

PARK CITY MUNICIPAL CORPORATION  
HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD  
MINUTES OF NOVEMBER 16, 2011

BOARD MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE: Sara Werbelow, Dave McFawn, Puggy Holmgren, Judy McKie, Katherine Matsumoto-Gray, David White

EX OFFICIO: Thomas Eddington, Kayla Sintz, Francisco Astorga, Polly Samuels McLean, Patricia Abdullah, Dina Blaes

---

Chair Werbelow called the meeting to order at 5:03 p.m

#### WORK SESSION

Board member McKie gave a detailed overview of the National Trust for Historic Preservation conference that she attended. She suggested that the Board look into joining the membership for the National Alliance of Preservation Commissions as they do quarterly publications that inform on the current historic preservation topics and challenges that communities are facing.

There were other informative publications at the conference that Board member McKie had available for people to read if they wished.

Board member McKie presented ideas to the Board of activities and programs that were talked about at the conference which might be viable to Park City, including:

- Holding a historic preservation and leadership training seminar
- Promote and capitalize on preservation month
- Behind the scene tour of a local rehabilitation (i.e. Washington School Inn)
- An annual self-assessment of the Historic Preservation Board
- Investigate revolving funds and trusts for preservation
- Form a preservation alliance group to focus proactively on properties in need (i.e. Centennial Hotel).

Overall she felt the conference was very educational and suggested that more members attend the conference next year.

#### ROLL CALL

Chair Werbelow noted that all Board Members were present with the exception of Board member Natt who was excused.

#### ADOPTION OF MINUTES – September 21, 2011

MOTION: Dave McFawn moved to APPROVE the minutes of September 21, 2011 as written. David White seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

#### ADOPTION OF MINUTES – October 5, 2011

MOTION: Dave McFawn moved to APPROVE the minutes of October 5, 2011 as written. David White seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

#### PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS

There was no input.

#### STAFF/BOARD COMMUNICATION & DISCLOSURE

Planner Sintz informed the Board that City Council continued the Land Management Code amendments to review of reconstruction. The action was in line with the recommendation of the Historic Preservation Board to wait until a reconstruction occurred that the Board could review. Board member Werbelow wondered if staff would call for a special session once the reconstruction had been approved. Staff did not feel that a special session would be required and that the item could be held at a regularly scheduled meeting.

Chair Werbelow asked for an update on the Imperial Hotel at 221 Main Street that was heard at the Board of Adjustment on November 15. City Attorney Mclean answered that the application was a Special Exception to allow for General Office use in the store front area of the Imperial Hotel. After a lengthy discussion the Board ruled that the Special Exception was a variance for use and therefore not allowed by State Code. The Board of Adjustment also denied the request for the Special Exception stating it did not meet the criteria set forth in the Land Management Code.

Board member Matsumoto-Gray disclosed she had asked Staff to send her the packets for the Design Review Team meetings. Planning Director Eddington cautioned that while this was allowed that the Board members should have no ex-parte communication regarding the items on the agenda.

#### REGULAR SESSION – Discussion/Public Hearing/Action Items

##### 335 Ontario Avenue – Grant Application Project# PL-11-01359

Planner Astorga introduced the item as a request for a Grant for a Landmark building built in 1902. The Grant would be for the waterproofing of a rear addition. The waterproofing would include a re-roof of the addition along with building a small parapet wall on the north end to divert the water to the south. This would require exposing the retaining wall on the east in order to do the waterproofing.

The total proposed cost was \$21,460. The eligible matching amount would be \$10,730. Planner Astorga gave a brief breakdown of the remaining grant funds available to the City. The Main Street RDA held approximately \$113 and the CIP fund held roughly \$60,000. Staff's recommendation was to award the Grant and deplete the Main Street RDA, using the CIP fund for the remaining amount.

Board member Matsumoto-Gray noted that the Grant Program Information Guide stipulates roofing as a maintenance item that “are the responsibility of the homeowner, but may be considered under specific circumstances.” She wondered what those circumstances were and if this project qualifies. A discussion ensued over precedence and qualifications of roofing projects. Board member White stated that the project, while affecting the roof, was a project to correct an issue that was harmful to the entirety of the historic structure. There was consensus among the Board that this would qualify for a grant.

There was additional discussion on the paint being applicable. It was made clear that the paint cost was only for the area that was being repaired. The Board felt that would be appropriate for the grant.

MOTION: Board member Matsumoto-Gray moved to award a matching grant for waterproofing at 355 Ontario Avenue in the amount of up to \$10,730. Board member Holmgren seconded the motion.

VOTE: 6-0. Motion carries unanimously.

450 Main Street – Determination of Significance  
Project# PL-11-01378

City Consultant Blaes explained that all the remaining items to the Board were updates of Historic Sites that were in process during the original adoption of the list. The projects had finished and were not being reassessed by the criteria for Significance. 450 Main Street, the site of the Post Office, was proposed to be added to the Historic Sites Inventory as a Significant site. The original building was built in 1921 but due to an addition did not qualify as a Landmark building.

Chair Werbelow wondered why the building was only now being added to the list. City Consultant Blaes said that this building was noticed while undertaking the re-evaluation of the Main Street National Historic district.

Chair Werbelow opened and closed the public hearing with no comments.

MOTION: Board member Holmgren moved to designate 450 Main Street as a Significant site as outlined in the Findings of Facts and Conclusions of Law. Board member White seconded the motion.

VOTE: 6-0. Motion carried unanimously.

Findings of Fact

1. The building at 450 Main Street is located in the Historic Commercial Business (HCB) District zone.
2. The building was constructed in 1921.
3. The original portion of the building reflects the typical construction methods found on civic and commercial buildings constructed during the mining era.
4. A remodel and expansion of the building in 1964 altered the Greek Revival stylistic elements found on original building, but retained the overall form and fenestration pattern.

5. The building was classified a contributing building in the 1979 Main Street National Register Historic District but in 1989, was reclassified as noncontributing due to the alterations made to the building in 1964.
6. All findings from the Analysis section are incorporated herein.

#### Conclusions of Law

1. The original portion of the building is at least fifty (50) years old.
2. The original building retains the physical characteristics that identify it as existing in or relating to the mining era.
3. The original building is important in local or regional history, architecture, engineering or culture associated with an era of Historic importance to the community; namely the mining era.
4. The building meets the criteria found in LMC Section 15-11-10(2) and therefore the Site is a Significant Site pursuant to LMC Section 15-11-10.

#### 575 Park Avenue – Determination of Significance Project# PL-11-01379

Consultant Blaes explained that the application before them was to change the designation of a currently Landmark structure to Significant. A large rear addition that was approved under previous guidelines was finished which now makes the structure unable to comply with the criteria for a Landmark structure.

Planner Sintz added that this was the last project to be approved under the old guidelines.

There was some discussion on Thematic districts and City Consultant Blaes clarified that a Thematic district is no longer used nationally, now they are called multiple property submissions. The same principle applies though when reviewing the designations. She further clarified that Thematic districts are only an honorary designation and that regulation and protection of historic buildings is done at a City level.

Chair Werbelow opened and closed the public hearing with no public input being given.

Board member McKie asked if the owner of the building was aware in the proposed designation change. Planner Sintz responded that the owners were made aware when the building permit was pulled that it would change the designation. They were further notified last week of the meeting and will be notified of any action taken at the meeting.

MOTION: Board member White moved to change the designation of 575 Park Avenue from a Landmark site to a Significant site as outlined in the Findings of Facts and Conclusions of Law. Board member McFawn seconded the motion.

VOTE: 6-0. Motion carried unanimously.

#### Findings of Fact

1. The building at 575 Park Avenue is located in the Historic Residential (HR-1) District zone.
2. The building was originally constructed before 1889.

3. The original portion of the building reflects the typical construction methods found on residential dwellings constructed during the mining era.
4. An expansion of the building in 2010 altered the original T/L Cottage form significantly, but the Essential Historical Form was retained.
5. The building was designated to the Historic Sites Inventory in 2009 as a Landmark Site, however, a 2010 addition added to the west side of the historic house result in the Site no longer being compliant with the criteria for designation as a Landmark Site.
6. The Site was never nominated to or listed on the National Register of Historic Places either individually or as part of a historic district.
7. All findings from the Analysis section are incorporated herein.

#### Conclusions of Law

1. The original portion of the building is at least fifty (50) years old.
2. The original building retains the physical characteristics that identify it as existing in or relating to the mining era.
3. The original building is important in local or regional history, architecture, engineering or culture associated with an era of Historic importance to the community; namely the mining era.
4. The building meets the criteria found in LMC Section 15-11-10(2) and therefore the Site is a Significant Site pursuant to LMC Section 15-11-10.

#### 147 Ridge Avenue – Determination of Significance Project# PL-11-01380

City Consultant Blaes introduced this item as being in a similar situation as 575 Park Avenue. The building was originally designated as Landmark. At the time of designation it was under construction. With the construction finished the site no longer meets the criteria to remain Landmark. Staff recommended that the Board change the designation of the site to be Significant.

The historic portion of 147 Ridge Avenue was reconstructed. City Consultant Blaes clarified that reconstructed buildings have very limited and narrow opportunities to remain on the National Register and that this reconstruction did not meet that criteria.

Chair Werbelow opened and closed the public hearing with no public input being given.

The Board agreed that the reconstruction was well done. Board member Matsumoto-Gray wondered if the building had not been a reconstruction would it remain Landmark. Planner Sintz stated that Staff would find it hard for the building to meet the criteria for Landmark due to the mass and scale of the rear addition. City Consultant Blaes agreed that the size of the addition, while well removed from the historic building, is simply too large.

Chair Werbelow wondered how long approvals and projects might take. Staff answered that under the prior guidelines it required that a building permit only be submitted for within two years but now the City process has changed so an applicant must pull a building permit within one year of Design Review approval.

MOTION: Board member Holmgren moved to change the designation of 147 Ridge Avenue from a Landmark site to a Significant site as outlined in the Findings of Facts and Conclusions of Law. Board member Matsumoto-Gray seconded the motion.

VOTE: 6-0. Motion carried unanimously.

#### Findings of Fact

1. The building at 147 Ridge Avenue is located in the Historic Residential Low-Density (HRL) District zone.
2. The building was originally constructed c. 1885.
3. The original portion of the building reflects the typical construction methods found on residential dwellings constructed during the mining era.
4. An expansion of the building in 2010 altered the original Hall-Parlor form significantly, but the Essential Historical Form was retained.
5. The original building was Reconstructed using new materials.
6. The building was designated to the Historic Sites Inventory in 2009 as a Landmark Site, however, subsequent changes result in the Site no longer being compliant with the criteria for designation as a Landmark Site.
7. The Site was nominated to the National Register of Historic Places in 1984, but was never listed because of owner objection.
8. All findings from the Analysis section are incorporated herein.

#### Conclusions of Law

1. The Site was previously designated as a Landmark Site.
2. The building meets the criteria found in LMC Section 15-11-15(A)(3) authorizing Reconstructed Sites to remain on the Historic Sites Inventory as Significant Sites.
3. The Reconstructed building retains the physical characteristics that identify it as relating to the mining era.
4. The Reconstructed building is important in local or regional history, architecture, engineering or culture associated with an era of Historic importance to the community; namely the mining era.
5. The building meets the criteria found in LMC Section 15-11-10(2) and therefore the Site is a Significant Site pursuant to LMC Section 15-11-10.

#### 601 Sunnyside Drive – Determination of Significance Project# PL-11-01381

City Consultant Blaes reviewed the Determination of Significance for 601 Sunnyside Drive and explained that this is building was a reconstruction. The previous building was extremely delapidated and little of the original materials were re-usable. She felt that projects such as these were perfect examples for giving the building department the ability to allow for reconstructions.

Chair Werbelow opened and closed the public hearing with no public input being given.

MOTION: Board member McFawn moved to change the designation of 601 Sunnyside Drive from a Landmark site to a Significant site as outlined in the Findings of Facts and Conclusions of Law. Board member White seconded the motion.

VOTE: 6-0. Motion carried unanimously.

#### Findings of Fact

1. The building at 601 Sunnyside Avenue is located in the Residential Development
2. (RD) District zone.
3. The historic building that originally occupied the site was constructed c. 1885.
4. The Site was nominated to the National Register of Historic Places in 1984, but was never listed because of owner objection.
5. The building was designated to the Historic Sites Inventory in February 2009 as a Landmark Site.
6. The building was found by the Planning Staff to meet criteria set forth in the Land Management Code to allow its Reconstruction; specifically, 1) the building was found by the Chief Building Official to be hazardous or dangerous pursuant to Section 115.1 of the International Building Code, 2) the home could not be made safe or serviceable through repair, and 3) the form, features, detailing of the house were accurately depicted by means of new construction (placement, orientation, and location of the house were not accurately depicted but rather approximated).
7. The original building was Reconstructed using primarily new materials, though as much as possible of the original board and batten siding was reapplied to the exterior of the new building.
8. All findings from the Analysis section are incorporated herein.

#### Conclusions of Law

1. The Site was previously designated as a Landmark Site.
2. The building meets the criteria found in LMC Section 15-11-10(A)(3) authorizing Reconstructed Sites to remain on the Historic Sites Inventory as Significant Sites.
3. The Reconstructed building retains the physical characteristics that identify it as relating to the mining era.
4. The Reconstructed building is important in local or regional history, architecture, engineering or culture associated with an era of Historic importance to the community; namely the mining era.
5. The building meets the criteria found in LMC Section 15-11-10(A)(3) and therefore the Site is a Significant Site pursuant to LMC Section 15-11-10.

#### 210 Grant Avenue – Determination of Significance Project# PL-11-01382

City Consultant Blaes first thanked the Building department and particularly Michelle Downard for the additional research and information that was found on this property. Policy direction when the Historic Sites Inventory was adopted is that it was easier to put properties that are in doubt on the list than to leave them off. A photograph was provided by Gene Carr that was taken in 1965 that shows that the structure at 210 Grant Avenue was not present. A later photo, also provided by Gene Carr, from 1978 show that the buildings are present. Staff recommends with the additional information provided that the Board remove the property from the Historic Sites Inventory.

Chair Werbelow opened the public hearing. Jeremy Pack, the owner of the property at 210 Grant Avenue, addressed the Board and asked that the Board not remove the site. He purchased the property as historic, it has the feel of a historic building, at approximately 380 square feet it has the size of a historic structure, and it looks historic.

Hearing no further public input Chair Werbelow closed the public hearing.

Board member McKie asked how the building could end up on the first inventory. City Consultant Blaes responded that the the City did not do an intensive level survey so there were no title searches done on properties. There were no tax photos available for this property and nothing found in the historic society records. The tax assessors building cards have dates of construction that vary widely. The early sanborn maps show a building on the lot that is not shown on later sanborn maps. A contractor spoke to the Building department and stated he built it in the 1970s from salvaged materials and during her research City Consultant Blaes found no information to substantiate that the building is more historic than that.

Chair Werbelow reopened the public hearing so the property owner, Jeremy Pack, could address the Board again. He asked that the Board table the item so that he had a chance to do more research on the property and prove that it meets the criteria to remain on the sites inventory. Chair Werbelow closed the public hearing. She was pleased to hear from an owner that wanted to see the property stay historic.

Staff recommended that the property be removed from the Historic Sites Inventory as there has been issues and questions as to the historic elements as far back as 2008.

Staff addressed Board member White's question that the property could be removed and then pending additional information by the applicant could again be added to the list based on the results of that research. Board member McFawn felt it was just as easy to allow the applicant time.

Sara Werbelow re-opened the public hearing so the property owner, Jeremy Pack, could address the Board again. He stated that he needed the time. His reason for purchasing the house was because it was historic and listed on the Historic Sites Inventory. Board member McFawn asked how long the owner would need. Mr. Pack responded that he would like a couple months.

Hearing no further public input Chair Werbelow closed the public hearing.

Board member Holmgren agreed with Board member White in that you should remove the property and then look at adding it back onto the Sites Inventory should research and evidence show that it is historic. The evidence she had before her showed that the property was not historically significant. While the structure looks old and meets the size and scope of a historic structure that does not make it historic.

Board member McKie commended the owner for being so passionate in owning a historic structure. She reminded Mr. Pack that having the structure on or off the Sites Inventory does not change the house and how the owner should feel about it. She felt that there was something to be said for the feeling of significance that a structure brings to the community even though it may not meet the criteria.

Board member Matsumoto-Gray asked for clarification on the sanborn maps and what they showed. City Consultant Blaes answered that the 1929 sanborn maps shows a collection of accessory structures that do not show up on later maps. Grant Avenue and Swede Alley were realigned over the years. At first glance this building could have been an accessory structure to a building on Main Street.

Board member Matsumoto-Gray thought it best to err on the side of preservation. Without property research this structure could be a reconstruction and has the look of an accessory structure. Staff felt that conclusion was not likely as the accessory structure had on sewer or water and was the first photos show it as having a garage door. If the structure was moved from a previous location it would be City Consultant Blaes stated it would be virtually impossible to find when and where the original house was built and when it moved as it would not show up on a title search.

MOTION: Board member Holmgren moved to remove the site located at 210 Grant Avenue from the Historic Sites Inventory as outlined in the Findings of Facts and Conclusions of Law. Chair Werbelow seconded the motion.

Board member Matsumoto-Gray also asked if it was possible if the photo provided was not from 1965 but from 1961 in which case the structure could possibly be over 50 years old. Staff explained that a property being 50 years old does not make it significant in its own right. If the structure was built in the 1960s it is then not reflective of that architectural type. If salvaged materials were used they would not be used in the design of mining buildings but would be reflective of the A frame 60s style house.

Board member Matsumoto-Gray's opinion was that the owner is motivated in researching the property and that there was still doubt in the history of the building. She favored waiting for the owner to research the property. City Attorney Mclean reminded the Board there was a motion on the table to remove the structure and that should be voted on first.

Board member Holmgren voted aye.  
Chair Werbelow voted aye.  
Board member White voted aye.  
Board member McFawn voted nay.  
Board member Matsumoto-Gray voted nay.  
Board member McKie voted nay.

VOTE: 3-3. Motion did not pass.

MOTION: Board member McFawn moved to keep the site located at 210 Grant Avenue on the Historic Sites Inventory and continue the item for three months to allow the owner time to reasearch the property history. Board member Matsumoto-Gray seconded the motion.

Board member McFawn voted aye.  
Board member Matsumoto-Gray voted aye.  
Board member McKie voted aye.  
Board member Holmgren voted nay.  
Chair Werbelow voted nay.  
Board member White voted nay.

VOTE: 3-3. Motion did not pass.

Due to the lack of action the Determination of Significance for 210 Grant Avenue continued to the next regularly scheduled meeting of the Historic Preservation Board on Wednesday, December 7, 2011.

222 Grant Avenue – Determination of Significance  
Project# PL-11-01383

City Consultant Blaes outlined this property is the same situation as 210 Grant Avenue. The building is not built in the 1965 photo but is present in a 1978 photograph. Staff was recommending that the site be removed from the Historic Sites Inventory based on the evidence presented in the staff report.

Chair Werbelow opened the public hearing. Dave O'Baghey, the owner of 222 Grant Avenue, addressed the Board. He asked for a clarification of what the ramifications are if the building was taken off the Historic Sites Inventory. Planner Sintz stated that if insignificant the building could be torn down or would no longer be able to allow for commercial use within the current zone. City Attorney Mclean added that the building would also fall under a different section in the Design Guidelines regarding construction. Mr. O'Baghey responded that he had no plans for potential commercial use and no objection to removing it from the list. The structure was currently used as a residence and planned to continue to do so.

Board member Matsumoto-Gray asked if there were any materials found during remodeling the structure that would make the owner think it was historic. Mr. O'Baghey heard from a third source that the building had been relocated from Ogden or Coalville. The current structure was built on a foundation and the interior walls indicated the building was 50-60 years old. He noted nothing in the construction that indicated it was historic.

Hearing no further public input Chair Werbelow closed the public hearing.

Board member White noted that the house had two historic society ribbons on it but also added that the ribbons were of no particular value in determining historic significance. He had worked on projects that were built in the 1980s that had been awarded ribbons.

MOTION: Board member White moved to remove the property located at 222 Grant Avenue from the Historic Sites Inventory as outlined in the Findings of Facts and Conclusions of Law. Board member McFawn seconded the motion.

Board member Matsumoto-Gray voted nay.

VOTE: 5-1. Motion carries.

Findings of Fact

1. The property at 222 Grant Avenue is located in the Historic Residential (HR-2B) District.
2. The site was designated as a Significant Site by the HPB in February 2009 following analysis and a recommendation made by staff based on information from field visits and several secondary sources.
3. Photographic information was recently made available that indicates the building is not at least 50 years old.

4. All findings from the Analysis section are incorporated herein.

Conclusions of Law

1. Information not previously considered in the designation of 222 Grant Avenue as a Significant Site was appropriately considered after February 2009 when the HPB took formal action to designate the property to the Historic Sites Inventory.
2. The site at 222 Grant Avenue is not at least 50 years old.
3. The site at 222 Grant Avenue does not comply with the criteria set forth in Title 15-11-10(A)(2) and therefore the Site is not a Significant Site pursuant to Title 15-11-10.

Board member Holmgren asked the Board to keep in mind when reviewing buildings that just because it is old does not mean it meets the criteria of the Land Management Code for significance. And that buildings and structures may look old but that doesn't mean that they are in fact historic.

MOTION: Board member Holmgren moved to adjourn the meeting. Board member White seconded the motion.

VOTE 6-0. Motion carries unanimously.

Prepared by \_\_\_\_\_

Patricia Abdullah  
Planning Analyst