

PARK CITY MUNICIPAL CORPORATION  
HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD  
MINUTES OF AUGUST 21, 2013

BOARD MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE: David White, Gary Bush, John Kenworthy,  
Marian Crosby, Puggy Holmgren

EX OFFICIO: Thomas Eddington, Anya Grahn, Polly Samuels-Mclean, Patricia Abdullah

---

ROLL CALL

Vice-Chair Holmgren called the meeting to order and noted that all Board Members were present except for Puggy Holmgren who was expected to arrive later in the meeting.

Director Eddington introduced Christy Alexander, a new planner in the Planning Department.

WORK SESSION

Overview of the intensive level survey of the historic buildings within Main Street and Mining Boom Era Residences Thematic National Register District

Planner Anya Grahn noted that the HPB had expressed an interest in learning more about intensive level surveys. She reported that the City Council had contracted a Salt Lake City firm, CRSA, to conduct an intensive level survey of various historic sites and buildings in Park City. The Staff report provided a brief background of intensive level survey and reconnaissance level survey and the difference between the two.

Steve Cornell, a representative from CRSA, provided an overview of the project and the 18 month schedule. A significant amount of work is involved with the project because of the numerous historic buildings in the Main Street National Register District and the Historic Sites District. He handed out a packet to the Board Members and noted that the first sheet showed a breakdown of the tasks that would be performed over the 18 month period to create intensive level surveys for all of the historic properties in the National Register District. Mr. Cornell reviewed the packet and the checklist of items, as well as an explanation of what goes into the survey and examples of a completed historic sites form. The sites are documented with photographs, title searches, biographical research information, photocopies of USGS maps. Any research material that can be discovered and collected is also included. Each property has its own separate file. He presented a list of all of the properties involved and outlined the steps of the process and how each property is evaluated. Mr. Cornell explained that a reconnaissance survey is very broad and basic. The intensive level survey is very detailed and collects specific information.

Board Member Crosby asked what the colored bars represented on the inventory list. Mr. Cornell stated that he had not done the color coding, but he believed the colors represented certain things. For example, orange might mean that there was no available information for a particular site. It was intended to be a tracking document to create an internal record.

Mr. Cornell clarified that he was one of a team of four professionals who were working on this intensive level survey project.

Board Member Crosby asked, if a property begins to undergo a restoration process over a period of years, how CRSA knows when to go back and update the inventory list to reflect the change in the property. Mr. Cornell stated that it was based on permitting and maps. They look at permits, Sanborn map, photographic research, and in some cases they talk to the property owners. He noted that Sanborn maps show changes over the years, but they are limited. They also look at deeds and title searches because these documents discuss the structure and the property.

Board Member Kenworthy asked how they handle historic walls. Steve replied that walls are in the historic sites inventory as part of the mining infrastructure. They have been involved in a couple of projects where they uncovered or unearthed existing walls from a previous era in Park City history. Those walls were re-exposed and they became part of the landscape. He explained that the primary task is to make sure the historic value of the existing feature is well documented so it could not be inadvertently torn down in the future. Board Member Kenworthy understood that the walls are treated the same as a structure. Steve replied that this was correct.

Steve encouraged the Board members and other residents to stop and talk to the team or ask questions when they see them in town.

## REGULAR MEETING

### PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS

Ruth Meintsma, a resident at 305 Woodside Avenue, stated that it was rumored that an A-frame from the ski era at 949 Empire was going to be demolished. She recalled from previous visioning meetings that there was consensus that the town in general wanted to save these structures. She attended a joint meeting with the Planning Commission and the City Council and a count was taken on how many were for and against saving this era. The count was unanimous to save them. Ms. Meintsma believed the City needed to move forward immediately because the 949 Empire structure may be the beginning and others would follow.

Ms. Meintsma offered to do whatever she could to help and asked whether the next step would be to take her concerns to the City Council.

Planner Grahn stated that in the past some people have requested an application to demolish an A-frame. In most cases the goal for demolition was to rebuild a new structure. The Planner is usually successful in arguing the reasons for keeping the structure because of setbacks or square footage. In the case of 949 Empire, the applicant wanted to raise the structure because it is becoming a nuisance and he wanted additional land and open space. She pointed out that it was difficult to argue saving the A-frame in this case.

Planner Grahn remarked that the ski era is something they intend to look at and the Staff was considering design guideline provisions to address these structures. Director

Eddington noted that the structure at 949 Empire is at risk for being demolished and it is a concern, but it is not listed as Historic Sites Inventory property; therefore, the owner has the right to move forward with their application. He noted that the matrix on page 23 of the Staff report shows it as an HDDR application that has been submitted.

Chair Pro Tem White stated that he has heard the discussion about designating A-frame structures as historic; and he understood that it had not moved forward and the Staff was looking at addressing that issue next Fall. Director Eddington replied that they were looking at next year, subsequent to the finalization of the General Plan. Even if the Staff had the time and resource to address it soon, the 949 Empire application would still be vested under the current Code, which allows what the owner was proposing to do.

Ms. Meintsma asked if an inventory needed to be the first step. Director Eddington replied that it should start with an inventory. They could add Code language for early recreation era, ski era; for example the early 1960's. However, in fairness to the property owners it would be beneficial for them and for the Staff to know which specific properties would be affected by doing the inventory.

Ms. Meintsma remarked that an inventory is very involved. To avoid putting a burden on the Staff, she asked if a citizen could take photos with addresses and then research when each structure was actually built. Director Eddington stated that it was possible to start the reconnaissance level surveys, which is how they started the original Historic Sites Inventory. Ms. Meintsma asked if a Code provision could be made on the basis of that simple list. Director Eddington replied that the list would be expanded to a more complete, intensive level survey, and that could be put into the Code. He noted that the steps were analysis, research and then move forward. He assumed there 7 to 13 structures that would apply.

Assistant City Attorney McLean pointed out that the current Code language calls for a site to be greater than 50 years; but it does not call out the ski era as an era to be protected. Ms. Meintsma understood that the era needs to be specifically defined and added to the existing mining era. Chair Pro Tem White clarified that it has to be defined as a historic era. Director Eddington replied that this was correct. Currently, the design guidelines note the early ski period as an era, but it is not a protected era.

Ms. Meintsma understood that if they had a simple inventory list, it would not be difficult to move forward with a new definition of historic, including the ski era. Director Eddington replied that it could be done if the Staff had the necessary research and analysis. He reiterated that it would be difficult to stop the proposed demolition at 949 Empire because it would be vested under the current Code. He noted that the City could consider a moratorium but it would have to be implemented by the City Council. Ms. Meintsma stated that she would take her concerns and suggestion to the City Council. She would be willing to take the photos and do the research.

#### STAFF/BOARD MEMBER COMMUNICATIONS AND DISCLOSURES

Director Eddington noted that Patricia Abdullah had done a great job preparing the Historic District Design Review Matrix. He pointed out that the purple color on the first three pages were projects that were approved under the 1983 design guidelines and

were continuing through the development process. Those projects are reviewed under a different and more lenient set of guidelines. Everything not shaded were projects that came in under the 2009 updated design guidelines.

Patricia Abdullah stated that June 2006 was chosen as the cutoff date because that is when they entered with the Historic Property report and started to make an actual list of historic buildings. Prior to 2006 they did individual determinations of significance on each project as it came in. Ms. Abdullah reviewed the matrix format. She noted that expired means that the project went through the approval process but for whatever reason the construction was not completed and the building permit expired. The project would have to restart under the new guidelines even though it was originally approved under the previous guidelines. Pending means the project was in the process of actually being approved.

Director Eddington stated that if an individual Board Member has an interest in a specific project on the matrix, they were welcome to come into the Planning Department to look at the plans and talk to the Planner. Ms. Abdullah stated that the matrix would be updated monthly and provided for each HPB meeting.

**Board Member Holmgren joined the meeting.**

Board Member Holmgren asked about adding submittal dates on the matrix. Ms. Abdullah offered to add the dates. Director Eddington stated that the PL number after the address begins with the year it was submitted. For example, PL-11 means that it was submitted in 2011.

Ms. Abdullah reminded the Board members that they were scheduled to meet on September 18<sup>th</sup> rather than September 4<sup>th</sup>.

**REGULAR AGENDA – Discussion Public Hearing and Action**

1049 Park Avenue – Grant      Application PL-13-02016

Planner Grahn reported that the Nathaniel L Houston house at 1049 Park Avenue is a landmark structure that was built in 1895 as a one-story hall and parlor. At some point a second story was added. Prior to 1949 and out of period, two rear additions were made. At the time the second story was added, the rear roof form continued over a shed addition to create a salt box roof type.

The applicant was proposing a number of improvements to the house as detailed in the Staff report; 1) pour a new foundation under the historic structure; 2) structurally stabilize the house; 3) reconstruct the porch to resemble the porch depicted in a tax photo; 4) refurbish the existing wood windows to accommodate insulated glass; 5) siding restoration and repair; 6) refinish exterior trim in accordance with Design Guideline #5 and replace deteriorated trim with in-kind matching design, dimension, material and finish; 7) replace the existing roof with asphalt roofing.

Planner Grahn reported that the grant amount did not include excavation, house lifting or bracing of the house to pour the new basement foundation. The Staff supported the

proposed structural work. The porch restoration would be necessary because the porch would be taken down when they lift the house to pour the foundation. The window fenestration is necessary to maintain the historic integrity of the house. Planner Grahn stated that replacing the roof with asphalt is considered maintenance and was not included in the grant amount. If the roof was being replaced for structural issues it would have been grant eligible.

Planner Grahn noted that the cost of the total work was \$149,538.84. The Staff recommended that the HPB award a grant in the amount of \$42,114.92, which is half of the total cost of the eligible preservation work.

Board Member Kenworthy asked if the applicant had a timeline for the project. Planner Grahn stated that the applicant was ready to move forward with the Building Department to finalize the permits. Patricia Abdullah explained that according to the grant agreement, the applicant has 60 days to pull a building permit after the grant has been awarded, and nine months to complete the work.

Chair Pro Tem White asked if the footing and foundation work included the basement. Planner Grahn replied it was just for concrete and the labor to build the foundation. The grant did not include the cost of excavating, lifting the house or bracing the house. She clarified that the foundation work was only under the historic portion of the house.

Board Member Holmgren supported grant funds for the foundation. However, she questioned the siding restoration and repair. Planner Grahn explained that some of the elements are too deteriorated to be repaired and would need to be replaced in-kind.

Board Member Bush commented on the porch restoration. He understood the reconstruction were the posts and the roof. Planner Grahn replied that it was the posts, the roof and a concrete slab. Board Member Bush asked if the slab on grade was a front or side porch. Planner Grahn believed it was a front porch. In looking at the photo on page 42 of the Staff report, Board Member Bush thought the original porch looked like a wood porch. Chair Pro Tem White remarked that the photo on page 47 looked like a concrete slab porch. He asked if the project was approved with a concrete slab. Planner Grahn answered no. Chair Pro Tem White suggested removing the concrete slab from the grant, unless the owner wanted to make a wood porch.

Director Eddington asked if the Board would be willing to grant the funds if the owner was willing to make the change from slab on grade to wood, as shown in the historic photo. The Board members agreed to fund the porch restoration on that condition. Board Member Holmgren suggested removing the concrete slab and the stairs from the grant request. Chair Pro Tem White noted that the drawing on page 62 showed a wood porch with concrete stairs. Planner Grahn did not believe it would make sense to put down a concrete slab and build a wood porch. Director Eddington thought it looked like a joist structure was built to lay the wood on. He believed the drawing on page 62 indicates the intent to utilize wood.

Director Eddington suggested that the HPB award the grant up to a specific amount, conditioned upon the fact that the porch is wood. He assumed that wood would be less

expensive than slab on grade. Chair Pro Tem White thought the steps leading up to the porch should also be wood. Director Eddington agreed.

Director Eddington asked if a specific grant amount needed to be determined this evening. Assistant City Attorney McLean stated that the HPB could approve a maximum amount and delegate the Staff to make the final determination, staying within the maximum.

Chair Pro Tem White remarked that if the porch is elevated two feet, it would require structure footings and foundation. Board Member Bush pointed out that raising the elevation two feet would also require a handrail. He felt that adding steps and a handrail would significantly change the look.

Board Member Kenworthy supported a wood porch. Board Member Crosby asked if the proposed new basement was the reason for raising the house to the extent that requires four steps up. Planner Grahn replied that the design guidelines allow an existing historic structure to be raised a maximum of two feet for the purpose of adding a foundation.

Board Member Holmgren stated that removing the \$3,250 for slab on grade and the \$900 for the stairs reduces the total grant amount to \$37,965. She was comfortable with the remaining items as outlined in the Staff report. Board Member Holmgren supported the grant to help restore the home.

Planner Grahn asked if the Board would be willing to grant up to \$42,113 with a condition of approval requiring that the porch be rebuilt with wood flooring; or whether they preferred to remove the slab on grade and the steps, for a total grant amount of \$37,965.

Board Member Bush questioned the accuracy of the \$9,500 cost to reconstruct the porch and the roof. He suggested that the owner re-price the porch reconstruction using wood. Chair Pro Tem White stated that the actual walking surface would require some type of underneath structure, which could increase the cost.

Board Member Kenworthy preferred to give the owner the incentive to think about using wood for the porch and steps. He believed the Board could make a motion that subtracts the slab on grade and the steps, with the caveat that if the owner changes to wood the grant amount could go up to but not exceed \$42,000.

The Owner would have to verify the costs of the wood porch. If the owner is not amenable to wood, the number would be reduced to \$37,965 as calculated by Board Member Holmgren.

Director Eddington clarified that Board Member Kenworthy was suggesting that they condition up to a maximum of \$42,000, based on the assumption of a full porch reconstruction with wood.

**MOTION:** Board Member Kenworthy made a motion to award the grant for 1049 Park Avenue in an amount up to \$42,000, contingent upon wood steps and a wood porch. Fifty percent of the cost would be paid by the homeowner and 50% would be paid by the

Historic Preservation Board Meeting  
August 21, 2013

grant. If the owner chooses to reconstruct the porch with concrete, the grant amount would be reduced to \$38,000. Board Member Crosby seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

The meeting adjourned at 6:10 p.m.

Approved by \_\_\_\_\_  
David White, Chair Pro Tem  
Historic Preservation Board