



AGENDA

MEETING CALLED TO ORDER AT 5:00 PM	<i>pg</i>
ROLL CALL	
APPROVAL OF MINUTES FOR NOVEMBER 16, 2011	5
PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS – <i>Items not on regular meeting schedule.</i>	
STAFF/BOARD COMMUNICATION & DISCLOSURES	
REGULAR AGENDA – <i>Possible public hearing and action as outlined below.</i>	
210 Grant Avenue – Determination of Significance	PL-11-01382
<i>Possible action</i>	19
WORK SESSION – <i>Discussion items only. No action will be taken.</i>	
Historic Guidelines Training	41
ADJOURN	

Times shown are approximate. Items listed on the Regular Meeting may have been continued from a previous meeting and may not have been published on the Legal Notice for this meeting. For further information, please call the Planning Department at (435) 615-5060.

A majority of Historic Preservation Board members may meet socially after the meeting. If so, the location will be announced by the 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 Park City Planning Department at (435) 615-5060 24 hours prior to the meeting.

MINUTES OF NOVEMBER 16, 2011

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

DRAFT

REGULAR AGENDA

Historic Preservation Board Staff Report

Author: Thomas E. Eddington, Jr., AICP
Dina Blaes, Preservation Consultant
Subject: Historic Sites Inventory – 210 Grant Avenue
Application #: PL-11-01382
Date: December 7, 2011
Type of Item: Administrative

Summary Recommendation

Staff recommends the Historic Preservation Board conduct a public hearing and consider removing the site located at 210 Grant Avenue from the Historic Sites Inventory.

Topic

Applicant: Planning Department
Location: 210 Grant Avenue
Proposal: Remove 210 Grant Avenue from the Historic Sites Inventory
Zoning: Historic Residential 2B (HR-2B) District

Background

On November 16, 2011 the Historic Preservation Board heard this item as part of the regular agenda. Public input was given by the owner/representative, Jeremy Pack, indicating he wished the property to remain on the inventory and believed it to be historic. There was a motion to remove the site from the Historic Sites Inventory but a tie vote of 3:3 made it unsuccessful. A second motion was made to continue the item three months to give the owner/representative time to provide additional information; motion also of which was not successful due to a 3:3 tie vote. Due to the lack of action at the last meeting, the application was continued to December 7, 2011.

No further information has been provided by the owner/representative and no new information has surfaced establishing 210 Grant's historical significance.

The attached Exhibit A – HPB Staff Report of November 16, 2011 outlines the criteria of which 210 Grant is being recommended to be removed from the Historic Sites Inventory.

Summary

In summary, staff recommends the HPB find that the site does not comply with the criteria set forth in Title 15-11-10(A)(2) for designation as a Significant Site and that the site be removed from the Historic Sites Inventory.

Public Input

A public hearing, conducted by the Historic Preservation Board, is required prior to removing sites from the Historic Sites Inventory. The public hearing for the

recommended action was properly and legally noticed as required by the Land Management Code. Public input given by the owner on November 16, 2011 is summarized above.

Alternatives

- Conduct a public hearing on the Site described herein and remove the Site from the Historic Sites Inventory based on the findings of fact and conclusions of law set forth in the staff report.
- Conduct a public hearing and reject removal of the Site from the Historic Sites Inventory, providing specific findings of fact and conclusions of law for the action.
- Continue the action to a date certain.

Significant Impacts

There are no significant fiscal impacts on the City as a result of removing the Site described in this report from the Historic Sites Inventory.

Consequences of *not* taking the Recommended Action

Not taking the recommended action will result in a Site remaining on the Historic Site Inventory that does not meet the criteria for designation.

Recommendation

Staff recommends the Historic Preservation Board conduct a public hearing and vote to remove the Site described in this staff report from the Historic Sites Inventory based on the following findings of fact and conclusions of law:

Findings of Fact

1. The property at 210 Grant Avenue is located in the Historic Residential 2B (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 that no building existed on the site in 1965.
4. Structural lumber workmanship in the building indicates more recent construction to include lack of saw marks and evidence of kiln drying.
5. All findings from the Analysis section are incorporated herein.

Conclusions of Law

1. Information not previously considered in the designation of 210 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 210 Grant Avenue is not at least 50 years old.
3. The site at 210 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.

Exhibits

Exhibit A - November 16, 2011 HPB Staff Report with attachments

Exhibit B – 210 Grant Avenue Historic Site Form, 2011 Proposed



PLANNING DEPARTMENT

Historic Preservation Board Staff Report

Author: Thomas E. Eddington, Jr., AICP
Dina Blaes, Preservation Consultant
Subject: Historic Sites Inventory – 210 Grant Avenue
Application #: PL-11-01382
Date: November 16, 2011
Type of Item: Administrative

Summary Recommendation

Staff recommends the Historic Preservation Board conduct a public hearing and remove the site located at 210 Grant Avenue from the Historic Sites Inventory.

Topic

Applicant: Planning Department
Location: 210 Grant Avenue
Proposal: Remove 210 Grant Avenue from the Historic Sites Inventory
Zoning: Historic Residential (HR-2B) District

Background

The Park City Historic Sites Inventory, adopted February 4, 2009, includes four hundred five (405) sites of which one hundred ninety-two (192) sites meet the criteria for designation as Landmark Sites and two hundred thirteen (213) sites meet the criteria for designation as Significant Sites. The house at 210 Grant Avenue was considered a Significant Site.

Staff's evaluation of the two hundred thirteen (213) sites for compliance with the criteria set forth in 15-11-10(A)(2) and the subsequent recommendation to the HPB to include them on the Historic Site Inventory as Significant Sites was based on information gathered during field visits and from secondary sources, including:

- Reports and photographs from Reconnaissance Level Surveys (RLS) conducted in 1983 and 1995.
- Sanborn Fire Insurance maps from 1889, 1900, 1907, and/or 1929.
- Files on individual buildings held at the State Historic Preservation Office.
- Books on architectural styles, building types, architectural history, and mining history.
- Building cards and photos from the Summit County Tax Assessor that are held at the Park City Historical Society & Museum (PCHS&M) research library and archive.

When evaluated for inclusion on the City's Historic Sites Inventory, weight was given to overall form, type and condition of materials, and general cues that suggest its construction during the mining era such as roof form (although it was noted in the Historic Site Form as having an atypical pitch and eave depth) and the use of a rolled steel multi-pane window in the primary façade. These window types were commonly

used on industrial buildings during the mining era. The window dates from the mining era. In addition, the building could not be definitively located on the 1929 Sanborn Fire Insurance Map, yet several small square structures appear on the Sanborn map (1929 and 1907) in this area of Grant Avenue that are assumed to have served as storage or accessory structures to primary structures along Grant Avenue and Main Street during the mining era. Without clear evidence that the building was NOT constructed during the historic period (1869-1929) combined with a number of conditions that suggested the building could have been constructed during the mining era, the building was included in the list of Historic Sites adopted by the Historic Preservation Board in February 2009 as the city's Historic Sites Inventory.

In the summer of 2009 after the Historic Site Inventory had been adopted by the City, new information—photographs from 1965—were found that provide evidence that the building was not constructed during the historic period and, therefore, does not meet the criteria for listing on the Historic Sites Inventory.

Further information from the property folder on file with PC Planning Department is provided below. The following timeline is based upon the timeline included in an email dated August 4, 2010 from Francisco Astorga (planner) to Lance Peto (owner at the time of correspondence) and was based on research conducted by Michelle Downard of the Building Department: (Comments in *italics* were inserted for this staff report by Preservation Solutions)

- 1916 – Summit County Assessor records this building being built.

1929 Sanborn maps show a building at this location, which is the structure referred to by Summit County. Photographic evidence from c. 1965 shows the site as a vacant lot. The structure seen today does not appear in photographs until 1978. Further, there is no evidence to substantiate a claim that the building is historic and was moved to this location from another site in Park City or elsewhere.

- 1978 – Dale Nielson states that he built the garage and that he had permits. No permit record can be found. To this day, building has no sewer or water connection.

Photos taken as part of the 1978-79 Main Street National Register nomination package show a portion of this building and the adjacent building at 222 Grant Avenue behind the structure at 204 Main Street (now demolished).

- 1985 – A fire incident was recorded on the dwelling neighboring this structure, however no other fire incidents found concerning this structure.
- 1991 – Purchased from Dale Nielson to Stanley Paul Johnson. Stanley Paul Johnson stated that Dale Nielson told him that he had built it in 1978.
- 1994 – Building permit for addition to garage structure. The permit referred to historic district commission.

Shed dormer is not visible in the 1978 photograph – south portion of the building is blocked by Main Street building--but a 1995 photo taken during a Reconnaissance Level Survey clearly shows the dormer.

- 2007 – Change of ownership.
- 2007 – Building permit for deck and stairs and another for office space. Contractor for 2007 remodel described the structural elements as not kiln dried, not hewed down and fully dimensional lumber.

Contractor comments are relevant, but it should be noted that dimensional lumber was used in the US beginning in the early nineteenth century and hewn elements were replaced by sawn wood when vertical frame saws and manual pit saws were replaced by circular saws also in the early nineteenth century. What is most significant is the lack of saw marks – clearly a sign of early circular saw use--and the evidence of kiln drying – another indication that the wood (at least the structural elements) is not historic.

The Planning Department is seeking to remove 210 Grant Avenue from the Historic Sites Inventory because a second analysis of the site conducted based on new information indicates that the site does not comply with the criteria set forth in 15-11-10(A)(2) of the LMC for designation as a Significant Site. Specifically, the site is not at least 50 years old and therefore does not comply with criterion (b) of Title 15-11-10(A)(2).

210 Grant Avenue has been mistakenly associated as a garage use to 222 Grant Avenue, however, it is located on a separate piece of property from 222 Grant and not associated with 222 Grant in any way as an accessory structure.

Analysis

The Historic Preservation Board is authorized by Title 15-11-5(I) to review and take action on the designation of Sites to the Historic Sites Inventory. In addition, Title 15-11-10(C) authorizes the Planning Department to remove a Site from the Historic Sites Inventory if:

15-11-10(C)(1) CRITERIA FOR REMOVAL

(a) The Site no longer meets the criteria set forth in 15-11-10(A)(1) or 15-11-10(A)(2) because the qualities that caused it to be originally designated have been lost or destroyed, or

(b) The Building (main, attached, detached or public), Accessory Building, and/or Structure on the Site have been demolished and will not be reconstructed, or

(c) Additional information indicates that the Building, Accessory Building, and/or Structure on the Site do not comply with the criteria set forth in 15-11-10(A)(1) or 15-11-10(A)(2).

If the Historic Preservation Board finds, based on the analysis below, that the site does not comply with the criteria set forth in Title 15-11-10(A)(2), it will be removed from the Historic Sites Inventory.

15-11-10. PARK CITY HISTORIC SITES INVENTORY.

(A) CRITERIA FOR DESIGNATING SITES TO THE PARK CITY HISTORIC SITES INVENTORY.

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

(a) It is at least fifty (50) years old or has achieved Significance in the past fifty (50) years if the Site is of exceptional importance to the community; and

Analysis: The site does not meet this criterion. It is not at least 50 years old. Photographs from planning consultant Gene Carr provide evidence that the building was not constructed at this location until after 1965. Further, there is no evidence to support the theory that the building was constructed during the Historic Period (1869-1929) and moved to this location.

(b) It retains its Essential Historical Form, meaning there are no major alterations that have destroyed the Essential Historical Form.

Major alterations that destroy the essential historical form include:

(i) Changes in pitch of the main roof of the primary façade if 1) the change was made after the Period of Historic Significance; 2) the change is not due to any structural failure; or 3) the change is not due to collapse as a result of inadequate maintenance on the part of the Applicant or a previous Owner, or

(ii) Addition of upper stories or the removal of original upper stories occurred after the Period of Historic Significance, or

(iii) Moving it from its original location to a Dissimilar Location, or

(iv) Addition(s) that significantly obscures the Essential Historical Form when viewed from the primary public Right-of-Way.

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

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

(ii) Lives of Persons who were of Historic importance to the community, or

(iii) Noteworthy methods of construction, materials, or craftsmanship used during the Historic period.

Summary

In summary, staff recommends the HPB find that the site does not comply with the criteria set forth in Title 15-11-10(A)(2) for designation as a Significant Site and that the site be removed from the Historic Sites Inventory.

Notice

Legal Notice of this public hearing was published in the Park Record and posted in the required public spaces.

Public Input

A public hearing, conducted by the Historic Preservation Board, is required prior to removing sites from the Historic Sites Inventory. The public hearing for the recommended action was properly and legally noticed as required by the Land Management Code.

Alternatives

- Conduct a public hearing on the Site described herein and remove the Site from the Historic Sites Inventory based on the findings of fact and conclusions of law set forth in the staff report.
- Conduct a public hearing and reject removal of the Site from the Historic Sites Inventory, providing specific findings of fact and conclusions of law for the action.
- Continue the action to a date certain.

Significant Impacts

There are no significant fiscal impacts on the City as a result of removing the Site described in this report from the Historic Sites Inventory.

Consequences of *not* taking the Recommended Action

Not taking the recommended action will result in a Site remaining on the Historic Site Inventory that does not meet the criteria for designation.

Recommendation

Staff recommends the Historic Preservation Board conduct a public hearing and vote to remove the Site described in this staff report from the Historic Sites Inventory based on the following findings of fact and conclusions of law:

Findings of Fact

1. The property at 210 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 210 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 210 Grant Avenue is not at least 50 years old.
3. The site at 210 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.

Exhibits

Exhibit A - Photographs

Exhibit B – 210 Grant Avenue Historic Site Form, 2011

EXHIBIT A – Photographs



210 Grant Avenue, West elevation, 2011



210 and 222 Grant Avenue, northwest oblique of site, 2011. Not proximity of white house located to the north and east of subject property.



Upper Grant Avenue/Swede Alley, northwest oblique, c. 1965

HISTORIC SITE FORM -- HISTORIC SITE INVENTORY

PARK CITY MUNICIPAL CORPORATION (06-09)

1 IDENTIFICATION

Name of Property:

Address: 210 Grant Avenue

AKA: 210 Swede Alley

City, County: Park City, Summit County, Utah

Tax Number: PC-579

Current Owner Name: 210 Grant Ave LLC, c/o Avenue Communities

Parent Parcel(s):

Current Owner Address: 230 W Fifth Street, Tempe, AZ 85281

Legal Description (include acreage): SUBD: PARK CITY BLOCK 72 (MILLSITE RES) BLOCK: 72 LOT: 20 BUILDING: 0.00 THE W'LY 50 FT OF LOT 20 BLK 72 MILLSITE RESERVATION TO THE PARK CITY SURVEY; ACCORDING TO THE OFFICIAL PLAT THEREOF ON FILE & OF RECORD IN THE SUMMIT COUNTY RECORDERS OFFICE EXCEPTING THEREFROM THE N'LY 7 FT & THE N'LY 7 FT OF THE W'LY 50 FT OF LOT 21 BLK 72 MILLSITE RESERVATION TO THE PARK CITY SURVEY; ACCORDING TO THE OFFICIAL PLAT THEREOF ON FILE & OF RECORD IN THE SUMMIT COUNTY RECORDERS OFFICE; EXCEPTING ANY PORTION LYING WITHIN THE FOLLOWING PARCEL: BEG AT A PT DUE S 210.37 FT & DUE E 327.83 FT FROM THE NE COR OF LOT 16 BLK 12 PARK CITY SURVEY PARK CITY UTAH; & TH RUN N 26*56'04" E ALONG THE SE'LY HAND RAILING ON AN EXISTING WOODEN STAIRWAY; TH N 43*45'13" E 13.27 FT; TH N 56*52'21" E 52.88 FT TO THE W'LY EDGE OF SAND RIDGE RD; TH S 16*59'50" E 28.65 FT; TH S 05*02'33" E 34.13 FT; TH S 07*17'37" W 45.44 FT; TH N 85*50'10" W 21.5 FT TO AN EXISTING FENCE COR; TH N 85*50'10" W 39.39 FT; TH N 01*51'09" W 56.72 FT ALONG THE TOP OF AN EXISTING ROCK RETAINING WALL TO THE PT OF BEG; ALSO EXCEPTING ANY PORTION LYING WITHIN THE FOLLOWING PARCEL: BEG AT AN EXISTING FENCE COR THAT IS DUE E 294.47 FT & DUE S 142.16 FT FROM THE NE COR OF LOT 16 BLK 12; ACCORDING TO THE AMENDED PLAT OF PARK CITY ON FILE IN THE OFFICE OF THE RECORDER OF SUMMIT COUNTY UTAH; TH N 77*50'30" E ALONG A FENCE 25.22 FT; TH N 04*00'00" W 1.25 FT; TH N 86*00'00" E BETWEEN TWO HOUSES 41.0 FT TO THE W'LY SIDE OF AN EXISTING RD; TH S 28*00'00" E ALONG SD RD 36 FT TO THE EXTENSION OF THE NW'LY SIDE OF A 3 FT WOODEN STAIRWAY; TH S 53*00'00" W ALONG SD STAIRWAY 63 FT TO AN ANGLE PT; TH CONTINUING ALONG SD STAIRWAY S 39*03' W 26.03 FT TO A PT ON A FENCE LINE EXTENDED; TH N 11*00'00" W ALONG THE EXTENSION OF & THE FENCE LINE 82.0 FT TO THE PLACE OF BEG BAL 0.04

2 STATUS/USE

Property Category

- building(s), main
- building(s), attached
- building(s), detached
- building(s), public
- building(s), accessory
- structure(s)

Evaluation*

- Landmark Site
- Significant Site
- Not Historic

Reconstruction

- Date: _____
Permit #: _____
 Full Partial

Use

- Original Use: Unknown
Current Use: Commercial

- *National Register of Historic Places: ineligible eligible
 listed (date:)

3 DOCUMENTATION

Photos: Dates

- tax photo:
- prints: c. 1965, '78, '95, '06, '09, '11
- historic: c.

Drawings and Plans

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

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

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

Researcher/Organization: Preservation Solutions/Park City Municipal Corporation Date: March 2011

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

Blaes, Dina & Beatrice Lufkin. "Final Report." Park City Historic Building Inventory. Salt Lake City: 2007.
 Carter, Thomas and Goss, Peter. *Utah's Historic Architecture, 1847-1940: a Guide*. Salt Lake City, Utah: University of Utah Graduate School of Architecture and Utah State Historical Society, 1991.
 McAlester, Virginia and Lee. *A Field Guide to American Houses*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1998.
 Preservation Solutions. "Historic Site Form – Historic Site Inventory." Park City: 2008.
 Roberts, Allen. "Final Report." Park City Reconnaissance Level Survey. Salt Lake City: 1995.
 Roper, Roger & Deborah Randall. "Residences of Mining Boom Era, Park City - Thematic Nomination." National Register of Historic Places Inventory, Nomination Form. 1984.

4 ARCHITECTURAL DESCRIPTION & INTEGRITY

Building Type and/or Style: Other residential type No. Stories: 1 ½

Additions: none minor major (describe below) Alterations: none minor major (describe below)

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.):

Site: Setting includes a shallow building pad with the primary structure located at the street edge and the rear yard rising at a severe slope to the east. There is no intentional vegetation or landscaping and the slope is covered in dense shrubs and trees. North side-yard is paved (concrete), front and south side yard are gravel.

Foundation: Concrete foundation.

Walls: Wooden drop siding. Rear elevation-stair from north side to rear deck.

Roof: Gable roof form with corrugated metal sheathing material. Large shed dormer springs from south ridge.

Windows/Doors: Multi-pane steel casement window on south elevation, fixed multi-light casement window in upper front gable, paired four-over-four double hung sash type windows located south of the main entry door – wood panel.

Essential Historical Form: Retains Does Not Retain, due to: retains a form that reflects the traditional house forms in Park City, but the house was constructed after c.1965. It is new construction using some salvaged materials in order to mimic a historic house form.

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 1 ½-story frame house was constructed after c. 1965 from new and salvaged materials to reflect historic house forms in Park City. The general form, gable front, was a common house type in Park City during the mining era, but the pitch of the roof is slightly steeper than typical as is the eave depth. The fenestration pattern and door placement are not typical for the mining era either. The larger multi-pane steel casement type window was commonly used mid-century on commercial, industrial, and residential buildings.

Setting (The physical environment--natural or manmade--of a historic site. Describe the setting and how it has changed over time.): The setting has been altered due to development surrounding the site and structure, namely the roadway (Swede Alley/Grant Avenue) and the development of a large parking area across the street. The lot is narrow and likely precluded any further development on the site because of the slope to the rear of the structure.

Workmanship (The physical evidence of the crafts of a particular culture or people during a given period in history. Describe the distinctive elements.): There is no physical evidence from the historic period that can be substantiated. The cues that originally suggested it was constructed during the historic period are the simple frame construction, the use of non-beveled (drop-novelty) wood siding, the plan type, the simple roof form, and the plain finishes.

Feeling (Describe the property's historic character.): The physical elements of the site, in combination, are compatible with a sense of life in a western town of the early twentieth centuries, but do not possess strong historic character from that era.

Association (Describe the link between the important historic era or person and the property.): Originally believed to have been constructed during the historic period, photographic evidence from Gene Carr made available in 2009 shows that this structure has no association with any important historic era or person in Park City.

Addition information to substantiate status as non-historic building – from the property folder on file with PC Planning Department:

Email dated August 4, 2010 from Francisco Astorga (planner) to Lance Peto.

Research conducted by Michelle Downard, Building Department (MD comments = regular, Preservation Consultant response/comment = *italic*):

- 1916 – Summit County Assessor records this building being built.
 - *1929 Sanborn maps show a building at this location, which is the structure referred to by Summit County. Photographic evidence from c. 1965 shows the site as a vacant lot. The structure seen today does not appear in photographs until 1978. Further, there is no evidence to substantiate a claim that the building is historic and was moved to this location from another site in Park City or elsewhere.*
- 1978 – Dale Nielson states that he built the garage and that he had permits, no permit record can be found, no sewer or water connection.
 - *Photos taken as part of the 1978-79 Main Street National Register nomination package show a portion of this building and the adjacent building at 222 Grant Avenue behind the structure at 204 Main Street (now demolished).*
- 1985 – a fire incident was recorded on the dwelling neighboring this structure, no other fire incidents found.
- 1991 – Purchased from Dale Nielson to Stanley Paul Johnson. Stanley Paul Johnson stated that Dale Nielson told him that he had built it in 1978.
- 1994 – building permit for addition)permit referred to historic district commission.
 - *Shed dormer is not visible in the 1978 photograph – south portion of the building is blocked by Main Street building--but a 1995 photo taken during a RLS clearly shows the dormer.*
- 2007 – Purchased from Stanley Paul Johnson to 210 Grant Avenue, LLC.
- 2007 – Building permit for deck and stairs and another for office space. Contractor for 2007 remodel described the structural elements as not kiln dried, not hewed down and fully dimensional lumber.
 - *Contractor comments are relevant, but it should be noted that dimensional lumber was used in the US beginning in the early nineteenth century and hewn elements were replaced by sawn wood when vertical frame saws and manual pit saws were replaced by circular saws also in the early nineteenth century. What is most significant is the lack of saw marks – clearly a sign of early circular saw use--and the evidence of kiln drying – another indication that the wood (at least the structural elements) is not historic.*

This structure is considered compatible new construction.

5 SIGNIFICANCE

Architect: Not Known Known: (source:)

Date of Construction: c1975

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:

This site does not represent an important part of history or architecture of the community.

1. Historic Era:

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

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. 1: Northwest oblique. Camera facing southeast, 2011.

Photo No. 2: Southwest oblique. Camera facing northeast, 2011.

Photo No. 3: West elevation. Camera facing east, 2011.

Photo No. 4: Northwest oblique. Camera facing southeast, 2009.

Photo No. 5: West elevation. Camera facing east, 2006.

Photo No. 6: West elevation. Camera facing east, 1995.

Photo No. 7: Partial view behind 204 Main Street, 1978.

Photo No. 8: Upper Grant Avenue-250 Grant Avenue visible on left (summer), c. 1965.

Photo No. 9: Upper Grant Avenue-250 Grant Avenue visible on left (winter), c. 1965.

HISTORIC SITE FORM - HISTORIC SITES INVENTORY

PARK CITY MUNICIPAL CORPORATION (10-08)

1 IDENTIFICATION

Name of Property:

Address: 210 Grant Avenue

AKA: 210 Swede Alley

City, County: Park City, Summit County, Utah

Tax Number: PC-579

Current Owner Name: 210 Grant Ave LLC

Parent Parcel(s):

Current Owner Address: 230 W Fifth Street, Tempe, AZ 85281

Legal Description (include acreage): SUBD: PARK CITY BLOCK 72 (MILLSITE RES) BLOCK: 72 LOT: 20 BUILDING: 0.00 THE W'LY 50 FT OF LOT 20 BLK 72 MILLSITE RESERVATION TO THE PARK CITY SURVEY; ACCORDING TO THE OFFICIAL PLAT THEREOF ON FILE & OF RECORD IN THE SUMMIT COUNTY RECORDERS OFFICE EXCEPTING THEREFROM THE N'LY 7 FT & THE N'LY 7 FT OF THE W'LY 50 FT OF LOT 21 BLK 72 MILLSITE RESERVATION TO THE PARK CITY SURVEY; ACCORDING TO THE OFFICIAL PLAT THEREOF ON FILE & OF RECORD IN THE SUMMIT COUNTY RECORDERS OFFICE; EXCEPTING ANY PORTION LYING WITHIN THE FOLLOWING PARCEL: BEG AT A PT DUE S 210.37 FT & DUE E 327.83 FT FROM THE NE COR OF LOT 16 BLK 12 PARK CITY SURVEY PARK CITY UTAH; & TH RUN N 26*56'04" E ALONG THE SE'LY HAND RAILING ON AN EXISTING WOODEN STAIRWAY; TH N 43*45'13" E 13.27 FT; TH N 56*52'21" E 52.88 FT TO THE W'LY EDGE OF SAND RIDGE RD; TH S 16*59'50" E 28.65 FT; TH S 05*02'33" E 34.13 FT; TH S 07*17'37" W 45.44 FT; TH N 85*50'10" W 21.5 FT TO AN EXISTING FENCE COR; TH N 85*50'10" W 39.39 FT; TH N 01*51'09" W 56.72 FT ALONG THE TOP OF AN EXISTING ROCK RETAINING WALL TO THE PT OF BEG; ALSO EXCEPTING ANY PORTION LYING WITHIN THE FOLLOWING PARCEL: BEG AT AN EXISTING FENCE COR THAT IS DUE E 294.47 FT & DUE S 142.16 FT FROM THE NE COR OF LOT 16 BLK 12; ACCORDING TO THE AMENDED PLAT OF PARK CITY ON FILE IN THE OFFICE OF THE RECORDER OF SUMMIT COUNTY UTAH; TH N 77*50'30" E ALONG A FENCE 25.22 FT; TH N 04*00'00" W 1.25 FT; TH N 86*00'00" E BETWEEN TWO HOUSES 41.0 FT TO THE W'LY SIDE OF AN EXISTING RD; TH S 28*00'00" E ALONG SD RD 36 FT TO THE EXTENSION OF THE NW'LY SIDE OF A 3 FT WOODEN STAIRWAY; TH S 53*00'00" W ALONG SD STAIRWAY 63 FT TO AN ANGLE PT; TH CONTINUING ALONG SD STAIRWAY S 39*03' W 26.03 FT TO A PT ON A FENCE LINE EXTENDED; TH N 11*00'00" W ALONG THE EXTENSION OF & THE FENCE LINE 82.0 FT TO THE PLACE OF BEG BAL 0.04

2 STATUS/USE

Property Category

- building(s), main
- building(s), attached
- building(s), detached
- building(s), public
- building(s), accessory
- structure(s)

Evaluation*

- Landmark Site
- Significant Site
- Not Historic

Reconstruction

- Date:
- Permit #:
- Full
 - Partial

Use

- Original Use: Residential
- Current Use: Residential

- *National Register of Historic Places: ineligible eligible
- listed (date:)

3 DOCUMENTATION

Photos: Dates

- tax photo:
- prints:
- historic: c.

Drawings and Plans

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

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

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

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

Blaes, Dina & Beatrice Lufkin. "Final Report." Park City Historic Building Inventory. Salt Lake City: 2007.
Carter, Thomas and Goss, Peter. *Utah's Historic Architecture, 1847-1940: a Guide*. Salt Lake City, Utah: University of Utah Graduate School of Architecture and Utah State Historical Society, 1991.
McAlester, Virginia and Lee. *A Field Guide to American Houses*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1998.
Roberts, Allen. "Final Report." Park City Reconnaissance Level Survey. Salt Lake City: 1995.
Roper, Roger & Deborah Randall. "Residences of Mining Boom Era, Park City - Thematic Nomination." National Register of Historic Places Inventory, Nomination Form. 1984.

4 ARCHITECTURAL DESCRIPTION & INTEGRITY

Building Type and/or Style: Other residential type No. Stories: 1 1/2

Additions: none minor major (describe below) Alterations: none minor major (describe below)

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.): General disrepair.
- 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: Not verified, but does not appear to have a foundation other than wooden sills.

Walls: Drop siding.

Roof: Gable roof form with unknown sheathing material.

Windows/Doors: Multi-pane steel casement window.

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 1 1/2-story frame house appears to have been constructed after 1907 based on many of the physical elements. The general form, gable front, was a common house type in Park City during the mining era. The fenestration and door placement are not typical for the mining era. The larger upper window type, multi-pane steel casement type--was commonly used mid-century on commercial, industrial, and residential buildings. An integrated garage door, if found to be original, suggests this was constructed as a commercial building to support adjacent commercial activities on Main Street. A large shed dormer was constructed, but likely added within the historic period as evidenced by the condition of the siding and trim material.

Setting (The physical environment--natural or manmade--of a historic site. Describe the setting and how it has changed over time.): The setting has been altered due to development surrounding the site and structure, namely the roadway (Swede Alley/Grant Avenue) and the development of a large parking area across the street. The lot is narrow and likely precluded any further development on the site because of the slope to the rear of the structure.

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 structure are the

simple methods of construction, the use of non-beveled (drop-novelty) wood siding, the plan type, the simple roof form, 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 town of the early twentieth centuries.

Association (Describe the link between the important historic era or person and the property.): Simple structures like this one were commonly constructed in Park City during the mining era. Though this structure does not appear on the 1907 Sanborn Insurance map, its design and materials suggest it was constructed during the mining era.

5 SIGNIFICANCE

Architect: Not Known Known: (source:)

Date of Construction: c. 1910

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.¹ This structure may have been constructed for a commercial use or a use in support of adjacent commercial activities.

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. 1: West elevation. Camera facing east, 2006.

Photo No. 2: West elevation. Camera facing east, 1995.

¹ From "Residences of Mining Boom Era, Park City - Thematic Nomination" written by Roger Roper, 1984.





WORK SESSION

Historic Preservation Board Work Session Staff Report



Author: Kayla Sintz, Senior Planner
Dina Blaes, Preservation Consultant
Subject: Historic Guidelines Training
Date: December 7, 2011
Type of Item: Training

Historic Guidelines Training:

- Survey of the policy discussions and public comments that informed the development of new Design Guidelines for Historic Districts and Historic Sites.
- Review of the process of updating the Historic Sites Inventory and how the public's reaction informed the city's decision to establish a two-tiered inventory of historic buildings that more accurately reflects the values of the community than one which is solely based on dictates from the National Park Service.
- Discussion on the National Historic Register criteria and Park City's Historic Sites criteria.