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06.07.2023 Meeting Minutes
ROLL CALL

Chair Randy Scott called the meeting to order at 5:00 p.m. A roll call was conducted and all members were present with the exception of Jack Hodgkins and John Hutings.

MINUTES APPROVAL

A. Consideration to Approve Historic Preservation Board Meeting Minutes from May 3, 2023.

Board Member Lola Beatlebrox referenced the second or third page of the Minutes where she was asking about Thanes Canyon. She recalled that she was asking about the house on Park Avenue that collapsed. She did not recall if she said Thanes or not.

MOTION: Board Member Douglas Stephens moved to APPROVE the Minutes of May 3, 2023. Board Member Puggy Holmgren seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Board.

PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS

There were no public communications.

STAFF AND BOARD COMMUNICATIONS AND DISCLOSURES

Senior Historic Preservation Planner, Caitlyn Tubbs reported that the Artist Selection Committee met with the two artists who responded to the Request for Proposals ("RFP") for the Preservation Awards art piece. She noted that the candidates were two very talented local artists. The Committee would make the selection in the near future.
Chair Scott apologized for not being able to attend the meetings but stated that the portfolios that both candidates put together were top-notch.

Planner Tubbs reported that the vote would occur via email, so when all votes are received, they will announce the winner. Board Member Beatlebrox commented that she did not receive the email for the vote.

Chair Scott suggested that the votes be submitted by next week.

There were no further Staff Communications.

5. **CONTINUATIONS**

   A. **317 Ontario Avenue - Material Deconstruction - The Applicant Seeks Approval for Material Deconstruction of a Portion of a Significant Historic Structure to Facilitate the Construction of an Addition. PL-22-05451 (A) Public Hearing; (B) Continue to a Date Uncertain**

   **MOTION:** Board Member Beatlebrox moved to CONTINUE 317 Ontario Avenue – Material Deconstruction, to a date uncertain. Board Member Stephens seconded the motion.

   **VOTE:** The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Board.

   B. **Historic District Design Guideline Illustrations - Work Session (A) Continuation to a Date Uncertain**

   Planner Tubbs reported that the contract for this work was not yet in place, necessitating a continuance of this item.

   Board Member Stephens asked if the Board is required to continue Work Session items. Assistant Planning Director, Rebecca Ward reported that because the matter was publicly noticed, the Board would need a motion to continue.

   **MOTION:** Board Member Stephens moved to CONTINUE Historic District Design Guideline Illustrations – Work Session, to a date uncertain. Board Member Beatlebrox seconded the motion.

   **VOTE:** The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Board.
6. **WORK SESSION**

A. **Temporary Winter Balcony Enclosures - Work Session - The Historic Preservation Board will Review and Discuss the Temporary Winter Balcony Enclosure Program and Regulations and Provide a Formal Recommendation to the City Council.**

Planner Tubbs reported that the Temporary Winter Balcony Enclosure Pilot Program was recently before the City Council in a Work Session. When the item went to the City Council, it was set to expire at the end of April 2023; however, following the direction given to Staff, the Pilot Program was extended through April 30, 2024. The City Council requested Staff return to the Historic Preservation Board (“HPB”) to obtain a formal recommendation as to any changes in the standards, whether the program should be expanded to include Historic buildings, whether to include permanent or year-round enclosures and any other feedback. She reported that the Temporary Winter Balcony Enclosure Program provides a method for property owners along Main Street or in the Historic Commercial Business (“HCB”) Zoning District who own non-historic buildings with balconies to enclose the balconies between November 15 and April 30 to provide more usable area during the busiest times of the year.

Under the current standards, three properties would qualify for the program. She stated that the program began in 2016 and was renewed a few times. To date, the Riverhorse on Main was the only property owner to utilize the Balcony Enclosure Program. The owner came before the Board to provide feedback and comments on the program and the utilization of the outdoor space during those winter months.

Planner Tubbs reminded those present that collectively, the Board was generally in support of continuing the program, and was supportive of the existing Design Guidelines outlined in the Land Management Code (“LMC”) for the program. She noted, however, that the HPB indicated they were not in support of permanent enclosures or allowing these enclosures on Historic buildings in the HCB Zone. She reported that during a Work Session, the Planning Commission indicated there was split support for the Program. Those who supported the Program wanted to see stronger Design Guidelines and enforcement measures. The Planning Commission also did not wish to expand the Program to allow for Permanent Enclosures or allow for Enclosures on Historic Structures.

Planner Tubbs reiterated that City Council requested a formal recommendation from the HPB and from the Planning Commission as the Program moves forward. The Council also expressed concerns regarding the proposed expansion into Historic Structures, as well as presenting equal opportunities for property owners along Main Street. She stated that the Historic Park City Alliance (“HPCA”) expressed its support of continuing the Balcony Enclosure Program, and was supportive of expanding the Program to allow for permanent or year-round enclosures.
Planner Tubbs reported on Staff's concerns since the inception of the Program in 2016 and noted these concerns were outlined in depth in the Staff Report. She mentioned that the concerns were primarily related to incompatibility with the existing Historic District Design Guidelines adopted in 2019. She noted that the Design Guidelines recommended minimal amounts of glazing on second-floor façades, and were protective of the prevailing pattern and mass and scale of the solid void openings along Main Street for both Historic and Non-Historic Structures.

In addition, Staff had concerns about the effect the Enclosures would have on neighboring or abutting Historic Structures. She provided the example of an Enclosure that would be required to attach to an adjacent Historic Structure and any potential effects those attachment methods would have on those Historic materials.

Planner Tubbs presented the Staff's concerns regarding the impacts of parking, water, and sewer use. As the only example they have of a Balcony Enclosure was for a restaurant, during the winter months there would be a few hundred additional square feet of dining space, which would impact the overall parking, water use, and sewer demands for the local area. She indicated that if the HPB were interested in allowing the Program to continue, the Council would like to hear that feedback. Additionally, the Council requested HPB feedback on any concerns or proposed changes to the Design Standards or regulations.

Planner Tubbs reported that a representative of the HPCA was present, as well as representatives from Riverhorse on Main and City Engineer, John Robertson.

Board Member Stephens asked which three non-historic buildings would qualify under this Program. Planner Tubbs was unsure of the other two buildings, aside from Riverhorse on Main. There was discussion about whether one of the buildings was the 501 Restaurant. Planner Tubbs confirmed that only three properties would qualify under the current regulations.

Board Member Holmgren asked if the Program would be limited to the three properties, or whether it would be like the dining decks where only so many could apply. Planner Tubbs advised that under current regulations, only the three properties could apply. If the LMC was amended to expand these regulations, then additional properties could potentially qualify.

Board Member Stephens noted that to do that, they would go into the Historic inventory or new construction would need to take place.

Chair Scott opened the public hearing.

Seth Adams appeared on behalf of Riverhorse on Main. He acknowledged that this Program was controversial; however, it was something he took advantage of because of the summer dining decks in the past. He noted those were something that others could
profit from that he could not because he did not have the footprint for the door on Main Street. He reported that he developed the Program with the City to create something that he could take advantage of in the winter and noted that he could not utilize similar space during the summer months. Speaker Adams reported that it was a great success, and it was implemented with the guidance of Staff at the time and architects.

Speaker Adams reported that people have told him that the Balcony Enclosure did not take much away from Main Street and that it actually looked nicer than the outside of the building. He added that the Enclosure did not block views and did not change the aspect of Main Street. He understood there were more Historic decks out there, but this building was constructed many years ago, and would likely not be allowed today. He would like to be able to capitalize on the use of the building and remain in business for another 30 years. He stressed that the Balcony Enclosure Program helped tremendously.

Speaker Adams pointed out that the Balcony Enclosure was originally approved as a Temporary Structure. Putting it up and taking it down has taken a toll on the Enclosure, as it was not something to be handled so often. He stated they were able to leave the Enclosure up during COVID-19, and it has become more and more of an asset. He indicated that his company would be happy to address any proposed design changes. He noted that the Balcony Enclosure was over City property, and was not taking up parking spaces or impeding traffic. He stressed that it provided people with a unique view of Main Street, and they were proud of that. He stressed that they would like to keep the Balcony Enclosure up and have it in place on a long-term basis.

Board Member Beatlebrox understood that Speaker Adams would like to keep the Balcony Enclosure as a permanent feature. Speaker Adams stated they would like to keep it permanent, and felt it would be a benefit to have it up year-round in terms of finances and safety. He stated there was only one person who knows how to install and uninstall the Enclosure. They built this Enclosure years ago based on suggestions to have tinted windows. He reiterated that they would be happy to improve it.

In addition, Speaker Adams stated that if the City needed five feet over Main Street in the future, he would be happy to come up with a different solution. Currently, however, the Balcony Enclosure was not hurting anything from a Historic Preservation standpoint because it looks like the building does now.

Board Member Long asked the speaker when he moved into the space. Speaker Adams stated the restaurant had been in that location since 1987, and they first put the Balcony Enclosure up in 2016. Board Member Long asked if anything changed when they first put the Balcony Enclosure in place and specifically mentioned a rent increase with the promise of being able to seat additional people in the winter and create additional income.

Speaker Adams stated that he had begun to be charged rent year-round for the Enclosure, and they started putting up tents to accommodate weddings and Sundance events to help bring in additional revenue to compensate for the increased rent.
Board Member Beatlebrox asked for an estimate of the number of additional people the restaurant was able to seat in the evening on a typical ski season night. Speaker Adams advised they could seat 100 people in the space created by the Enclosure. He added they did approximately 2 ½ turns with the 40 seats in that area. He noted that the restaurant was designed so that it was very easy to create groups of eights, tens, twos, and twelves, and this space was also designed to accommodate any type of scenario.

In response to an inquiry from Board Member Beatlebrox, Speaker Adams stated that the Balcony Enclosure was not attached to a Historic Structure on either side of the restaurant and that at most, the Enclosure touched those structures. He used the example of a garage door’s contact with the ground.

Board Member Beatlebrox observed that the Balcony Enclosure at this restaurant was no different than having a deck on Main Street.

With regard to a question raised regarding the tinting, Planner Tubbs stated she would look into it but the current Design Guidelines prohibited tinted glass. Speaker Adams noted that tinting was one of the required Design Guidelines in 2016 to make the Enclosure more appealing from the street. He added that the technology had greatly changed since 2016, and referenced a slide before the Board. He stated the bottom slides were companies they have looked at to replicate what they have now that has infrared heating and would be better for the restaurant in the long run.

Planner Tubbs noted that Chief Building Officer, Dave Thacker was present to respond to questions.

Ginger Wicks identified herself as the Executive Director of the HPCA and expressed support for Speaker Adams and the Balcony Enclosure Program. From the Board’s perspective, she stated they want the historic feel of the street maintained but they also want to create a platform of success for the town’s businesses. She noted that given the challenges facing businesses, which include high rents and high cost of wages, providing opportunities to expand their footprints and garner more revenue was important. She commented that Riverhorse on Main is a perfect example of this Program. The enclosure was not attached to a Historic Structure and provided Speaker Adams an opportunity that he otherwise would not have. Speaker Wicks felt it was a win-win for the street and the businesses if they could support the businesses as they move through the process.

Board Member Stephens asked Speaker Wicks if the HPCA expressed that it wanted this Program to expand to all business owners on Main Street with an outdoor dining deck on the second level.

Speaker Wicks stated that if additional businesses could have the opportunity to take advantage of a Program like this, as long as it met the Guidelines determined by the HPB, the HPCA would take the position that other businesses should have the opportunity to
participate in the Program. She reiterated the example of the Balcony Enclosure at Speaker Adams' business and noted that you really cannot tell that the structure is there. Speaker Wicks felt that it would be up to the business owner to work with the HPB to make sure that the look of the community does not get skewed.

Board Member Long noted the conundrum that the Enclosures were desired during the time of the year when Park City receives the most affluent clientele. He notices the Enclosures all the time and it is a matter of aesthetics versus profitability. He stressed that they must keep in mind the season that this request is directed towards.

Board Member Beatlebrox observed that Riverhorse on Main was the only business that had a Balcony Enclosure pursuant to this Program, and asked Board Member Long what other Enclosure he was referring to.

Board Member Long stated that during winter, as he looks down Main Street, he can see the architecture the more open it remained. The fewer things that extend beyond the plane of the buildings, the purer the views. He felt that any type of Enclosure or obstruction would take the aesthetics away from the integrity of the street. Board Member Long added that the summer street decks were lower and not within the same visual plane as Balcony Enclosures. He also noted the different clientele during the summer and commented that it was a rather festive summer feel to the street. He felt it was difficult to equate the two. As a real estate agent, he mentioned that whenever he showed an outside area that would be subject to weather, they do not count the rent during that time period.

John Kenworthy stated that he resides in zip code 84060. He previously served on the HPB as Chair and noted that it was the most rewarding position he has had in his years of service. He also served as President of the HPCA and worked with Speaker Wicks. He currently serves as a Member of the Planning Commission. Speaker Kenworthy reported that he owns a restaurant with a deck that would not comply with the current Code. He noted that only one business currently utilizes the Program and only three businesses can utilize the program. He identified the other two restaurants as Pinecone Ridge and Grappa. He stressed that because only three would qualify under the current Code, this would not be something that could be done up and down the street. Speaker Kenworthy commented that the program was implemented with an eye toward restaurant owners and the lack of capacity. He serves on the Restaurant Board and commented that restaurants simply do not have the seating necessary for the tourism that has come to the City over the years. He commented that during COVID-19 they had record numbers during the slow season.

Speaker Kenworthy reported that someone like Speaker Adams could take advantage of that by keeping the Enclosure up year-round. He served as Chair when they allowed the Code. They allowed it originally as a Temporary Program to see how it would work. Looking back, he was glad that they implemented the program because it worked out perfectly. As someone who is a restaurant owner, the hospitality of the town is diminished
when someone has to sit outside for 90 minutes because they cannot get a seat anywhere in town. He commented that Shabu was sold out for the entire season before the season even started. The restaurant business has a very slim margin and unfortunately, family restaurants would not be able to make it with the current rents. Speaker Kenworthy stated that tables can only be turned so often and that a hamburger and fries will not support the current rent. He stated that the old Tent Code helped in the past but it was an eyesore and unsustainable on many levels. The tent issues were addressed over the past decade and he did not doubt that the solution offered by Speaker Adams was the best solution. Speaker Kenworthy expressed his support for the program and strongly suggested that the Enclosure be allowed year-round.

Chair Scott asked if Speaker Kenworthy’s support extended to any Historic or non-Historic businesses that have an outdoor dining space. Speaker Kenworthy noted that Grappa is set back and with regard to the ambiance, one area might work. Grappa’s entire summer business is the patio and felt that the owner would never install an Enclosure during the summer. Speaker Kenworthy commented that the structure installed by Speaker Adams is nice and worked well. He supported the Program, as written, including the Historic buildings.

*Casey Adams* responded to Board Member Long’s comment about the affluent clientele and stated that based on her experience in hospitality, the affluent clientele loves the deck. She noted that it brings a vibe that they are all trying to enjoy and flow to the community. She felt that even visitors to Park City value and appreciate the Balcony Enclosure.

Board Member Holmgren commented that it is magic to use the deck when it is snowing.

Board Member Beatlebrox asked Planner Tubbs for some of the specific Design Guidelines requested by the Planning Commission. Planner Tubbs stated that there were no specific suggestions but the general input from the Planning Commission was that the Balcony Enclosures might not be as historically appropriate under the existing Design Guidelines. She mentioned the large expanse of glass, tinted glass, and overall style and massing. Planner Tubbs reported that the Planning Commission recommended that if the Program continued they look into the Design Guidelines and regulations in the LMC to ensure that they go hand in hand.

Board Member Stephens asked if there was a separate portion of the Code that deals with Design Guidelines for Temporary Structures. Planner Tubbs explained there is a provision in the Historic Commercial Business Zoning District that is separate from the Design Guidelines.

Board Member Stephens asked if they were to make this a permanent solution if it would fall under the typical LMC guidelines for building permanent structures, which would also include following the Historic District Design Guidelines. Planner Tubbs stated that if the City chose to allow the Enclosures on a permanent or year-round basis, it would still
require an LMC amendment to remove the Temporary Enclosure qualifications because they are focused on being seasonal or temporary.

Board Member Stephens asked if it would be possible for the Riverhorse structure to remain because when the Design Guidelines kick in that would be different from the Design Guidelines in the current provision for Temporary Enclosures. He acknowledged property line and engineering issues. If they were to allow this permanently for one building, he wondered if it would present an unfair advantage because the owners of Historic buildings cannot cover their decks. He felt there was not an even playing field and added that it might be easier to put something together if there were more than one building utilizing this Program. He mentioned the new deck at 449 Main that is empty at times during the winter unless it is nice enough and the heaters work.

Planner Tubbs commented that while under the existing standards, only three properties would qualify, Staff looked at the Historic Structures in the HCB Zone that might also qualify if the Program were expanded to include Historic Structures. Eight properties could potentially avail themselves of the Program.

Board Member Stephens did not know how a Temporary Structure could be installed on a Historic building and meet the Design Guidelines. He struggled with the process. Speaker Adams recalled previous discussions regarding doing something for one business. He happens to have a deck that will accommodate a Temporary Enclosure. He noted that the other Main Street summer decks create an unfair advantage to a tenant on a second level who cannot have a Main Street summer deck. He mentioned the visual for people walking down Main Street. He was willing to work with the City and stated that could move it back five feet so that it is not over City property although it is not ideal. He commented that other businesses are not installing them because they are costly. He felt that the Balcony Enclosure was valuable to his business. He reported that he pays rent for every inch of his space and this is a tool that allows his business to survive.

In response to an inquiry, Speaker Adams explained that to install/uninstall the Enclosure involves partially closing the road, removing the structure with a crane, and then putting it on a flatbed trailer to remove it and store it offsite. He reported that it takes two to three days to accomplish both the installation and removal. He stated that although it is doable, he would like to make it something that fits and can remain. Board Member Beatlebrox noted that every building is different and did not feel that such variability in Park City means they should have an even playing field. Board Member Stephens agreed but stated that they needed to apply the Design Guidelines evenly and consistently for Historic or new buildings. It seemed like the Guidelines were different for these Temporary Enclosures. He felt that the Guidelines at the time were appropriate; however, over the years they have been fine-tuned. His question was how the Design Guidelines will be applied to Temporary Structures. If it were not a Temporary Structure, the Design Guidelines in place for permanent structures should be applied. Speaker Adams spoke off-mic in response to these comments.
Chair Scott added that the LMC will need to be amended to specifically include something like this for a permanent structure. Board Member Stephens felt it would just be governed as a Permanent Structure.

Assistant Director Ward reported that as a Permanent Structure, it will go through the full process. She noted that it is not on the property and will require additional review by the City Council. Board Member Stephens understood that if the owner does not want to go through the City Council process they can bring the façade back to the property line.

Speaker Adams reported that the patio is already in the right-of-way and was approved in the 1980s. Nothing was filed with the City or County at the time for the easement over the property. It was discovered when he originally went through the process. The easement was then approved followed by the Temporary Balcony Enclosure, which at the time was his only option.

Speaker Adams reported that they can pull the Balcony Enclosure back five feet to the property line although it would not be financially desirable.

Board Member Stephens asked if the easement defines what could be done. Speaker Adams stated it was just an easement over the sidewalk.

Planner Tubbs added that with the Temporary Balcony Enclosures, there is an Encroachment Agreement with a snow-shed provision. There was also a requirement for an annual License Agreement from the City Council to operate in the right-of-way. Speaker Adams noted that there had never been a complaint, issue, or fine for the snow shed.

In response to an inquiry, Planner Tubbs stated that the Balcony Enclosure will not meet the current Design Guidelines. Board Member Stephens commented that that was the issue they were trying to address and noted that it meets the Guidelines for a Temporary Structure but does not meet the Guidelines for the street. He felt that if it were to become permanent it would have to meet the Guidelines, as they exist now.

Speaker Adams was unaware of the differences from then to now and while he was involved in the design he did not recall the details and others who were involved no longer work here.

Speaker Kenworthy considered those same things 10 years ago and they looked at it as a temporary situation and a test. He was focused on “removable” and something that will have to be dealt with annually. He noted that there is not a “removable structure” provision in the LMC. He commented that it is not fair that he has a street-level dining deck and Speaker Adams cannot use his deck. He reiterated that the dining decks are very valuable to business owners. He added that they pay different fees to keep the dining decks and it is an annual process. Speaker Kenworthy commented that Board Member Stephens’ questions were the same issues they dealt with 10 years ago. They
did not create a new LMC and reiterated the distinction between “removable” and “temporary.”

Assistant Director Ward clarified that when the Pilot Program was put in place there were Historic District Design Guidelines that were part of the Lease Agreement that would go before the City Council for annual approval on whether it could be installed and removed by April 30. As part of the Work Sessions with the HPB and the Planning Commission, Assistant Director Ward stated they were to look at those particular standards and re-evaluate them. She explained they were not necessarily codified. She commented that when the Pilot Program was instituted, the City Council amended the Code so that the Temporary Winter Balcony Enclosure was included. If the Program continues, they will not need to change the Code; however, the Design Guidelines that are specific to the Temporary Winter Balcony Enclosures were outlined in the Lease Agreement process.

Board Member Long wondered if they would next be asked if the summer street decks can be enclosed so they can better serve their customers. Board Member Beatlebrox stated they do not need to worry about that now but she wondered about the dining globes that arose during COVID-19, and whether they required a process to be installed. Planner Tubbs explained that the dining globes go through a process, although it was not necessarily this process. She stated that they were coordinated through Special Events. Assistant Director Ward added that for those that were up for the season, there was an administrative process for temporary improvements similar to what is applied to tents.

Board Member Beatlebrox asked how that differs from the Temporary Balcony Enclosures. Assistant Director Ward explained that the dining globes are on the applicant's property and are usually associated with an Outdoor Dining Permit. She added that the dining globes are also not affixed to a structure and a temporary enclosure on the street to support the outdoor dining that occurs mostly during the summer. Board Member Holmgren felt that the dining globes were not used often along Main Street.

Chair Scott asked the Board if they were interested in allowing them to be year-round permanent structures and if they want to continue with the Program. He stated that it could be helpful to understand the applicable portions of the LMC and have a Work Session where they could review it. When the matter first came before the Board, he felt it could impact Main Street significantly. In reality, their decisions will impact businesses and the historic feel of Main Street. He was not comfortable making a decision without getting clarity. He mentioned the potential for including the Planning Commission as part of that Work Session so that they would all be aligned.

Planner Tubbs understood that Chair Scott was suggesting a walking site tour along Main Street followed by a Joint Work Session with the Planning Commission with LMC language that they could consider. Speaker Adams stated that if anyone walked Main Street today the windows on his Balcony Enclosure likely looked tinted although they are completely clear. They installed blinds on the inside to keep the sun out because the sun makes the space unusable until 7:00 p.m. or 8:00 p.m. He stressed that they designed it
to be completely see-through, but they have had to add things to make it usable for the restaurant. If it were permanent, there would be a lot of improvements, such as double-paned windows and it could be improved to meet the LMC.

In response to an inquiry, Speaker Adams stated that the Enclosure has not yet been taken down because they could not get a contractor to perform that work. Now that the dining decks are up, removal of the temporary structure would become more of an issue. Speaker Adams stated that they have been trying to remove the structure for two weeks. He has a place to store it and has new flooring ready to install but he is in a holding pattern. They would like to remove it because they would like to make improvements to it in any event.

Board Member Beatlebrox asked Speaker Adams if there are timing constraints and if the Planning Commission wants to make a decision about the permanency. Planner Tubbs reported that Staff received feedback from the City Council indicating that they would like an answer by year’s end so the applicant would have the information on the Design Guidelines before the Balcony Enclosure would be installed following the 2023-2024 season. Chair Scott noted the importance of fairness to business owners so they can plan accordingly.

Planner Tubbs reiterated that if the Board is interested in a Joint Work Session with the Planning Commission, Staff could coordinate that and schedule a Joint Session. Board Member Beatlebrox was interested in a Joint Work Session and commented that it was unclear as to exactly what applied in this situation. Because the decision would be permanent versus non-permanent, she was not confident that it should be permanent; however, she supported the balcony idea and felt it was a great addition for the town, tourists, and residents.

Board Member Stephens stated that if it were permanent, it would be easy because it would then need to go through the regular process involving the Design Guidelines. He did not believe the Board could give special consideration to three buildings on Main Street because they cannot do spot zoning. He did not think they could give anyone special treatment where they would not have to comply with the Design Guidelines, the LMC, and the Building Code simply because it has now gone from Temporary to Permanent.

Speaker Adams commented that they adhered to the design through the entire process and the design was well accepted.

Chair Scott stated that the Board’s responsibility at a Joint Work Session would be to look at the historic fabric of the street and the potential of Historic Structures. They would leave it to the LMC experts in the Planning Department to create what is needed. He felt there was a good marriage of knowledge for them to have an effective meeting and be galvanized in the decision together.
Planner Tubbs stated that Staff would look into scheduling a Joint Work Session with a walking site tour. Chair Scott added that applicable LMC provisions would be helpful. He felt there might need to be new language added to the Code specific to this.

Planner Tubbs added that often there is an overlap between the Guidelines in the Lease Agreement and the LMC or other City Ordinances.

B. **Paint and Stain Opacity - Work Session - The Historic Preservation Board Will Discuss the Paint and Stain Opacity Requirements for Structures in the Historic Districts, Review Samples, and Provide Feedback to Planning Staff.**

Planner Tubbs reported that this is one of the Design Guidelines that is discussed with designers and homeowners alike that materials such as wood that are traditionally painted shall have an opaque rather than transparent finish. She reported that it is fairly simple as laid out in the Code; however, when they get samples of siding, there are questions regarding whether it is opaque enough or if it is considered fully opaque. They also get questions about whether the sample would look different inside or under shade as opposed to outside. Property owners and designers have requested further clarification on how opaque the materials must be to be Code compliant.

Planner Tubbs indicated that the general rule in terms of paint and stain opacity in the Historic Districts is that if the wood grain texture can still be seen as opposed to the wood grain color, that would be considered opaque enough.

Planner Tubbs presented several siding samples to the Board to demonstrate different levels of opacity. The first sample was one that Staff would generally consider as not fully opaque. She noted the grain texture and color differences and the wear and tear on the siding. The next sample demonstrated some level of color change and still appeared to be somewhat unfinished. The third sample showed less grain texture and color difference except when up close where color differences could be seen.

Planner Tubbs noted that these samples are stains, paints, or pre-finishes. She noted that one of the features of the new siding materials on the market is that siding can come pre-finished or pre-stained. The pre-finishing is represented to protect the product from sun damage, bleaching, or color change.

The final sample was the pre-finished wood stained to be dark. Planner Tubbs noted that the grain texture and grain color disappeared; however, upon closer inspection, it could still be seen.

Planner Tubbs demonstrated a sliding scale of paint opacities for the Board. She explained that the scale showed a change in opacity from 20% to 100%. She noted that the darker color covers better than the white paint; however, with both there comes a point where the grain coloring comes through. She explained that in the past, applicants pointed out that the LMC allows for the staining of exterior siding materials; however, by
the very nature of the stain, it does not go darker. She presented an example of various coats and highlighted the minimal color difference.

Planner Tubbs reported that the reason they require full opacity in the Historic District is outlined in the Packet. She referenced a memo from the Planning Department’s Historic Preservation Consultant who found that throughout the development of paint when it becomes readily available in Park City, exteriors of Historic Structures are traditionally painted as a fireproofing method. She added that fully opaque paints are advertised for exterior use only and stains and varnishes are advertised for interior use only.

Planner Tubbs requested feedback from the HPB with regard to the appropriate level of opacity in the Historic District, whether for use on Historic Structures or new construction. Board Member Stephens noted that there were also hybrid structures, wherein there is a Historic home with a new addition and the new addition would be treated like new construction. He asked if they called for anything outside of the Historic District requirements for new construction.

Planner Tubbs stated that they require the wooden materials to be painted, whether they are attached to a Historic Structure or a new build, or a new addition. The paint or stain opacity requirements are not required outside of the Historic District.

Chair Scott asked how this would apply to the wood-burning technique. Planner Tubbs stated that would qualify when initially done; however, as it ages and weathers, it tends to show more of the grain and color difference. Therefore, it was not considered a long-term solution. Planner Tubbs explained that the LMC requires paint or stain; however, the stain does not cover the grain as well as paint. Chair Scott noted that his home was stained with a solid stain that works much like paint.

Board Member Holmgren asked if the colors on the samples would be part of the Guidelines. Planner Tubbs reported that they were just examples to illustrate the general rule of thumb. They do not regulate the paint or stain color in the Historic Districts; they just require them to be opaque.

Board Member Holmgren stated the reason her house is purple is because they were trying to provide guidelines.

Chair Scott felt that the opacity at 75 to 80 percent seemed to work.

Board Member Beatlebrox noted that historically they did not have stains. She felt that they need to stay closest to what they had in the early 1900s, which was opaque paint or stain. She did not support anything that looks modern for a Historic home.

Assistant Director Ward mentioned that during the last Work Session, there was a lot of public interest in person. People were attending remotely to provide input for this meeting.
Board Member Stephens asked if there was a big issue in this regard, or whether there was an issue within the Design Guidelines on Historic Residential Structures. Planner Tubbs responded that there were not necessarily problems but as they assist applicants through the Historic District Design Review process, they have presented samples similar to those presented at this meeting. She noted it had become difficult to explain why one was acceptable and another was not without having a formula or clarity.

Planner Tubbs stated that it is a consistent requirement for Historic homes although not as common as with new construction or new additions. Some property owners were interested in finishing the exterior of their Historic homes to something that would be more transparent.

Board Member Stephens suggested that the Board focus on whether they could agree on the opacity level for Historic Structures.

Chair Scott opened the public hearing.

Matthew Christensen identified himself as the applicant referenced by Planner Tubbs. He hoped to use the pre-finished wood product. His Architect is the Director of Design for Brandon Architects who could better speak to the wood varietals. He stated that his is a new build and offered that some varieties would have more texture. His proposed design is monochromatic wood. The sample before the Board is sustainable and is reclaimed wood from river water. The sample was installed on the deck at his Jeremy Ranch home for approximately 1-½ years and showed only a very slight color change over that time period.

Speaker Christensen stressed that the products can last a long time with very little upkeep. He felt it was consistent with the general idea of opacity and uniformity. With his home, they tried to accomplish more of an industrial feel as an ode to the mining days. He referenced the historical purpose of paint for use in fireproofing and added that it was also a way to enforce the completion of a home.

Speaker Christensen would appreciate consideration of the Epay wood product and scheduled some larger samples to be shipped to Planner Tubbs so the Board could get a good idea of how it would look. He clarified that he currently resides in Jeremy Ranch but is building a home in Old Town for which he was seeking approval for the proposed siding.

Ryan McDaniel, AIA reported that Speaker Christensen’s project is new construction. He felt that anytime they look at historic preservation, the period of construction matters. Paint and stain are very different and paint is much more easily controlled in terms of the finish. Stains result in a tremendous range in terms of opacity as well as a tremendous amount of upkeep.
Speaker McDaniel stated that natural wood is a beautiful siding and architects love the natural characteristics of natural wood. The species of wood is another important factor. He challenged the Board to consider some of the alternatives, especially for a new construction project that would be aesthetically pleasing, fit into context, and have a look that would be true to history and reflective of industrial architecture from Park City’s mining era.

Speaker McDaniel stressed that reclaimed wood and sustainable products should not be taken lightly. He identified issues with staining natural wood and mentioned Volatile Organic Compounds (“VOC”) that are harmful to the environment. As an architect, they look for sustainable alternatives. Because Epay is reclaimed, it has certain qualities and would not have a huge range of color variation based on exposure as compared with natural cedar for example. He felt that paint and stains were two separate things for discussion as was the period of an existing house. Using reclaimed wood siding on new construction that is trying to fit within a Historic District is a great fit, especially as a sustainable option.

There were no further public comments.

Chair Scott liked Board Member Stephens’s suggestion of addressing one issue at a time. He felt that Historic Structures should have an opacity of 75% or more. Board Member Holmgren agreed.

Board Member Stephens stated that historic wood in Park City was over 100 years old and needed good protection with an adequate coat of paint. For longevity of the material on Historic Structures, he suggested allowing only paint at 100%.

There was discussion of opacity at 75%. Board Member Beatlebrox suggested at least 80%. Board Member Stephens commented that one coat of watered-down paint included in the sample would not provide adequate protection. He reiterated his suggestion of 100%. The remainder of the Board agreed.

Board Member Stephens noted the difficult environment and the lack of the vapor barrier in Historic Structures that allow moisture on the siding from the inside in addition to exterior elements. He stressed that the material needs to be sealed. The Board confirmed its consensus for 100% opacity for Historic homes.

With regard to new construction or new additions, Board Member Stephens wanted to give the design community as much flexibility as possible. He felt that new additions 10 to 15 years ago were out of proportion and they could lose the home.

Board Member Holmgren would like to see the proportion maintained and referenced the house that was built next to hers as an example of a bad proportion. She stressed that proportion, especially in Old Town, is important.
Board Member Stephens commented that the Code already contains provisions that call for the design to be broken up with massing and other elements. Rather than having an opacity standard, he suggested it might not matter for new construction. There was discussion regarding paint color.

Chair Scott liked the comments of Board Member Stephens and stated that by allowing flexibility with infill and additions, if all additions and infill were stained that would make the Historic Structures stand out, which is what they want to accomplish. If they make everything the same, the Historic Structures would not stand out the way they should.

Board Member Stephens commented that the material suggested in the public comment was consistent in grain and could be an interesting material for a newly constructed home or addition. It would allow for changing the vertical patterns in the building, as well as trim.

Board Member Long liked the more opaque color and agreed with the Board. Board Member Beatlebrox was also in agreement.

Planner Tubbs confirmed that the Board suggested 100% opacity for all Historic Structures and no opacity requirements for additions to Historic Structures or new infill construction. Board Member Beatlebrox added that an owner could use paint or stain.

Planner Tubbs asked if the Board would recommend updating the LMC since the language in the LMC includes both Historic Structures and new construction or additions. There was a consensus among the Board Members that the LMC should be amended in this regard.

Assistant Director Ward sought clarification on the percentage. Board Member Stephens explained that the Board requested 100% opacity for the paint on Historic Structures, and no requirement for infill or new additions to Historic Structures.

7. **ADJOURN**

**MOTION:** Board Member Holmgren moved to ADJOURN. Board Member Stephens seconded the motion.

**VOTE:** The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Board.

The Historic Preservation Board Meeting adjourned at approximately 6:50 p.m.
RIVERHORSE ON MAIN

Balcony Enclosure
Introduction

Riverhorse on Main has been a pillar of the Main Street community ever since its opening back in 1987. As time has passed and Park City has continued to expand and grow, Riverhorse has followed suit. We have strived to create ways to thrive in this unique and costly industry. We value creating spaces and experiences that serve our friends, our community, and visitors alike. When we purchased Riverhorse many years ago we were excited to rebrand and design the interiors as well as upgrade operations.

When the opportunity was given to us to add the enclosure we were thrilled. It has been a huge success for us as well as a fun and exciting addition for the community and visitors. We understand when we had the opportunity to develop this program several years ago that others chose not to participate. Riverhorse has a larger and more viable space for this program, we understand not all do. We are however willing to assist any other restaurants or businesses that would like to participate.

We want this restaurant to have success and thrive for another 30 plus years, and the deck enclosure has given us the ability to better ensure long term success. Growth and change in this industry is a must to stay fresh and relevant. We believe it would be a great set back for us to not have and use this space in the winter, so approval of the program on a long term basis would be great, however a plan to make this structure or one similar would be the ultimate goal.
Below you can see the initial façade v. what we have in place now.

As you can see, the glass elements were already in place. The color scheme of the glass enclosure falls perfectly in line with the rest of the building, without altering or contrasting it.

We realize this patio is 5 feet over city property. However, we feel, as do others, that it doesn’t affect the street, the sidewalk or the view.

Below is the original concept drawing approved by city staff.

Most say that this is the original façade of the building as it blends in perfectly with the surrounding elements. Most don’t even know that it is supposed to be there or original.
It is our understanding that the some of the concern is regarding our current design – “it is that the building is detracting from the overall western architectural appearance of Main Street”.

We found other images from buildings on Main Street, that have been designed and built, similar to ours. These other spaces are quite modern and do not have a western feel.

We are trying to maximize what we have worked hard to create and are grateful to have. We would be open to input and discussion on how the patio could be worked to be able to be permanently in place for us.
There certainly could be other alternatives to using this structure, but I believe 99% would agree what we have is the best. The tent suggestion is not in line with our brand or caliber.

A possible alternative could be a pergola or some type of retractable awning system.
Summary

Riverhorse on Main will continue to strive to be the restaurant of choice for our local community, visitors and partners.
We believe the program is a beneficial one, not just to the owners and staff of Riverhorse, but also to the Main Street experience. As stated in the introduction, we are also willing to assist others in implementing the program.
We would love to continue the program, as well as proposing to take it a step further. We hope to work together to produce a way to make it a permanent agreement or code adjustment. This would make it much less costly and stressful on us to not have to be uncertain each season and be able to better layout our business proforma.
Historic Preservation Board
Staff Report

Subject: 316 Woodside Avenue
Application: PL-21-05087
Author: Caitlyn Tubbs, Senior Planner
Date: July 5, 2023
Type of Item: Material Deconstruction

Recommendation
(I) Review the Material Deconstruction request to remove a portion of the historic side and rear of 316 Woodside Avenue, a Significant Historic Structure, to facilitate the construction of an addition, (II) conduct a public hearing, and (III) consider approving the request for Material Deconstruction based on the Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Conditions of Approval outlined in the draft Final Action Letter (Exhibit A).

Description
Applicant: Matt Safchik
Location: 316 Woodside Avenue
Zoning District: Historic Residential – 1
Adjacent Land Uses: Residential
Reason for Review: The Historic Preservation Board reviews and takes Final Action on Material Deconstruction requests in accordance with LMC § 15-11-12-5.

CUP Conditional Use Permit
HDDG Historic District Design Guidelines
HDDR Historic District Design Review
HPB Historic Preservation Board
HR – 1 Historic Residential – 1
HSI Historic Sites Inventory
LMC Land Management Code
PCMC Park City Municipal Corporation
SSCUP Steep Slope Conditional Use Permit

Terms that are capitalized as proper nouns throughout this staff report are defined in LMC § 15-15-1.

Summary
The Applicant seeks to remove a portion of the historic roof framing and approximately 64 square feet of non-historic siding material to facilitate the construction of a new addition on the Woodside Avenue side of the property. The Applicant intends to remove the roof framing supporting approximately 600 square feet of the historic roof and replace the beams with new lumber. The roof shape, pitch, form, and height will not be modified. 316 Woodside Avenue is a Significant Historic Site constructed c. 1889. The
site is unique because it is on a corner lot fronting the 3rd Street Public Stairs and the historic side faces Woodside Avenue.

Figure 1: 1920s photograph facing south and looking at Front Facade.

Figure 2: Oblique front view looking southwest c. 1940s
Background
On November 26, 2021, the Planning Department received a complete Historic District Design Review (HDDR) application for an addition to the Significant Historic Structure at 316 Woodside Avenue. The property was designated a Significant Historic Site (HSI Form) on the Park City Historic Sites Inventory (HSI) in 2015. The subject property is located within the HR – 1 Zoning District.

There have been many past applications for 316 Woodside Avenue as listed below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Administrative Lot Line Adjustment combining Lots 31 and 32 of Block 3 of the Park City Survey, creating one Lot of Record known as the Thibault Plat Amendment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between 2001 and 2002</td>
<td>A new foundation was constructed along with a basement renovation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>The Planning Department denied an Administrative Conditional Use Permit (CUP) for a proposed parking pad due to inactivity from the Applicant.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The original design of the proposed addition included connecting to a bay projection ("bump-out") on the side of the Structure. On May 4, 2022, the Historic Preservation Board determined the bay projection on the historic side of the home was significant to the Historic Structure (Staff Report, Minutes) and could not be removed to facilitate the construction of the new addition.

The Applicant has revised the proposed design of the addition to connect to a side porch which was recently enclosed. The non-historic siding is proposed to be removed, and the Applicant intends to highlight the historic porch by incorporating additional glazing and traditional porch elements such as railings and posts. The Applicant has submitted a Historic District Design Review application which will proceed to a public hearing after the Historic Preservation Board has issued the Material Deconstruction decision.

On March 8, 2023, the Planning Commission approved a Conditional Use Permit and a Steep Slope Conditional Use Permit for 316 Woodside Avenue (Staff Report, Minutes, page 22). The approved Conditional Use Permit allows the proposed addition to encroach into the front setback along Woodside Avenue by six feet per LMC § 15-2.2-4.

This proposal was reviewed by the Design Review Team (DRT) on March 22, 2023, March 29, 2022, January 19, 2022, and December 15, 2021. The DRT is comprised of Planning staff and PCMC’s Historic Preservation Consultant, SWCA.

**Analysis**

The Historic Preservation Board reviews and takes Final Action on Material Deconstruction of Historic Structures pursuant to LMC §15-11-12.5(A)(2). Additions to Historic Structures shall be considered only on non-character defining facades, usually tertiary facades (LMC §15-13-2(B)(4)(a)(2)). The connection to the proposed addition will be made at the rear corner where the secondary and tertiary facades meet. The "bump out" projection on the side (secondary) façade was found to contribute to the historic character of the home but the proposed addition will not alter or affect this feature. The proposed addition is located on the non-character-defining rear (tertiary) façade and does not interfere with historic features on the side (secondary) façade.

Material Deconstruction is defined in the LMC § 15-15-1 as “The disassembly of structures for the purpose of salvaging and reusing as many of the construction materials or building components. In some cases, deconstruction or dismantling may be used to remove non-historic materials from a historic site or structure o to remove those historic construction materials or building components that are beyond repair.”

The Applicant’s proposal is to remove the framing for approximately 600 square feet of the roof and approximately 64 square feet of non-historic siding material to facilitate the construction of a new addition on the Woodside Avenue side of the property. The form, shape, height, and pitch of the Historic Structure’s roof will not be modified; the Applicant seeks to replace deteriorated beams with new timber and replace the roofing
New additions to Historic Structures must be constructed in such a way that the Historic Integrity of the Structure is not diminished per LMC § 15-13-2(A). Historic Integrity is defined in LMC § 15-15-1 as “The ability of a Site to retain its identity and, therefore, convey its Significance in the history of Park City. Within the concept of Historic Integrity, Park City Municipal Corporation recognizes seven (7) aspects or qualities as defined by the National Parks Service, that in various combinations define integrity. They are as follows:”

Staff has outlined the aspects and qualities and provided an analysis of the project’s compliance in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Analysis of Proposal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Location: The place where the Historic Site was constructed or the Historical event took place.</td>
<td>Complies – The existing Historic Structure is not being relocated from its current (original) site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design: The combination of physical elements that create the form, plan, space, Structure, and style of a Site. Design includes such considerations as the</td>
<td>Complies – The character-defining features (e.g. front porch, roof form and pitch, siding, etc.) are not being removed. The Applicant has also proposed the replacement of original roof framing members to maintain the existing roof pitch and form; this replacement will not be visible from outside the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Structural System, Massing, Arrangement of Spaces, Pattern of Fenestration, Texture and Colors of the Surface Materials, Type, Amount and Style of Ornamental Detailing, and Arrangement and Type of Plantings in the Designed Landscape.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Historic Structure.</strong> The overall massing and scale of the Historic Structure are not being altered and the Applicant has proposed an addition that is compatible in design and scale with the existing building.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Setting: The Physical Environment, Either Natural or Manmade, of a Historic Site, Including Vegetation, Topographic Features, Manmade Features (Paths, Fences, Walls) and the Relationship Between Structures and Other Features or Open Space.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Complies –</strong> The Site is fairly steep and somewhat obscures the view of the Historic Structure from the Woodside Avenue public right-of-way. Alongside the proposed addition, the Applicant has proposed the construction of a retaining wall at the foot of the slope to provide a flat open space for the owner’s use. This retaining wall will be located where the Site already flattens out and will not detract from the setting of the Historic Structure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Materials: The Physical Elements that Were Combined or Deposited During a Particular Period of Time in a Particular Pattern or Configuration to Form a Historic Site.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Complies –</strong> The existing roofing materials are not original to the Historic Site and the Applicant is also proposing to remove decorative shingles from a gabled eave which are non-original to the house. The remaining character-defining features (e.g. front porch, roof form and pitch, siding, etc.) are not being removed. The Applicant has also proposed the replacement of original roof framing members to maintain the existing roof pitch and form; this replacement will not be visible from outside the Historic Structure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Workmanship: The Physical Evidence of the Crafts of a Particular Culture or People During Any Given Period of History, Including Methods of Construction, Plain or Decorative Finishes, Painting, Carving, Joinery, Tooling, and Turning.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Complies –</strong> The character-defining features of the Historic Structure that best demonstrate the vernacular style and workmanship of the Structure will not be altered. The front porch and other architectural details will be protected and maintained.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Feeling: A Site’s Expression of the Aesthetic of Historic Sense of a Particular Period</strong></td>
<td><strong>Complies –</strong> The Historic Structure is in good repair and the primary façade has not been extensively modified over time.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
of time. Feeling results from the presence of physical features that, taken together, convey the Property’s Historic character.

| Association: The direct link between an important Historic era or Person and a Historic Site. A Site retains association if it is in the place where the activity occurred and is sufficiently intact to convey that relationship to an observer. | Complies – The existing Historic Structure is not being relocated or reoriented as part of this application and maintains its direct link to the Site. |

(II) The Development Review Committee does not require Conditions of Approval.¹

The Development Review Committee (DRC) reviewed this request on December 21, 2021, and again on April 5, 2022. The DRC did not request any Conditions of Approval for this application.

Department Review
The Planning Department and City Attorney’s Office reviewed this report.

Notice
Staff published notice on the City’s website and the Utah Public Notice website, and posted notice to the property on June 21, 2023. Staff mailed courtesy notice to property owners within 300 feet on June 21, 2023. The Park Record published a notice on June 21, 2023.²

Public Input
Staff did not receive any public input at the time this report was published.

Alternatives
- The Historic Preservation Board may approve the Material Deconstruction;
- The Historic Preservation Board may deny the Material Deconstruction and direct staff to make Findings for the denial; or

¹ The Development Review Committee meets the first and third Tuesday of each month to review and provide comments on Planning Applications, including review by the Building Department, Engineering Department, Sustainability Department, Transportation Planning Department, Code Enforcement, the City Attorney’s Office, Local Utilities including Rocky Mountain Power and Dominion Energy, the Park City Fire District, Public Works, Public Utilities, and the Snyderville Basin Water Reclamation District (SBWRD).
² LMC § 15-1-21
• The Historic Preservation Board may request additional information and continue the discussion to a date certain or uncertain.

**Exhibits**
Exhibit A: Draft Final Action Letter
Exhibit B: Applicant’s Submitted Plans
Exhibit C: Applicant’s Physical Conditions Report and Historic Preservation Plan
Exhibit D: SSCUP and CUP Final Action Letter dated March 8, 2023
July 5, 2023

Steven Swanson
sasarchitect.pc@gmail.com
435-513-1079

CC: Matt Safchik

NOTICE OF HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD ACTION

Description
Address: 316 Woodside Avenue
Zoning District: Historic Residential - 1
Application: Material Deconstruction
Project Number: PL-21-05087
Action: APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS (See Below)
Date of Final Action: July 5, 2023

Project Summary: The Applicant seeks approval for Material Deconstruction of a portion of the side façade and interior roof framing of a Significant Historic Structure to facilitate the construction of an addition.

Action Taken
On July 5, 2023, the Historic Preservation Board conducted a public hearing and approved the Material Deconstruction according to the following findings of fact, conclusions of law, and conditions of approval.

Findings of Fact

1. The Site is located at 316 Woodside Avenue, also known as Lot A of the Thibault Plat Amendment.
2. 316 Woodside Avenue is a Significant Historic Structure on Park City’s Historic Sites Inventory.
3. The home was originally constructed c. 1889 and is an L-cottage type house.
4. In 1984, 316 Woodside Avenue was listed on the National Register of Historic Places as part of the Park City Mining Boom Era Residences Thematic District.
5. On March 4, 2015, the Historic Preservation Board reviewed a Determination of Significance application (PL-14-02555) and found 316 Woodside Avenue complied with the requirements for a Significant Historic Site.

6. On September 14, 2021, a Historic District Design Review Pre-Application (PL-21-04992) was submitted regarding a proposed addition to the rear of the Historic Site.

7. On November 29, 2021, a Steep Slope Conditional Use Permit (SSCUP) application (PL-21-05086) and Historic District Design Review (HDDR) application (PL-21-05087) were submitted.

8. On May 4, 2022, the Historic Preservation Board determined the small “bump out” on the rear of the Structure was historically significant to the Site (PL-22-05238).

9. On December 16, 2022, a Conditional Use Permit application (PL-22-05483) was submitted to allow the encroachment of the proposed addition into the front setback along Woodside Avenue.

10. On March 8, 2023, the Planning Commission reviewed the SSCUP (PL-21-05086) and CUP (PL-22-05483), conducted a public hearing, and approved the Steep Slope Conditional Use Permit and Conditional Use Permit.

Material Deconstruction

11. The Applicant proposes the Material Deconstruction of approximately 64 square feet of the side and rear façade to facilitate the construction of an addition and attached garage.

12. The Applicant proposes Material Deconstruction of interior roof framing supporting approximately 600 square feet of roofing materials. The form, pitch, shape, and height of the roof will not be altered.

13. Additions to Historic Structures shall be considered only on non-character-defining facades, usually tertiary facades.

14. The construction of the proposed addition will not diminish the Historic Integrity of the Structure as defined in LMC §15-13-2(A) and as demonstrated in the analysis included in the July 5th Staff Report.

15. The Historic Preservation Board approved the Material Deconstruction to accommodate an addition and garage, accessed from the front of the property, subject to the Conditions of Approval below.

16. The Findings for “Complies” from the Analysis of Proposal sections of the Staff Report dated July 5, 2023 are incorporated herein by reference.
Conclusions of Law
1. The proposed addition is located on the secondary façade of the Historic Structure and adjacent to the Woodside Avenue public right-of-way. (LMC §15-13-2(B)(4)(a)(2)).
2. The proposal to construct an addition complies with the requirements set forth in the Historic Residential (HR-1) District (LMC Chapter 15-2.2).
3. The proposal to construct an addition complies with the Design Guidelines for Historic Residential Sites (LMC §15-13-2(B)(4)).

Conditions of Approval
4. The Applicant is responsible for notifying the Planning Department and Building Department prior to proposing any changes to this approval.
5. The Applicant shall submit in writing any changes, modifications, or deviations from the approved scope of work for Planning review and approval/denial in accordance with the applicable standards prior to construction.
6. The Applicant must obtain Historic District Design Review approval prior to the submittal of a building permit.
7. An encroachment or access agreement is required for work conducted five feet or less from a lot line or having the potential to encroach on another property.
8. A Soils Report completed by a geotechnical engineer as well as a temporary shoring plan, if applicable, will be required at the time of building permit application.
9. The Site shall be re-graded so that all water drains away from the Structure and does not enter the foundation.
10. The Applicant shall complete a Historic Preservation Plan, subject to approval by the Chief Building Official and the Planning Director, or their respective designee(s), prior to the submittal of a building permit.
11. The Applicant shall provide the City with a Financial Guarantee to ensure compliance with the conditions and terms of the Historic Preservation Plan and the relevant documents shall be recorded with Summit County prior to the submittal of a building permit.
12. The addition shall be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future the essential form and integrity of the Significant Historic Structure could be restored.
13. The Applicant shall abide by an approved Historic Preservation Plan ensuring all historic materials not approved for material Deconstruction are protected during
all stages of construction. Additionally, the Applicant shall protect neighboring
and adjacent Historic Structures during all stages of construction. Any damage or
loss of historic materials outside the scope of this Material Deconstruction
approval (on the subject property or neighboring historic structures) shall be
reported to the Planning Department immediately.

If you have questions or concerns regarding this Final Action Letter, please call (435)-
615-5063 or email caitlyn.tubbs@parkcity.org.

Sincerely,

________________________________________
Randy Scott, Chair
Historic Preservation Board

CC: Caitlyn Tubbs, Sr. Historic Preservation Planner
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REVERSE BOARD & BATTEN - CHARCOAL
CORNER BOARD/ TRIM - WHITE
HISTORIC SIDING - MINT GREEN

NEW ROOF RIDGE
FACIA - MATTE CARBON
STEEL GUARD - DK. GREY W/ WOOD SLATS
GRADE @ P/L

7185.8'
7166'-3 1/2"
9'-5 1/2"=15R@7.56"
11'-0"=17R@7.75"

STEEL GUARD - DK. GREY W/ WOOD SLATS

7175'-9"

7166-3 1/2"

HISTORIC HOME transition

historic porch element

reverse board & batten - charcoal
historic siding - mint green
corner board/ trim - white
standing seam - matte carbon
steel guard - dk. grey w/ wood slats
facia - matte carbon
board/ panel - dk. grey

12

5

w/ wood slats

7175-9"
NEW 2X10 RAFTERS W/ R49 INSUL
5/8 ROOF SHEATHING/ 1.5” S.S. ROOFING

NEW 2X6 EAVES/ 1X6 FACIA

REMOVE 2X4/ 2X6 ROOF & CROSS-TIES

316 WOODSIDE –PARTIAL BUILDING SECTION
Wednesday September 30, 2020

To: Matt Safchik

RE:  STRUCTURAL OBSERVATION FOR 316 WOODSIDE AVE, PARK CITY UTAH

The residence was visited on Wednesday September 30, 2020 to address any negative issue on the livability, soundness, or structural integrity of the property. All observations were visible in nature. No material testing was performed. The following are the items that were found at the time of the site visit.

1. Slightly out of plumb walls, see figures 1-5. The plumbness issue was minor and does not pose any structural issues. The cause of the bowing could be from a past water issue that was fixed later in the modern update. The new engineered beams that were placed through the house appears to have stabilized the issue.

2. The deck area shown in figure 6 and 7 appear to be intact without any structural issues. A stain on the decking will help it last longer.

3. Dry wall sagging shown in figures 8-11 in the upper floor ceiling. These appear to be minor and is not evidence of any major structural issue. Figure 11 shows a crack in the window trim. All these can be by a painter. The cause could be from the snow loads transferred through the roof framing.

4. Undersized roof framing for today’s standards, see figures 12-18. Cracks in the beam end in figure 13. This can be fixed with a mending plate such as a Simpson MP36. As the structure has stood for over 100 years, it can reasonably be anticipated that barring unforeseen events, the structure will continue to hold. The corrugated steel roof will also help distribute the loads.

5. Cracks in bottom floor slab, figures 19 and 20. Cracking in residential slabs are relatively common due to the construction practices which include the omission of slab reinforcing and control joints.

6. Water dripping from piping onto the foundation wall, see Figures 21 and 22. Moisture in the bottom floor will accelerate mold and dry rot in the wood.

7. Connection from city stairs needs new hangars on each stair stringer. See figures 23 and 24.

Based on our observations, the structural integrity of the residence is acceptable without any expensive repairs.
Figure 9: Dry Wall Sagging

Figure 10: Dry Wall Sagging

Figure 11: Dry Wall Cracking

Figure 12: Roof Framing

Figure 13: Roof Framing

Figure 14: Roof Framing

Figure 15: Roof Framing

Figure 16: Roof Framing
This letter is meant only to address the specific items outlined and all recommendations are based solely on structural observations that could be made at the time of the site visit. Epic Engineering did not do the original design for this residence and will not be held liable for the integrity of any structural elements other than those explicitly addressed in this letter and figures.

If I can be of any further assistance, please contact me at your convenience.

Respectfully,

Jeremy Ellis, P.E.

Epic Engineering, P.C.
PHYSICAL CONDITIONS REPORT
For Use with the Historic District Design Review (HDDR) Application

For Official Use Only
PLANNER: __________________________ APPLICATION #: __________________________
DATE RECEIVED: __________________________

PROJECT INFORMATION
NAME: Safchik Residence Addition/ remodel
ADDRESS: 316 Woodside Ave.
Park City, UT

TAX ID: THBLT-A

SUBDIVISION: __________________________

SURVEY: __________________________ LOT #: __________________________ BLOCK #: __________________________
HISTORIC DESIGNATION: ☐ LANDMARK ☑ SIGNIFICANT ☐ NOT HISTORIC

APPLICANT INFORMATION
NAME: Matthew Safchik
MAILING ADDRESS: P.O. Box 2251
Park City, UT 84060

PHONE #: (305 606 0820 - 435 513 1079 -
EMAIL: safchik@me.com

APPLICANT’S REPRESENTATIVE INFORMATION
NAME: Steven A Swanson
PHONE #: (305 606 0820 - 435 513 1079 -
EMAIL: sasarchitect.pc@gmail.com

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.
ACKNOWLEDGMENT OF RESPONSIBILITY

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: ____________________________
Name of Applicant: Matthew Safchik
Mailing Address: P.O. Box 2251
Park City, UT 84060`
Phone #: (305) 606 0820 - Fax #: ( ) - safchik@me.com
Email: ____________________________
Type of Application: Physical Conditions Report/ HDDR

AFFIRMATION OF SUFFICIENT INTEREST

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: Matthew Safchik
Mailing Address: P.O. Box 2251
Park City, UT 84060`
Street Address/ Legal Description of Subject Property: THBLT-A Single-family historic residence

Signature: ____________________________ Date: 11-21-21

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.

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.
Photo #1: West Elevation from Woodside Ave.

Photo #2: Deck & rail
Photo #3: Structure from first move (2002)

Photo #4: Attic Framing
Photo #5: 316 Woodside - Roof

Photo #6: Roof detail
Photo #7: Exterior siding - historic

Photo #8: Siding Detail - existing, current condition
Photo #9: 316 Woodside - Porch

Photo #10: Porch detail - under construction 2001
Photo #11: 316 Woodside - Porch

Photo #12: Porch detail - under construction 2001
Photo #13 Interior- Front Room

Photo #14: Porch detail - under construction 2001
PHYSICAL CONDITIONS REPORT

Detailed Description of Existing Conditions. 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element/Feature:</th>
<th>Deck/ steps &amp; railing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This involves:</td>
<td>☑ A later addition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>An original part of the building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Estimated date of construction: 2002</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Describe existing feature:

Wood- framed deck & stairs with redwood decking surface takes up a good portion of the site, wrapping around three sides of the residence. Much of the deck has painted wood railing/ balusters. Only the essential portions of this non-historic site feature are proposed to remain for access purposes. Wood railings are proposed to be replaced by painted metal.

Describe any deficiencies: Existing Condition: ☑ Excellent ☑ Good ☑ Fair ☐ Poor

Decking & some framing are in need of repair/ replacement.

Photo Numbers: 1,2
Illustration Numbers: 

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.
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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element/Feature: Structure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This involves:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☒ An original part of the building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☒ A later addition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated date of construction: 1889/2002</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Describe existing feature:

Vertical board/drop siding construction has been studded inside, floor framing 2x10 joists have been doubled/stabilized during the lift/lower level construction in 2002. Masonry chimney was removed at that time. New Reinf. concrete footings/walls & slab @ lower level.

New shear wall construction @ Lower level.

Describe any deficiencies:

Existing Condition: ☒ Excellent ☐ Good ☐ Fair ☐ Poor

Roof framing is 2x4 - typical - needs bracing & reinforcing. Skip sheathing roof boards will need plywood over the top.

Photo Numbers: 3,4
Illustration Numbers: 

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.
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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element/Feature:</th>
<th>Metal roofing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This involves:</td>
<td>☒ An original part of the building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☒ A later addition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated date of construction:</td>
<td>1990</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Describe existing feature:

Standing-seam metal roofing - non-historic.

Roof slopes covered are from 4:12 through 12:12 pitches.

Color is light gray. Metal drip edge is light gray, gutters/

downspouts are white

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

Standing-seam metal roofing- med. to light grey prefinished steel. Observe wear due to age & climate weathering. White gutters & downspouts throughout are in fair to good condition. Electric heat cable on North appears to still function.

Photo Numbers: 5,6  Illustration Numbers: 

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.
**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.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element/Feature:</th>
<th>N/A - Chimney (removed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

This involves: [x] An original part of the building  
[ ] A later addition  
Estimated date of construction: **Removed 2000**

Describe existing feature:

Wood stove chimney (brick) - Removed 2000 during lift & re-set.

Describe any deficiencies:  
Existing Condition:  
[ ] Excellent  
[ ] Good  
[ ] Fair  
[ ] Poor

N/A

Photo Numbers: ___________________________  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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element/Feature:</th>
<th>Exterior siding/ trim/ decorative features</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This involves:</td>
<td>X An original part of the building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X A later addition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated date of construction:</td>
<td>1889</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Describe existing feature:

- Historic drop-siding, painted - fair to good condition.
- Corner board/ window trim - 1x4/ 1x6 pine (replacement/ non-historic)
- Natural cedar fish-scale type shingle (non-historic) on gable front.

Describe any deficiencies:

- Some curling/ cupping & deterioration of the historic drop-siding is observed.
- Some wall - out of plane/ out of plumb, due to settling & lateral forces over time.

Existing Condition: ☑ Excellent ☐ Good ☐ Fair ☐ Poor

Photo Numbers: 7, 8

Illustration Numbers: 

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.
Element/Feature: ________________________________

This involves:  □ An original part of the building
              □ A later addition  Estimated date of construction: ________________

Describe existing feature:

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

Photo Numbers: ____________________________  Illustration Numbers: ____________________________
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Element/Feature:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

This involves:  
- [ ] An original part of the building  
- [ ] A later addition  

Estimated date of construction: ________________

Describe existing feature:

Describe any deficiencies:

Existing Condition:  
- [ ] Excellent  
- [ ] Good  
- [ ] Fair  
- [ ] Poor

Photo Numbers: __________________________  
Illustration Numbers: __________________________
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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element/Feature: Foundation walls</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

This involves: □ An original part of the building
☑ A later addition
Estimated date of construction: 2000

Describe existing feature:

Reinforced concrete foundation walls/footings - non-historic.

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

None

Photo Numbers: 4, 10
Illustration Numbers: 

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.
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: Porch/ Posts & Decking

This involves: ☒ An original part of the building
☐ A later addition

Estimated date of construction: 1889/ 2000

Describe existing feature:

The porch maintains its original shape & dimensions, though some materials have changed over time.

No documentation has been found to determine if the turned posts & brackets were original - they were likely added later. The natural beadboard ceiling was a later addition - no date however.

The cedar deck & wood framing are from the ca. 2000 remodel.

Describe any deficiencies:

Existing Condition: ☐ Excellent ☒ Good ☐ Fair ☐ Poor

The Deck & Soffit do not reflect the type of detailing that was typical for this age of home.

Photo Numbers: 9, 10
Illustration Numbers: 

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.
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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element/Feature:</th>
<th>HVAC/ Plumbing/ Electrical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This involves:</td>
<td>☑ A later addition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Estimated date of construction: _______________________</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Describe existing feature:

```
HVAC - Central boiler - radiant heat, package A/C (mini-split) Pex/ copper supply. PVC drain/ SS, 200A Elect. service. in basement from overhead service/ drop on west side roof of home. Water & gas service is from Woodside Ave.
```

Describe any deficiencies:

```
Existing Condition: ☑ Good

No Fire suppression system
```

Photo Numbers: ____________________________  Illustration Numbers: 1
9. Door Survey

**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: 2
Number of historic doors on the structure: 0
Number of existing replacement/non-historic doors: 2
Number of doors completely missing: 0

Please reference assigned door numbers based on the Physical Conditions Report.
Number of doors to be replaced: ____________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Door #:</th>
<th>Existing Condition (Excellent, Good, Fair, Poor):</th>
<th>Describe any deficiencies:</th>
<th>Photo #:</th>
<th>Historic (50 years or older):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D1</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.
10. Window Survey

**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 Form

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Window #:</th>
<th>Existing Condition (Excellent, Good, Fair, Poor):</th>
<th>Describe any deficiencies:</th>
<th>Photo #:</th>
<th>Historic (50 years or older):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td></td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>historic vertical separation gone</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>window replaced by greenhouse</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td></td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td></td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td></td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td></td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td></td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td></td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td></td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td></td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Number of windows to be replaced: **all - 11**
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.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element/Feature:</th>
<th>Front room/ Kitchen</th>
<th>Bedroom / Bay window</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This involves:</td>
<td>☒ An original part of the building</td>
<td>☒ A later addition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Estimated date of construction: 1889-2015</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Describe existing feature:

Interior has had several remodels & finish changes over the life of the home - most recent was 2015, with new paint, kitchen, bath & flooring

Describe any deficiencies: Existing Condition: ☒ Excellent ☐ Good ☐ Fair ☐ Poor

Modern-style detailing.

Photo Numbers: 13, 14

Illustration Numbers: ________________________________
Element/Feature: ____________________________

This involves:  
☐ An original part of the building  
☐ A later addition  

Estimated date of construction: ____________________________

Describe existing feature:

Describe any deficiencies:  

Existing Condition:  
☐ Excellent  
☐ Good  
☐ Fair  
☐ Poor

Photo Numbers: ____________________________  Illustration Numbers: ____________________________
1. Front Elevation- existing

- Historic siding
- Non-historic railings
- Non-historic shingles

South Elevation
2. Elevation- existing
3. Elevations- existing
4. Bay window - adaptation

Current bay w/ Windows replaced by non-historic doors

1982 Photo showing West facade & historic bay window
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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>For Official Use Only</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PLANNER: ______________ APPLICATION #: __________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DATE RECEIVED: ___________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLANNING DIRECTOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPROVAL DATE/INITIALS: ___________ APPROVAL DATE/INITIALS: ___________</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PROJECT INFORMATION**

- **LANDMARK**
- **SIGNIFICANT**
- **DISTRICT:** __________________

**NAME:**

Safchik Residence Addition/Remodel

**ADDRESS:**

316 Woodside Ave
Park City

**TAX ID:**

THBLT-A

**SUBDIVISION:**

_ OR_

**SURVEY:**

_ LOT #: ___________ BLOCK #: ___________

**APPLICANT INFORMATION**

**NAME:**

Matthew Safchik

**PHONE #:**

(305) 606 0820

**FAX #:** (____ ) -

**EMAIL:**

safchik@me.com

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.
INSTRUCTIONS FOR HISTORIC PRESERVATION PLAN

The 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:

1. **Multiple Buildings and/or Structures.** 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.

2. **Scope of Work.** Summarize the impacts the proposed project will have on each of the elements/features identified by the 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.

3. **Construction Issues.** 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:

   - **Preservation.** 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.

   - **Rehabilitation.** 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.

   - **Restoration.** 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.

   - **Reconstruction.** 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.

4. **Conditions Evaluation.** 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.

5. **References.** 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: Side yard facing 3rd St. & Woodside Ave.

This involves: □ Preservation  ☑ Restoration  □ Reconstruction  □ Rehabilitation

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

The decks, rail & balusters that wrap the historic house create a false context that separates it from its site & connection to the larger neighborhood. Much of this deck will be removed and grade brought up to a median level approximating an earlier building-ground relationship prior to the lifting of the home in 2000.

The heavy wood rail/baluster as well creates a detail that is out of historic context, and is planned to be replaced only where necessary, with a more transparent, historically sensitive painted 'wrought iron' look.

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: Roof & floor framing.

This involves: □ Preservation  □ Restoration  □ Reconstruction  □ Rehabilitation

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

The floor & roof structure are not planned to be changed, roof framing will be reinforced as required from underneath.

New framing for the addition will be typical wood shear wall construction to meet current codes.
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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element/Feature: Metal roofing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This involves:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Preservation       ☑ Restoration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Reconstruction  ☐ Rehabilitation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

The existing non-historic metal roof will be replaced with standing-seam metal roofing, which will also be used on the addition.

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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element/Feature: Chimney - N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This involves:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Preservation       ☐ Restoration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Reconstruction  ☐ Rehabilitation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

The old brick chimney was removed in 2000.
**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.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element/Feature:</th>
<th>Preservation</th>
<th>Restoration</th>
<th>Reconstruction</th>
<th>Rehabilitation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

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:

- Paint and repair of existing historic wood siding/trim. Replacement & addition of new painted wood siding/trim.
  - Fish-scale shingles will be removed & siding repaired or replaced.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element/Feature:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

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:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element/Feature:</th>
<th>Preservation</th>
<th>Restoration</th>
<th>Reconstruction</th>
<th>Rehabilitation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element/Feature:</th>
<th>Preservation</th>
<th>Restoration</th>
<th>Reconstruction</th>
<th>Rehabilitation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element/Feature: Foundation/ retaining wall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This involves:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☒ Preservation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Restoration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Reconstruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Rehabilitation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

- Existing retaining wall (West elevation) will be added to, to increase height

---

**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.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element/Feature: Porch deck, posts &amp; ceiling</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This involves:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Preservation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☒ Restoration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Reconstruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Rehabilitation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

- The porch deck will be rebuilt in an historically accurate way, with painted sloping deck boards & painted facia.
- Porch posts & brackets will be stripped, filled & repaired, then re-painted. The oversize (2x6) post base trims will be reduced to 1x material or eliminated.
- Beadboard ceiling will be painted.
### 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.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element/Feature: Doors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This involves:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Preservation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Restoration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Reconstruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Rehabilitation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

No historic doors exist.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element/Feature:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This involves:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Preservation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Restoration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Reconstruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Rehabilitation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

...
### 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.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element/Feature:</th>
<th>Windows</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This involves:</td>
<td>☑ Preservation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ Reconstruction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

No historic windows exist. New painted or clad wood windows will have historically correct frame & sash

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element/Feature:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This involves:</td>
<td>☐ Preservation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ Reconstruction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element/Feature: Heating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This involves:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Preservation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Restoration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Reconstruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Rehabilitation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Radiant heat will be used throughout, & will need a new boiler & zone system

**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.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element/Feature: Addition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This involves:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Preservation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Restoration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Reconstruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Rehabilitation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Addition utilizes the existing bay window for connection to the historic home. This historic element has been altered significantly, with the addition of non-historic window & doors. Only the west-facade & the roof will be impacted. Non-historic French doors will be removed & oversized non-historic windows on both sides replaced with properly sized & detailed units.
4. PROJECT TEAM
List the individuals and firms involved in designing and executing the proposed work. Include the names and contact information for the architect, designer, preservation professional, contractor, subcontractors, specialized craftspeople, specialty fabricators, etc…

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

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

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

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

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

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

Signature of Applicant: Matthew Safchik Date: 11/21/21

Name of Applicant: Matthew Safchik
Supplemental Sheets

Supplemental pages should be used to describe the scope of work and preservation treatment for any additional elements and features not previously described in this packet.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element/Feature:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This involves:</td>
<td>☐ Preservation ☐ Restoration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ Reconstruction ☐ Rehabilitation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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


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:


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.
March 8, 2023

Matthew Safchik
PO Box 2251
Park City, UT 84060
305-606-0820

NOTICE OF PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION

Description
Address: 316 Woodside Avenue

Zoning District: Historic District – 1 (HR-1)

Application: Steep Slope Conditional Use Permit (SSCUP) & Conditional Use Permit (CUP)

Project Number: PL-21-05086 & PL-22-05483

Action: APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS (See Below)

Date of Final Action: March 8, 2023

Project Summary: The Applicant Proposes to Construct an addition with a single car parking garage to a Significant Site over a Steep Slope. The proposed addition will encroach into the required Front Setback by approximately four and a half feet (4' 6").

Action Taken
On March 8, 2023, the Planning Commission held a public hearing and approved the proposal for the construction of an addition over a Steep Slope to a Significant Historic home at 316 Woodside Avenue and within the Required Front Yard Setback, according to the following findings of fact, conclusions of law, and conditions of approval.

Findings of Fact
1. The Site is located at 316 Woodside Avenue.
2. The Site is located within the Historic Residential – 1 (HR-1) Zoning District.
3. The Applicant proposes to construct an addition to a Significant Structure over a Steep Slope and within the required Front Setback.
4. Staff reviewed 316 Woodside Avenue's SSCUP application for compliance with the 16 Conditional Use criteria for Steep Slopes in LMC §15-2.2-6(B).
5. Staff reviewed 316 Woodside Avenue's CUP application for an exception to encroach into the required Front Setback.

6. The application was reviewed per LMC § 15-13-2 Design Guidelines for Historic Residential Sites and LMC Chapter 15-2.2, Historic Residential – 1 (HR-1) District.

7. Staff mailed courtesy notice to property owners within 300 feet on February 8, 2023.

8. The Analysis Section of the Staff Report is incorporated herein.

Conclusions of Law
1. The CUP, as conditioned, is consistent with the Park City Land Management Code, specifically section 15-2.2-4 and 15-2.2-6.
2. The Use is consistent with the Park City General Plan, as amended.
3. The effects of any differences in use or scale have been mitigated through careful planning.

Conditions of Approval
1. Final building plans and construction details shall reflect substantial compliance with the plans approved February 22, 2023, by the Planning Commission. Any changes, modifications, or deviations from the approved design that have not been approved in advance by the Planning and Building Departments may result in a stop work order.
2. The Applicant shall receive approval of a Historic District Design Review Permit prior to Building Permit issuance.
3. If the Applicant does not obtain a complete building permit within one year of the date of this approval, these Steep Slope Conditional Use Permit and Conditional Use Permit approvals will expire unless the Applicant submits a written extension request to the Planning Department prior to the expiration date and the Planning Department approves an extension.
4. The Applicant is responsible for notifying the Planning Department prior to making any changes to the approved plans.
5. Any changes, modifications, or deviations from the approved scope of work shall be submitted in writing for review and approval/denial in accordance with the applicable standards by the Planning Director or designee prior to construction.
6. Residential fire sprinklers are required for all new or renovation construction on this lot, per requirements of the Chief Building Official.
7. The property is located outside the Park City Landscaping and Maintenance of Soil Cover Ordinance (Soils Ordinance) and therefore not regulated by the City
for mine related impacts. If the property owner does encounter mine waste or mine waste impacted soils they must handle the material in accordance to State and Federal law.

8. Any areas disturbed during construction surrounding the proposed work shall be brought back to its original state.

9. Metal materials shall not be reflective.

10. All exterior lighting, on porches, decks, garage doors, entryways, etc. shall be down directed and fully shielded to prevent glare onto adjacent property and public rights-of-way and shall comply with the City’s outdoor lighting code in LMC Section 15-5-5(J). Final lighting details will be reviewed by the Planning Staff prior to installation.

11. Historic exterior features (all inclusive but namely, the pop-out roof, sidelight windows and siding) shall be preserved.

12. Distinctive materials, components, finishes and examples of craftsmanship should be retained and preserved.

13. Deteriorated or damaged historic features and elements should be repaired rather than replaced.

14. The site shall be recognized as a physical record of its time, place, and use.

15. Chemical or physical treatments should be undertaken using recognized preservation methods.

16. Construction should be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment could be restored.

17. Landscaping shall be water-efficient with drought tolerant plants and water-wise landscaping is encouraged.

18. The Applicant will be required to acquire and record an encroachment agreement, subject to the City Engineer’s approval for the proposed driveway and the use of the driveway as a second tandem off-street parking space.

19. The driveway shall remain 12’ in width maximum, the front door access shall not read as part of the driveway and shall be treated either with different material or color to differentiate the walkway from the driveway.

20. Prior to submitting a building permit, the Application shall submit a plan demonstrating how they will provide the temporary shoring needed during construction, subject to City Engineer approval.
21. The Applicant shall submit a geotechnical report and design of the temporary shoring and final slope stability prior to submitting a building permit, subject to City Engineer approval.

22. The Applicant shall provide soil stabilization details documenting how the disturbed area will be restored and stabilized, to be approved by the City Engineer prior to submission of a building permit.

23. The Applicant shall provide a landscape bond to ensure the stabilization and vegetation rehabilitation is complete prior to submission of a building permit.

24. City Engineer review and approval of all lot grading, utility installations, public improvements and drainage plans for compliance with City standards is a condition precedent to building permit issuance.

25. All retaining walls shall be approximately four feet (4') in height and be consistent in size to those seen in Park City historically.

26. If nail shoring is required for the Steep Slope stabilization, the Applicant will be required to submit a geotechnical report to the Engineering Department as part of the Building Permit application.

27. The Engineering Department requires the submittal of a storm drainage analysis. The storm drainage study must include the calculations showing the required storm drainage volume storage to match the pre and post development conditions for a 100-year 24-hour event.

28. Outdoor lighting must be reviewed and approved by the Planning Department prior to installation and must comply with the City’s Dark Sky requirements. Outdoor lighting must be fully shielded, down-directed, and 3,000 degrees Kelvin or less.

29. The property owner shall not create a lockout unit or accessory apartment. If the Applicant would like to establish either of those uses they will need to obtain additional permits.

30. The Final Grade shall be no more than four feet (4') in height difference from Existing Grade.

Please be aware that this approval in no way exempts the property from complying with other requirements that may be in effect on the property, and building permit regulations, as applicable. It is the responsibility of the property owner and applicant to ensure compliance with these regulations.

This letter is intended as a courtesy to document the status of your request. The official minutes from the Planning Commission meeting are available in the Planning Department office and online.
If you have questions regarding your application or the action taken, please don't hesitate to contact Caitlyn Tubbs at 435-615-5053 or caitlyn.tubbs@parkcity.org. She will continue working with you through the Building Permit and Certificate of Occupancy process.

Sincerely,

Laura Suesser
Planning Commission, Chair
Cc: Caitlyn Tubbs, AICP
    Senior Historic Preservation Planner
Recommendation
(I) Review the Material Deconstruction request, (II) conduct a public hearing, and (III) consider approving the request for Material Deconstruction of a portion of the sides and rear of a Significant Historic Structure to facilitate the construction of a new addition as outlined in the draft Final Action Letter Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Conditions of Approval (Exhibit A).

Description
Applicant: Mary Louden

Location: 317 Ontario Avenue

Zoning District: Historic Residential – 1

Adjacent Land Uses: Residential


Summary
The Applicant seeks to remove a portion of the wooden lap siding material on the sides and rear of the Historic Structure to facilitate the construction of an addition on the
Ontario Avenue side of the property.

**Background**
On November 11, 2022, the Planning Department received a Historic District Design Review Pre-Application for an addition to the rear of 317 Ontario Avenue. This request was reviewed by the Design Review Team (DRT) on November 23, 2022, where the DRT did not have any concerns regarding the design of the proposed addition. On March 29, 2023, the Planning Department received a complete Historic District Design Review application for an addition to the Significant Historic Structure at 317 Ontario Avenue.

The property is designated a Significant Historic Site ([HSI Form](#)) on the Park City Historic Sites Inventory (HSI) ([LMC § 15-11-10](#)). The subject property is located within the Historic Residential -1 (HR – 1) Zoning District. 317 Ontario Avenue is also known as the A. W. Webster home. It was originally constructed in c. 1885 and is a one-and-a-half-story Hall-Parlor Structure built in a Victorian-Vernacular style. The Structure was built during the Settlement & Mining Boom Era (1868 – 1893) and has undergone some modifications to the roofing and siding materials. Additionally, the roof form was previously modified by a large dormer and balcony addition. The rear of the Historic Structure faces Ontario Avenue and is set far below the grade of the public right-of-way. The non-historic dormer addition is visible from Ontario Avenue, but the front of the Historic Structure is only visible from the pedestrian path from Marsac Avenue to Ontario Avenue.
The Applicant is seeking approval for Material Deconstruction to remove a portion of the siding material on the sides and rear of the Structure to facilitate the construction of an addition. In addition to HPB’s approval for Material Deconstruction, the Applicant will be required to obtain Historic District Design Review approval, subject to LMC Chapter 15-13, Design Guidelines for Historic Districts and Sites, and LMC § 15-11-9, Preservation Policy, prior to the issuance of a building permit. Prior to receiving HDDR approval the Applicant will be required to obtain Steep Slope Conditional Use Permit (SSCUP) approval subject to LMC § 15-1-10, Conditional Use Review Process, and LMC § 15-2.2-6, Development on Steep Slopes. The Applicant has submitted a Historic District Design Review (HDDR) application (PL-22-05451) and a Steep Slope Conditional Use Permit (SSCUP) application (PL-23-05600) which are currently under review.

Analysis

The Historic Preservation Board reviews and takes Final Action for Material Deconstruction requests in accordance with LMC § 15-1-8 and LMC § 15-11-12.5(A)(2). Additions to Historic Structures shall be considered only on non-character defining facades, usually tertiary facades (LMC §15-13-2(B)(4)(a)(2)). The proposed addition is located on the tertiary façade of the Historic Structure and adjacent to the Ontario Avenue public right-of-way.

Material Deconstruction is defined in LMC § 15-15-1 as “The disassembly of structures for the purpose of salvaging and reusing as many of the construction materials or building components. In some cases, deconstruction or dismantling may be used to remove non-historic materials from a historic site or structure or to remove those historic construction materials or building components that are beyond repair.”

The Applicant proposes to construct an addition and transitional element at the rear of the Historic Structure. There is an existing dormer projection that is not considered to be historically significant on which modifications have already been made. This dormer was added to the Historic Structure after 1984 when the National Register Nomination Form was created. The Applicant proposes to remove some sections of historic wooden lap siding (totaling approximately 62 square feet) to attach the proposed addition to the existing Historic Structure.
New additions to Historic Structures must be constructed in such a way that the Historic Integrity of the Structure is not diminished per LMC § 15-13-2(A). Historic Integrity is defined in LMC § 15-15-1 as “The ability of a Site to retain its identity and, therefore, convey its Significance in the history of Park City. Within the concept of Historic Integrity, Park City Municipal Corporation recognizes seven (7) aspects or qualities as defined by the National Parks Service, that in various combinations define integrity. They are as follows:”

- Staff has outlined the aspects and qualities and provided an analysis of the project’s compliance in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Analysis of Proposal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Location: The place where the Historic Site was constructed or the Historical event took place.</td>
<td><strong>Complies</strong> – The existing Significant Historic Structure is not being relocated from its current (original) site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design: The combination of physical elements that create the form, plan, space,</td>
<td><strong>Complies</strong> – The construction methods utilized on 317 Ontario Avenue are common around the mining-era miners’ cottages within Park City’s Historic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Areas of Siding to be Removed
| Structure, and style of a Site. The design includes such considerations as the structural system, massing, arrangement of spaces, pattern of fenestration, texture and colors of the surface materials, type, amount and style of ornamental detailing, and arrangement and type of plantings in the designed landscape. | Districts. The home was built with a vernacular construction style and included minimal decorative finishes. The proposed addition utilizes a similar solid-to-void ratio and roof form as seen on the Historic Structure. The removal of a portion of siding from the sides and rear of the Historic Structure will not detract from the Historic Character of the Structure or its perceived workmanship. |
| Setting: The physical environment, either natural or manmade, of a Historic Site, including vegetation, topographic features, manmade features (paths, fences, walls) and the relationship between Structures and other features or open space. | Complies – The site is very steep adjacent to Ontario Avenue and becomes flatter toward the west, where the Historic Structure sits. The Applicant proposes minimal site manipulation or grading beyond what is necessary to construct the proposed addition. |
| Materials: The physical elements that were combined or deposited during a particular period of time in a particular pattern or configuration to form a Historic Site. | Complies with Condition of Approval #11 – The 317 Ontario HSI Form asserts the siding on the cottage is original, which contradicts a 2008 historic information form. The Form also states the existing standing seam metal roofing is non-original to the Structure and replaced the previous shingled roofing. The Structure sits on a concrete foundation and is noted in the Physical Conditions Report (Exhibit C) as being in generally good condition. Planning staff recommends a condition of approval that any siding removed during Material Deconstruction that is in good repair be used on other sections of the Historic Structure where the siding may need to be repaired or replaced. |
| Workmanship: The physical evidence of the crafts of a particular culture or people during any given period of history, including methods of construction, plain or decorative finishes, painting, carving, joinery, tooling, and | Complies - The construction methods utilized on 317 Ontario Avenue are common around the mining-era miners' cottages within Park City’s Historic Districts. The home was built with a vernacular construction style and included minimal decorative finishes. The proposed addition utilizes a similar solid-to-void ratio and roof form as seen on the Historic Structure. The removal of a portion of siding |
from the sides and rear of the Historic Structure will not detract from the Historic Character of the Structure or its perceived workmanship.

| Feeling: A Site’s expression of the aesthetic of Historic sense of a particular period of time. Feeling results from the presence of physical features that, taken together, convey the Property’s Historic character. | Complies – The proposed addition utilizes complementary architectural elements such as massing, roof forms, and simple designs to not detract from the Historic Structure. The Applicant has proposed the use of similar building materials around the Structure to make the entirety of the building cohesive but also differentiate between the proposed new construction and the Historic Structure. |
| Association: The direct link between an important Historic era or Person and a Historic Site. A Site retains association if it is in the place where the activity occurred and is sufficiently intact to convey that relationship to an observer. | Complies – The existing Historic Structure will not be relocated, lifted, or reoriented and maintains its direct link to its original Historic Site. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Analysis of Proposal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lot Size: The minimum Lot Area is 1,875 square feet for a Single Family Dwelling.</td>
<td>Complies - The 317 Ontario property is exactly one Old Town Lot measuring 25 feet in width and 75 feet in depth, with a total lot size of 1,875 square feet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot Width: The minimum width of a Lot is twenty five feet (25’), measured fifteen feet (15’) back from the Front Lot Line.</td>
<td>Complies – The subject property is 25 feet in width measured 15 feet back from the Front Lot Line.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Footprint: The maximum building footprint for a Lot measuring 25’ by 75’ is 844 square feet.</td>
<td>Complies – The combined footprint of the existing Historic Structure and the proposed addition is 844 square feet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front and Rear Setbacks: 10 feet each, totaling 20 feet</td>
<td>Complies – The existing Historic Structure encroaches approximately 4 feet 6 inches into the required Rear Setback; per LMC §15-2.2-4 the Historic Structure in its current location is a valid Non-Complying Structure. The proposed addition is located 16 feet 6 inches from the Front Lot Line and is compliant with the required front setback.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Side Setbacks: 3 feet each, totaling 6 feet</td>
<td><strong>Complies with Condition of Approval #12</strong> – The existing Historic Structure encroaches onto the neighboring property to the south by four and a half feet; per LMC § 15-2.2-4 the Historic Structure in its current location is a valid Non-Complying Structure. The Historic Structure does not encroach into the required northern side setback. The proposed addition is located 3 feet from the Side Lot Lines and the roof eaves encroach into the setback by 1 foot 6 inches on the northern and southern sides. Per LMC §15-2.2-3(J) roof overhangs and eaves are permitted to encroach into a Side Setback by 1 foot. Staff Recommends a condition of approval that the roof/eave overhangs be reduced by at least six inches on either side to comply with this requirement prior to the approval of the HDDR.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Height: Maximum height of 27 feet from Existing Grade and no more than 35 feet from lowest finish floor plane to highest wall top plate.</td>
<td><strong>Complies with Condition of Approval #13</strong> – The height of the proposed Structure, addition included, is 35 feet from the lowest finish floor plane to the topmost wall plate. The proposed addition is 32 feet from Existing Grade to the ridgeline on the northern elevation and 29 feet from Existing Grade to the ridgeline on the southern elevation. Staff Recommends a condition of approval that the height of the proposed addition be reduced to comply with the requirements of the Land Management Code prior to the approval of the HDDR. The Applicant has provided a 17 foot horizontal step by connecting the proposed addition to an existing non-historic roof form located 22 feet above Existing Grade.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development on Steep Slopes: A Steep Slope CUP is required for construction of an addition to an existing Structure when the building footprint of the addition is located on or projecting over a slope of 30% or greater.</td>
<td><strong>Complies with Condition of Approval #14</strong> – The Applicant has filed a Steep Slope Conditional Use Permit (PL-23-05600). Staff recommends a condition of approval that the SSCUP be approved prior to the issuance of a building permit.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The proposal to construct an addition complies with the Design Guidelines for Historic Residential Sites (LMC §15-13-2(B)(4)).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Analysis of Proposal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Protection for Historic Structures and Sites:</td>
<td>Complies –</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Additions to historic buildings should be considered only when it is demonstrated that the new use of the building cannot be accommodated by solely altering interior spaces.</td>
<td>1) The Applicant intends to construct an addition with a one-car garage to provide an off-street parking option for the homeowner. The Applicant has a need for additional interior space than what is currently available.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Additions to historic structures shall be considered with caution and shall be considered only on non-character defining facades, usually tertiary and occasionally secondary facades. Additions shall not compromise the architectural character of historic structures. Additions to the primary facades of historic structures are inappropriate.</td>
<td>2) The proposed addition is located on the rear (tertiary) façade of the Historic Structure and will attach to the Structure where the historic roof form has already been modified. By connecting to the Structure where modifications have already been made the proposed addition will have minimal effect on the architectural character or historic integrity of the Historic Structure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Additions should be visually subordinate to historic buildings when viewed from the primary public right-of-way.</td>
<td>3) The Historic Structure fronts away from Ontario Avenue, the primary public right-of-way, and is situated below the grade of the street. The proposed addition will not impact the view of the historic front of the property. The proposed addition will obscure some view of the rear of the Historic Structure but the addition’s design, massing, and use of materials were developed to mitigate this effect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Additions to historic structures shall not be placed so as to obscure, detract from, or modify historic roof forms.</td>
<td>4) The proposed addition connects to the Historic Structure through the portion of the historic roof form which was previously modified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Additions to historic structures shall not contribute significantly to the removal or loss of historic material.</td>
<td>5) The proposed addition connects to the historic structure where an existing projection extends from the Historic Structure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) Where the new addition abuts the historic building, a clear transitional element</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
between the old and the new should be designed and constructed. Minor additions, such as bay windows or dormers do not require a transitional element.

7) Maintain and preserve additions to structures that are significant to the era/period of restoration.

8) In-line additions shall be avoided.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transitional Elements:</th>
<th>Complies –</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) In-line additions should be avoided, generally are not appropriate.</td>
<td>1) The Applicant has not proposed an in-line addition with this application.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) A transitional element shall be required for any addition to a historic structure where the footprint of the addition is 50% or greater than the footprint of the historic structure. The historic structure’s footprint may include additions to the historic structure made within the historic period that have gained historic significance in their own right.</td>
<td>2) The existing Historic Structure has a building footprint of approximately 540 square feet; the proposed addition would add 303 square feet, which is about 56% of the existing Structure. The Applicant has included a transitional element in the proposed design of the addition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) When an addition to a historic structure is less than 50% of the historic structure’s footprint but exceeds the height of the historic structure due to either the greater height of the addition, site topography (e.g. an uphill addition), or both, a transitional element shall be required.</td>
<td>3) The proposed addition exceeds 50% of the footprint of the Historic Structure and also exceeds the height of the Structure due to its greater height and location on the uphill portion of the subject property.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) On a rear addition, the width of the transitional element shall not exceed two-thirds</td>
<td>4) The proposed transitional element is approximately 10 feet in width and is located on a 24-foot-wide façade; the</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Structure. The Applicant’s existing conditions drawings (Exhibit B, page 8) show the areas of the Structure where the siding would be removed, totaling around 62 square feet of siding.

6) The Applicant has utilized an existing non-historic projection as a transitional element.

7) There are no additions to the existing Historic Structure that have been determined to be significant to the era or period of restoration.

8) The Applicant has not proposed an in-line addition.
(2/3) the width of the elevation to which the transitional element is connected. The transitional element shall be set in from the corners of the affected historic elevation by a minimum of two feet (2').

5) In the case of additions to the secondary façade, visible from the primary public right-of-way, the transitional element shall be setback a minimum of five feet (5') from the primary façade. All other previous guidelines apply.

6) The depth of the transitional element (i.e., the distance between the affected historic elevation and the addition) shall be a minimum of one-third (1/3) the length of the least wide historic elevation adjacent to the impacted historic elevation.

7) The highest point of the transitional element shall be a minimum of two feet (2') lower than the highest ridgeline of the historic structure.

8) Balconies and decks may be attached to the secondary facades of a transitional element; however, no roof deck is permitted on the transitional element.

9) When an existing non-historic or non-contributory addition is used as a transitional element, the preceding guidelines for transitional elements shall not apply.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Compatibility:</th>
<th>Complies –</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

(Proposed transitional element is located over 18 feet from the primary façade.

6) The proposed transitional element is approximately 9 feet in depth and the least-wide elevation adjacent to the rear façade is 18 feet in depth; the proposed transitional element is approximately half the length of the least-wide elevation.

7) The proposed transitional element utilizes the existing modified roof form which sits exactly at the ridgeline of the Historic Structure. The proposed transitional element and addition do not expand this non-conformity.

8) The Applicant has not proposed any decks or balconies on the transitional element.

9) The proposed addition utilizes an existing non-historic and non-contributory modification as the transitional element.
1) Additions shall complement the visual and physical qualities of the historic building.
2) The addition shall be a contemporary interpretation of the historic structure’s architectural style.
3) Additions shall be subordinate in scale to the primary historic structure. The footprint of an addition shall not exceed 50% of the footprint of the historic structure, including any additions that have achieved historic significance in their own right.
4) Additions shall be visually subordinate to historic structures.
5) Large additions shall be visually separated from historic buildings when viewed from the primary public right-of-way.
6) Building components and materials used on additions shall be similar in scale and size to those found on the historic building.
7) Window shapes, patterns, and proportions found on the historic building should be reflected in the new addition.
8) Windows, doors, and other features on a new addition shall be designed to be compatible with the historic structure and surrounding historic sites. Windows, doors, and other openings shall be of sizes and proportions similar to those found on nearby historic structures. When using new building materials and installation methods as those found on the existing Historic Structure.

1) The proposed addition utilizes similar building materials, roof forms, and solid-to-void ratios as seen on the existing Historic Structure.
2) The proposed addition is compatible with the existing Historic Structure while also differentiating itself through alternative material installation patterns (e.g. vertical siding instead of historic horizontal siding).
3) The overall massing of the proposed addition has been broken up to complement the existing mass and scale of the Historic Structure.
4) When viewed from the front façade of the Historic Structure the proposed addition does not include architectural details or ornamentation that detracts from the Historic Structure. The existing front of the Historic Structure remains the clear primary entrance.
5) The proposed addition is sited at the rear of the Historic Structure but is prominent from the primary public right-of-way due to its location on an uphill portion of the subject property. The Applicant has mitigated these visual impacts by proposing a transitional element between the existing Historic Structure and incorporating complementary design features and building materials into the proposed addition.
6) The proposed addition utilizes similar building materials and installation methods as those found on the existing Historic Structure. Additionally, the proposed roof form and the solid-to-void ratio of the new windows are compatible with the patterns found on the existing Structure.
7) The Applicant has proposed the installation of windows with a
window patterns and designs, those elements shall respect the typical historic character and proportions of windows on the primary historic structure and adjacent historic structures. The solid-to-void relationship and detailing of addition shall be compatible with the historic structure.

compatible 2:1 height-to-width ratio as is supported in the HDDGs. The opening patterns are similar to the patterns of the windows on the existing Structure.

8) The Applicant has proposed the installation of windows with a compatible 2:1 height-to-width ratio as is supported in the HDDGs. The opening patterns are similar to the patterns of the windows on the existing Structure. The proposed doors are simple in design and are compatible with the Historic District.

**Department Review**
The Planning Department and City Attorney’s Office reviewed this report.

**Notice**
Staff published notice on the City’s website and the Utah Public Notice website, and posted notice to the property on June 21, 2023. Staff mailed courtesy notice to property owners within 300 feet on June 21, 2023. The Park Record published a notice on June 21, 2023.¹

**Public Input**
Staff did not receive any public input at the time this report was published.

**Alternatives**
- The Historic Preservation Board may approve the Material Deconstruction;
- The Historic Preservation Board may deny the Material Deconstruction and direct staff to make Findings for the denial; or
- The Historic Preservation Board may request additional information and continue the discussion to a date certain or uncertain.

**Exhibits**
Exhibit A: Draft Final Action Letter
Exhibit B: Applicant’s Submitted Plans
Exhibit C: Applicant’s Physical Conditions Report
Exhibit D: Applicant’s Historic Preservation Plan
Exhibit E: 2016 Intensive Level Survey Form

¹ LMC § 15-1-21
NOTICE OF HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD ACTION

Description
Address: 317 Ontario
Zoning District: HR-1 Historic Residential
Application: Material Deconstruction of Significant Historic Material
Project Number: PL-22-05451
Action: APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS (See Below)
Date of Final Action: July 5, 2023
Project Summary: Applicant Seeks Approval for Material Deconstruction of a Portion of a Significant Historic Structure to Facilitate the Construction of an Addition.

Action Taken
On July 5, 2023, the Historic Preservation Board conducted a public hearing and approved the Material Deconstruction for portions of 317 Ontario Avenue according to the following findings of fact, conclusions of law, and conditions of approval.

Findings of Fact
1. 317 Ontario Avenue is a Significant Historic Structure on Park City’s Historic Sites Inventory.
2. The home was originally constructed c. 1885 and is a 1.5-story Hall-Parlor style house.
3. In 1984, 317 Ontario Avenue was listed on the National Register of Historic Places as part of the Park City Mining Boom Era Residences Thematic District.
4. On November 11, 2022 the Applicant submitted a Historic District Design Review Pre-Application to discuss a potential addition to the Structure.
5. On March 29, 2023 the Applicant submitted a full Historic District Design Review application for a proposed addition.

Material Deconstruction
6. The Applicant proposes the Material Deconstruction of 62 square feet of the existing siding on the rear exterior walls to accommodate an addition to expand the living area of the home and provide an attached garage.
7. Additions to Historic Structures shall be considered only on non-character defining facades, usually tertiary facades.
8. The Historic Preservation Board approved the Material Deconstruction to accommodate an addition and garage, accessed from the front of the property, subject to the Conditions of Approval below.
9. The Findings for “Complies” from the Analysis of Proposal sections of the Staff Report dated July 5, 2023 are incorporated herein by reference.

Conclusions of Law
1. The proposed addition is located on the tertiary façade of the Historic Structure and adjacent to the Ontario Avenue public right-of-way. (LMC §15-13-2(B)(4)(a)(2)).
2. The proposal to construct an addition complies with the requirements set forth in the Historic Residential (HR-1) District (LMC Chapter 15-2.2).
3. The proposal to construct an addition complies with the Design Guidelines for Historic Residential Sites (LMC §15-13-2(B)(4)).

Conditions of Approval
1. The Applicant is responsible for notifying the Planning Department and Building Department prior to proposing any changes to this approval.
2. The Applicant shall submit in writing any changes, modifications, or deviations from the approved scope of work for Planning review and approval/denial in accordance with the applicable standards prior to construction.
3. The Applicant must obtain Historic District Design Review and Steep Slope Conditional Use Permit approval prior to the issuance of a building permit.
4. An encroachment or access agreement is required for work conducted five feet or less from a lot line or having the potential to encroach on another property.
5. A Soils Report completed by a geotechnical engineer as well as a temporary shoring plan, if applicable, will be required at the time of building permit application.
6. The site shall be re-graded so that all water drains away from the Structure and does not enter the foundation.
7. The Applicant shall complete a Historic Preservation Plan, subject to approval by the Chief Building Official and the Planning Director prior to the issuance of a building permit.
8. The Applicant shall provide the City with a Financial Guarantee to ensure compliance with the conditions and terms of the Historic Preservation Plan prior to the issuance of a building permit.

9. The addition shall be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future the essential form and integrity of the Significant Historic Structure could be restored.

10. In-line additions shall be avoided.

11. The Applicant shall re-use any salvageable removed original siding material to replace areas of damaged siding on the remainder of the Historic Structure.

12. The Applicant shall reduce the eave overhangs in the side yards to comply with the requirements of LMC §15-2.2-3(J).

13. The height of the proposed addition shall be reduced to comply with the requirements of the Land Management Code prior to the approval of the HDDR.

14. A Steep Slope Conditional Use Permit (SSCUP) shall be approved prior to the issuance of a building permit.

If you have questions or concerns regarding this Final Action Letter, please call (435) 615-5063 or email caitlyn.tubbs@parkcity.org.

Sincerely,

Randy Scott, Historic Preservation Board Chair

CC: Caitlyn Tubbs, Senior Historic Preservation Planner
CROSS CANYON IMAGES
ONTARIO
317 Ontario Ave.
Park City, UT 84060
GENERAL NOTES

SITE PLAN DRAWING IS FOR INFORMATION ONLY. THIS DRAWING IS NOT TO BE CONSIDERED AS A DEED OR LEGAL DOCUMENT. THE DRAWING IS FOR PLANNING PURPOSES ONLY. ALL SETBACKS, ELEVATIONS, DISTANCES AND OTHER MEASUREMENTS ARE APPROXIMATE AND SHOULD NOT BE DEEMED RELIABLE FOR LEGAL PURPOSES. THEY ARE SUBJECT TO CHANGE. DO NOT DEPEND ON THIS DRAWING FOR REAL ESTATE TRANSACTIONS OR CONSTRUCTION. IT IS THE RESPONSIBILITY OF THE OWNER AND/or CONTRACTOR TO VERIFY ALL SETBACKS, ELEVATIONS, DISTANCES AND OTHER MEASUREMENTS BEFORE PROCEEDING WITH ANY CONSTRUCTION OR DEVELOPMENT.

SITE PLAN NOT TO SCALE.

SITE PLAN NOTES:
1. ALL SURFACE WATER SHALL DRAIN AWAY FROM THE HOUSE AT ALL POINTS. DIRECT THE DRAINAGE WATER TO THE STREET OR AN APPROVED DRAINAGE COURSE BUT NOT ONTO THE NEIGHBORING PROPERTIES. THE GRADE SHALL FALL A MINIMUM OF 6" WITHIN THE FIRST 10 FEET. -IRC R401.3
2. STABILIZATION CONSTRUCTION ENTRANCE FOR A MINIMUM OF 50’ FROM ROADWAY, A FILTER FABRIC SHALL BE INSTALLED OVER A COMPACTED SUBGRADE. A 6" LAYER OF 1”-2” AGGREGATE SHALL BE PLACED OVER THIS MEMBRANE. DAILY INSPECTION FOR SEDIMENT BUILD UP AND/or LOSS OF GRAVEL WILL BE ENFORCED, AND REMEDIED AT ONCE.
3. DRAINAGE TO COMPLY WITH IRC CHAPTER 4
4. MAXIMUM ALTERED SLOPES AT 2:1.
5. MINIMUM SLOPE FOR DRAINAGE = 2%.
6. DRAIN AWAY FROM BUILDING.
7. CONTAIN DRAINAGE ON PROPERTY.
8. BOULDER RETAINING WALLS NOT TO EXCEED 4'-0" EXPOSED HEIGHT.
9. EXCAVATION NOT TO EXCEED 2:1 SLOPE WITH OUT A SOILS REPORT.

UTILITY NOTES
1. ALL UTILITY LINES TO BE UNDERGROUND.
2. ABOVE GRADE UTILITY BOX TO BE IN SCREENED LOCATION.
3. SNOW REMOVAL SNOW PLOWED FROM DRIVE SHALL NOT BE PUSHED ONTO THE STREET.
4. WATER SERVICE LID
5. UTILITY POLE
6. SEWER MANHOLE
7. ELECTRIC METER BOX
8. GAS METER
9. STORM DRAIN MANHOLE
10. WATER METER
11. SEWER CLEAN OUT

SWPPP SIGN AND SWPPP DOCUMENT MUST BE ON SITE DURING CONSTRUCTION.

DOWNSTREAM SEDIMENT TRAPS NEED TO EXTEND UP BOTH SIDES FAR ENOUGH TO PREVENT OFFSITE DEPOSITION. FIELD VERIFY.

UTILITY POLE
SEWER MANHOLE
ELECTRIC METER BOX
GAS METER
STORM DRAIN MANHOLE
WATER METER
SEWER CLEAN OUT

Jonathan DeGray
ARCHITECT
317 Ontario Avenue
Park City, UT 84060
Tel. 435-649-7263, E-mail: degrayarch@qwestoffice.net

DATE: 2/13/2023 11:39:12 PM
PROJECT NUMBER:
SHEET NUMBER:
REVISIONS:

THE GRAPHIC MATERIAL AND DESIGN ON THIS SHEET ARE INSTRUMENTS OF SERVICE AND REMAIN AT ALL TIMES THE PROPERTY OF JONATHAN DEGRAY - ARCHITECT P.C. VIOLATORS WILL BE PROSECUTED TO THE FULLEST EXTENT OF THE LAW.
Floor Plan Mid Level

Floor Plan Lower Level
DOOR SCHEDULE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MARK</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>DOOR</th>
<th>HALL</th>
<th>FRAME TYPE</th>
<th>REMARKS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LOWER LEVEL DOORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MARK</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>DOOR</th>
<th>HALL</th>
<th>FRAME TYPE</th>
<th>REMARKS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MID LEVEL DOORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MARK</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>DOOR</th>
<th>HALL</th>
<th>FRAME TYPE</th>
<th>REMARKS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOP LEVEL DOORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MARK</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>DOOR</th>
<th>HALL</th>
<th>FRAME TYPE</th>
<th>REMARKS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

WINDOW SCHEDULE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MARK</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>FRAME</th>
<th>MAT'L</th>
<th>FINISH</th>
<th>REMARKS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

WINDOW NOTES

- ALL WINDOWS TO HAVE A MIN. U-VALUE OF 0.31
- ALL WINDOWS TO HAVE A MIN. GLAZING AREA OF 24" HT.
- ALL WINDOWS TO HAVE A MIN. NET CLEAR OPENING OF 5.7 S/F
- ALL WINDOWS TO HAVE A MIN. SILL HT. OF 44" FROM FLOOR
- GLAZING IN HAZARDOUS LOCATION IS REQUIRED TO BE GLAZED WITH SAFETY MATERIAL. IRC SECTION R308.3 AND R308.4.
- GLAZING IN HAZARDOUS LOCATION IS REQUIRED TO BE GLAZED WITH SAFETY MATERIAL. IRC SECTION R308.3 AND R308.4.
- ALL WINDOWS, EXCEPT WINDOWS SHOWN AS "NO GLAZING", SHALL BE PROVIDED WITH SAFETY GLAZING MATERIAL.
- ALL WINDOWS, EXCEPT WINDOWS SHOWN AS "NO GLAZING", SHALL BE PROVIDED WITH SAFETY GLAZING MATERIAL.
- ALL WINDOWS, EXCEPT WINDOWS SHOWN AS "NO GLAZING", SHALL BE PROVIDED WITH SAFETY GLAZING MATERIAL.
- ALL WINDOWS, EXCEPT WINDOWS SHOWN AS "NO GLAZING", SHALL BE PROVIDED WITH SAFETY GLAZING MATERIAL.
- ALL WINDOWS, EXCEPT WINDOWS SHOWN AS "NO GLAZING", SHALL BE PROVIDED WITH SAFETY GLAZING MATERIAL.

ROOM FINISH SCHEDULE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FLOOR</th>
<th>WALL NAME</th>
<th>MATERIAL</th>
<th>COLOR</th>
<th>REMARKS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DATE:  
REVISIONS:  
SCHEDULES:  

Jonathan DeGray  
Architect  
P.O. Box 1674, 614 Main Street, Suite 302, Park City, 84060  
Tel. 435-649-7263, E-mail: degrayarch@qwestoffice.net
# PHYSICAL CONDITIONS REPORT
For Use with the Historic District Design Review (HDDR) Application

For Official Use Only

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PLANNER:</th>
<th>APPLICATION #:</th>
<th>DATE RECEIVED:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

## PROJECT INFORMATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME:</th>
<th>ADDRESS:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mary Louden</td>
<td>317 Ontario Ave.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TAX ID:</th>
<th>OR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PC-455</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBDIVISION:</th>
<th>OR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SURVEY:</th>
<th>LOT #:</th>
<th>BLOCK #:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HISTORIC DESIGNATION:</th>
<th>LANDMARK</th>
<th>SIGNIFICANT</th>
<th>NOT HISTORIC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

## APPLICANT INFORMATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME:</th>
<th>MAILING ADDRESS:</th>
<th>ADDRESS:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mary Louden</td>
<td>5441 Night Sage Ln.</td>
<td>Fort Worth, TX 76109</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PHONE #:</th>
<th>FAX #:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(817) 296-6279</td>
<td>( ) -</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EMAIL:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:melouden@gmail.com">melouden@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## APPLICANT’S REPRESENTATIVE INFORMATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME:</th>
<th>PHONE #:</th>
<th>EMAIL:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jonathan DeGray - Architect</td>
<td>(435-649-7263</td>
<td><a href="mailto:degrayarch@qwestoffice.net">degrayarch@qwestoffice.net</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.
ACKNOWLEDGMENT OF RESPONSIBILITY

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: ____________________________________________
Name of Applicant: Mary Louden
Mailing Address: 5441 Night Sage Ln.
Address: Fort Worth, TX 76109
Phone #: (817) 296-6279 Fax #: ( ) -
Email: melouden@gmail.com
Type of Application: ________________________________________________

AFFIRMATION OF SUFFICIENT INTEREST

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: Mary Louden
Mailing Address: 5441 Night Sage Ln.
Street Address/ Legal Description of Subject Property: 317 Ontario Ave. Single old town lot with single family home.

Signature: ____________________________________________ Date: __________________________

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 attach 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.

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.
PHYSICAL CONDITIONS REPORT

Detailed Description of Existing Conditions. 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element/Feature:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This involves:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑ An original part of the building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ A later addition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated date of construction:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Describe existing feature:

Building site appears original on the west, historic front, but heavily modified on the rear or east side. The home access was originally via a sidewalk off Shortys Stair. At some point a stair off Ontario was created and an addition to the rear that allows access to the home via a roof top patio.

Describe any deficiencies: Existing Condition: ☑ Excellent ☐ Good ☐ Fair ☐ Poor

Stairs and roof top deck from Ontario appear to be new construction and incompliance with building code.

Photo Numbers: 1-23 Illustration Numbers: |
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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element/Feature:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This involves:</td>
<td>□ An original part of the building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☑ A later addition</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Describe existing feature:

The building structure has been renovated. Addition of a shed dormer and roof top deck appear to have been done at the same time. The building sits on a new foundation.


Describe any deficiencies:

Existing Condition: □ Excellent ☑ Good □ Fair □ Poor

Existing foundation and frame structure are in good condition.

Photo Numbers: 7,8,10,16,17,25-24 Illustration Numbers: ____________________________

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.
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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element/Feature:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This involves:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑️ A later addition</td>
<td>Estimated date of construction: ____________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Describe existing feature:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roof was renovated same time as the rest of the home.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Describe any deficiencies:</td>
<td>Existing Condition: ☐ Excellent ☑️ Good ☐ Fair ☐ Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appears in good condition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photo Numbers: 25-34</td>
<td>Illustration Numbers:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**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.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element/Feature:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

This involves:  
- [ ] An original part of the building  
- [ ] A later addition  

Estimated date of construction: 

Describe existing feature:

**There is no existing chimney**

Describe any deficiencies:  
Existing Condition:  
- [ ] Excellent  
- [ ] Good  
- [ ] Fair  
- [ ] Poor

Photo Numbers: ___________________________  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.

Element/Feature: ______________________________________

This involves:  □ An original part of the building
               ☑ A later addition

Estimated date of construction: __________________________

Describe existing feature:

Building appears to have been renovated previously. Exterior walls appear in good condition.

Describe any deficiencies:  

Existing Condition:  □ Excellent  ☑ Good  □ Fair  □ Poor

None

Photo Numbers:  See all photos  Illustration Numbers: __________________________

Building appears to have been renovated previously. Exterior walls appear in good condition.

None

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.
### 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element/Feature:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

This involves:  

- [ ] An original part of the building  
- [✓] A later addition  

Estimated date of construction: _________________

Describe existing feature:

**Foundation appears new.**

Describe any deficiencies:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing Condition:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>□ Excellent</td>
<td>[✓] Good</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Photo Numbers: 7-17  
Illustration Numbers:  

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.
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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element/Feature:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This involves:

☑ A later addition
☐ An original part of the building

Estimated date of construction: ________________

Describe existing feature:

Porch appears to have been reconstructed as part of previous addition.

Describe any deficiencies:

Existing Condition: ☐ Excellent ☑ Good ☐ Fair ☐ Poor

Photo Numbers: 7, 8, 13, 14, 15

Illustration 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element/Feature:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This involves:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑️ A later addition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated date of construction:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Describe existing feature:

Existing systems appear to be no more than 10 years old

Describe any deficiencies:

Existing Condition: ☑️ Good

Photo Numbers: 28

Illustration Numbers:
9. Door Survey

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.
**Door Survey Form**

Total number of door openings on the exterior of the structure: 4
Number of historic doors on the structure: 0
Number of existing replacement/non-historic doors: 4
Number of doors completely missing: 0

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

Number of doors to be replaced: 0

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Door #</th>
<th>Existing Condition (Excellent, Good, Fair, Poor)</th>
<th>Describe any deficiencies</th>
<th>Photo #</th>
<th>Historic (50 years or older)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Door is new</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Door is new</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Door is new</td>
<td>16, Sim</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>206</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>New Terrace Door</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.
10. Window Survey

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 Form**

Total number of window openings on the exterior of the structure: 6
Number of historic windows on the structure: 1
Number of existing replacement/non-historic windows: 5
Number of windows completely missing: 0

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

Number of windows to be replaced: 0

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Window #:</th>
<th>Existing Condition (Excellent, Good, Fair, Poor):</th>
<th>Describe any deficiencies:</th>
<th>Photo #:</th>
<th>Historic (50 years or older):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Historic Double Hung</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Fixed Picture</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Double Hung</td>
<td>10,30</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Double Hung</td>
<td>14,25</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Double Hung</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Double Hung</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element/Feature:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This involves:</td>
<td>☑ A later addition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ An original part of the building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Estimated date of construction: ________________</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Describe existing feature:

Interior was updated during the last remodel

Describe any deficiencies:  

Existing Condition: ☑ Good  ☐ Excellent  ☐ Fair  ☐ Poor

Photo Numbers: 25-34  
Illustration Numbers: ____________________________

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Signature of Applicant: Jonathan DeGray Date: 3-28-23
Name of Applicant: Jonathan DeGray - Architect
### Historic Preservation Plan

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

#### For Official Use Only

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PLANNER:</th>
<th>APPLICATION #:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DATE RECEIVED:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PLANNING DIRECTOR</th>
<th>CHIEF BUILDING OFFICIAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**APPROVAL DATE/INITIALS:**

| APPLICATION #:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**APPLICATION #:**

**DATE RECEIVED:**

### Project Information

- **LANDMARK:**
- **SIGNIFICANT:**
- **DISTRICT:**

**NAME:**

**ADDRESS:**

**TAX ID:**

**OR**

**SUBDIVISION:**

**OR**

**SURVEY:**

**LOT #:**

**BLOCK #:**

### Applicant Information

**NAME:** Jonathan DeGray - Architect

**PHONE #:** (435-649-7263)

**FAX #:**

**EMAIL:** degrayarch@qwestoffice.net

---

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element/Feature:</th>
<th>Preservation</th>
<th>Restoration</th>
<th>Reconstruction</th>
<th>Rehabilitation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

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

The historic home will be maintained in it's existing location and condition. Changes to the site will occur between the existing home and Ontario Ave to accomodate the construction of the addition. The existing roof top deck and stair will be removed.

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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element/Feature:</th>
<th>Preservation</th>
<th>Restoration</th>
<th>Reconstruction</th>
<th>Rehabilitation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

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

The rear wall of the historic home will be modified to accomodate attachment of the new addition. All other parts of the historic home exterior will remain as is.
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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element/Feature:</th>
<th>Preservation</th>
<th>Restoration</th>
<th>Reconstruction</th>
<th>Rehabilitation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

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

The none historic low slope shed roof at the rear of the historic form will be modified to accept the addition.

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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element/Feature:</th>
<th>Preservation</th>
<th>Restoration</th>
<th>Reconstruction</th>
<th>Rehabilitation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

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

There is no chimney existing or proposed.
**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.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element/Feature:</th>
<th>Preservation</th>
<th>Restoration</th>
<th>Reconstruction</th>
<th>Rehabilitation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This involves:</td>
<td>☑ Preservation</td>
<td>☑ Restoration</td>
<td>☑ Reconstruction</td>
<td>☑ Rehabilitation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

The rear wall, east wall, of the historic form and the non historic existing addition will be modified to accept the new addition attachment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element/Feature:</th>
<th>Preservation</th>
<th>Restoration</th>
<th>Reconstruction</th>
<th>Rehabilitation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This involves:</td>
<td>☑ Preservation</td>
<td>☑ Restoration</td>
<td>☑ Reconstruction</td>
<td>☑ Rehabilitation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element/Feature:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This involves:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

*There is no plan to change the historic form foundation, The foundation of the existing non historic rear addition will be modified.*

**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.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element/Feature:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This involves:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element/Feature:</th>
<th>Preservation</th>
<th>Restoration</th>
<th>Reconstruction</th>
<th>Rehabilitation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

This involves:  

- ✔ Preservation  
- ☐ Restoration  
- ☐ Reconstruction  
- ☐ Rehabilitation  

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

The existing front door of the historic form will remain. The existing rear doors in the non historic additions will be removed and replaced with period appropriate doors per the approved plan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element/Feature:</th>
<th>Preservation</th>
<th>Restoration</th>
<th>Reconstruction</th>
<th>Rehabilitation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

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:
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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element/Feature:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This involves:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑ Preservation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Restoration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Reconstruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Rehabilitation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

All windows in the historic form will remain as is.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element/Feature:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This involves:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Preservation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Restoration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Reconstruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Rehabilitation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element/Feature:</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

This involves:  
- [ ] Preservation  
- [ ] Restoration  
- [x] Reconstruction  
- [ ] Rehabilitation

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

Mechanical, electrical and plumbing systems will be replaced per the interior remodel and addition as presented in the approved plans.

**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.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element/Feature:</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

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:


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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Signature of Applicant: Jonathan DeGray Date: 3-28-23
Name of Applicant: Jonathan DeGray
HISTORIC SITE FORM
Utah State Historic Preservation Office

1 IDENTIFICATION

Name of Property: Thomas Savage House

Address: 316 Ontario Avenue

City, County: Park City, Summit, Utah

Current Owner Name: Cathleen and Craig A. Savage (jt.)

Current Owner Address: PO Box 762
Park City, UT 84060

Legal Description (include acreage): see continuation sheet

2 STATUS/USE

Property Category Evaluation Use

- building(s) eligible/contributing Original Use: single dwelling
- structure ineligible/non-contributing Current Use: single dwelling
- site out-of-period
- object

3 DOCUMENTATION

Photos: Dates

- digital: Nov. 2013 (3)
- prints: 2006, 1940s

Drawings and Plans

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

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

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

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

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


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


Researcher/Organization: Daniel Carmen / CRSA Architecture

Date: October 2015
4 ARCHITECTURAL DESCRIPTION

Building Style/Type: cross-wing type / vernacular style

No. Stories: 1

Foundation Material: not verified

Wall Material(s): drop-novelty wood siding

Additions: none x minor _ major (describe below)

Alterations: none x minor _ major (describe below)

Number of associated outbuildings _0_ and/or structures _0_.

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

316 Ontario is a cross-wing type house, which has retained many of its original historical elements. The cross-wing, also known as a T/L cottage, is one of the main three house types built during the historic Park City mining era. The cross gable roof is sheathed with composition shingles. There is a small shed extension off the north side of the house, which can be seen in the c. 1940 tax photo and remains largely unchanged. The walls are clad with drop-novelty wood siding. There is a pair of one-over-one double hung sash windows in the front gable end and a single window of the same type next to the door under the porch. Storm windows are present on all these windows. The windows in the gable end have a wood pediment header and although it closely matches the original, it appears to be newer. The porch is covered by a shed extension of the roof and is supported by simple wood square posts with no railing. The door is a wood frame and panel door. The site slopes up from the street and a wood stair leads to the porch from the sidewalk. No foundation is visible in the available photographs, thus its materiality remains unverified. The overall form and materiality of the building remains intact and the building retains its historic value.

5 HISTORY

Architect/Builder: unknown

Date of Construction: c. 1895

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

(see instructions for details)

C Architecture _

C Agriculture _

C Commerce _

C Communications _

C Community Planning & Development _

C Conservation _

C Economics _

C Education _

C Engineering _

C Entertainment/Recreation _

C Ethnic Heritage _

C Exploration/Settlement _

C Health/Medicine _

C Industry _

C Invention _

C Architecture _

C Landscape _

C Literature _

C Maritime History _

C Military _

C Performing Arts _

C Politics/Government _

C Religion _

C Science _

C Social History _

C Transportation _

C Other: Mining _

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

This house appears on the 1900 Sanborn Insurance map, which was the first of those maps to cover this area, making it difficult to determine exactly when it was built. The property was initially owned by the Park City Townsite Corporation, and may have been used to house workers at that time. The title history shows that it was sold to James Mehan in 1916, who sold it shortly after to Thomas Savage.

Thomas Savage appears on the 1920 census, living in this house with his wife Maria and their daughter Margaret. They were born in Ireland, and immigrated to the U.S. in 1910 and 1915 respectively. Thomas worked as a miner, and was caught in a cave-in in 1923, while working for the Daly West mine. He died from injuries sustained in that accident in 1924. His wife Maria sold the house to Thomas’s brother Herbert in that same year.

Herbert Savage is noted as owning an occupying this house on both the 1930 and 1940 census. His family consisted of his wife Margaret, and their four children. He was also born in Ireland, and came to the U.S. in 1913. He worked as a miner, and was killed in a snow slide in 1949. The property stayed in his family until 2014, when it was sold to the current owners, Alcalde Properties LLC.
Legal Description (include acreage): A PORTION OF LOTS 4 & 5 BLK 59 AMENDED PLAT OF PARK CITY SURVEY; MORE PARTICULARLY DESC AS FOLLOWS: BEG AT A PT S 23°38'00" E 13.59 FT ALONG THE E'LY R/W LINE OF ONTARIO AVE FROM THE NW COR OF LOT 5, BLK 59 PARK CITY SURVEY; & RUN TH N 66°22'00" E 44.38 FT; TH N 71°15'01" E 30.73 FT TO THE E'LY LINE OF LOTS 5 & 4; TH ALONG SD E'LY LINE S 23°38'00" E 33.80 FT TO THE SE'LY COR OF LOT 4; TH S 66°22'00" W 75 FT TO THE SW'LY COR OF LOT 4 & TH E'LY R/W LINE OF ONTARIO AVE; TH ALONG SD E'LY LINE N 23°38'00" W 36.41 FT TO THE PT OF BEG CONT 2691 SQ FT OR 0.062 AC; ALSO LOT 3 BLK 59 PARK CITY SURVEY CONT 1875 SQ FT (LESS 1637 SQ FT 574-132 PC-487-A)(LESS 0.01 AC 1461-1324 PC-492-1-A) BAL 0.06 AC 574-134 619-32 (REF:NWD-216547-134 619-32) 2092-1672
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TRANSACTION DATES</th>
<th>GRANTOR (SELLER)</th>
<th>GRANTEE (BUYER)</th>
<th>TYPE OF TRANSACTION</th>
<th>DOLLAR AMOUNT</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12/22/1882</td>
<td>Edward P. Ferry</td>
<td>David McLaughlin</td>
<td>W.D.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/13/1916</td>
<td>W.I. Snyder</td>
<td>James Mehan</td>
<td>W.D.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/29/1916</td>
<td>James Mehan</td>
<td>Tom Savage</td>
<td>W.D.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/23/1922</td>
<td>Tom Savage</td>
<td>Maria Savage</td>
<td>W.D.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lot 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/29/1924</td>
<td>Maria Savage</td>
<td>Herbert Savage</td>
<td>W.D.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/7/1939</td>
<td>Summit County</td>
<td>Herbert Savage</td>
<td>Red. Cert.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/6/1991</td>
<td>John, William, and Cathleen Savage</td>
<td>Cathleen Savage</td>
<td>Q.C.D</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lot 3 and portion of Lots 4 &amp; 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/24/2014</td>
<td>Craig Savage</td>
<td>Alcalde Properties LLC</td>
<td>W.D.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Researcher: Daniel Carmen, CRSA Architecture  
Date: 10/30/2014
Outside of extents of 1889 Sanborn map
Thomas Savage Dies

Yesterday morning at the Miners Hospital, Thomas Savage, the unfortunate young man who on the 31st of last May was caved on while at work in the Daly West and suffered a broken back, succumbed to his awful injuries, after nine months of suffering.

Deceased had been in Park City for thirteen years, always popular with his fellow workmen, and a genial, all round good fellow with hosts of friends. His awful accident caused wide spread regret and sorrow, and his passing away while a severe shock to his loved ones came as a relief, because of much suffering, with no hope of recovery. To the bereaved young widow and brother sympathy goes out in their sad affliction.

Thomas Savage was a native of Ireland, and was thirty-five years old on the 18th of last August. He came to America fourteen years ago, working in Colorado a year before coming to Park City. He is survived by his widow and one child, also a brother, Herbert Savage, who resides in this city.

Funeral services will be held at the Catholic church next Monday morning at 10 o'clock.

Park Record 2/15/1924

Miner Killed In Snow Slide—Two Escape

A tragic death occurred Monday afternoon when Herbert Savage was caught in a snow slide and two others, Owen Perrod and Leonard Addy, narrowly escaped the avalanche of snow that thundered down the hillside just south of the last home in Empire canyon.

Herbert Savage's body was recovered by rescue workers approximately half an hour after the slide occurred.

Injured were Leonard Addy, who suffered minor bruises.

Owen Perrod, under care of a physician, was at his home for treatment of shock, bruises and a cut on the jaw suffered when a rescue worker's shovelfoul ganged him.

Occurred at 4 p.m.

The slide occurred at approximately 4 p.m.—only a few minutes after more than 50 men employed at the Judge and Alliance Mill were on route from their work to their homes.

Consisting of top-over snow which was deposited by a blizzard which raged here Sunday, the slide came down the mountainside "like water coming down a mountain," in the words of John Busio who witnessed the spectacle.

The slide deposited about 25 feet of snow on the canyon highway, its length was approximately 175 feet.

Mr. Busio, Nick Naglich and Joe Lopez, who live in neighboring homes a short distance below the slide area, were credited Monday night with spreading the alarm which brought rescue work promptly enough to save Addy and Perrod from suffocation.

Heard Slide's Rumbling

Mr. Busio said he was cleaning the snow from the roof of his chicken coop when he heard a rumbling noise a short distance up the canyon.

Watching the slide engulf Mr. Savage, Mr. Addy and Mr. Perrod, he called to Mr. Naglich and Mr. Lopez. The three ran to where the victims were last seen and frantically began shoveling to reach them. Other neighbors living farther down the canyon, attracted by the roar, rushed to join the rescue effort.

Mr. Addy "ran" the slide and was unharmed.

Caught Full Force

Mr. Perrod was caught with the full force of the slide and was thrown against the side of the canyon, where rescuers reached him after a few minutes digging.

He said Monday night that "it picked me up and whipped me around and set me down near a telephone pole."

The body of Mr. Savage was found under approximately six feet of snow after rescuers and police had probed for half an hour the area where he was last seen. Sheriff George M. Fisher, Dr. C. A. Laffoon, and members of the Park City fire department worked over Mr. Savage for approximately half an hour before he was pronounced dead. His body was removed from the slide area at about 6 p.m.

Amazing Predigf[as]

Less than five minutes before the slide rumbled down about 50 men employed at the Judge and Alliance Mill had passed the slide area. They returned to the scene when they heard the slide and participated in the rescue operations.

Property Damage Light

Only property damage as result of the slide was to Mr. Lopez's chicken coop, which was partially wrecked.

Services Friday

Funeral services for Herbert William Savage will be conducted tomorrow, Friday, at 10 a.m. in St. Mary's of the Assumption Catholic church by Rev. William F. Kennedy.

Mr. Savage was born July 31, 1891, at Tullymore, Newcastle, Ireland, and had been a resident of this city for the past 40 years. He was a miner.

He was a charter member of Miners Mill and Smelter Workers union, local No. 99, and of St. Mary's of the Assumption parish. He married Mary Mulcahy December 23, 1917 in this city.

Surviving are his widow and three sons and two daughters: John T., Roland H. William J., Bridget Margaret and Kathleen Savage, all of this city.

Holy rosary will be recited Thursday at 8 p.m. at Archer mortuary. Friends may call at the mortuary Thursday and Friday prior to services. Burial will be in the city cemetery.

Park Record 2/10/1949
316 Ontario Avenue, Park City, Summit County, Utah

Intensive Level Survey—Biographical and Historical Research Materials

Tax photo c. 1940