be used to access a basement garage addition.

Single-width tandem garages are recommended. Side-by-side parking configurations are strongly discouraged; if used, they shall be visually minimized when viewed from the public primary right-of-way.

Garages featuring a side-by-side parking configuration, at a minimum, shall maintain a two foot (2') horizontal offset in the wall plane between the two garage doors.

## SCENARIO 3: ATTACHED GARAGES

When construction of a detached garage is not feasible, an attached garage may be considered.

A single-vehicle garage door not greater than 9 feet wide by 9 feet high shall be used to access a garage.

Single-width tandem garages are recommended. Side-by-side parking configurations are strongly discouraged; if used, they shall be visually minimized when viewed from the primary public right-of-way.

Garages featuring a side-by-side parking configuration shall maintain a 2 foot horizontal offset in the front wall plane.

Garages shall be subordinate to the pedestrian entrance of the house. Where excavation is required for access to the garage, the pedestrian entrance should still be clearly articulated. Where excavation is not required, the pedestrian entrance shall be proud of the garage wall plane.

#### DECKS

Decks shall be constructed in inconspicuous areas where visually minimized from the primary public right-of-way, usually on the rear elevation. When built on a side elevation of a new structure, a deck should be screened from the primary public right-of-way with fencing and/or appropriate native landscaping.

The visual impact of a deck should be minimized by limiting its size and scale. Introducing a deck that visually detracts from a new structure, or substantially alters a site's proportion of built area to open space is not appropriate.

Decks and related steps and railings shall be constructed of materials and in styles that are compatible with the structure to which they are attached as well as with the character of the Historic District as a whole.

Decking materials such as fiber cement or plastic-wood composite floor boards shall not be used unless they are made of a minimum of 50% recycled and/or reclaimed materials.

Significant site features, such as mature trees, shall be protected from damage during the construction of a deck by minimizing ground disturbance and by limiting use of heavy construction equipment.

## BALCONY & ROOF DECKS

New balconies and roof decks shall be visually subordinate to the new building and shall be minimally visible from the primary public right-of-way.

A new balcony shall be simple in design and compatible with the character of the Historic District. Simple wood and metal designs are appropriate for residential structures. Heavy timber and plastics are inappropriate materials.

A roof deck shall be visually minimized when viewed from the primary public right-of-way.

#### **NEW ACCESSORY STRUCTURES**

New accessory structures on flat or downhill sites shall generally be located in the rear yard, unless located in a character zone with similar development patterns.

New accessory structures may be located at the street front when a pattern of front yard historic accessory structures has been established along the street, and when the proposed placement of the accessory structure does not create a danger or hazard to traffic by obstructing the view on the street.

Accessory structures (such as sheds and detached garages) shall be subordinate in scale to the primary structure.

## ADDITIONS TO EXISTING NON-HISTORIC STRUCTURES

An addition shall complement the visual and physical qualities of the existing structure.

An addition shall be visually subordinate to the existing structure and shall be compatible with the scale of the historic buildings and structures in the neighborhood. When the combined effects of the addition's footprint,

height, mass, and scale are such that the overall size of the addition is larger than the existing structure, the volume of the addition shall be broken into modules that reflect the scale of those components seen on the existing structure. Multiple modules are encouraged to add articulation and architectural interest.

Components and materials used on additions shall be similar in scale and size to those found on the existing structure.

Windows, doors, and other features on a new addition shall be designed to be compatible with the existing structure and surrounding historic sites. Windows, doors, and other openings shall be of sizes and proportions similar to those found on the building as well as those found on historic structures in the Historic District. When using new window patterns and designs, those elements shall respect the typical historic character and proportions of windows on adjacent historic structures. Also, the solid-to-void relationships and detailing of an addition shall be compatible with the existing structure and with historic buildings in the Historic District.

#### **RECONSTRUCTION OF NON-SURVIVING STRUCTURES**

Reconstruction of a documented but non-surviving historic structure that existed in Park City is allowed when no existing building in Park City with the same historical significance has survived.

Reconstruction may be allowed when documentary and physical evidence is available to facilitate an accurate reconstruction.

Reconstruction shall not be based on conjectural designs or on a combination of different features from other historic buildings.

Reconstruction shall include recreating the documented design of exterior features such as the roof shape, architectural detailing, windows, entrances and porches, steps and doors, and their historic spatial relationships.

A reconstructed building shall accurately duplicate the appearance of the non-surviving historic property in materials, design, color, and texture.

A reconstructed building shall duplicate the building, but also the setting, placement, and orientation of the nonsurviving structure.

Reconstruction shall re-establish the historic relationship between the building(s) and historic site features.

A building may not be reconstructed on a location other than its original site.

## SIDEBARS:

#### COMPATIBLILITY & COMPLEMENTARY

"Compatible" and "Complementary" are terms often used in historic preservation to describe the relationship between historic structures and new infill construction. Many characteristics and features contribute to compatible and complementary design, which helps to ensure the preservation of Park City's Historic Sites and Districts. These characteristics include:

- Form
- Mass and scale
- Roof shapes

- Building height
- Floor height
- Setbacks
- Materials
- Repetition or rhythm of solid-to-voids
- Rhythm of entrances and/or porches
- Window and door sizes, proportions, and patterns
- Orientation of entrances
- Landscaping

## MASONRY RETAINING WALLS

Retaining walls contribute to the context and rhythm of streetscapes in Old Town. Historically, retaining walls were a simple method for property owners to manage the steep and complex topography. In addition, retaining walls helped define property boundaries and create yards spaces where space was otherwise limited.

Historic retaining walls were stacked by hand using stones found at local quarries or on site. The stones were carried by hand, making them rather uniform and small in size. Retaining walls were either dry stacked or used mortar. After 1900, concrete retaining walls began to appear.

As new retaining walls are introduced to Old Town, the following should be considered:

- Materials for new retaining walls visible from the right-of-way should reflect the building's era and style.
- Stones in new retaining walls shall be no larger than stones that a miner would be capable of carrying. New stones shall be similar in type, color, texture, scale, and proportion to those used historically in the District. Large boulders are discouraged and are not in keeping with the character of the Historic District.
- Historically, retaining walls were no more than 3 to 5 feet in height. It is generally preferred that new retaining walls over 5 feet be terraced to prevent large vertical planes of retaining walls on the streetscape. The Design Review Team recognizes the need to retain more earth as development occurs in Old Town; however, the Design Review Team encourages retaining walls that are in keeping with the scale of those found historically throughout the Historic District. Terracing multiple walls of 3 to 5 feet in height is encouraged with vegetation in between each terrace.
- Board-formed concrete may be appropriate. New concrete retaining walls shall be textured. A smooth or polished concrete finish is inappropriate and not in keeping with the character of the District.
- New retaining walls shall be screened with vegetation where appropriate.
- Retaining walls of alternative designs and materials shall be reviewed on a case-by-case basis.

## FENCING

As with retaining walls, fences were typical historic site features found throughout Old Town. The repetition of these site features created a sense of continuity and rhythm along the street front. Wood and woven wire fences were common front yard enclosures that followed the site perimeter, most commonly along the street front. New fences visible from the right-of-way should reflect the period of significance of the historic primary structure.

Several styles of fencing that were common during the historic period and are appropriate for use in the Historic District:

- Picket fences. Historically, wood picket fences may have been the most common fence type used in front yards. These fences had flat, dog-eared, or pointed tops and were generally less than 3 feet high. Pickets were typically 3-1/2 inches wide with spacing of 1-3/4 inches between boards.
- Wire fences. Various types of wire, including woven wire, were stretched between wood or metal posts. This fence type was very common in Park City; however, many of these original wire fences have been lost.
- Simple wrought and cast iron fences.
- Fences of alternative designs and materials will be reviewed on a case-by-case basis. Substitute materials such as fiber cement or plastic-wood composite materials should not be used unless they are made of a minimum of 50% recycled and/or reclaimed materials. Further, it must be demonstrated that the use of these materials will not diminish the historic character of the neighborhood. Vinyl and Trex-type fencing is generally not appropriate in the Historic District and will be reviewed on a case-by-case basis.

# Historic Preservation Board Staff Report



Subject:Historic District Grant ProgramAuthor:Anya GrahnDate:April 5, 2017Type of Item:Work SessionProject Number:GI-17-00353

# Summary Recommendations

Staff recommends that the Historic Preservation Board (HPB) review this staff report and provide input on the purposes of the Historic District Grant program.

# **Background**

On January 8, 2015, City Council approved changes to the Historic District Grant Program and adopted a policy to manage the grant program. Grants are to be used toward specific rehabilitation projects. Primary residents (either the homeowner or a full time renter) may be awarded up to fifty percent (50%) of total eligible construction costs, while homes which are used as a secondaryhome or nightly rental may be awarded up to forty percent (40%) of total eligible construction costs. Commercial property owners are eligible for up to fifty percent (50%) total eligible construction costs. Grant applicants may receive up to 10% increased funding for those renovation projects that improved a site's designation from "significant" to "landmark."

The program has largely been "on hold" since 2015 as we consider amendments to the eligibility and administration of the Historic District Grant program.

The following selected links relate to passing the revisions to the grant program in 2015 (note that these reports include previous staff reports and minutes to the City Council and HPB):

October 9, 2014	City Council Report (starting page 81) + Minutes (starting
	page 3)
December 4, 2014	City Council Report (starting page 25) + Minutes (starting
	page 10)
January 5, 2017	City Council Report (starting page 20)

In January 2017, the Planning Department contracted Kjersti Monson of Duval Companies to conduct a study of our Historic District Grant program and recommend changes for its administration.

# Analysis:

Staff is working with our consultant to define the purpose of the Historic District Grant program. During past discussions, staff has found that the HPB and City Council discussions have revolved around two themes:

- 1. The purpose of the Historic District Grant Program is to preserve historic buildings and structures.
- 2. The Historic District Grant Program should incentivize primary homeownership in Old Town.

Staff finds that the primary purpose of the Historic District Grant Program is to preserve historic buildings and structures. By incentivizing historic preservation, the City is encouraging the rehabilitation and adaptive reuse of historic structures. Maintaining our historic resources and historic character is a priority for City Council.

# HPB Discussion Requested.

# **Recommendation**

Staff recommends that the Historic Preservation Board (HPB) review this staff report and provide input on the purposes of the Historic District Grant program.

# <u>Exhibits</u>

Exhibit A — Approved Grant Policy, January 8, 2015

## Part I: Historic District Grant Program

The Historic District Grant Program awards matching grants to assist property owners in maintaining and preserving their historic commercial and residential structures. Grant funds are applied to exterior improvements only, and all work must comply with the Design Guidelines for Historic Districts and Historic Sites. The policy outlines the many ways property owners and the City can work together to preserve Park City's historic sites and structures.

## A. Goals

- Offset the costs of rehabilitation work in the City's two (2) National Register Historic Districts
- 2. Provide funding to projects that provide a community benefit through historic preservation
- 3. Inspire greater preservation of Park City's historic sites and structures

## **B.** Objectives

- 1. Inspire citizen involvement and appreciation for the historic preservation of Park City's sites and structures.
- 2. Encourage the preservation of historic sites and structures in the City's two (2) National Register Historic Districts.
- 3. Promote projects that preserve and enhance the historic architecture of Park City.
- 4. Further projects that meet the Design Guidelines for Historic Districts and Historic Sites

## C. General Rules

- The applicant must apply for a Historic District Grant prior to the start of any construction work. The application must include a written scope of work and specifications, cost estimate, drawings as they apply to the specific work, color photographs, and a brief history of the structure.
- The Historic Preservation Board (HPB) will review grant applications on a "first come, first serve" basis. The HPB may award grants up to \$25,000. Those grants exceeding \$25,000 will require the HPB to forward a positive recommendation to City Council; these recommendations will be reviewed as part of the City Council consent agenda.
- 3. Any total grant awards greater than the budgeted amount allocated for the Lower Park Avenue and Main Street RDAs will be approved and adjusted as part of the year-end budget process.
- 4. Upon completion of the work and final inspections, the grant applicant will submit proof of payment to the Planning Department for disbursement of funds.
- 5. Following receipt of the grant funds, the grant recipient will sign a Historic Grant Program Agreement and Historic Preservation Agreement.

## D. Eligibility

- 1. Applicant Eligibility
  - a. Houses lived in by primary residents (those houses in which the homeowner or a renter lives full-time) may be awarded up to fifty percent (50%) of their construction costs, while homes which are used as secondary homes or nightly

rental (i.e. not lived in by the primary resident) may be awarded up to forty percent (40%). Commercial property owners will be eligible to receive up to fifty percent (50%) of their construction costs. An additional ten percent (10%) may be awarded to property owners committed to renovating a Significant structure in order to elevate its status to Landmark.

- 2. Eligible Improvements
  - a. Improvements shall be completed in compliance with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and include exterior work such as siding, windows, foundation work, masonry repair, structural stabilization, exterior trim, exterior doors, cornice repair, porch repair, retaining walls, as well as historic steps and stairs. The Historic Preservation Board may identify additional eligible improvements (such as Physical Conditions Reports and Preservation Plans, etc.) as necessary; these improvements shall be noted on the Historic District Grant Application.