PUBLIC NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that the HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD of Park City, Utah will hold its Historic Preservation Board Meeting at the City Council Chambers, 445 Marsac Avenue, Park City, Utah 84060 for the purposes and at the times as described below on Wednesday, December 2, 2020.

NOTICE OF ELECTRONIC MEETING & HOW TO COMMENT VIRTUALLY:
This meeting will be an electronic meeting without an anchor location as permitted by Utah Code Open and Public Meetings Act section 52-4-207(4) as amended June 18, 2020, and Park City Resolution 18-2020, adopted March 19, 2020. The written determination of a substantial health and safety risk, required by Utah Code section 52-4-207(4) is attached as Exhibit A. Historic Preservation Board members will connect electronically. Public comments will be accepted virtually as described below.

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

Exhibit A: Determination of Substantial Health and Safety Risk

On December 2, 2020 the Board Chairperson determined that conducting a meeting with an anchor location presents a substantial risk to the health and safety of those who may be present at the anchor location.

Utah Code section 52-4-207(4) requires this determination and the facts upon which it is based, which include: • Governor Herbert declared a COVID-19 State of Emergency on November 8, 2020. • Summit County has extended its Emergency Declaration and Public Health Emergency Declaration through January 8, 2021. • Statewide COVID cases and hospitalizations are increasing exponentially.

This determination is valid for 30 days, and is set to expire on January 2, 2021.

Dated: December 2, 2020

MEETING CALLED TO ORDER AT 5:00 PM.

1. ROLL CALL

2. MINUTES APPROVAL

2.A. Consideration to Approve the Historic Preservation Board Meeting Minutes from November 4, 2020.
3. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS

4. STAFF AND BOARD COMMUNICATIONS AND DISCLOSURES

5. CONTINUATIONS

5.A. 1003 Norfolk Avenue – Historic District Design Review
(A) Public Hearing (B) Continue to January 6, 2021
1003 Norfolk Avenue Continuation Staff Report

6. REGULAR AGENDA

6.A. 221 Main Street – Historic District Design Review
Historic Preservation Board Review for Material Deconstruction of a Landmark Historic Site – The Applicant is Proposing to replace an existing window on the side façade with a door. PL-20-04462
(A) Public Hearing (B) Possible Action

Staff Report
Exhibit A: Draft Action Letter
Exhibit B: Existing and Proposed Plans
Exhibit C: Physical Conditions Report and Historic Preservation Plan
Exhibit D: Historic Site Inventory Form
Exhibit E: Photographs from November 9, 2020 Staff Site Visit

7. ADJOURN

A majority of HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD members may meet socially after the meeting. If so, the location will be announced by the HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD Chair Person. City business will not be conducted. Pursuant to the Americans with Disabilities Act, individuals needing special accommodations during the meeting should notify the Planning Department at 435-615-5060 or planning@parkcity.org at least 24 hours prior to the meeting. Wireless internet service is available in the Marsac Building on Wednesdays and Thursdays from 4:00 p.m. to 9:00 p.m. Posted: See: www.parkcity.org

*Parking validations will be provided for meeting attendees that park in the China Bridge parking structure.
PARK CITY MUNICIPAL CORPORATION
HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD
MINUTES OF NOVEMBER 4, 2020

BOARD MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE: Chair Doug Stephens, Lola Beatlebrox, Puggy Holmgren, Jack Hodgkins, John Hutchings, Randy Scott, Tony Toly

EX OFFICIO: Bruce Erickson, Caitlyn Barhorst, Mark Harrington

The Historic Preservation Board meeting was conducted virtually via Zoom. The public was able to submit eComments during the meeting.

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

Determination of the Health and Safety Risk under the OPMA

Chair Stephens read the Determination of Health and Safety Risk under OPMA. Notice of electronic meeting and how to comment virtually. The meeting will be an electronic meeting without an anchor location as permitted by Utah Code Open and Public Meetings Act Section 52-4-207(4) as amended June 18, 2020, and Park City Resolution 18-2020 adopted March 19, 2020. The written determination of a substantial health and safety risk, required by Utah Code section 52-4-207(4) attached as Exhibit A.

The Historic Preservation Board Members will connect electronically. Public comments will be accepted virtually. To comment virtually, use eComment or raise your hand on Zoom. eComments submitted before the meeting date will be attached to the packet as appendices. eComments submitted on HPB meeting days will be read aloud. For more information on participating virtually and to listen live, please go to www.parkcity.org

Chair Stephens read from Exhibit A, Determination of Substantial Health and Safety Risk. On October 7, 2020, the Board Chair determined that conducting a meeting with an anchor location presents a substantial risk to the health and safety of those who may be present at the anchor location. Utah Code Section 52-4-207(4) requires this determination and the facts upon which it is based, which include Summit County has extended its emergency declaration and public health emergency declaration through January 8, 2021. Statewide Covid cases and hospitalizations are increasing.

This determination is valid for 30 days and is set to expire on November 7, 2020.
ADOPTION OF MINUTES

Board Member Holmgren referred to page 6, 5th paragraph, and inserted the word \textit{was} in the first sentence to correctly read “Vice-Chair Scott replied that Mr. Alter \textit{was} correct”.

MOTION: Board Member Beatlebrox moved to APPROVE the minutes of October 7, 2020 as corrected. Board Member Scott seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed. Chair Stephens abstained since he was absent from the October 7th meeting.

PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS

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

STAFF/BOARD COMMUNICATIONS AND DISCLOSURES

Director Erickson reported that Doug Stephens had chosen to resign from the position of HPB Chair. The Board would need to elect a new full-time Chair at the next meeting. Director Erickson expressed appreciation for Mr. Stephens time and service. He will remain on the HPB but not as the Board Chair.

Board Member Stephens stated that because he has not been able to attend HPB Meetings, he thought it was best for Randy Scott to conduct the meeting for 1128 Park Avenue this evening, since Mr. Scott has been chairing the meetings in his absence and was familiar with the project.

Director Erickson stated that because Mr. Stephens had resigned his position as Board Chair, Randy Scott would chair the remainder of the meeting this evening in his role of Vice-Chair.

REGULAR AGENDA


Planner Barhorst reported that this was the third HPB meeting regarding Material Deconstruction on the Landmark site at 1128 Park Avenue.

Planner Barhorst provided a brief overview of the prior discussions and what needed to be decided this evening based on the site visit with the Board yesterday.
Planner Barhorst stated that per the Code under the Material Deconstruction Section, the HPB reviews the removal of historic material to accommodate new additions, new construction, or structural upgrades. She noted that the review authority reviews the proposed plans for compliance with the LMC Design Guidelines.

Planner Barhorst remarked that this meeting would have two parts. The first is to focus on the contributing status of the shed addition, which has been a major part of the discussion since the September HPB meeting. She noted that the Staff had done a full review of the three proposals. Based on the direction given at the last meeting, the Staff wanted the ability to make final action of approval or denial based on the applicant’s proposals. The exhibits in the Staff report were included for all three proposals, which included a draft letter of denial based on the Staff’s analysis; and a draft letter of approval which leaves blanks for the HPB to make findings for approval for one of the proposals.

Planner Barhorst noted that the shed addition at the rear intersection of the T cottage of the site is in question at this point. The applicant has requested determination of the contributing status of this portion of the building with regards to constructing the new addition and transitional element required per the design guidelines. She reported that the house was originally a Park Avenue facing shotgun house. Since the first meeting, the Staff determined that the south facing cross gable was added at some point between 1907 and 1929 as the first phase of the addition. A shed was added after that time period and shows up in the 1929 Sanborn map. Planner Barhorst had included a series of photos in the Staff report that clearly shows the shingles in the cross-T addition.

Planner Barhorst thought it was important to note that this property appears to be the only extant example of a cross-T footprint Park City house that was originally a shotgun that was added on to with a side cross gable rather than what is typically seen. It was either constructed as an original T or L shape, or it was a hall-parlor house with the front facing gable added. It is a unique property in the sense of its construction history.

Planner Barhorst presented a slide showing the original roof of the shotgun house and the original chimney. She pointed out the roof and construction of the floor in the shed additional being discussed this evening. Planner Barhorst noted that there was no evidence of a foundation having existed. As previously discussed, the Sanborn map has a slight offset in the wall plane on the south facade. There is no real evidence supporting the fact that the Sanborn map condition is not the condition that currently exists. She clarified that the purpose of the site visit yesterday was to give the Board the opportunity to look at the interior demolition. Planner Barhorst presented another photo showing the roof shingles of the cross-T addition, which puts the shed/kitchen footprint at a later date.
Planner Barhorst stated that in her analysis of the project, her findings point towards the fact that the shed addition is contributing to the historic integrity of this Landmark site and should be considered in the footprint of the historic structure with regards to the transitional element requirements.

Planner Barhorst stated that the Landmark site criteria in the Land Management Code points to three main concepts. Currently, here analysis is focused on Item B, which is in question for retaining the historic integrity in terms of location, design, settings, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association as defined by the National Park Service. Planner Barhorst reported that the property was nominated in the thematic nomination of 1984 for the Mining Boom Era residences in Park City. It was not listed because the owner objected; however, it still qualifies for listing on the National Register. She noted that the nomination form speaks specifically to a shed extension at the rear of a house. It is complimentary to the house in scale and materials. In period rear extensions are part of Park City’s architectural vocabulary. Although in many cases an extension represents a major alteration of the original house, it usually contributes to the significance of a house because it documents the most common and acceptable method of expansion of the small Park City House.

Planner Barhorst had included a few definitions to help the Board understand what they were discussing this evening. The definition of a contributing building, structure, site/area or object is a building which is main, attached, detached, or public, accessory building structure site or object that is determined by the Historic Preservation Board to meet the specific criteria set forth in LMC 15-11-10, which is the section regarding the Historic Sites Inventory criteria. Planner Barhorst continued, a portion of an existing building, an accessory building structure or object may also be considered contributory to the historical significance of a building or site if it reflects the historical or architectural character of the site or district as designated by the Historic Preservation Board.

Planner Barhorst commented on the applicant’s proposed treatment of restoring the footprint back to the T footprint that existed between 1907 and 1929, as evidence by the Sanborn maps and the physical evidence that was found in the roof structure. She noted that it would be reviewed under Approach Number 3, Restoration, from the design guidelines document from 2009 that was still be updated with the new guidelines. She stated that restoration centers on retaining materials from the most significant period in the property’s history. Since changes in a site convey important information about the development history of that site and its structures, restoration is less common than preservation or rehabilitation. Planner Barhorst read the actual definition in the LMC regarding restoration, “The act or process of accurately depicting the form, features, and character of a property as it appeared at a particular period of time by means of removal of features from other periods in its history, and reconstruction of
missing features from the restoration period”. She pointed to the fact that the definition speaks to other periods in its history, and the fact that this property has designated its historic era between 1894 and 1930, the Mature Mining Era. She presented a snapshot from the Historic Sites Inventory form for this property.

Planner Barhorst stated that it this specific house is unique in the fact that it was originally a shotgun house, it was added on to twice, and it has three phases of construction within the historic period as defined in the HSI, which end in the 1930 date. Planner Barhorst noted that this was the issue the HPB needed to decide this evening. The applicant was requesting a determination on whether the shed addition is considered contributing to the historic integrity of this specific property.

Board Member Hutchings asked if the construction of the house was unique. He could think of two other structures that were constructed in the same way as the initial 1907 structure and the various additions. Planner Barhorst explained that this structure is specifically unique because the original footprint is a shotgun house, rather than the parlor house with a front porch that goes across the entire house. The front gable was added to the shotgun form. That makes it different from the others.

Board Member Hodgkins asked about 1125 Park Avenue. Planner Barhorst replied that the Staff believes that 1125 Park Avenue was built as the T. The structure at 1128 Park Avenue became a T-cottage by addition; and because it was a shotgun form that had a side gable added rather than the front gable.

Board Member Beatlebrox understood that the applicant was not proposing any demolition or to remove anything regarding the shotgun house or the T-addition; and therefore, the uniqueness would remain. Planner Barhorst replied that the T-form would remain, and the structure would still be unique.

Board Member Hodgkins noted that the maps do not suggest that the house ever had a front porch. Planner Barhorst replied that it was difficult to date because sometimes the maps show the porch and other times not. She assumed it probably had some type of lean-to but not necessarily a porch with a floor. She pointed out the entrance which she believed was added to the primary facade. Based on the Sanborn maps, it was hard to tell what was there exactly.

Kevin Horn, the project architect clarified that the applicant intends to keep the shotgun and T-addition to maintain the historic character and uniqueness of the property. Mr. Horn commented on the National Register and noted that Planner Barhorst mentioned that the original owner in 1984 declined being on the National Register. As a matter of consistency, he was unsure whether they could now add those National Historic requirements when it was already memorialized in the HSI that the owner had declined.
Board Member Hodgkins asked Mr. Horn to further clarify his comment regarding the National Register. Mr. Horn explained that when all these homes were put on the Historic Site Inventory, the owners had an opportunity to either accept being part of the National Register or decline to be part of the National Register. Planner Barhorst stated that the Historic Sites Inventory was codified as it currently exists. The initial version was in 2007. At that time the Historic Sites Inventory criteria of retaining historic integrity per the National Register is where the overlap occurs. Planner Barhorst clarified that the 1984 nomination form and the owner objection was at that level. The Historic Sites Inventory was codified and the owner objection was clarified.

Board Member Hodgkins asked if Planner Barhorst was saying that it was not listed individually, but it was listed as part of the Historic District. Planner Barhorst stated that it is not listed because the owner objected; however, because everything is the same as when it was qualified in the 1984 analysis, the structure should still qualify today for the National Register per HSI criteria (B).

Mr. Horn understood that by Code the structure is part of the Park City Historic Sites Inventory. If the owner exercises their right to decline, it is not part of the National Register of Historic Places. Board Member Hodgkins thought the only difference is that it does not allow the owner to take tax credits. Board Member Toly questioned why an owner would not want the tax credits. Mr. Hodgkins agreed. He did not understand why that would not be an advantage. Mr. Horn stated that specific requirements come with the tax credits.

Mr. Horn stated that requirements also come with the tax credits and he assumed the owner did not want to be limited by those requirements, and therefore, declined.

Assistant City Attorney Harrington stated that early in the process there was not a list. It was presumption of historic significance if certain criteria were met. The thematic nomination was part of that presumption of historic significance until the City had a consultant prepare the actual list. It was not uncommon for people to opt out of the National Register. Board Member Hodgkins asked if Mr. Harrington was saying that people opted out because of the local requirements and not necessarily the national requirements. Mr. Harrington clarified that without knowing anything for sure, this was all speculation. He remarked that the City program was at its infancy at that point and people were weary of any listing or designation because they were concerned about voluntarily restricting their property. Mr. Harrington stated that the HSI list is adopted differently than the thematic nomination. He noted that the criteria overlap because they incorporate the references specifically in some sections; however, the fact that someone declined has no bearing on the application of the criteria if it is incorporated in the Code.
Board Member Hodgkins had concerns with using the term restrictions, especially regarding the National Registry. He understood that the restrictions are set at the local level. There are only incentives to have it registered at the National level. He wanted that to be clear.

Mr. Horn noted that Planner Barhorst had shown four options on a historic project, one being restoration. He noted that he did 222 Sandridge, 1055 Norfolk, and he was currently about to finish 158 Main, 1119 Park Avenue, and 526 Park Avenue. Mr. Horn stated that a portion of those projects were approached with restoration and they maintained the historic portion of the home. For example, the home at 1119 Park Avenue had a garage and they added a roof on to that garage and made it part of the home. Mr. Horn stated that they upgraded the historic nature of that garage to work with the home because it was a 1960s concrete block addition. He thought 1055 Norfolk was the best example of a home that was oddly added on to and refaced, and how they took it back to its period of the T-shape and worked from there. Mr. Horn remarked that they have been doing this kind of approach over the past ten years under the same guidelines as now. The difference is Code, but he did not believe the Code was meant to throw away or speak against the Guidelines they have been using for the past several years. He pointed out that there were many other projects that he did not do that took the restoration approach.

Mr. Horn stated that with that approach, the original thought was to take off the shed and focus on the significant T-form that makes the house significant. Mr. Horn noted that the original and the T have rough sawn dimensional lumber. The addition has nominal dimension lumber with a smooth sawcut. It is a more modern construction, which shows that it was not built at the same time. The shingles also indicate it was not built at the same time. As they pick a time period to restore the historic portion to, it is not out of line to restore it to a time that pre-dated this shed addition.

Mr. Horn stated that they were directed by the HPB to analyze this as being removed as a non-historic element. The other would be not to do a restoration and do a preservation of everything intact as it is, including the shed. In that scenario, he would question that it is contributory to the significance of the shotgun with the T-addition, which they will maintain.

Planner Barhorst clarified that the Board was being asked to consider Proposals 1, 2 and 2(b) outlined in the Staff report.

Vice-Chair Scott noted that the question for the Board is whether the shed structure is contributory to the historic significance of the building.
Board Member Holmgren stated that at one point in the past there was a committee called Save Our Sheds, because they were being quickly and easily demolished without notice. She recalled that the HPB awarded a grant to property owners on Hillside because they restored a shed on their property. Ms. Holmgren remarked that the group went through the city because so many sheds were falling down, and people were taking the wood to build other things. She felt strongly that the shed is an integral part of this house.

Board Member Beatlebrox thought Save Our Sheds was about freestanding sheds and outbuildings, not ones that were attached. She felt they were talking about two different circumstances. Board Member Holmgren replied that it was very open and intended to save all historic sheds. It was at the time when the HPB was first started as opposed to the HDC. There were some contentious meetings, but they all agreed on saving the sheds.

Mr. Horn noted that he has participated in shed preservation; specifically, at 222 Sandridge and 526 Park Avenue. He believed this was different because the type of roof slope is a shed roof. If it had been a gable addition, he did not think they would be calling it a shed.

Board Member Beatlebrox commented on how her thinking has evolved since they started reviewing this project a few months ago. She stated that the first month they were looking at a plan with a clean line taking it back to the T-shape, and keeping the structure Landmark because it was taking it back to a particular time in history between 1907 and 1929. Ms. Beatlebrox thought the transitional element made sense, and the massing of the addition appeared to be proportionate. She pointed out that in a later meeting the Board was concerned about the shed addition and requested a site visit. As soon as she climbed the ladder and looked at the A-frame from the interior and the roof tiles, she felt that was the essence of the house and that the shed was tacked on because somebody needed more room. She did not think it was a great piece of architecture. Ms. Beatlebrox remarked that in the second month she still had the same opinion that the first design was a viable design and would definitely from the side of going down Park Avenue, accentuate the T-shape and keep the facade beautiful and historic right on Park Avenue. In looking at old pictures, the shed is not visible because of shrubbery and cars.

Board Member Beatlebrox noted that in the third month the HPB looked at the interior demo and she could see both sides of the issue. She could see the stone foundation below, which is historic, and very old wood. However, in her opinion, it was not definitive that the shed was old and needed to be preserved. Ms. Beatlebrox mentioned Crescent Tram and the Rio Grande as examples of projects that were taken back to an earlier year. She noted that the Star Hotel was demolished and will be restored to a year that will be unfamiliar to many people, but it will still remain a Landmark building.
Board Member Beatlebrox pointed out that this applicant wants to preserve and not demolish the main building. She could vote either way on whether the shed is contributory, but personally, she thought the main facade facing Park Avenue and the A-line of the T is the most important architectural piece. It would be a dealbreaker for her if that piece was not preserved and restored.

Board Member Hutchings stated that after looking at this, he came to the conclusion that the shed is contributory to the significance for all the reasons outlined in the Staff report. He thought the shed addition was common to what people were doing with these homes during that historic area. It did not believe it was unique. Mr. Hutchings remarked that other preservation projects have included these types of additions, as well as preserving the original and the T-addition.

Board Member Hodgkins understood the points about historic significance. He agreed with the other examples where they allowed other buildings to go back to a particular period in time. Mr. Hodgkins was unclear on what year the applicant was looking to restore this property. He also had a difficult time believing that the property could be restored to include the L, without including the shed. Mr. Hodgkins did not believe there was much evidence to suggest that they were added in much later times. He understood that they point to the roof and that the roofline suggests that the roof on the shed piece was built at a different time. He thought there were many examples of that around Park City, especially in buildings as old as the one at 1128 Park Avenue. Mr. Hodgkins stated that there have been years with significant snow loads and plenty of roofs have failed, including a theater where the whole roof collapsed. He did not think it was inconceivable to think that the roof was flatter initially and that somebody replaced it with a steeper roof that would shed the snow more appropriately. In looking at the floorboards and the foundation, it was evident that someone took great effort to build it. He took exception to the term “tacked on” because someone thought through the space and spent time building the foundation. Mr. Hodgkins did not believe it was an afterthought.

In terms of integrity, Board Member Hodgkins stated that removing the last lien-to-space would be “disneylanding” what they think of as historic for Park City, which is the traditionally L-shaped, T-house they are more familiar with that was done in a later time period. He thought it was important to keep in mind that this is an 1895 house with an addition that was completed by 1907. Mr. Hodgkins felt strongly that the volume in this location is historic and should not be discounted. He clarified that he was not suggesting that the owner could not go back and remove the whole thing and return to the shotgun house. However, he found it difficult to keep half of the addition rather than whole piece, because from the standpoint of integrity it is a combined unit, including all three parts.
Board Member Toly stated that she was not able to attend either of the site visits and would refrain from commenting.

Vice-Chair Scott stated that he could see both sides. He thought it was interesting that the house started out as a shotgun home. There are imperfections in home construction in Park City and they are challenged with keeping those imperfections. Even the way that rooflines do not lineup is beautiful and tells part of the story for the implied T-cottage that is so familiar in the community.

Vice-Chair Scott stated that when he was able to look at the addition and the difference in lumber, he thought it tells a story of a fairly different time period. He knows that it shows up in the 1924 Sanborn maps, but based on what he saw, he thought it was quite a bit later. Vice-Chair Scott stated that for some reason it lost a little bit of its significance yesterday when he walked through it, and it caused him to pause. He was on the fence, and in his opinion, it is most important to preserve the visual element that they all recognize. He understood Board Member Hodgkin’s point about the “disneylanding” of Park City because they do not want everything to look the same.

Vice-Chair Scott stated that a secondary issue is the addition that was placed on this unit prior to 1929. If they choose to say it is historic, it sets a precedent for others.

Board Member Stephens stated that in looking at the 1929 Sanborn map and the shed addition off the back, it only goes out as far as the rear gable on the original shotgun. However, when you visit the site, you can see that the shed actually goes out further. Planner Barhorst noted that where the wall breaks is hidden by the trees. Since it does not show up in the Sanborn map as existing in the historic period, and per the changes to the material deconstruction Code, the Staff can review and approve the removal of non-historic additions.

Board Member Stephens pointed out that the siding is historic. Mr. Hodgkins stated that there is a break in the siding, and it does not follow through. Mr. Stephens replied that his point is that the shed addition is actually two additions. He noted that all over Park City, they have historically dealt with the fact that these houses may have three or four additions. The question is at what point do they allow removal of additions to properties, and at what point do they not allow it. Mr. Stephens stated that if they go down the path of 50 years old or shows up on the Sanborn map, would they need to keep every addition. He thought that would make it difficult for people to redo these historic homes for today’s uses. Mr. Stephens clarified that he was not making an argument for keeping or not keeping the addition. His concern was more about the criteria for when an addition should be kept and when it can be removed.
Vice-Chair Scott thought an addition should be kept when it falls in the same era as the main home. Planner Barhorst stated that this was how she interprets it as well. Board Member Hodgkins agreed that it should be the period that is most historic. In this case they were saying the Mining Era, which ends in the early 1930s. He noted that the last addition piece was beyond that period. Mr. Hodgkins stated that if the owner chose to restore it to the 1930s or 1940s and wanted to leave it in place, they could.

Board Member Hodgkins stated that in looking at preservation in General, buildings are preserved to a certain period in time when someone takes the time and effort to preserve them. They make that decision on what to leave and what to remove because buildings have a fourth dimension and pieces keep getting added over time. He pointed out that this house is about to have another addition added to it. Mr. Hodgkins remarked that the question is how to peel back to what is essential for the historic piece.

Mr. Horn stated that David Baglino had built all the projects he has designed over the last ten years and he was on the line and asking to make comments. Mr. Baglino was unmuted. Mr. Baglino stated that the majority of the homes have had multiple additions similar to the one at 1128 Park Avenue. He noted that it was typical for every home to have two or more additions. On most of the homes they picked the oldest historic period to restore the house back to its original configuration. Mr. Baglino remarked that in many cases, it was not uncommon for an exterior shed to be tacked onto the house and used as interior living space. He felt that occurred on this house. He noted that the low ceiling in certain spots does not meet Code. He did not fully understand why going back to the original shotgun was not a good viable option for this project, because it restores the original integrity of the home and removes what has been “scabbed” on.

Planner Barhorst informed Mr. Baglino that it was already determined that the shed was carefully constructed and not just tacked on.

Planner Barhorst explained the different proposals to help the Board get a better idea of how the contributing nature will play a role in the transitional element and design of the addition, which is part of deciding which proposal is most compliant with the design guidelines. Proposal 1 is whether the shed being removed or if it is determined that the shed needs to be preserved. The applicant put forth Proposal 2(a) which uses the shed addition as the transitional element. Proposal 2(b) creates a wall offset from the south elevation; however, an addition is constructed on to the top of the roof of the historic structure.

Board Member Beatlebrox thought it would all hinge on whether the shed addition is contributory. Board Member Hodgkins agreed. He did not understand
why they were looking at the proposals. He thought they should be making the determination based on the findings of facts.

City Attorney Mark Harrington explained that the threshold determination isolates which one the Board can focus on for their options. The expectation is that if the majority agrees it is contributory, they can look at Proposal 2 as the mostly likely option to start with their analysis. He noted that the Board could also go through each one and vote them up or down pursuant to the proposed findings. For the sake of efficiency, Planner Barhorst thought it was more logical to first consider the determination of contributory and that would take them to the appropriate option to consider.

Mr. Horn thought this all hinged on Item 9, the transitional element, which says historic or contributory. If the Board determines it to be historic, the question will be whether it is contributory to the significant portion and form of the structure. He asked the Board to first address the historic aspect and then whether it is contributory because it affects Options 2(a) and 2(b).

Planner Barhorst stated that Design Guideline #9 is the review for each of the three proposals. Under the transitional element guidelines, it states “when an existing non-historic or non-contributory addition is used as a transitional element, the proceeding guidelines for transitional elements shall not apply”. This is where Proposals 2(a) and 2(b) keep the shed addition but have varying degrees of using it as a transitional element.

Board Member Stephens thought the Board was only deciding whether or not the shed addition is contributory and should remain as part of the house, and to give the applicant the parameters for material deconstruction on the shed addition. Mr. Stephens stated that the three proposals were fairly architectural, and he did not believe the HPB has the purview to do design review. He thought that would fall under the HDDR and the Historic District Guidelines as applied by Staff. Planner Barhorst stated that the Design Guidelines compliance regarding the transitional element, which is affecting the material deconstruction of the shed addition, is the Code that was changed at the beginning of March. Planner Barhorst clarified that the shed proposal for removal needs to comply with the design guidelines and be reviewed for compliance. She noted that the HPB could make findings that are different from the Staff’s proposed findings.

Board Member Beatlebrox agreed with Board Member Stephens that the crux of the matter is whether or not the shed is contributory. If the Board determines that it is contributory, the first proposal will not apply, and the other two proposals need to be looked at for compliance with the remaining guidelines. Ms. Beatlebrox thought it was a straightforward decision and she was frustrated that in three months the Board has never voted on this application. The result is a frustrated Board and a frustrated applicant.
Vice-Chair Scott understood that Proposal 1 was the applicant’s ideal situation. If it is considered contributory, then they would like the Board to look at the other two proposals. Kevin Horn reiterated that in his opinion it is either historic or contributory because they are not treated the same as they move forward. In the initial proposal, they considered the shed not historic and not contributory. After a previous HPB meeting, if it was deemed to stay, they looked at how they might work with it under that circumstance, in which case contributory enters in.

Mr. Alter, the applicant, understood all their points of view; however, he wanted to know to what extent precedent applies. He believed there was significant precedent for the approach of going back to a specific period of time and doing the restoration approach. He asked about the Board’s policy on that without any change in law or guidelines.

Planner Barhorst replied that the design guidelines were updated in May 2019. This was the first application to propose a restoration approach under the 2019 Design Guidelines and the March 2020 material deconstruction change, which allowed Staff review of minor alterations and added a review of the Design Guidelines with regards to removing the historic material. Planner Barhorst was unsure whether the precedent question could be answered.

Board Member Beatlebrox thought it was an important concept. She cited three precedents this evening, and she did not believe there was anything in the LMC that forbids it. Planner Barhorst stated that the Design Guidelines analysis that the Staff completed addresses loss of historic material, etc.

Vice-Chair Scott pointed out that the applicant was going back to a period, not a specific year. He believed the logjam in this application is that the addition was still in the same mining boom period even if it was at the very end. Planner Barhorst remarked that this specific house is the shotgun T-addition shed additions. She clarified that this Landmark site is the only one like it that has been found in the Sanborn Map studies.

Board Member Hutchings believed his house was another example of an initial shotgun house, a T-addition, and a shed that was built after the T-addition by 1920. His home is also a Landmark home and another example that is exactly like 1128 Park Avenue. Mr. Hutchings stated that when the Board did the analysis on this house, they determined that the shed was historic.

Director Erickson suggested that Vice-Chair Scott do a straw poll on the historic nature of the shed, and then move forward to findings of fact and conclusions of law per the design guidelines.
Board Member Beatlebrox understood that the decision was that the shed was contributory, as written in the Staff report. She previously never heard the word historic. Vice-Chair Scott disagreed because in the packet it is referred to as a “historic shed addition” in the Staff report. Planner Barhorst believed the consensus was that the shed addition is very likely historic. The contributing nature to the proposed restoration to the T-cottage is what they need to vote on. If it is voted that the shed addition is contributing to the structure, the applicant could move forward with it remaining. If it is not contributing, they will need to move forward with removal. Vice-Chair Scott clarified that the question is whether the shed addition is a critical contributing element.

Mr. Alter understood that if they find it non-contributory, it could still remain as a different option for the transitional element. Planner Barhorst replied that he was correct.

Vice-Chair Scott called for a straw poll on whether the shed addition is contributory. Board Member Holmgren asked if the answer is either historic or contributory. Board Member Hodgkins clarified that they were saying that historic is contributory.

Board Members Holmgren, Hodgkins, Hutchings, and Toly answered yes to the shed addition being historic/contributory. Board Members Beatlebrox, Stephens, and Scott answered no. Board Member Stephens thought the shed addition could be removed and still keep the significance of the home.

With the majority believing the shed addition is historic/contributory, the Board moved forward to discuss Proposals 2(a) and 2(b).

Planner Barhorst stated that Proposal 2(a) was using the shed addition as the transitional element per the #9 Design Guideline. However, since it has been deemed contributory, per her findings Proposal 2(a) is no longer applicable. Planner Barhorst suggested that the Board discuss Proposal 2(b) since there is some form a transitional element.

Board Member Beatlebrox asked if there was no transitional element because the applicant was trying to maximize the footprint on the addition, or because there is no way to put in a transitional element.

Mr. Horn stated that Proposal 2(a) was considered to accomplish what everyone was looking for in terms of compliance with the ordinance, the Board’s desire to have it maintained and preserved, and the owners desire to have sufficient addition to make the project viable to pay for the preservation of the historic portion. In order for that to be accomplished, they would keep and preserve the shed roof addition, but it would need to be deemed non-contributory and they would not need a transition element. Additionally, in his mind, this is not an inline
addition because it has a 5-foot offset. Mr. Horn emphasized that for those reasons there is not a transitional element.

Board Member Beatlebrox recalled that Planner Barhorst had said that it did not comply because there was no transitional element. Planner Barhorst answered yes. She noted that there are specific guidelines regarding the width of the transitional element and that it needs to be set in from the corners of the affected historic elevation by a minimum of two feet. There is also a depth requirement. Another guidelines states that where the new addition abuts the historic building, a clear transitional element between the old and the new should be designed and constructed. Planner Barhorst stated that Mr. Horn was correct in saying that if the shed addition was deemed non-contributing, the transitional element requirements per exception #9 would not apply.

Board Member Beatlebrox agreed with the offset and that the difference was evident, but transitional elements are elegant and definitive in how they present the historic home and how they distance themselves from the modern or new construction. In her opinion, transitional elements are extremely important. Planner Barhorst noted that very specific guidelines in the LMC address that issue.

Board Member Hodgkins thought they needed to be careful not to confuse the guidelines of a transitional element as the definition of a transitional element. He stated that the guidelines give specifics, but why it is called transitional is never defined. Mr. Hodgkins stated that when they are not defining terms, they need to refer to the National Park Service or other places to understand the definition of a transitional element. He believed a transitional element is a new addition that is subordinate to the historic structure and needs to set it apart and make the new addition be visually distinguishable from the historic structure. In his mind, he wants to be able see and read the historic building without being distracted by the addition. He believes that gets to the integrity of a historic renovation.

Planner Barhorst reviewed Proposal 2(b). She noted that this proposal was brought forth as a revision to Proposal 2(a). The Staff was asking for a clearer transition from the old and the new and pointed to the Design Guideline regarding the wall offset of two feet to create a band of space. Planner Barhorst stated that per her analysis, the addition in this floorplan directly sits above both the historic shotgun gable and a portion of the historic shed addition, which does not comply with the Design Guidelines.

Board Member Beatlebrox asked if anyone wanted to change their vote on the straw poll. She believed there were consequences of saying that this was a contributory shed. One of the consequences is that the first proposal was viable and it can come back into play if someone changes their vote. However, another consequence is that the applicant would need to downsize his proposal for the
addition. She pointed out that the HPB does not have the purview to address the addition. Vice-Chair Scott agreed. The HPB is tasked with determining the historic nature of the property.

Board Member Hodgkins asked why the addition was so close to the old house and why the applicant wanted to keep it that close. Mr. Horn replied that this home and the adjacent home are set back an additional amount from Park Avenue, which leaves a very small space behind the house for an addition and a transition element would take up all the buildable space.

Board Member Beatlebrox stated that yesterday she walked through a large portion of the backyard that is owned by Park City Municipal. There is 10-foot setback from that lot line, which leaves a very small area for an addition. She believed that was a unique problem with this particular property. Ms. Beatlebrox emphasized that the HPB is only concerned with the historic nature of the original house. That was the reason for looking at both proposals. Vice-Chair Scott agreed, noting that the conflict is the desire for someone to preserve the home.

Planner Barhorst stated that this property is in the HRM zone, which does not have the same footprint restrictions as most HR-1 projects. She stated that design of the addition was not within the purview of the HPB. She noted that the design was still under review because it was contingent on whether or not the historic shed was designated as contributing.

Mr. Alter stated that the Board’s decision could potentially leave the property sitting for years without being preserved. Board Member Holmgren pointed out that there are rules against neglecting property. Mr. Alter clarified that he was not suggesting neglect, but the property would not be renovated. He thought one of the goals was to work together to encourage people to do these renovations. Board Member Hodgkins stated that it is a goal, but it must be done within the guidelines and the allotted space. If the lot size was not changed, you can only build so much and still preserve the integrity. Mr. Hodgkins thought there were other avenues for the applicant to pursue such as variances, but he did not believe they should sacrifice the historic integrity of a very old home in Park City because of the lot line.

Mr. Alter thought there was a lot of precedence and instances where additions have not been removed are the minority rather than the majority. He believed precedence was on the side of going back to a historic period and removing the shed. Based on the smooth 2x4s, he believed the shed addition came after the 1940s. Planner Barhorst disagreed. She stated that the 2x4 dimension currently seen in Home Depot came about in the 1960s. Since Park City had very close access to railroads, they most likely had building materials early on when the lumber mills started to regulate a more consistent dimension for lumber. There was no way to know for sure unless they did some testing of the actual tree rings.
Mr. Alter recalled from the last discussion that there was no need to do a site visit if they were not trying to determine when it was built because the materials appeared to be much later than the other part of the home. At that time, everyone agreed to visit the site to make that determination. He thought the site visit showed that it was very different than the part that it was attached to; however, the Board decision is now the same.

Vice-Chair Scott appreciated the three site visits. He did not believe the second visit was impactful enough and the visit yesterday was a rerun from what they had previously requested. He understood Mr. Alter’s comments; however, the Board made the decision that the historic shed is significant and contributory to the historic structure.

Dave Baglino understood that they would no longer be allowed to tear off any portions of the home to take it back to its Mining Era original build, which meant that everything historic from here forward on every building will need to be kept. He noted that in the past the applicant was allowed to pick the timeframe they wanted to put it back to but that would no longer be the case. Mr. Baglino stated that the Board was making a significant decision because it will need to be followed forever, which is not what has been followed in the past.

Planner Barhorst understood Mr. Baglino’s concern. She explained that every project is reviewed case by case as to the specific contributing elements. She noted that there are various examples of Significant sites that retain less historic integrity automatically because they are not Landmark. She stated that the HPB would be discussing another property with a similar issue following this item. Planner Barhorst clarified that the conversation is still site by site and not completely off the table. However, for this specific property at 1128 Park Avenue, the decision is that the shed addition is historic and contributing to the integrity of the Landmark site.

Mr. Baglino used a property on Norfolk where they ended up doing exploratory research and found an octagon looking front porch area that was very unique for its historic time period, and everyone agreed they should take it back to that era. Mr. Baglino stated that they were allowed to rip off the front of the house and take it back to the original date because it was unique. They lost square footage by changing it back to its original existence, but it looked much nicer. Mr. Baglino felt that the decision made this evening would no longer allow them to do that. He stated that they were not trying to get square footage in all situations. For this property the intent is to put everything back to its original form and also gain square footage to make it a viable project. He thought there should be set rules so when someone buys a historic house they know what is allowed.
Board Member Hodgkins pointed out that when the Land Management Code changed, the integrity of historic preservation changed with it. Board Member Beatlebrox did not believe the LMC change prevented a homeowner from taking a Landmark or a Significant house back to a certain date. Mr. Hodgkins clarified that he was not saying that it did. He noted that the applicant has not said what date it would be restored too. Ms. Beatlebrox thought it was obvious from the picture that they were restoring it to the date before the shed was added, but there is no evidence on the exact timeframe. Mr. Hodgkins did not think they could prove that the two never went hand in hand. He thought the foundation appears to continue across from one to the other.

Mr. Horn stated that there is a significant difference in time. The T and the rear shed are very different. He pointed out that no one would have shingled their attic and then added on to it. Board Member Hodgkins clarified that he never said the roofline has always been that way. He did not think the shingles Mr. Horn was pointing to were historic. Mr. Hodgkins stated that changing the roofline to how it was originally is acceptable.

Planner Barhorst asked City Attorney Harrington to direct the HPB on the next step.

City Attorney Harrington stated that there were several ways to proceed. The applicant could choose to propose which application proposal he would prefer to have voted up or down for purposes of final action. For potential positive action, the first decision regarding the contributing shed pushes the decision to Proposal 2(a) or 2(b). From what he heard from the discussion, he thought 2(a) was the most acceptable. Mr. Harrington stated that the only option for a positive action on 2(a) would be to fill in the blanks in the proposed findings in a manner that references conditions of approval to achieve compliance with the Design Guidelines outlined in the Staff report. The negative action finds no compliance on the transition element and a reduction in the dominant form of the setback for the adjacent structure. Mr. Harrington stated that the blanks would be complies as conditioned, and they would add two conditions to make it clear to the applicant what they want the Staff to consider as they finalize the Design Guideline Review. Other than that option, unless the applicant specifies differently, it was best for the Board to deny Proposal 2(a) pursuant to the findings of fact proposed by Staff and as modified by anything they want to add or delete.

Vice-Chair Scott understood that the Mr. Harrington was suggesting the Board choose the option that gets them closest to their action, and then modify the action letter of denial with findings of fact and proposed conditions. Planner Barhorst explained that based on the option proposed by City Attorney Harrington, if the applicant wants to pursue action of approval based on the draft final action letter of approval for 2(a), which is Exhibit J, that would be contingent
upon conditions that the HPB can add in approving a version of 2(a) where the transitional element will need to come into compliance with the Design Guidelines. Board Member Hodgkins assumed this option would prevent a future HPB meeting and put it in the hands of the Staff. Planner Barhorst replied that he was correct.

Board Member Stephens understood that it would go to the Staff anyway through the HDDR process. He was confused as to why they were not doing a proposal that only deals with whether or not the shed addition is contributory. City Attorney Harrington replied that the Board did not want to delegate the subsequent decision 100% to Staff. This is a hybrid year for the HPB in terms of whether it works. They want sufficient detail to say the deconstruction complies with the design guidelines, but they are not approving all the other features and the design behind it. The Board wants to approve the transition element to know that it complies. Ms. Harrington stated that it would be a bit of a push for the Board to say they like what they see except for the transition element and they are going to condition it. He remarked that they were trying to thread the needle in terms of not having a circular process where the applicant comes back repeatedly for a decision.

Mr. Harrington emphasized that the primary decision is determining what can and cannot be removed. He noted that the Board made the primary decision by a four to three determination to keep the shed intact. The next decision is whether the Board wants to see the detail in the transition element, or whether they are comfortable with the overall concept and conditioning that with referencing the specific language of the applicable design guideline.

Board Member Beatlebrox asked if the transition element is the contributory shed itself. Mr. Horn stated that if it were deemed “non-contributory” then yes, it would be the transition element. He thought that was the difficulty because the ordinance basically says if it is a bad addition that was done in 1970 or 1980 it could remain. If it looks historic, it needs to either come off to a point or have another element tied to it.

City Attorney Harrington explained that the Planning Commission and the City Council saw too many things removed too easily, and they wanted to eliminate the first option where if it was significant and contributing it should not be removed, but it still requires the transition element. He thought that was where this decision was headed unless someone changed their mind. The question is whether the Board wants to condition that or deny these particular applications and make the applicant come back with a demonstration of how the transition element will occur at the material deconstruction point.

Planner Barhorst stated that the applicant could also decide if they want a denial of Proposal 2(a) based on the Staff’s proposed findings of fact and conclusions of
law in Exhibit J. Mr. Horn asked if by denying 2(a) means they are not denying Option 1. City Attorney Harrington stated that the Board can only vote on one option. If the applicant wants a specific proposal denied for purposes of an appeal, they should specify which one they want the Board to act. Otherwise, the Board will act on the option most consistent with their determination of the contributing nature of the shed. Mr. Harrington pointed out that normally an applicant would only be allowed to bring one proposal to the HPB. However, because of the unique nature of the site visits and the different options, they tried to have different options for the Board, depending on what they decided on the first option.

Mr. Horn stated that two options were presented. One was to remove the shed the second was to keep the shed and preserve it but consider it non-contributory. Vice-Chair Scott informed Mr. Horn that the Board already determined that it was contributory. Mr. Horn understood that the Board was denying both options.

Board Member Stephens pointed out that the Board took a straw poll, but the decision was not made by a motion and vote. He thought they should be looking at Proposal 1, which encapsulates the Board Members who did not believe the shed addition was contributory. Mr. Stephens stated that voting on Proposal 1 would formalize the Board’s position.

Planner Barhorst noted that the Staff’s draft action letters for denial goes back to the claim in the Staff’s analysis that the historic shed addition is contributory. She thought Mr. Stephens was correct that taking action on Proposal 1 would track who were for and against the motion.

Mr. Stephens stated that if Proposal 1 is denied and the applicant appeals to the Board of Adjustment, they would be the appropriate Board to look at whether the applicant was suffering an economic hardship based on unique circumstances of the lot that other property owners did not have.

Vice-Chair Scott called for a motion on Proposal 1. At the request of Board Member Beatlebrox, Planner Barhorst read the Design Guidelines Analysis from the Proposal 1 draft Final Action Letter of Denial, beginning with Finding 16 in the Findings of Fact, Exhibit F in the Staff report. She noted an error in Finding #16 and replaced the word “foundation” with “shed addition”.

MOTION: Board Member Hodgkins moved to DENY Proposal 1 based on the Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law found in the draft action letter, with the change to Finding #16 to replace “foundation” with “shed addition”. Board Member Holmgren seconded the motion.

Vice-Chair Scott apologized for not opening the public hearing before the Board made a motion and took action.

Vice-Chair Scott opened the public hearing.

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

Vice-Chair Scott closed the public hearing.

The Board revoted following the public hearing.

MOTION: Board Member Hodgkins moved to DENY Proposal 1 based on the Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law found in the draft action letter, with the change to Finding #16 to replace “foundation” with “shed addition”. Board Member Holmgren seconded the motion.


Findings of Fact
1. The property is located at 1128 Park Avenue.
2. The Legal Description is All Lot 8 & S 1/2 Lot 9 BLK 56 Snyder’s Addition to Park City. Parcel Number SA-365. This Lot is part of the Double H Plat Amendment approved by Ordinance 2019-28. Upon recordation of the plat, the legal description and parcel number with Summit County will be updated to reflect the change.
3. The property is located in the Historic Residential- Medium Density (HRM) Zoning District.
4. The property at 1128 Park Avenue is designated as Landmark on the Park City Historic Sites Inventory.
5. On July 27, 2020 the Planning Department received a complete Historic District Design Review application.
7. For the September 16, 2020 site visit, staff published notice on the City’s website and posted notice on the property on September 15, 2020. The Park Record published notice on September 12, 2020. For the November 3, 2020 site visit, staff published notice on the City’s website, and posted notice on the

8. The Historic Single-Family Dwelling was constructed circ. 1895.

9. The Minimum Lot Area for a Single-Family Dwelling is 1,875 square feet. This Lot contains 2,812.50 square feet.

10. The applicant has submitted a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) application (PL-20-04607) that is currently under review per LMC 15-2.4-6 Existing Historic Structures. The request is to construct a basement addition beneath the existing historic structure’s footprint that currently does not meet setbacks. This CUP application was approved by the Planning Commission on September 23, 2020.

11. The proposed addition complies with the required Front and Rear Setbacks. The minimum Front and Rear Setbacks are ten feet (10’) each; the Applicant is proposing a ten-foot (10’) Rear Setback for the addition.

12. The proposal complies with the Side Setbacks. The south Side Setback is five feet (5’) and the north Setback is five feet (5’) with the Conditional Use Permit application to approve the construction of the basement addition within the Setback.

13. The proposal complies with LMC 15-2.4-7, with a maximum height of twenty-seven feet (27’) from Existing Grade. The maximum height of the proposed structure is 27 feet (27’). Per LMC 15-2.4-5(A) Any proposed building height exceptions will be reviewed by the Planning Director. No proposed building height exceptions are approved with this action letter.

14. On September 2, 2020, the Historic Preservation Board approved the Material Deconstruction for the Landmark Historic Site consisting of removal of the Historic foundation including lifting the existing floor elevation by two feet (2’) for the construction of a basement. The applicant proposed to lift the Historic Structure from its existing USGS elevation of 6925’- 8 ½” to a new elevation of 6927’- 8 ½” in order to accommodate the new basement foundation.


16. The proposed Material Deconstruction of the Historic shed addition has been reviewed for compliance with LMC § 15-13-2 Design Guidelines for Historic Residential Sites, including the following applicable Design Guidelines:

A. Universal Guidelines:

1. A site should be used as it was historically or be given a new use that requires minimal change to the distinctive materials and features.
   - Does not comply; the applicant proposes to remove the Historic shed addition, a distinctive feature.

2. Changes to a site or building that have acquired historic significance in their own right should be retained and preserved.
• Does not comply; the applicant proposes to remove the Historic shed addition, a change to a building that has acquired historic significance in its own right.

3. The historic exterior features of a building should be retained and preserved.
   • Does not comply; the applicant proposes to remove the Historic shed addition, a historic exterior feature.

4. Distinctive materials, components, finishes, and examples of craftsmanship should be retained and preserved.
   • Does not comply; the applicant proposes to remove the Historic shed addition, a distinctive component to the Landmark Historic Site.

5. Deteriorated or damaged historic features and elements should be repaired rather than replaced.
   • Complies; per the submitted Historic Preservation Plan, the applicant proposes to repair rather than replace all deteriorated or damaged historic features and elements.

6. Features that do not contribute to the significance of the site or building and exist prior to the adoption of these guidelines, such as incompatible windows, aluminum soffits, or iron porch supports or railings, may be maintained; however, if it is proposed they be changed, those features must be brought into compliance with these guidelines.
   • Not applicable; the applicant does not propose to maintain any features that do not contribute to the significance of the building.

7. Each site should be recognized as a physical record of its time, place and use. Owners are discouraged from introducing architectural elements or details that visually modify or alter the original building design when no evidence of such elements or details exists.
   • Complies; the applicant has not proposed to introduce architectural elements or details.

8. Chemical or physical treatments, if appropriate, should be undertaken using recognized preservation methods. Treatments that cause damage to historic materials should not be used. Treatments that sustain and protect, but do not alter appearance, are encouraged.
   • Complies; the applicant is not proposing to use any treatments that cause known damage to historic materials.

9. New construction such as new additions, exterior alterations, repairs, upgrades, etc., should not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the historic site or historic building. New construction should be differentiated from the historic structure while also maintaining compatibility with the historic structure in materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the historic structure, the historic site, and its environment.
• Does not comply; the proposed new construction destroys historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the historic building by proposing to remove the Historic shed addition.

10. New additions and related new 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.
• Complies; the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment could be restored if the proposed new construction were to be removed in the future.

B. Specific Guidelines:

2. Primary Structures
   a. Exterior Walls
      (2) Preserve and maintain historic exterior materials including wood siding (drop siding, clapboard, board and batten), frieze boards, cornices, moldings, shingles, etc., as well as stone and masonry. Repair deteriorated or damaged historic exterior materials using recognized preservation methods appropriate to the specific material.
      • Complies; The applicant proposes to preserve, maintain, and repair the historic exterior materials.

4. Additions to Primary Structures
   a. Protection for Historic Structures and Sites
      (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.
      • Complies; the applicant desires to construct an addition to achieve additional square footage that cannot be accommodated by solely altering interior spaces.
      (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 façades of historic structures are inappropriate.
      • Does not comply; the addition is proposed to be located on the tertiary façade; however, the removal of the Historic shed addition compromises the architectural character of the historic structure by removing a contributing Historic feature.
      (3) Additions should be visually subordinate to historic buildings when viewed from the primary public right-of-way.
      • The Administrative Staff Review of the Historic District Design Review will confirm compliance with this Design Guideline.
      (4) Additions to historic structures shall not be placed so as to obscure, detract from, or modify historic roof forms.
      • Does not comply; the proposed Transitional Element of the addition entirely removes the roof form of the Historic shed addition.
(5) Additions to historic structures shall not contribute significantly to the removal or loss of historic material.
• Does not comply; Based on the submitted information by the applicant, significant loss of historic material is proposed with the removal of the Historic shed addition.
(6) Where the new addition abuts the historic building, a clear transitional element 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.
• Does not comply; the Transitional Element does not comply with the specific guidelines (below) regarding Transitional Elements.
(7) Maintain and preserve additions to structures that are significant to the era/period of restoration.
• Does not comply; Based on the submitted information by the applicant, the Historic shed addition contributes to the Historic Integrity of the Landmark Historic Site.
(8) In-line additions shall be avoided.
• Complies; the proposed addition is not in-line with the Historic Structure.

b. Transitional Elements
1. In-line additions should be avoided and generally are not appropriate.
• Complies; the proposed addition is not in-line with the Historic Structure.
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.
• Does not comply; the proposal removes an addition to the historic structure made within the historic period that has gained historic significance in its own right.
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.
• Not applicable; the addition is greater than 50%.
4. On a rear addition, the width of the transitional element shall not exceed two-thirds (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’).
• Complies; the width of the Historic elevation is 25’-2” and the transitional element is 17’-4” and is set in from the corners by a minimum of two feet.
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.
- Not applicable; no additions to the secondary façade are proposed.

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.
- Complies; the depth of the transitional element on the south elevation is 5’-6” adjacent to the 14’-2” elevation, and the depth of the transitional element on the north elevation is 9’-0” adjacent to the 25’-2” 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.
- Complies; the highest point of the transitional element is a minimum of two feet lower than the highest ridgeline of the historic structure.

8. Balconies and decks may be attached to the secondary façades of a transitional element; however, no roof deck is permitted on the transitional element.
- Not applicable; no balcony or roof deck is proposed 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.
- Not applicable; the applicant is not proposing to use a non-historic or non-contributory addition as the transitional element.

17. The Design Review Committee, Development Review Committee, and Planning and Legal Departments reviewed this application.

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

Conclusions of Law
1. The proposal complies with the Land Management Code requirements pursuant to LMC § 15-2.4 Historic Residential Medium Density (HRM) District, including § 15-2.4-1 through § 15-2.4-5 and § 15-2.4-11
2. The does not comply with the Land Management Code requirements pursuant to LMC § 15-2.4-12 Architectural Review.
3. The proposal does not comply with the Land Management Code requirements pursuant to LMC § 15-11-12.5 Historic Preservation Board Review for Material Deconstruction.

WORK SESSION


Planner Barhorst reported that yesterday the HPB visited the site at 1125 Park Avenue. As outlined in the Staff report, the Staff was requesting discussion and
direction on the contributing status of both the addition that shows up in 1907 where the kitchen is currently located, as well as the small rear addition that shows up in 1929. Planner Barhorst requested that the Board try to better date when this structure was actually built and discuss the contributing status of the two additions.

Planner Barhorst stated that the applicant was prepared to present their thoughts this evening and come back with a proposal once they have a better idea of what the Board thinks.

Jonathan DeGray, the project architect, stated that the applicant was looking for feedback from the HPB on the portions of the house in question. What stays and what goes will affect how the design will be produced. Mr. DeGray believed that the circa 1900 footprint was the original historic form. A kitchen addition was added in 1907. A second addition was added in 1929 as a back bedroom. Mr. DeGray stated that the back bedroom and the non-historic portion shown on the drawing were the main issues. He asked the Board to discuss the 1907 addition. Mr. DeGray noted from the photographs that the 1929 addition abuts the house next door at 1129 Park Avenue, which creates a number of issues they preferred to avoid. He stated that removing the gable back closer to the 1929 Sanborn would be ideal. Mr. DeGray remarked that removal of the bedroom would also be ideal. He indicated the break line in the photograph, which shows where the addition was put on. There would still be encroachment on to the adjacent lot but eliminating the bedroom would help address building Code issues.

Mr. DeGray stated that the applicant would also like to remove the 1907 addition in order to accommodate a garage at the back of the lot. The intrusion of the door in the kitchen restricts the amount of clearance for the driveway. He requested input from the Board regarding removal of that addition.

Wendy Smith, the applicant, was concerned after hearing the long discussion on the house across the street at 1128 Park Avenue. Although this property has similar conditions, she believed this situation was different because she was talking about taking the house back to its original T-form. Ms. Smith thought the applicant for 1128 Park Avenue was less clear on what time period they were going back to.

Board Member Hodgkins asked if the applicant’s preference was to work with the 1900 date. Ms. Smith answered yes. Mr. DeGray pointed out that it could be seen in the Sanborn map. He pointed out how their plan would give a clearance between the two buildings and allow them to incorporate a driveway to a garage at the rear of the property. Mr. Hodgkins thought the only reason for not allowing that would be if there were some historic event or owner that happened at a later date in time. He asked if that had been researched. Mr. DeGray had not done
that research. All they knew at this point is what was on the City’s report for this property.

Ms. Smith stated that everything on the ownership was published on the City report. She understood that the people who lived at 1125 were the in-laws of Mable, who lived in the 1129 Park Avenue house. From there it was sold to Joe and Sherry Buhler. Sherry Buhler was the more recent owner who sold it.

Planner Barhorst reported on additional historic documentation that was contracted out a few years ago but had not yet been adopted into the HSI.

Planner Barhorst stated that she did not have enough time to include much of an analysis in the Staff report. She suggested breaking the discussion into two pieces. The first is whether the kitchen addition contributes to the historic integrity based on its features. The second is whether the back bedroom addition that connects the two structures is contributing.

Vice-Chair Scott asked if this structure was considered Landmark. Ms. Smith answered yes. Mr. Scott understood the long evening, but he thought this was a relevant discussion based on their comments in the previous application. He pointed out that everyone is looking for consistent guidelines, but every home is different. To create one policy that works for all is very difficult.

Vice-Chair Scott clarified that Planner Barhorst was looking for general discussion on how the Board feels about the addition that was added prior to 1907, and how the Board feels about the second addition that was put in prior to 1929. Vice-Chair Scott recognized the building code issue with the bedroom addition, and he was unclear how that could be resolved. Planner Barhorst stated that there is a separation depending on the lot line, which will dictate how the plat amendment goes through. She noted that there will also be conversations of a duplex structure and the existing condition. Planner Barhorst remarked that there are ways to get around it such as sprinkling to meet Fire Code, as well as historic exceptions per the Chief Building Official.

Planner Barhorst gave her preliminary analysis based on some concepts and what features she finds to be the most contributing to the character to this site.

Board Member Stephens clarified that the building issues, lot line issues, fire separation issues, and the driveway were not issues for the HPB to consider. Planner Barhorst replied that he was correct; however, they can be part of the conversation.

Planner Barhorst broke it down to the phases of construction. The structure was built in 1900 as one of the original T-cottages that was built as a T rather than a T by addition. The kitchen addition that shows up in 1907 followed the same lines
as her analysis for the property across the street. Those additions characterize Park City in its essence during that development period where miners built on to their houses when they had more money. She needed to research the records to see whether an actual miner lived in this specific house. Planner Barhorst stated that in concept, those in-period additions make this house unique. The way it was added on and how the siding is in line with the old eave of the original cross gable is an interesting construction method. How it intersects at the roofline is still preserved currently. In her analysis, those little pieces of construction history are important to these character defining features.

Planner Barhorst stated that the addition at the rear did not have as much visual prominence from the right-of-way, but it does connect the structures. Disconnecting the structure removes the potential historic connection between the two. She agreed with Board Member Stephens that the construction issues would need to be resolved depending on the Board’s decision as to whether or not this addition is contributing to the site.

Board Member Hodgkins believed that if the owner wanted to restore the structure historically to a certain date within the mining Era, that they should be able to do so. Planner Barhorst noted that the guidelines allow for that per Staff review and analysis. However, based on her training and background, as well as her understanding of Park City history, a restoration approach for every structure eliminates a lot of history in Park City. Mr. Hodgkins agreed that it was an interesting dilemma. He noted that the Code does not necessarily give preference the decade of 1910 to 1920, which is probably the height of the mining time period in Park City. The Code only talks about the mining period. He agreed that there is history in a lot of additions that get added, but if an owner is serious about restoring a home to its original build, he could not understand why they would object or overrule it.

Vice-Chair Scott was conflicted with what they had decided for the structure across the street at 1128 Park Avenue. For example, if there had been a Sanborn map 1910 image showing the shotgun home with the addition, and then in 1929 the historic shed was added. He asked if Mr. Hodgkins would have voted differently on 1128 Park Avenue if the applicant had specifically wanted to take the home back to 1910. Mr. Hodgkins answered yes. He had argued that if they wanted to take it back to 1895 or 1900 and leave the shotgun house in place, he was in total agreement with that.

Board Member Beatlebrox thought Board Member Hodgkins was contradicting himself. Mr. Hodgkins did not agree that he was contradicting because the Sanborn maps did not tell the history of the house at 1128 Park Avenue. It went from one to another and suddenly both pieces showed up at the same time on the same map. Mr. Beatlebrox did not think that was the applicant’s fault. Mr. Hodgkins noted that the applicant wanted to keep the T addition. If they wanted
to remove it, he was completely fine taking it back to the shotgun form. Planner Barhorst clarified that the difference is an original footprint restoration versus a piecemeal version.

Planner Barhorst stated that Board Member Hodgkin’s comments is the feedback the Staff and applicant wanted in terms of a clear restoration. Board Member Beatlebrox asked if Mr. Hodgkins was saying that the addition would have a transitional element to the right of the shotgun house and then reach back into the back lot. Mr. Hodgkins stated that the LMC has provisions to allow for that. In his opinion, it could be allowed as long as the 1895 house can stand and read alone, and the additions are in the background. Based on his reading of the National Park Guidelines and transitional elements, it is important to see and feel the historic piece, which is why there needs to be a transitional piece.

Board Member Hutchings wanted to know what they should think of as historic. He asked if it was the Sanborn map from 1889. He has always thought of it as the era, and what additions to these homes are contributory to the era, which can extend all the way to the 1920s time period for this particular house. He looks at these additions as historic from the perspective of that was what people were doing with those homes at the time. In his opinion, tearing off most of these additions is removing the historic material.

Board Member Hodgkins agreed. However, in also looking at the LMC, the way it is written does not say the object is to restore the home to 1929, which would include all the additions, and that suddenly the story is completely told and they want to show the story as 1929. Mr. Hodgkins thought it was up to the owner’s discretion how they want to restore their own home.

Board Member Hutchings stated that he was looking at more from the perspective of what the HPB is allowed to permit. He asked if the applicant tells the Board what date they want to restore the home to, and the Board looks at the evidence as to how the structure looked in that time period; or whether the Board needs to look at it from the era. He was unclear on the process and was looking for an answer.

City Attorney Harrington clarified that the key determination is the contributing nature. If they determine it is not contributing, he agreed with Board Member Hodgkins that the owner can pick and choose which non-contributing additions they can keep or remove. However, the Board needs to make that case by case determination on each of those additions, whether they contribute to the current listing and significance of that structure under the City regulations. If it is contributing, they cannot pick and choose which pieces to remove. Mr. Harrington pointed out that it was the counter argument in the last application because their decision was a migration from past applications. The HPB needs to be consistent with how they made the threshold determination. The same
elements that were evaluated in the last application needs to be evaluated with this application, unless there is a different baseline determination that the additions are non-contributing.

Board Member Hutchings asked if the addition is contributing to the era or to a particular date. Using this property as an example, he might suggest that the first addition is contributing to the era, but not to the 1889 date because the Sanborn maps shows it did not exist at that time.

Vice-Chair Scott liked the clarity of Board Member Hodgkin’s approach because it is easy to support. However, he was stuck on the contributing factor of where it starts and where it stops. Mr. Hodgkin’s thought the question was about the history. He believed they were talking architectural history. He did not think they could say Kearns bought the house in 1910, and if they discover he did, they could go back to 1900 because it is contributing in a different way being a historic owner. In terms of historic preservation of architecture, going back to the original design is preferable in looking at how preservation is viewed around the world.

Board Member Stephens stated that they were not contributing to a period as much as contributing to a specific structure. That is the reason for evaluating each structure under each application. Mr. Stephens thought it goes back to Mr. Hodgkin’s comments. If they look at it as contributing to a structure, the property owner has the opportunity to say this is the year of the architectural structure that they want to restore it back to. In this case, Mr. DeGray had mentioned the 1907 Sanborn map, which clearly shows the original mass of the structure. The question is whether it would contribute to the 1907 building, and in this case, he believed it would not. If the applicant wanted to take it back to 1929, then it does contribute to the 1929 building. Mr. Stephens pointed out that it does not contribute to the 1900 building because the addition was not there to begin with.

Board Member Toly asked why every applicant would not go back to the date of the very first original structure. It is the smallest footprint, it is easier to develop, and there are less restrictions and issues. Mr. Stephens replied that it is not always the easiest. For example, in this particular application there are setback issues and encroachments. Once the additions are removed, they cannot go back into the setback. Mr. Stephens believed that most times the applicant will go back to a form of the structure that is easier to work because it gives the architect and the applicant the opportunity to do an appealing addition that meets the types of goals Mr. Hodgkin’s referenced where there is a clear read between the historic structure and the additions.

Board Member Toly asked if the Board ever gets a say in the decision on what the applicant is actually designing. She understood that the Board decides on the historic preservation aspects and not in what the structure will look like. Mr. Stephens pointed out that the HPB can say there needs to be a transition
element to distinctly separate the old from the new. Mr. Stephens stated that every time they give an architect the ability to have a more significant transitional element, they are helping to preserve the historic structure and how it reads from the street.

Vice-Chair Scott understood that the HPB can still give feedback toward the material deconstruction of whatever area is going to be connected to the transition element. Planner Barhorst replied that he was correct.

Board Member Hodgkins thought it would be helpful for the HPB to only see the parts of the house that they have jurisdiction over, rather than the design of the whole house. He asked if it was possible for the Staff to only bring forth the design of the transitional element. Planner Barhorst stated that she had that same thought with previous proposals. If there is consensus among the Board members to change the requirements, she would support that direction.

Board Member Beatlebrox strongly objected to that idea. She thought the mass, scale, and proportion of the addition next to the historic structure is definitely part of the HPB purview. Ms. Beatlebrox believed the Board made that very clear when they reviewed the house next to the Library and in their due diligence when they went through photographs of additions that loomed over and dwarfed historic buildings. Planner Barhorst thought Ms. Beatlebrox concerns had been addressed in the work sessions when the design guidelines were being developed.

Board Member Hodgkins stated that the Board is usually told that the review has not been completed and the Board does not have the purview to talk about the design. Ms. Beatlebrox recalled that the Board definitely made their opinions known. Planner Barhorst stated that the reason for seeing the addition in a previous proposal was because it did not have a transition element. The Staff waits to complete their review until the HPB approves the transitional element, or determines whether the house can be lifted, etc. The Staff has preliminary design discussions, but it is not finalized because things could change depending on the HPB decision. Planner Barhorst suggested the possibility of having the design of the addition approved by Staff first so the HPB has clear direction on what is being presented.

Board Member Stephens agreed more with Board Member Hodgkins. The Board has always left it to the Staff to go through the HDDR process and handle the massing and design details. It is important for the HPB to see how the transition will be handled if they approve the removal of historic material. Mr. Stephens understood that the design review process still goes through the Staff and the Board only looks at it to give the architect and the owner some guidance to start the design review process.
Ms. Smith requested an up or down vote from the HPB even though it was not binding just to have an idea of where the Board stands. Director Erickson stated that the Board could not do a straw poll because the Staff had not completed the analysis. However, each Board member could give their opinion, or Planner Barhorst could summarize the comments from this evening and write a report.

The majority of Board members were comfortable with Planner Barhorst writing a report. Board Member Hodgkins reiterated that he was comfortable with the 1907 or 1900 restoration provided that the Staff review can prove that the structure was not owned at a later date by someone who is historic, or some event occurred at the location at a later date. He stated that the event does not necessarily have to be in the mining period. When they look at preservation, they are talking about 50 years or older.

Director Erickson summarized that the question is whether both additions contribute to the Landmark status of the house. Planner Barhorst noted that Historic Sites form lists three options for a structure: historic era, persons or architecture. For this particular property, the HSI form shows it is under the Mature Mining Era, 1894-1930. She read from the Historic Sites Inventory. “Park City was the center of one of the top three metal mining districts in the State during Utah’s Mining Boom Period of the late 19th and early 20th centuries, and it is one of only two major metal mining communities that have survived to the present. Park City’s houses are the largest and best preserved group of residential buildings in a metal mining town in Utah. As such, they provide the most complete documentation of the residential character of mining towns of that period, including settlement patterns, building materials, construction techniques, and socio-economic makeup. The residences also represent the State’s largest collection of 19th and early 20th century frame houses. They contribute to the understanding of a significant aspect of Park City’s economic growth and architectural development as a mining community”. Planner Barhorst noted that the HSI form does not designate a historic event or persons living there as significant to the history.

Board Member Beatlebrox stated that she was amazed when they went into the kitchen and looked at all the roof lines and all the old wallpaper. To her it reeks history. The fact that it touches the other building is tremendously quirky and very unique.

Board Member Hodgkins agreed with Board Member Beatlebrox. He loves the house as it exists today, and he loves the addition that is non-historic and can be removed. The house tells a great story as it is. Unfortunately, Park City is not trying to create Williamsburg and they need to take that into consideration. He noted that people will be able to see what the home looked like in 1900 versus 1929, and that might be as telling historically as the building across the street that will reflect a decade or two later. Mr. Hodgkins thought there would be a
hodge-podge of preservation dates and each one will tell its own story to a certain date. It has to be that way unless they make all of Old Town a historic museum.

Board Member Stephens agreed with Mr. Hodgkins as he described it. He believed they could give clear direction to the applicant as to which period they were trying to bring it back to, and the applicant can show the nature of the historic house, the additions, and what was done later. Mr. Stephens liked Mr. Hodgkins comment about getting an eclectic historical pattern of built structures in the City that will show what structures were like in different years and different periods. All would be authentic to the point in time that the architect and the applicant brought to the Planning Department and the HPB to make their case. It helps give everyone clarity on what they were trying to do. He thought that was the frustration for the last applicant.

Board Member Stephens pointed out that for 1125 Park Avenue, the applicant and Mr. DeGray have stated that they were looking to bring this back to the 1907 structure. Even if they wanted to do the 1929 structure, the HPB would evaluate what they present and determine whether the addition is contributory to the 1907 structure or to the 1929 structure.

Ms. Smith clarified that she was requesting to go back to the 1900 year. Board Member Hodgkins stated that based on the Sanborn map, the 1907 footprint was the same as the 1900 footprint. Ms. Smith believed it was actually built pre-1900 which was a very unique time. She was excited about doing the transition and making it clear that the structure in back is different.

Board Members Holmgren and Hutchings lost their Zoom connection and were not able to make final comments.

The Historic Preservation Board Meeting adjourned at 8:20 p.m.

Approved by
Randy Scott, Vice-Chair
Historic Preservation Board
Summary Recommendation
Staff recommends the Historic Preservation Board open a public hearing and continue the review of the proposed Material Deconstruction of 1003 Norfolk Avenue to January 6, 2021. Staff is continuing to work with the applicant to review the proposed Restoration of the circ. 1900 footprint. The historical records for this property through photographic evidence is limited and staff is working on developing an accurate record of the property.

Description
Applicant: Gary Bush
Location: 1003 Norfolk Avenue
Zoning District: Historic Residential (HR-1) District
Historic Designation: Landmark
Historic Era: Mature Mining Era, 1894-1930
Reason for Review: Land Management Code (LMC) § 15-11-12.5 Historic Preservation Board Review for Material Deconstruction
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Subject: Material Deconstruction
Application: PL-20-04462
Author: Liz Jackson, Planner
Date: December 2, 2020
Type of Item: Administrative

Summary Recommendation
Staff recommends the Historic Preservation Board review the proposed Material Deconstruction, hold a public hearing, and consider approving the proposed Material Deconstruction based on the Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Conditions Approval as found in the draft Action Letter (Exhibit A).

Description
Applicant: Seth Adams, Riverhorse Ventures LLC
Location: 221 Main Street
Zoning District: Historic Commercial Business (HCB) District
Historic Designation: Landmark
Historic Era: Mature Mining Era, 1894-1930
Reason for Review: Land Management Code (LMC) § 15-11-12.5 Historic Preservation Board Review for Material Deconstruction

Acronyms
HPB Historic Preservation Board
LMC Land Management Code
HDDR Historic District Design Review
HSI Historic Sites Inventory

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

Executive Summary
The Applicant is proposing Material Deconstruction of 221 Main Street, a Landmark Historic Structure. The proposal consists of removing a non-Historic window located in a Historic window opening and installing a door.

Background
The applicant submitted a complete Historic District Design Review (HDDR) Application on October 28, 2020. The property located at 221 Main Street is designated as Landmark of the Park City Historic Sites Inventory (HSI) (see Historic Site Form). The subject property is located in the Historic Commercial Business (HCB) Zoning District. The following is a list of City Applications (past and present) related to the proposed project:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Permit Number</th>
<th>Application Type</th>
<th>Review Authority</th>
<th>Review Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PL-11-01301</td>
<td>Historic District Design Review</td>
<td>Planning Department Staff</td>
<td>Approved for wood window replacements in existing and historic locations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL-20-04462</td>
<td>Historic District Design Review</td>
<td>Planning Department Staff and Historic</td>
<td>Under Review with this Application.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Preservation Board</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**History of Development on the Site**

The Imperial Hotel, the Structure located at 221 Main Street was built circ. 1904 for John and Anna Bogan, who owned it for several years. John Bogan was a miner and owner of the Bogan Mine, which later became part of the rich Silver King Consolidated Mine. The Imperial Hotel is one of the remaining boarding houses built following passage of the boarding house bill in 1901 which revoked the right of the mines’ managements to require that their miners live in the boarding houses near the mines if they were not married or their families were not living in town with them. As miners moved to nicer accommodations a bit further from the mines, this building primarily served to house miners, but during the flu epidemic it was used as an emergency hospital.

It has gone through various minor alterations that do not compromise the historic integrity. The entire upper part of this building was destroyed in a fire circ. 1940 and rebuilt, and the change in roof form can be seen in Image 1 and 2 below, pre and post fire. The building was condemned circ. 1974 and restored later that decade. According to the 1978 Park City Historic Walking Tour brochure created by Bea Kummer and Patricia Smith, the distinctive dormers were added back to the gambrel roof as a part of restoration efforts.

This Site was listed on the National Register of Historic Places in 1984 as part of the Park City Mining Boom Era Residences Thematic District, and the nomination form can be found in the Historic Sites Inventory Form in **Exhibit D** under “Bogan Boarding House.”

The Site currently has a café in the street level (stone foundation) floor, a restaurant in the 1<sup>st</sup> level, and living space in the upper levels up into the gambrel roof and dormer Area.
Figure 1: Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps (circ. 1889-1941)
Image 1: Circ. 1930s photograph (pre-fire)

Image 2: Circ. 1968 photograph
Image 3: Circ. 1970s photograph

Image 4: Circ. 1982 Photograph
In 2014, a Termination of Easements and Declaration of New Easements was recorded with Summit County (Entry no. 01004481). More specifically, this is a Parking and Access Easement, giving 221 Main Street “perpetual easement that will allow the 221 Property Access to the Parking Area in the basement of the 205 Building and exclusively use two parking stalls and then to travel by foot up the elevator in the 205 Building, out the back door and down the sidewalk that will connect to the improvements on the 221 Property.” This sidewalk also allows for emergency egress for the living space on the upper levels of 221 Main Street. In 2016, emergency egress was further clarified in a Modification and Clarification of Easement (Entry No. 01043772 with Summit County) that 221 Main Street could utilize 205 Main Street’s walkway and exit onto Main Street. See Exhibit E for photos of said walkway and Image 6 below. Although the rear access point exists for the upper levels, the Applicant is requesting a more accessible point of entry for those Areas of the Site.
Proposal
The Applicant is requesting that a door be added to replace an existing Historic window opening to access the existing upper level living space, as the existing access is only through the Riverhorse Provisions restaurant or a rear entry (noted in the paragraph above related to the 2014 Parking and Access Easement).
Image 7: 2020 Google Site photograph with subject window called out.

Figure 2: Existing window and proposed door location (see Exhibit B for complete plans)
Figure 2 is taken from the Applicant’s proposed plans and shows the change in dimensions for the proposed door. The existing window’s glass Area is 6’ tall by 2’ 5 ½” wide. The proposed door will be 7’ tall by 2’ 8” wide. Doors in the Historic Districts are typically 6’-8” to 7’ in height.

Staff has not found a historical photograph of the north elevation of the Structure where the door is proposed, but upon a Site visit on November 9, 2020 staff determined the window to be replaced is non-historic. See photographs in Exhibit E. The Historic Site Inventory for this Site calls out “There are several simple openings on the sides of the building…”

The door is for a possible new staircase that will be utilized for access to the upper level living space. The stairs are not a part of this Material Deconstruction review, but their installation will be based on the final action made by HPB. The Applicant has given reasoning for the new opening and stairs as:

“…the stair would be used for a main entrance, We need to get better access to the Historic residence on the 2nd & 3rd floor above provisions. I am unable to rent the property. The Entrance inside the store up to the residence is usable when the store is open, however the side entrance behind the 205 Brownstone is poorly lit/not easily accessible to use the property at 221. I think the stair could be supported from the ground, I have negotiated with Dr. Hoffman the property owner for the square footage of the stair over his property. So it potentially could be supported from below and not attached to the building completely.”

The new stair landing, as they are represented in Exhibit B, would be built out from the existing floor 1 patio Area on the north side of the property. According to the Historic Preservation Plan (Exhibit C) this would be a 4’ wide opening. The materials that would be affected (railing) are non-historic as evidenced by the photographs showing various replacement railings. See images 8 and 9 below.

*Image 8: Existing patio and possible future access point for new stair case*
Analysis
Staff has included relevant LMC sections, as this project proposal is limited in scope and not all aspects of the Code apply.

Per LMC § 15-11-12.5(A)(2) Historic Preservation Board Review for Material Deconstruction:

A. All Applications for Material Deconstruction involving any Building(s) (main, attached, detached, or public, Accessory Buildings and/or Structures designated to the Historic Sites Inventory as Landmark or Significant shall be subject to review and approval, approval with conditions, or denied by the following Review Authorities:

2. The Historic Preservation Board shall review the following:

Prior to issuance of a Building Permit for any Material Deconstruction work, the Review Authority shall review the proposed plans for compliance with the Land Management Code 15-13 Design Guidelines For Historic Districts and Historic Sites.

The Historic Preservation Board shall review the following:
The Applicant is proposing Material Deconstruction for the Landmark Historic Site consisting of removing a non-Historic window located in a Historic window opening and installing a door in its place. There is an existing opening and the wall alcove surrounding the door will not change, just the size of the opening. See Exhibit E photos.
from a staff Site visit.

Staff has reviewed the proposed Material Deconstruction for compliance with LMC §15-13-3 Design Guidelines for Historic Commercial Sites, including the following applicable Design Guidelines. Staff has found that the proposal complies with the following applicable Design Guidelines:

A. Universal Guidelines:
1. A site should be used as it was historically or be given a new use that requires minimal change to the distinctive materials and features.
   - Complies; the Applicant has proposed minimal change to the distinctive materials and features as the proposal affects a secondary façade. The Use is not proposed to change.

2. Changes to a site or building that have acquired Historic significance in their own right should be retained and preserved.
   - Complies; the Applicant has not proposed removal or modifications to changes to the building that have acquired Historic significance.

3. The Historic exterior features of a building should be retained and preserved.
   - Complies; the Applicant proposes to retain and preserve the Historic exterior features. The proposal affects a secondary façade and does not negatively impact the Historic Integrity of the Landmark Historic Site.

4. Distinctive materials, components, finishes, and examples of craftsmanship should be retained and preserved.
   - Complies; the Applicant proposes to retain and preserve the distinctive materials, components, finishes, and examples of craftsmanship. The siding will be replaced and repaired as needed.

5. Deteriorated or damaged Historic features and elements should be repaired rather than replaced.
   - Complies; per the submitted Historic Preservation Plan, the Applicant proposes to repair rather than replace all deteriorated or damaged Historic features and elements.

6. Non-historic alterations that have been made to elements of a property, such as window replacements, eave enclosures, or porch element substitutions, that are in place prior to the adoption of these Design Guidelines may be maintained. However, if additional alterations to these elements are proposed, the elements must be brought into compliance with these Design Guidelines.
   - Complies; The existing window is a non-historic window replacement as permitted in the 2011 application. The proposed modification complies with the Design Guidelines as provided in this analysis.

7. Each site should be recognized as a physical record of its time, place and use. Owners are discouraged from introducing architectural elements or details that visually modify or alter the original building design when no evidence of such elements or details exists.
   - Complies; the Applicant has not proposed to introduce architectural elements or details.
8. Chemical or physical treatments, if appropriate, should be undertaken using recognized preservation methods. Treatments that cause damage to Historic materials should not be used. Treatments that sustain and protect, but do not alter appearance, are encouraged.

- **Complies; the Applicant is not proposing to use any treatments that cause known damage to Historic materials.**

9. New construction, such as additions, exterior alterations, repairs, upgrades, etc. shall not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the historic site or historic building. New construction shall differentiate from the historic structure and, at the same time, be compatible with the historic structure in materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the historic structure, the historic site, and the Historic District.

- **Complies; the proposed exterior alteration does not destroy the Site’s character defining features as the proposed alteration is located on a secondary façade that is beyond the mid-point of the wall.**

10. New additions and related new 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.

- **Complies; the essential form and integrity of the Historic property and its environment could be restored if the proposed new construction were to be removed in the future.**

11. The proposed project must not cause the building, site or Historic District to be removed from the National Register of Historic Places.

- **Complies; the proposed modification does not negatively impact the Historic Integrity as defined by the National Park Service in terms of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association.**

B. Specific Guidelines:

2. Primary Structures
   b. Exterior Walls

   (1) Primary and secondary facade elements, such as window/door configuration, wall planes, recesses, bays, balconies, steps, porches, and entryways shall be preserved and maintained in their original location on the façade.

   - **Complies; the proposed door location is to be located within an existing window opening on the secondary façade.**

   (2) Exterior historic elements including wood siding (drop siding, clapboard, board and batten), frieze boards, cornices, moldings, shingles, etc., as well as stone and masonry shall be preserved and maintained. Deteriorated or damaged historic elements shall be repaired using recognized preservation methods appropriate to the specific material.

   - **Complies as Conditioned; See Condition of Approval #4.**

   (4) When an exterior historic element cannot be repaired, it shall be replaced with materials that match the original in all respects: scale,
dimension, profile, material, texture, and finish. The replacement of an existing historic element is allowed only when it can be demonstrated that the historic element is no longer safe and/or serviceable and cannot be repaired to a safe and/or serviceable condition.

- Complies as Conditioned; See Condition of Approval #4.

e. Doors (not included in Storefronts)

(7) New door openings may be considered on secondary façades. A new opening shall be similar in location, size, and type to those seen on the historic structure.

- Complies; The proposed door will be replacing an existing window opening on the secondary façade, near the rear of the Building and beyond the midpoint. This door shall be similar in design and scale to doors seen in the Historic Districts (COA #3).

f. Windows (not included in Storefronts)

(8) New window openings may be considered on secondary façades but only when placed beyond the midpoint. New window openings shall be similar in location, size, scale, type, and glazing pattern to those seen on the historic structure.

- Complies; The proposed door will be replacing an existing window opening on the secondary façade, near the rear of the Building and beyond the midpoint. This door is similar in design and scale to doors seen in the Historic Districts.

Staff has determined that this Site’s circumstances and Use validate the proposal for a more accessible entry point for the upper levels. The renovation of the non-historic window being replaced by a door will have minimal impact on the Historic integrity and visual character of the Structure overall, and the Code allows for doors and windows to be altered if they are on a secondary façade (see LMC 15-13-2(B)(2)(e) and (f) above). There is good cause for this alteration as this will benefit those that utilize the upper levels of the Structure and the proposed work will not have an overall negative impact on the Site. The Applicant will need to take precaution when designing the stairway that it can be a) legally installed over property lines b) have minimal effect on the Historic Structure and c) not prohibit the Star Hotel at 227 Main Street from accessing the mechanical equipment that will be located below the subject door. Although this isn’t being reviewed at this time, it is related to this project proposal and will need staff and the Applicant’s consideration.

**Recommendation**

Staff recommends the Historic Preservation Board review the proposed Material Deconstruction, hold a public hearing, and consider approving based on the Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Conditions Approval as found in the draft Action Letter (Exhibit A).
**Department Review**
The Design Review Team, Building, Planning, and Legal Departments reviewed this Application.

**Notice**
Per LMC § 15-1-21, staff published notice on the City’s website and the Utah Public Notice website, posted notice on the property, and mailed a courtesy notice to property owners within 100 feet on November 18, 2020. The *Park Record* published notice on November 18, 2020.

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

**Alternatives to Recommended Approval**
- The Historic Preservation Board may request additional information and continue the discussion to December 2, 2020.
- The Historic Preservation Board may deny the proposed Material Deconstruction of 221 Main Street and direct staff to prepare specific Findings and Conclusions reflecting the basis of the Board’s decision.

**Exhibits**
Exhibit A: Draft Action Letter
Exhibit B: Existing and Proposed Plans
Exhibit C: Physical Conditions Report and Historic Preservation Plan
Exhibit D: Historic Site Inventory Form
Exhibit E: Photographs from November 9, 2020 Staff Site Visit
The Historic Preservation Board of Park City, Utah met on Wednesday, December 2, 2020 for a duly noticed meeting. After determining that a quorum was present, the Board conducted its scheduled business.

NOTICE OF HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD ACTION

Project Address: 221 Main Street
Project Number: PL-20-04462
Type of Item: Administrative – Material Deconstruction
Hearing Date: December 2, 2020

Board Action: APPROVED – The Historic Preservation Board conducted a public hearing and found that the proposed Material Deconstruction of the Landmark Historic Site at 221 Main Street complies with the criteria in the Land Management Code, as outlined in the following Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Conditions of Approval.

Findings of Fact
1. The Site is located at 221 Main Street.
2. The Structure is designated as Landmark on the Historic Structures Inventory.
3. The Site is located within the Historic Commercial Business (HCB) Zoning District.
4. On October 28, 2020, the Planning Department deemed a Historic District Design Review (HDDR) Application complete for the property at 221 Main Street. The HDDR Application has not yet been approved as it is dependent on the HPB’s Review for Material Deconstruction approval.
5. The Structure was constructed circa 1904, per Summit County’s records.
6. The Historic Structure Form has identified this Site’s era of historical significance as the Mature Mining Era, 1894 to 1930.
7. The Structure first appears on the 1907 Sanborn Fire Insurance map as a 2 ½ story frame rectangular boarding house (“Lodge”), facing east toward Main Street.
8. The first photograph of the Structure on file was taken circa 1930 from a cross canyon viewpoint.
9. In 2011, a Historic District Design Review waiver letter was issued to replace the windows of this Site via permit PL-11-01301.
10. This Site was listed on the National Register of Historic Places in 1984 as part of the Park City Mining Boom Era Residences Thematic District.

11. The Applicant proposes to remove an existing non-historic window on the north side façade and replace it with a door. This will be the main entrance for the living space above the commercial levels. The existing window’s glass Area is 6’ tall by 2’ 5 ½” wide. The proposed door will be 7’ tall by 2’ 8” wide.

12. The proposed exterior changes shall not damage or destroy the exterior architectural features of the subject property which are compatible with the character of the Historic Structure.

13. In 2014, a Termination of Easements and Declaration of New Easements was recorded with Summit County (Entry no. 01004481). More specifically, this is a Parking and Access Easement, giving 221 Main Street “perpetual easement that will allow the 221 Property Access to the Parking Area in the basement of the 205 Building and exclusively use two parking stalls and then to travel by foot up the elevator in the 205 Building, out the back door and down the sidewalk that will connect to the improvements on the 221 Property.” This sidewalk also allows for emergency egress for the living space on the upper levels of 221 Main Street. In 2016, emergency egress was further clarified in a Modification and Clarification of Easement (Entry No. 01043772 with Summit County) that 221 Main Street could utilize 205 Main Street’s walkway and exit onto Main Street.

14. The Applicant is working with the property owner of 227 Main Street (AKA the Star Hotel) to produce an Encroachment Agreement to allow for stairs to be constructed over the 221 Main Street property line that will lead to the door proposed in this permit (PL-20-04462). Per the Applicant, the door proposed this permit will not be required if an agreement is not formed and the stairs cannot be constructed.

15. This Application’s Affirmation of Sufficient Interest has been signed by the owners of 221 Main Street and 227 Main Street to indicate the owners’ intention to create an Encroachment Agreement for stairs that cross over the property line between the two Sites.


17. The proposed Material Deconstruction of the Historic foundation has been reviewed for compliance with LMC § 15-13-2 Design Guidelines for Historic Residential Sites, including the following applicable Design Guidelines:

A. Universal Guidelines:
   1. A site should be used as it was historically or be given a new use that requires minimal change to the distinctive materials and features.
      - Complies; the Applicant has proposed minimal change to the distinctive materials and features as the proposal affects a secondary façade. The Use is not proposed to change.
2. Changes to a site or building that have acquired Historic significance in their own right should be retained and preserved.
   - Complies; the Applicant has not proposed removal or modifications to changes to the building that have acquired Historic significance.

3. The Historic exterior features of a building should be retained and preserved.
   - Complies; the Applicant proposes to retain and preserve the Historic exterior features. The proposal affects a secondary façade and does not negatively impact the Historic Integrity of the Landmark Historic Site.

4. Distinctive materials, components, finishes, and examples of craftsmanship should be retained and preserved.
   - Complies; the Applicant proposes to retain and preserve the distinctive materials, components, finishes, and examples of craftsmanship. The siding will be replaced and repaired as needed.

5. Deteriorated or damaged Historic features and elements should be repaired rather than replaced.
   - Complies; per the submitted Historic Preservation Plan, the Applicant proposes to repair rather than replace all deteriorated or damaged Historic features and elements.

6. Non-historic alterations that have been made to elements of a property, such as window replacements, eave enclosures, or porch element substitutions, that are in place prior to the adoption of these Design Guidelines may be maintained. However, if additional alterations to these elements are proposed, the elements must be brought into compliance with these Design Guidelines.
   - Complies; The existing window is a non-historic window replacement as permitted in the 2011 application. The proposed modification complies with the Design Guidelines as provided in this analysis.

7. Each site should be recognized as a physical record of its time, place and use. Owners are discouraged from introducing architectural elements or details that visually modify or alter the original building design when no evidence of such elements or details exists.
   - Complies; the Applicant has not proposed to introduce architectural elements or details.

8. Chemical or physical treatments, if appropriate, should be undertaken using recognized preservation methods. Treatments that cause damage to Historic materials should not be used. Treatments that sustain and protect, but do not alter appearance, are encouraged.
   - Complies; the Applicant is not proposing to use any treatments that cause known damage to Historic materials.

9. New construction, such as additions, exterior alterations, repairs, upgrades, etc. shall not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the historic site or historic building. New construction shall differentiate from the historic structure and, at the same time, be compatible with the historic structure in materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the historic structure, the historic site, and the Historic District.
Complies; the proposed exterior alteration does not destroy the Site’s character defining features as the proposed alteration is located on a secondary façade that is beyond the mid-point of the wall.

10. New additions and related new 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.

- Complies; the essential form and integrity of the Historic property and its environment could be restored if the proposed new construction were to be removed in the future.

11. The proposed project must not cause the building, site or Historic District to be removed from the National Register of Historic Places.

- Complies; the proposed modification does not negatively impact the Historic Integrity as defined by the National Park Service in terms of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association.

B. Specific Guidelines:

2. Primary Structures
   b. Exterior Walls

   (1) Primary and secondary facade elements, such as window/door configuration, wall planes, recesses, bays, balconies, steps, porches, and entryways shall be preserved and maintained in their original location on the façade.

   - Complies; the proposed door location is to be located within an existing window opening on the secondary façade.

   (2) Exterior historic elements including wood siding (drop siding, clapboard, board and batten), frieze boards, cornices, moldings, shingles, etc., as well as stone and masonry shall be preserved and maintained. Deteriorated or damaged historic elements shall be repaired using recognized preservation methods appropriate to the specific material.

   - Complies as Conditioned; See Condition of Approval #4.

   (4) When an exterior historic element cannot be repaired, it shall be replaced with materials that match the original in all respects: scale, dimension, profile, material, texture, and finish. The replacement of an existing historic element is allowed only when it can be demonstrated that the historic element is no longer safe and/or serviceable and cannot be repaired to a safe and/or serviceable condition.

   - Complies as Conditioned; See Condition of Approval #4.

e. Doors (not included in Storefronts)

   (7) New door openings may be considered on secondary façades. A new opening shall be similar in location, size, and type to those seen on the historic structure.

   - Complies; The proposed door will be replacing an existing window opening on the secondary façade, near the rear of the Building and beyond the midpoint. This door shall be similar in design and
scale to doors seen in the Historic Districts (COA #3).

f. Windows (not included in Storefronts)
(8) New window openings may be considered on secondary façades but only when placed beyond the midpoint. New window openings shall be similar in location, size, scale, type, and glazing pattern to those seen on the historic structure.

- Complies: The proposed door will be replacing an existing window opening on the secondary façade, near the rear of the Building and beyond the midpoint. This door is similar in design and scale to doors seen in the Historic Districts.

18. The Design Review Team, Building, Planning and Legal Departments reviewed this Application.
19. Per LMC § 15-1-21, staff published notice on the City’s website and the Utah Public Notice website, posted notice on the property, and mailed a courtesy notice to property owners within 100 feet on November 18, 2020. The Park Record published notice on November 18, 2020.
20. Staff did not receive any public input at the time this report was published.

Conclusions of Law
1. The proposal complies with the Land Management Code requirements pursuant to 15-2.6 Historic Commercial Business (HCB) District.
2. The proposal meets the criteria for material deconstruction pursuant to LMC 15-11-12.5 Historic Preservation Board Review for Material Deconstruction.
3. There is good cause for this HDDR Application, as the proposed project will minimally impact the Historic integrity of the Structure, as well as give a more easily accessible access point to the upper levels.

Conditions of Approval
1. Final Building plans and construction details shall reflect substantial compliance with the HDDR proposal approved by the Historic Preservation Board on December 2, 2020. Any changes, modifications, or deviations from the approved design that have not been approved by the Planning and Building Departments may result in a stop work order.
2. The Applicant is responsible for notifying the Building and Planning Departments if changes are made.
3. Replacement doors and windows shall exactly match any Historic doors in size, material, profile, and style. Doors and windows that are non-historic will abide by the requirements within LMC 15-13 Design Guidelines for Historic Districts and Historic Structures and the International Residential Code. The proposed door design shall be similar to the Historic doors seen on the Historic structure.
4. Where the Historic exterior materials cannot be repaired, they shall be replaced with materials that match the original in all respects: scale, dimension, texture, profile, material and finish. Prior to removing and replacing historic materials, the Applicant shall demonstrate to the Planning Director and Project Planner that the materials are no longer safe and/or serviceable and cannot be repaired to a safe and/or serviceable condition. No Historic materials may be disposed of prior to advance
approval by the Planning Director and Project Planner. Deteriorated or damaged historic elements shall be repaired using recognized preservation methods appropriate to the specific material.

5. This material deconstruction approval is subject to an Encroachment Agreement to be recorded with Summit County. Said Agreement shall include the staircase proposed to cross the North Side property line of 221 Main Street over the South Side property line of 227 Main Street.

If you have any questions, concerns, or comments regarding this letter, please do not hesitate to contact the Project Planner, Liz Jackson, at (435) 615-5065 or liz.jackson@parkcity.org

Regards,

Randy Scott
Historic Preservation Board Chair Pro-Tem

CC: Liz Jackson, Planner
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SURVEYOR'S CERTIFICATE

To Park City Municipal Corporation and Founders Title Company:

This is to certify that this map or plot and the survey on which it is based were made in accordance with "Minimum Standard Detail Requirements for ALTA/ACSM Land Title Surveys," jointly established and adopted by ALTA, ACSM and NAPL in 2005, and includes Items 1, 3, 4, 7a, 8, 10, 11b and 13 of Table A thereof. Pursuant to the Accuracy Standards as adopted by ALTA, ACSM and NAPL in effect on the date of this certification, the undersigned further certifies that the Positional Uncertainties resulting from the survey measurements made on the survey do not exceed the allowable positional tolerance.

John Demkowski, No. 152404

11-3-06

Date

TITLE DESCRIPTION

PARCEL 2

LOT 6 and the North 5 feet of Lot 5, Block 12 Amended Plat of Park City Survey.

NARRATIVE

1. This survey is performed in conjunction with a Commitment for Title Insurance issued by Founders Title Company dated October 4, 2006 as File No. F-510564.

2. The following exceptions in Schedule B, Section II of the title commitment dated October 4, 2006 as File No. F-510564 are not addressed by this survey: 1-16 and 18-22.

3. Refer to recorded survey S-61 in the Summit County Recorder's Office for foundation encroachment.

4. The subject property is located outside the 500-year floodplain according to the Federal Flood Insurance Rate Map, panel number 490139 0005 5, dated July 16, 1987.

5. Underground utilities are not within the scope of this survey.

6. Total area = 2,255 sq ft.

7. This survey amends and supersedes the survey dated October 18, 2006.
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EXHIBIT C

PHYSICAL CONDITIONS REPORT & HISTORIC PRESERVATION PLAN
INFORMATION GUIDE AND APPLICATIONS

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.
It is deemed to be in the best interest of the citizens of Park City, as well as the State of Utah, to encourage the preservation of buildings, structures, and sites of historic significance in Park City. These buildings, structures, and sites are among the City’s most important cultural, educational, and economic assets.

Application Process for sites in the Historic District

The Planning Department is authorized to require that developers prepare a Physical Conditions Report and Historic Preservation Plan as a condition of approving an application that affects a historic structure, site, or object.

What is a Physical Conditions Report?
A Physical Conditions Report is a preservation and rehabilitation tool that identifies, describes, and evaluates the existing condition of a historic building at the specific point in time that the report is completed. It should document the history of construction and past alterations based on physical and documentary evidence. It should also evaluate the condition of specific character-defining features that make up the site or structure.

What is a Historic Preservation Plan?
A Historic Preservation Plan recommends an overall treatment approach in order to address

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.
the conditions documented by the Physical Conditions report. The Historic Preservation Plan assesses and guides the effects of the proposed construction-related work in order to ensure that the proposed project complies with the Design Guidelines for Historic Districts and Historic Sites.

What does a Physical Conditions Report include?
A Physical Conditions Report is a comprehensive redecoration and evaluation of the elements, features, and spaces that make up a historic site or structure. The report shall identify each element, feature, and/or space and provide a detailed description of:

- What is it?
- What does it look like?
- What is it made of?
- How was it constructed?

The Physical Conditions Report should be completed after conducting a visual inspection of the existing conditions including uninhabitable space such as roofs, attics, basements, and crawlspaces. Selective demolition or removal of wall and floor coverings may be helpful, but is not required.

What does a Historic Preservation Plan include?
The Historic Preservation Plan outlines proposed treatments for the elements, features, and/or spaces identified by the Physical Conditions Report. These treatment options should be consistent with the Design Guidelines for Historic Districts and Historic Sites, consider potential impacts of proposed treatments, and avoid significantly altering the historic site’s or structure’s historic integrity.

What is the purpose of the Physical Conditions Report and Historic Preservation Plan?
The Physical Conditions Report helps establish the scope of work for the proposed project. By determining the condition of the specific elements and character-defining features of the site or structure, the report aids the applicant in selecting an appropriate treatment method for the Historic Preservation Plan.

The four (4) recognized treatment options are:

- **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.

Most projects will employ two (2) or more of these treatments.

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.
The Historic Preservation Plan outlines the proposed treatment for each element, feature, and/or space documented in the Physical Conditions Report. The Historic Preservation Plan considers the current and proposed program needs of the site and/or structure in order to guide treatment approaches and prevent alterations that may have an adverse effect on the site and/or structure.

**Who can complete a Physical Conditions Report and Historic Preservation Plan?**
The Physical Conditions Report and Historic Preservation Plan may be prepared by the property owner, architect, structural engineer, historic preservation consultant, contractor, or other members of the design team.
INSTRUCTIONS FOR PHYSICAL CONDITIONS REPORT

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

It is important to identify each element, feature, or space of a historic site and/or structure as all materials, elements, features, and space show the history of construction and past alterations that make up the historic site and/or structure as it exists today. Together and individually, these components contribute to or detract from the historic integrity. Each component should be described regardless of its historical significance.

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. **Conditions Assessment.** In order to fully document each element, feature, and/or space of the historic site or structure, a description of the individual item as well as a conditions evaluation should be provided.

   At a minimum, the description narrative should describe the overall appearance, material, and condition of each element, feature, and/or space. The description should also identify and evaluate causes for deterioration, decay, or loss of material. Descriptions should refer to the location and the extent of the deficiency. Photo-documentation should be referenced as well. Any limitations or obstacles to an inspection should be noted as part of the description.

   Window and Door Survey forms have been included as part of this application. All window and door openings should be assigned a number and described as part of the survey. Windows and doors in pairs or groupings should be assigned separate numbers.

3. **Structural Evaluation.** A licensed structural engineer’s report should be provided for any proposed panelization or reconstruction project. The structural engineer must certify that the building cannot be reasonably moved intact and demonstrate that the structural system is failing.

4. **Conditions Evaluation.** Each element, feature, and/or space of the historic site or structure shall be described in detail and include photographic documentation to illustrate the condition. Conditions shall be assessed as:

   - **Excellent Condition.** An element, feature, and/or space is evaluated to be in good condition when it meets the following criteria:
     - It is intact, structurally sound, and performing its intended purpose
     - There are no cosmetic imperfections
     - Needs no repair
   - **Good Condition.** An element, feature, and/or space is evaluated to be in good condition when it meets the following criteria:
     - It is intact, structurally sound, and performing its intended purpose
     - There are few cosmetic imperfections
     - It needs only minor or routine maintenance

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.
• **Fair Condition.** An element, feature, and/or space is evaluated to be in fair condition when it meets the following criteria:
  • There are early signs of wear, failure, or deterioration though the element or feature is generally structurally sound and performing its intended purpose
  • There is a failure of a sub-component of the element or feature
  • Replacement of up to 25% of the feature or element is required
  • Replacement of a defective sub-component of the element or feature is required.

• **Poor Condition.** An element, feature, and or/space is evaluated to be in poor condition when it meets the following criteria:
  • It is no longer performing its intended purpose
  • It is missing
  • It shows signs of imminent failure or breakdown
  • More than 25% of the feature or element is deteriorated or damaged and the element or feature cannot be made safe and serviceable through repair
  • It requires major repair or replacement

5. **Photo Documentation.** Historic and current photographic documentation shall be provided for the conditions described in the narrative for each element, feature, and/or space. Digital photos must be comprehensive and clear. At a minimum:

• Photographs of each building elevation should be provided. Multiple photographs may be used to document the entire length of a façade, if necessary.

• Where appropriate, a measuring scale should be included in the photograph to verify dimensions. This should be completed for any photographs of architectural details.

• Each feature described in this report must include at least one (1) corresponding photograph. More than one (1) photograph per description is encouraged.

• Photographs should be numbered and organized in the same order as the narratives described above. Photographs should be printed in color. To avoid creating a large and unmanageable file, it is recommended that you use an image file compressor when importing images into the contact sheets.

• Images on a Disc. Digital copies of the photographs used in the contact sheets that accompany this report should be saved separately on a CD-R and submitted to the Planning Staff with the report. Do not submit original materials. Materials submitted with the form will not be returned to the applicant.
  i. The size of the images should be at least 3,000 x 2,000 pixels at 300 dpi (pixels per inch) or larger if possible.
  ii. It is recommended that digital images be saved in 8-bit (or larger) format.
  iii. TIFF images are preferred, but JPEG images will be accepted.
  iv. The CD-R should be labeled as PCR Form “Property Address” “Date”.

• Contact sheets should be printed in color on high-quality paper (photo paper is preferred).

• The photos should be organized in a clear, comprehensive manner, reflecting the order of the Physical Conditions Report. Captions are recommended, but not required. See next page for example of photo numbering.
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

NAME: Riverhorse Venture, LLC
ADDRESS: 221 Main Street, Park City UT 84060

TAX ID: PC-193
SUBDIVISION: ____________________________ OR
SURVEY: ____________________________ LOT #: ____________________________ BLOCK #: ____________________________
HISTORIC DESIGNATION: ☑ LANDMARK ☐ SIGNIFICANT ☐ NOT HISTORIC

APPLICANT INFORMATION

NAME: Seth Adams
MAILING ADDRESS: PO Box 1914, Park City UT 84060
PHONE #: (435) 640-0233 FAX #: (435) 649-2409
EMAIL: seth@riverhorseparkcity.com

APPLICANT’S REPRESENTATIVE INFORMATION

NAME: ____________________________
PHONE #: ____________________________
EMAIL: ____________________________

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: Seth Adams
Mailing Address: PO Box 1914, Park City UT 84060
Phone #: (435) 640-0233 Fax #: (435) 649-2409
Email: seth@riverhorseparkcity.com
Type of Application: HDDR 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: Seth Adams
Mailing Address: PO Box 1914, Park City UT 84060
Street Address/ Legal Description of Subject Property: 221 Main Street, Park City UT 84060

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.
SAMPLE PHYSICAL CONDITIONS REPORT

This sample is based on the residence located at 664 Woodside Ave.

Sample Detailed Description of Existing Conditions:

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>
<th>Front Porch (East Facade)</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>1930s</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Describe existing feature:

Based on evidence from Sanborn Maps and historic tax photographs, the L-shaped front porch is an extension of the original 1905 porch and was constructed sometime in the 1930s. The square railings and square balustrades, square porch posts, porch ceiling, roof structure, and square horizontal members are all made of painted wood. The decking material is poured concrete. The roof of the porch is a shed roof and the roof material is standing seam metal. The porch is located on the east facade, wraps along the south facade, and continues to the west facade. The railing and balustrades break at the front entrance door, at the south end of the east facade, and at the side entrance which is centered on the south facade. The porch is flush with the existing grade on the east facade. The porch is very un-ornamental with no brackets or other decorative features.

Describe any deficiencies:

Several of the wood porch posts and horizontal members have been replaced. The new wood porch posts and horizontal members are unpainted. The remaining historic wood railings and balustrades, porch posts, porch ceiling, roof structure, and horizontal members are missing paint. The fascia board at the connection between the east facade gable and porch roof is rotted and damaged. Wires are hanging/detached near the east facade gable and porch roof connection on the east facade. The flashing between the main roof and the porch roof is showing signs of rust.

Photo Numbers: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 12, 13  Illustration Numbers: 7a

Multiple photos provide detailed documentation of existing features and any deficiencies.

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.
East Facade:
SAMPLE PHOTO DOCUMENTATION SHEET

Photo #1: East Elevation

![East Elevation](image1.jpg)

Photo #2: East Elevation Porch Ceiling and Support Structure Detail

![Porch Ceiling and Support Structure Detail](image2.jpg)

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.
This page intentionally left blank.
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>Addition of a Stairway to Level 2 of 221 Main Street</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>__________________________</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Describe existing feature:

Building encompasses nearly all of the site in this zero lot line zone.

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

None to be considered

Photo Numbers: __________________________ Illustration Numbers: AS-001, AS-002
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>Header above window being replaced</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>
<tr>
<td>Describe existing feature:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2x header above window (likely - interior drywall has not been removed to inspect)  
- Will be replaced with a door that is 2 1/2" wider than the window it is replacing.  
Minimal impact will be incurred to structure.

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

None to be considered

Photo Numbers: None  
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:** Siding in exterior wall

This involves:  
☐ An original part of the building
☐ A later addition  
Estimated date of construction: ____________________

Describe existing feature:

Any siding required to be removed in 2x wall will be salvaged and replaced - Impact will be minimal given proportions of door are similar to window it is replacing

Describe any deficiencies:

Existing Condition:  
☐ Excellent  ☐ Good  ☐ Fair  ☐ Poor

None to be considered

Photo Numbers: ___________________________  Illustration Numbers: ___________________________
7. Porches

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

Element/Feature: Front porch and its railing

This involves: ☑ An original part of the building  ☐ A later addition  Estimated date of construction: 1930's?

Describe existing feature:

A section of railing approximately 4' wide will be required to be removed for functionality of the proposed stairway that leads to the new 2nd floor door - Care will be taken to preserve the character of the rail with a new post to terminate the end point of rail.

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

None to be considered

Photo Numbers: __________________________  Illustration Numbers: __________________________
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.
## Window Survey Form

Total number of window openings on the exterior of the structure: 

Number of historic windows on the structure: 

Number of existing replacement/non-historic windows 

Number of windows completely missing: 

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

Number of windows to be replaced: 

<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>Excellent</td>
<td>Existing Window being replaced w/ Door</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</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>
<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>
North Elevation - See larger Version in HDDR Applicant for more Detail
Window # 1 - Elevation
# 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:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPLICATION #:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DATE RECEIVED:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLANNING DIRECTOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHIEF BUILDING OFFICIAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPROVAL DATE/INITIALS:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPROVAL DATE/INITIALS:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## PROJECT INFORMATION

- **☐ LANDMARK**
- **☐ SIGNIFICANT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME:</th>
<th>Riverhorse Venture, LLC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ADDRESS:</td>
<td>221 Main Street, Park City UT 84060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAX ID:</td>
<td>PC-193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBDIVISION:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SURVEY:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| LOT #: |   |
| BLOCK #: |   |

## APPLICANT INFORMATION

| NAME: | Seth Adams |
| PHONE #: | (435) 640-0233 |
| FAX #: | (435) 649-2409 |
| EMAIL: | seth@riverhorseparkcity.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.*

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

A new stair is being proposed to be installed on neighboring property but servicing the second level on this building. Affect on site is negligible as the building is already zero lot line and there is no new elements proposed or existing elements affected on the property aside from a minor railing modification on the Level 1 porch.

**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: Header in window/door opening</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:

Minimal structural work will be performed. A header may need to be replaced after de-construction of window opening ensues.
**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></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Siding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This involves:  

- [ ] Preservation  
- [ ] Restoration  
- [ ] Reconstruction  
- [x] Rehabilitation

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

**Minimal siding will be affected. Any historic siding removed in the door replacement process will be set aside and re-installed.**

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

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

Element/Feature: Window and opening

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:

Window will be removed to ready the opening for a door. Window is historic in proportions but was installed within the last 10 years as part of a major renovation of building.

Element/Feature: Door

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:

New 6 panel door is proposed to replace the window being removed. It will be constructed of wood and painted to match existing window color and overall building scheme.
FULL LITE
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Door chosen to replace window opening
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: __________________________ Date: ________________

Name of Applicant: __________________________________________________________

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.
## 1 IDENTIFICATION

**Name of Property:** Bogan Boarding House  
**Address:** 221 MAIN ST  
**City, County:** Park City, Summit County, Utah  
**Current Owner Name:** 221 MAIN STREET LLC, C/O: AVENUE COMMUNITIES  
**Ownership Information:**  
**Current Owner Address:** 230 W FIFTH ST, TEMPE, AZ 85281  
**Legal Description:** SUBD: PARK CITY BLOCK 12 BLOCK: 12 LOT: 5 AND:- LOT: 6 BUILDING: 0.00N 5 FT OF LOT 5 & ALL LOT 6 BLK 12 PARK CITY SURVEY M98-120 311-371 326-203 622-296 762-120 1056-57 1542-1073 1588-439 1851-550, 06 AC

## 2 STATUS/USE

### Property Category
- **Evaluation:**
  - ☐ building(s), main  
  - ☐ building(s), attached  
  - ☐ building(s), detached  
  - ☐ building(s), public  
  - ☐ building(s), accessory  
- **Use:**
  - Original Use: Residential  
  - Current Use: Residential

### Evaluation
- ☑ Landmark Site  
- ☑ Significant Site  
- ☑ Not Historic  
- ☑ Full  
- ☑ Partial

### Reconstruction
- Date:  
- Permit #:  

### Use
- *National Register of Historic Places: ☑ ineligible  
  ☑ eligible  
  ☑ listed (date: 10/22/1984 - Mining Boom Era Residences Thematic District)

## 3 DOCUMENTATION

### Photos: Dates
- ☑ tax photo:  
- ☑ prints:  
- ☑ historic: c.

### Research Sources
- ☑ abstract of title  
- ☑ tax card  
- ☑ original building permit  
- ☑ sewer permit  
- ☑ Sanborn Maps  
- ☑ obituary index  
- ☑ city directories/gazetteers  
- ☑ census records  
- ☑ biographical encyclopedias  
- ☑ newspapers

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


## 4 ARCHITECTURAL DESCRIPTION & INTEGRITY

### Building Type and/or Style:
- Rectangular block type  
- No. Stories: 2 ½

### Additions:
- ☑ minor  
- ☐ major (describe below)

### Alterations:
- ☑ minor  
- ☐ major (describe below)

**Researcher/Organization:** Preservation Solutions/Park City Municipal Corporation: November, 08
Number of associated outbuildings and/or structures: ☐ accessory building(s), # _____; ☐ structure(s), # _____.

General Condition of Exterior Materials:

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

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

Foundation: Stone and concrete.
Walls: Drop siding.
Roof: Clipped gable roof form.
Windows: Paired double-hung sash type.

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

Location: ☐ Original Location ☐ Moved (date __________) Original Location:

Design (The combination of physical elements that create the form, plan, space, structure, and style. Describe additions and/or alterations from the original design, including dates–known or estimated–when alterations were made): The 2 ½-story boarding house remains virtually unchanged from the description in the National Register nomination (see Structure/Site Information Form, 1983). The site has been rehabilitated and is in better condition than when the NR nomination was completed. The site retains its original design integrity.

Setting (The physical environment—natural or manmade—of a historic site. Describe the setting and how it has changed over time.): The setting has not been significantly altered from what is described in the National Register nomination and is seen on Sanborn Insurance maps.

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

Feeling (Describe the property's historic character.): The physical elements of the site, in combination, convey a sense of life in a western mining town of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.

Association (Describe the link between the important historic era or person and the property.): This structure is one of the remaining boarding houses built following passage of the boarding house bill in 1901.

This site was listed on the National Register of Historic Places in 1984 as part of the Park City Mining Boom Era Residences Thematic District. It was built within the historic period, defined as 1872 to 1929 in the district nomination, and retains its historic integrity. As a result, it meets the criteria set forth in LMC Chapter 15-11 for designation as a Landmark Site.

5 SIGNIFICANCE

Architect: ☐ Not Known ☐ Known: (source: ) Date of Construction: 1904

Builder: ☐ Not Known ☐ Known: (source: )
The site must represent an important part of the history or architecture of the community. A site need only be significant under one of the three areas listed below:

1. Historic Era:
   - Settlement & Mining Boom Era (1868-1893)
   - Mature Mining Era (1894-1930)
   - Mining Decline & Emergence of Recreation Industry (1931-1962)

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

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

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

6 PHOTOS

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

Photo No. 4: East elevation. Camera facing west, 2006.
Photo No. 7: East elevation. Camera facing west, 1983.
Photo No. 8: East elevation. Camera facing west, 1983.

---

2 From “Residences of Mining Boom Era, Park City - Thematic Nomination” written by Roger Roper, 1984.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Kind of Bldg.</th>
<th>St. No.</th>
<th>Main</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>APARTMENT</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>1-2-2078</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Stories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stories</th>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>Cu. Ft.</th>
<th>Sq. Ft.</th>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>x x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>12 x 14</td>
<td>Flr.</td>
<td>dirt</td>
<td>Walls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Att. Gar.</td>
<td>12 x 14</td>
<td>F1r.</td>
<td>dirt</td>
<td>Walls</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Description of Building

- **Foundation:** Stone ✓ Conc. None
- **Exterior Walls:** Nu-Lap on Siding
- **Insulation:** Floors ✓ Walls Clgs.
- **Roof Type:** Gable-deck Mtl. Shlg.
- **Doors:** Small Med. Large
- **Bays:** Small Med. Large
- **Porches:** Front & Rear
- **Basement Entr.:** @
- **Planters:** @

### cellar Bmt.
- ¼ ½ ¾ ¾ ¾ ¾ Full Floor: Stor. 70
- Attic Rooms Fin. Unfin.

### Plumbing

- Class ✓ Tub 3 Travs
- Basin ✓ Sink 7 Toller 3
- Urns ✓ Fins. Shtr.
- Dishwasher ✓ Garbage Disp.
- Stove ✓ H.A. Steam ✓ Stkr ✓ Blr.
- Oil ✓ Gas ✓ Coal ✓ Pipeless ✓ Radiant 710

### Air Cond.
- ✓ Fir.

### Finish
- ✓ Hd. Wd.
- ✓ Other

### Cabin
- 1 Mantels Blr. In 240

### Tile
- Walls ✓ Wainscot Floors

### Electrical
- ✓ Outlets ✓ Fixt.

### Storm Sash
- Wood ✓ Metal ✓ Doors ✓ Sash

### Metal Awnings

---

### Total Additions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Additions</th>
<th>Year Built 1891</th>
<th>Avg. Age 57</th>
<th>Reproduction Value</th>
<th>$7334</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Inf. by

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Owners</th>
<th>Tenant</th>
<th>Neighbor</th>
<th>Record</th>
<th>Est.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Remodel Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Remodel Year</th>
<th>Est. Cost</th>
<th>Bldg. Value</th>
<th>$1760</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Car

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Garages</th>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Depr. 2% 3%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Size

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>x</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Other

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Total Building Value

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Building Value</th>
<th>$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Appraised

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>12-9</th>
<th>1957</th>
<th>By 1331</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

---
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Structure/Site Information Form

1. Street Address: 221 Main Park City, Summit County, Utah
   Name of Structure: Bogan Boarding House
   Present Owner: Linda and Dale M. Nelson
   Owner Address: 4240 South 1300 East, Salt Lake City, UT 84117
   Year Built [Tax Record]:
   Tax#: PC 193
   Legal Description: Effective Age:
   Kind of Building:

   North 5 feet of Lot 5 and all of Lot 6 Block 23 Park City Survey
   Less than one acre.

2. Original Owner: John & Anna Bogan
   Construction Date: c. 1904
   Original Use: boarding house
   Present Use: Lodging
   Demolition Date:

   Building Condition: □ Excellent □ Site □ Unaltered
   □ Good □ Ruins □ Minor Alterations
   □ Deteriorated □ Major Alterations
   Integrity: □ Significant □ Not of the Historic Period
   Preliminary Evaluation: □ Not Contributory
   Final Register Status: □ National Landmark □ District
   □ National Register □ Multi-Resource
   □ State Register □ Thematic

3. Photography:
   Date of Slides: □ Front □ Side □ Rear □ Other
   Views: □ Front □ Side □ Rear □ Other
   Slide No.: □ Front □ Side □ Rear □ Other
   Date of Photographs: □ Front □ Side □ Rear □ Other
   Photo No.: □ Front □ Side □ Rear □ Other
   Research Sources:
   □ Abstract of Title □ Sanborn Maps □ Newspapers
   □ Plat Records/Map □ City Directories □ Utah State Historical Society
   □ Tax Card & Photo □ Biographical Encyclopedias □ Personal Interviews
   □ Building Permit □ Obituary Index □ LDS Church Archives
   □ Sewer Permit □ County & City Histories □ LDS Genealogical Society
   □ Other □ U of U Library
   □ BYU Library
   □ USU Library
   □ SLC Library

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

   Park Record. March 30, 1901, p. 3; April 6, 1901, p. 3; April 13, 1907, John Bogan obituary
This building is a two and one half story frame rectangular boarding house with a clipped gable roof. The first floor is raised up above street level, fronted by a stone base through which the front stairs are cut, and into which shops were created at the street level. Drop siding is the principal building material, but there is narrow lap siding on the gable section. When the roof was replaced in 1940 because of a fire, the gable section was re-sided, and it is probable that lap siding was the most readily available material. The building exhibits no particular style, but has the standard elements common to a majority of Park City houses. There is a two story porch constructed of lathe turned piers topped by simple jigsaw cut brackets. A simple straight post balustrade encloses the second story porch. Above the two center piers is a simple decorative pediment. The arrangement of openings on the facade is symmetrical and essentially identical for the first two floors. A door is centered between paired double hung windows. The doors and windows are the long, narrow Victorian type, the doors being topped by a transom. There is also a pair of windows centered in the gable end of the top half story. There are several simple openings on the sides of the building, and there is a one story rear extension. The extension appears on the 1907 Sanborn Insurance Map and is probably original. The only alterations to the exterior of the (See continuation sheet)

Built c. 1904, this boarding house at 221 Main is historically significant as one of only four extant boarding houses which were built in town after the passage of the mine boarding house bill. In addition, this building is one of only four early boarding houses in the entire Park City area to have survived to the present. Because miners were required to live in boarding houses close to the mines unless they were married with families in Park City, the greatest number of boarding houses were built up the various canyons, close to the mines. A 1901 bill, however, revoked the right of mine management to require men to live in the boarding houses. At that time this boarding house and others were built in Park City proper to accommodate the influx of single miners. None of the boarding houses that were built close to the mines have survived, and only four are extant in Park City, therefore this building is especially significant as one of the four early boarding houses that document this type of residential accommodation.

This boarding house was built around 1904 for John and Anna Bogan, who owned it for several years. John Bogan was a miner and owner of the Bogan Mine, which later became part of the rich Silver King Consolidated Mine. He had come from Illinois to Utah around 1877 and worked in the mines at Alta and Dry Fork before coming to Park City around 1879. John Bogan died in 1907 at the age of 62 and Anna died in 1919. This property remained with their sons John T. and James F. Bogan until around 1925.

This was one of several large boarding houses constructed in the town after the passage of a bill in 1901 which revoked the right of the mines' managements to require that their miners live in the boarding houses near the mines if they were not married or their families were not living in town with them. The boarding houses near the mines, though convenient for work, were (See continuation sheet)
221 Main
Description continued:

building include the addition of a cinderblock chimney and a small window to
the south facade, and a metal balustrade to the first floor porch section.
Those changes are minor, however, and do not affect the building's original
character.

History continued:

considered the poorest accommodations available, and many miners moved into
the new boarding houses in town after 1901.¹ This building served primarily
as a boarding house for miners, but during the 1918 flu epidemic it was used
as an emergency hospital. It is currently known as the Imperial Boarding
House, and is still in use as a lodging house.

¹Park Record, March 30, 1901, p. 3; April 6, 1901, p. 3.
Bogan Boarding House
221 Main
Park City, Summit County, Utah

East facade

Photo by Roger Roper, October 1983
Negative: Utah State Historical Society
Bogan Boarding House
221 Main
Park City, Summit County, Utah

East facade

Photo by Roger Roper, October 1983
Negative: Utah State Historical Society
EXHIBIT E

Interior of 221 Main Street
Rear Access from 205 Main Street into Upper Level of 221 Main Street
Rear Walkway of 205 Main Street that 221 Main Street Utilizes for Emergency Egress and Access
Looking North-west towards Main Street from the Existing Window Opening
Looking down from existing window opening