



**PARK CITY MUNICIPAL CORPORATION
HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD MEETING
MARSAC MUNICIPAL BUILDING
COUNCIL CHAMBERS
445 MARSAC AVENUE
PARK CITY, SUMMIT COUNTY, UTAH
MINUTES OF DECEMBER 6, 2023**

BOARD MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE: Douglas Stephens, Lola Beatlebrox, Puggy Holmgren, Jack Hodgkins, John Hutchings, Alan Long

EX OFFICIO MEMBERS: Caitlyn Tubbs, Senior Historic Preservation Planner; Rebecca Ward, Assistant Planning Director; Lillian Zollinger, Planner II; Mark Harrington, City Attorney

1. ROLL CALL

Board Member Douglas Stephens called the meeting to order at approximately 5:00 p.m. and conducted a roll call. All Board Members present were in chambers with the exception of Board Member Lola Beatlebrox, who participated remotely, and Chair Randy Scott. In the absence of Chair Scott, a Chair Pro Tempore needed to be selected.

MOTION: Board Member Hutchings moved to ELECT Douglas Stephens as Chair Pro Tempore for the meeting. Board Member Holmgren seconded the motion.

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

2. MINUTES APPROVAL

A. Consideration to Approve the Historic Preservation Board Meeting Minutes from November 1, 2023.

Board Member Jack Hodgkins referenced Page 3 of the Meeting Minutes. The vote stated: "Chair Scott noted that he could not hear Board Member Hutchings' vote, however, a quorum was present and the vote was unanimous." Board Member Hodgkins attended the meeting online and believed it was his vote that had not been heard.

MOTION: Board Member Holmgren moved to APPROVE the Historic Preservation Board Meeting Minutes from November 1, 2023, as amended. Board Member Hutchings seconded the motion.

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

3. STAFF AND BOARD COMMUNICATIONS AND DISCLOSURES

Senior Historic Preservation Planner, Caitlyn Tubbs, reported that on December 13, 2023, at 4:00 p.m. a site visit walk would be conducted on Main Street with the Planning Commission. The intention was to look at assorted temporary structures such as balcony enclosures and alpenglobes. Any members of the Board who were interested in attending that walk were welcome to do so. Currently, Staff is determining what the walking path will look like and what stops will be made. Additional information would be shared shortly. Planner Tubbs also informed the Board that the Little Bell Mine site was officially designated on the National Register of Historic Places as of November 27, 2023.

Chair Pro Tem Stephens asked about the Walking Tour. He questioned whether the Historic Preservation Board would be asked to participate in a Work Session with the Planning Commission. Planner Tubbs clarified that no Joint Work Session was scheduled but Board Members were welcome to attend the Planning Commission Meeting. Assistant Planning Director, Rebecca Ward, reported that a Work Session was scheduled for December 13, 2023, after the Walking Tour. Board Members could attend.

4. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS

There were no public communications.

5. CONTINUATIONS

A. 844 Empire Avenue - Material Deconstruction - The Applicant Seeks Material Deconstruction Approval to Construct a Side Addition on a Significant Historic Structure in the Historic Residential - 1 Zoning District. PL-22-05350 (Continued from 11/01/2023 Meeting).

Chair Pro Tem Stephens reported that the 844 Empire Avenue – Material Deconstruction application would be moved to the January 3, 2024, Historic Preservation Board Meeting. Planner Tubbs noted that the item was noticed for a public hearing. She asked that the Board hold the public hearing and continue the application until January 3, 2024.

Chair Pro Tem Stephens opened the public hearing. There were no public comments. The public hearing was closed.

MOTION: Board Member Hodgkins moved to CONTINUE 844 Empire Avenue – Material Deconstruction to January 3, 2024. Board Member Long seconded the motion.

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

6. REGULAR AGENDA

A. 959 Park Avenue - Material Deconstruction - The Applicant Proposes to Replace the North Foundation Wall on a Landmark Historic Site. PL-23-05892.

Planner II, Lillian Zollinger, presented the Staff Report and stated that the application is for 959 Park Avenue – Material Deconstruction. The property was designated as a Landmark Historic Site on Park City’s Historic Sites Inventory and constructed in 1895. The neighboring property, 961 Park Avenue, recently received approval for construction of a new single-family dwelling. That caused the 959 Park Avenue application to come about because there were concerns that the construction at 961 Park Avenue would disturb the foundation at 959 Park Avenue. The subject property appeared on three Sanborn Maps, which showed changes throughout the years. In 1907, a minor addition was extended towards the rear. It had largely remained the same since.

The applicant was proposing a replacement of the north foundation. The plan was to support the structure with temporary shoring, deconstruct the north foundation, and then construct the new foundation in the same location. The structure was not proposed to be lifted and no other modifications were requested that would disturb historic material. Staff recommended that the Historic Preservation Board review the proposed Material Deconstruction, conduct a public hearing, and consider approving the application for Material Deconstruction for 959 Park Avenue subject to the Draft Final Action Letter.

Chair Pro Tem Stephens opened the public hearing.

Paul K. raised his hand online to share a comment but did not reconnect to the meeting.

There were no comments. The public hearing was closed.

Board Member Beatlebrox believed that the actual location of the foundation work was under the house, which was confirmed. She thought the applicant was straightforward. Board Member Hodgkins pointed out that the subject of the Staff Report referred to Empire Avenue rather than Park Avenue. Planner Zollinger acknowledged the correction.

MOTION: Board Member Hutchings moved to APPROVE the Material Deconstruction at 959 Park Avenue, based on the Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Conditions of Approval outlined in the Draft Final Action Letter:

Findings of Fact

1. 959 Park Avenue is a Landmark Historic Structure on Park City’s Historic Sites Inventory.

2. The home was originally constructed c. 1895 and is a one-story frame hall and parlor house with a gable roof and original rear extension.
3. In 1984, 959 Park Avenue was listed on the National Register of Historic Places as part of the Park City Mature Mining Era.
4. On October 5, 2023, the Applicant submitted a full Historic District Design Review Application.

Material Deconstruction

1. The Applicant proposes the Material Deconstruction of the north foundation wall by stabilizing the Landmark Historic Structure with interior shoring beams and temporary walls, so as to not lift the structure.

Conclusions of Law

1. The proposed foundation replacement complies with the requirements set forth in the Historic Residential (HR-1) District (LMC Chapter 15-2.2).
2. The proposed foundation replacement complies with foundation requirements set forth in the Design Guidelines For Historic Residential Sites (LMC § 15-13-2(B)(2)(b)).
3. The proposed foundation replacement complies with material deconstruction requirements set forth in the Preservation Policy (LMC § 15-11-9).

Conditions of Approval

1. The Applicant is responsible for notifying the Planning Department and Building Department prior to proposing any changes to this approval.
2. The Applicant shall submit in writing any changes, modifications, or deviations from the approved scope of work for Planning review and approval/denial in accordance with the applicable standards prior to construction.
3. The Applicant must obtain Historic District Design Review approval prior to the issuance of a building permit.
4. An encroachment or access agreement is required for work conducted five feet or less from a lot line or having the potential to encroach on another property. An encroachment agreement may also be required for projects utilizing soil nails that encroach onto neighboring properties.

5. A Soils Report completed by a geotechnical engineer as well as a temporary shoring plan, if applicable, will be required at the time of building permit application.
6. Within five (5) days of installation of the cribbing and shoring, the structural engineer will inspect and approve the cribbing and shoring as constructed.
7. Historic Structures that are lifted off the foundation must be returned to the completed foundation within 45 days of the date the building permit was issued.
8. The Planning Director may make a written determination to extend this period up to 30 additional days if, after consultation with the Historic Preservation Planner, Chief Building Official, and City Engineer, they determine it is necessary. This would be based upon the need to immediately stabilize an existing Historic property, or specific site conditions such as access, or lack thereof, exist, or in an effort to reduce impacts on adjacent properties.
9. The Historic Preservation Plan must include a cribbing and excavation stabilization shoring plan reviewed and stamped by a State of Utah licensed and registered structural engineer prior to issuance of a building permit. Cribbing or shoring must be of engineer-specified materials.
10. The Applicant is responsible for notifying the Planning and Building Departments if changes are made. If the cribbing and/or shoring plan(s) are to be altered at any time during construction, the structural engineer shall submit a new cribbing and/or shoring plan for review. The structural engineer shall be required to re-inspect and approve the cribbing and/or shoring alterations within five (5) days of any relocation or alteration.
11. The Applicant shall also request an inspection through the Building Department following the modification to the cribbing and/or shoring. Failure to request such an inspection will be a violation of the Preservation Plan and enforcement action through the financial guarantee for historic preservation or ACE could take place.
12. The foundation shall be replaced and the site regraded so that all water drains away from the Structure and does not enter the foundation.
13. Any areas disturbed during construction surrounding the proposed work shall be brought back to their original state.

14. Deteriorated or damaged historic features and elements shall be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration or existence of structural or material defects requires replacement, the feature or element shall match the original in design, dimension, texture, material, and finish. The applicant must demonstrate the severity of deterioration or existence of defects by showing that the historic material safe no longer safe and/or serviceable and cannot be repaired to a safe and/or serviceable condition.
15. The historic windows, as listed on the Physical Conditions Report, shall be covered up and protected during construction.
16. Should the Applicant uncover historic window and/or door openings that were not documented at the time of the Historic Preservation Board's review, the Applicant shall schedule a site visit with the Planning Department and determine if the opening should be restored. Any physical evidence of lost historic window and/or door openings shall be documented, regardless of plans for restoration.
17. The Applicant shall provide the City with a Financial Guarantee to ensure compliance with the conditions and terms of the Historic Preservation Plan, and this Financial Guarantee shall be recorded with the Summit County Recorder's Office prior to submittal of a Building Permit.
18. The form, material, and detailing of a new foundation shall be similar to the historic foundation or similar to foundations of nearby historic structures. Historic foundations shall not be concealed with masonry blocks, plywood panels, corrugated metal, or wood shingles.

Board Member Long seconded the motion.

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

B. Fiscal Year 2024 Q1 Historic District Grant Program - The Historic Preservation Board will Review the 2024 Q1 Grant Applications and Determine the Awardees.

Planner Tubbs reported that the above item pertains to the first round of Historic District Grant Program applications. There was a newly revised timing structure for the program. Following multiple Work Sessions with the Board, it was determined that awards would be broken out into quarters. This was Q1 for Fiscal Year 2024. The budget allocated for the Historic District Grant Program for Fiscal Year 2024 was \$127,316. There were currently two applications to consider. The current request total was \$19,260. If the Board chose to approve the fully requested amounts, there would be \$108,056 in the Fiscal Year 2024 budget for the program.

The first application was for 97 Daly Avenue. The homeowner was requesting \$11,960 to replace the existing cedar shingle. It was a Significant Historic Structure and the applicant obtained a Historic District Design Review Waiver Letter for the roofing material replacement. As noted in the Staff Report, in Staff research of prior Building Permits and other materials, the shingles were not listed as being the original shingle material and had been replaced in the past. The homeowner explained in their application that with the record amount of snow received last year, the current cedar shingles suffered a lot of damage. She noted that in 1997, the property was awarded a grant award for \$10,000. That work included an overall remodel, including roofing, foundation, exterior wall stabilization, as well as mechanical, plumbing, and electrical systems upgrades.

The second application was for 416 Park Avenue. The request was for \$7,300 to repair the internal roof structure and eaves. With the record snowfall from last year, the roof structure had sustained some internal damage. The applicant had requested a grant from the City in order to make those repairs. Planner Tubbs noted that the property had received a Historic District Design Review Waiver Letter. In that waiver letter, it was noted that the overall form, pitch, and shape of the roof would not be altered as part of the repairs. The property had been awarded prior grants. In 2021, \$3,850 was awarded for roofing material replacement, and in 2010, \$1,750 was awarded for soffit and roof repair.

Staff recommended that the Historic Preservation Board review the two applications, accept public comment, and select any awardees for grant funding that the Board found to be appropriate. Chair Pro Tem Stephens asked if the Historic District Grant Program applications were normally open for public comment. This was confirmed. It was an administrative item, but a public comment period had been opened in the past.

There was discussion of 97 Daly Avenue. Board Member Long noted that the shingles protect the waterproof membrane underneath. He asked why the old cedar shingles were being replaced with new cedar shingles. Planner Tubbs reported that some photographs had been provided with the submittal materials. The waterproofing membrane underneath the shingles would also need to be replaced due to damage. Chair Pro Tem Stephens noted that the hand split single was not a historic shingle. He asked if something more historic would be used for the replacement. Planner Tubbs believed there would be a like-for-like replacement. Chair Pro Tem Stephens thought there should be hand-sawn shingles as that would improve the historic nature.

Board Member Beatlebrox asked if Chair Pro Tem Stephens wanted another application submission with updated costs. She believed the updated request would be much higher than what was currently being requested. Chair Pro Tem Stephens denied this. The estimate already included the barrier over the sub-roofing, a Class A roof system with a mineral surface fiberglass roll layer, cedar breather, and heavy fire-treated cedar shakes. The only difference he asked for was that the cedar shakes be hand-sawn. Board Member Hodgkins pointed out that the full amount of the estimate had not been requested. He was not sure the modified request would change the requested amount.

Planner Tubbs offered to adjust the Final Action Letter following confirmation with the applicant about the hand-sawn cedar shingles on the roof.

Chair Pro Tem Stephens asked for public comments on the 97 Daly Avenue application. One person initially raised their hand online, but declined the promotion to speak.

MOTION: Board Member Hutchings moved to forward a recommendation of APPROVAL to the City Council for the Historic District Grant Program request at 97 Daly Avenue, based on the Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Conditions of Approval outlined in the Draft Final Action Letter:

Findings of Fact

1. The Historic Preservation Board forwarded a positive recommendation to the City Council on December 6, 2023.
2. The property is located at 97 Daly Avenue.
3. 97 Daly Avenue is recognized as a Significant Historic Site on Park City's Historic Sites Inventory.
4. The property is located within the Historic Residential – 1 (HR-1) Zoning District.
5. On July 26, 2023, the Applicant submitted a Historic District Design Review (HDDR) Pre-Application for the proposed replacement of the cedar shake roof.
6. On August 2, 2023, the Interim Planning Director approved a waiver letter for the proposed roofing replacement.
7. On September 5, 2023, the Applicant submitted a complete Historic District Grant Application requesting a total grant award of eleven thousand nine hundred sixty dollars (\$11,960.00).
8. On November 1, 2023, the Historic Preservation Board held a work session to discuss the Fiscal Year 24 First Quarter Grant applications.
9. On December 6, 2023, the Historic Preservation Board reviewed the Fiscal Year 2024 First Quarter Grant applications and recommended an award in the amount of eleven thousand nine hundred sixty dollars (\$11,960.00).

Conclusions of Lawgffdtgr

1. The proposal complies with the Land Management Code requirements pursuant to Chapter 15-2.2, Chapter 15-11-9, and Chapter 15-13-2.

Conditions of Approval

1. The grantee must submit a Building Permit within 120 days of grant approval.
2. The proposed work must be completed no later than June 30, 2025.
3. The grantee must submit proof of payment to the Planning Department for disbursement of funds within 30 days of final inspection.
4. Improvements shall be completed in compliance with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation.
5. The grantee must maintain the architectural significance of the structure, retain and/or restore the historic character of the structure, preserve the structural integrity of the structure, and perform normal maintenance and repairs.
6. The grantee must enter into a five-year lien with the City. Should the property be sold within the five-year period, the applicant is responsible for repaying the City a pro-rated amount of the grant disbursement. If the property is sold within one year, 100% of awarded funds must be paid back to the City.
7. Any changes, modifications, or deviations from the approved scope of work shall be submitted in writing for review and approval/denial in accordance with the applicable standards by the Planning Director or his/her designee prior to construction.

Board Member Holmgren seconded the motion.

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

The Historic Preservation Board next discussed 416 Park Avenue. Chair Pro Tem Stephens asked for additional details about what would be done to the internal structure of the roof. Planner Tubbs reported that no drawings or photographs were received as part of the application. However, the proposed worksheet stated that the intention was to replace broken beams and reinforce the roof structure. Board Member Hodgkins asked if the broken beams were historic material. Planner Tubbs clarified that the applicant indicated the broken beams were not historic material, but noted that photographs would

help with that determination. Chair Pro Tem Stephens wanted to know if a Building Permit would be required with drawings and engineering. Planner Tubbs believed so. Chair Pro Tem Stephens was not certain that the Historic Preservation Board had enough information at the current time to vote in favor of the application. If the applicant was able to provide more information, it could be revisited.

Board Member Hutchings referenced the previous grant that had been awarded to the property in 2021. He wondered how this proposal differed from the previous roofing material replacement. Planner Tubbs reported that in 2021, a grant was awarded for the replacement of the shingles. This request was for the internal roof structure and eaves. Board Member Long wanted to know if there would be structural engineering calculations to show that this issue would not occur again in the future. He pointed out that there was not much slope and he worried that the issue would occur whenever there were heavy snow years. He was interested in seeing the structural engineer calculations in the future.

Since the Board intended to revisit the application at a future Historic Preservation Board Meeting, it was determined that public comment would be heard on 416 Park Avenue at a later date. Chair Pro Tem Stephens reiterated that additional information was needed.

C. Historic District Design Guideline Updates - The Historic Preservation Board Will Review Draft Illustrations for Land Management Code Chapter 15-13 Design Guidelines for Historic Districts and Historic Sites, Amendments to Maximum Driveway Designs in the Historic Districts, Removal of the Requirement that Non-Historic Structures Have an Opaque Finish and Minor Corrections.

Planner Tubbs reported that the Planning Department has been working on updates to the Historic District Design Guidelines. There was a Work Session held with the Board on November 1, 2023, to preview some of the proposed changes. The item was now being brought back to the Board to receive additional feedback on the proposed amendments. There was also a desire to find out whether the Board was ready to make a recommendation on the Historic District Design Guidelines to the Planning Commission.

There was a prior recommendation to illustrate the Design Guidelines and clarify driveway regulations. The Board also recommended that the Planning Department revise the opacity requirements for historic versus non-historic structures within the guidelines. There were a few minor grammatical corrections that were recommended by Staff as well.

In 1983, the Historic District Design Guidelines were 52 pages long and had illustrations. Currently, the Historic District Design Guidelines are approximately 81 pages and there are no illustrations. The City had contracted with Io LandArch and Lindsay Lloyd was present to answer questions. Planner Tubbs shared a few sample illustrations from Io LandArch. Others were included in the body of the proposed amendments. There were example illustrations to show transitional element requirements, appropriate placements for solar panels on corner and interior lots, and elements of commercial storefronts.

Staff recommended that the Design Guidelines be modified to clarify driveway regulations. The way the code was currently written, there was a recommendation for a 10-foot driveway width, but a limitation of 12 feet in width. Oftentimes, that 12-foot wide driveway extended the depth of the front setback and flared out to either a side-by-side parking configuration or a wider driveway once it was out of the setback area. The recommendation was that it be modified to a 10-foot width maximum and that there be a minimum of 18 inches between driveways if there was a side-by-side parking configuration proposed. Planner Tubbs explained that the intention was to modify the requirements so the overall impact of the hardscape in the Historic District was minimized.

A sample image was shared to illustrate what was proposed. Board Member Hodgkins asked about the example image shown on the left. Planner Tubbs clarified that the image on the left would currently meet the requirements of the Design Guidelines. Based on Staff research and findings related to the current parking configuration, the overall mass of the paving detracted from the historic character of the site and neighborhood. With so many vehicles parked in front of the structure, the view of the building was impacted. As a result, the middle graphic shown was recommended to be included in the amendments.

Board Member Hodgkins wanted to know if the example photos would be included in the Design Guidelines. Planner Tubbs explained that those had been shown to the Board to better illustrate what was described and would not be included in the codified ordinance. However, if the Board felt example photos were needed to show appropriate materials, that could be considered. Chair Pro Tem Stephens asked whether the illustration on the left would no longer be permitted if the amendments were approved. This was confirmed.

Board Member Hodgkins wanted to know if Staff was interested in receiving specific feedback about the illustrations shown or if there was a desire to find out if there was support for illustrations in general. Planner Tubbs explained that a bit of both was desired. The intention of getting the illustrations created was to codify them as part of the ordinance in order to assist with the overall accessibility and understanding of the Design Guidelines. Chair Pro Tem Stephens thought the guidelines needed to clearly visually define what was expected. It was necessary to look at all of the proposed illustrations to ensure that there was consistency with what was described in the language. Assistant Director Ward noted that it would be possible to separate out the different elements of what was proposed and review the non-substantive amendments, opacity, and driveway standards. There could be a Work Session to review the illustrations. Chair Pro Tem Stephens wanted to make sure that the illustrations were consistent with the language.

Planner Tubbs reported that on June 7, 2023, the Historic Preservation Board recommended that there be fully opaque paint and stain treatments on historic structures. Non-opaque finishes were recommended for non-historic additions and new construction. As part of the proposed amendments, Staff had removed the requirement from infill construction, so it would just be historic structures that would be required to be painted or stained to full opacity. Board Member Hodgkins thought that removing the requirement

from the non-historic pieces might result in a different interpretation that was not what the Board anticipated or expected to see with infill and new construction in the Historic Districts. Planner Tubbs noted that as part of the Work Session, there was a technical memo from preservation consultant, SWCA. As part of their research, they found that historically and traditionally, primary structures were painted fully opaque. Typically, outbuildings or other accessory structures were left with a raw finish. Some feedback had been received from a few local property owners who were interested in a raw wood or reclaimed wood appearance on portions of their new infill construction. The Board wanted to ensure that whenever new construction was connected to a historic structure, there was a complimentary architectural style and delineation between materials.

Board Member Hodgkins expressed concerns that the amendment would result in more modern materials in Historic Districts. It was important to be careful about the wording included in the Design Guidelines. Board Member Hutchings agreed with the comments shared. If one of the goals was to have new infill fit in the historic setting, a lot more needed to be done. Planner Tubbs stated that the opacity requirements could be revisited during a future Work Session if desired by the Historic Preservation Board.

Chair Pro Tem Stephens pointed out that whenever there was a historic structure substantially redone, there was usually an addition done as well. Based on what was proposed, the historic building would be painted, but he wondered what the options or limitations were for a new addition. Planner Tubbs explained that under the existing requirements, if the applicant chose to clad the new construction in wood siding, it would be required to be painted or stained to full opacity, just like the historic structure. With the proposed amendments, the opacity requirement would be removed from the new infill construction portion only. The historic structure itself would still need to be painted or stained to full opacity, but that would provide the property owner with more flexibility. There would be a bit more aesthetic flexibility for wood materials on new additions and new homes in Historic Districts, but the historic structure requirements would remain.

Board Member Hodgkins wanted to make sure the non-historic buildings were still compatible. Chair Pro Tem Stephens believed what was being discussed was compatibility for infill or additions. Board Member Hodgkins was referring to both. Chair Pro Tem Stephens thought the additions had been addressed because that was what the Planning Department did through the Historic District Design Review process. Planner Tubbs noted that there was an array of requirements, which included the architectural style, roof pitch, shapes and dimensions of windows, and other items that collectively contributed to the historic character of a site and the district as a whole.

Assistant Director Ward asked if Board Member Hodgkins was asking specifically about the underlying materials that would be permitted. This was confirmed. For a new build, language stated that the primary siding material should be similar to what was seen on historic structures. Historically, the most common material was painted, horizontal lap siding with a reveal between six to eight inches. There was a provision related to synthetic building materials, such as fiber cement or plastic wood composite siding, shingles, and

trim, where if the synthetic materials met certain sustainability standards, there was some flexibility provided in the materials that were allowed. Board Member Hodgkins wanted to review that information and look at some examples.

Chair Pro Tem Stephens asked if there was comfort with the finishes on new materials. Board Member Hutchings asked if what was before the Board only related to additions to historic homes. Planner Tubbs clarified that it related to additions to historic homes and new builds in the Historic Districts. Chair Pro Tem Stephens wanted to understand whether there was consensus on new additions to historic structures. Board Member Hodgkins was open to the non-opaque finishes but needed to understand what materials were permitted. Planner Tubbs reported that several materials could be utilized. Chair Pro Tem Stephens asked for clarity on the finishes for new additions to historic homes. He noted that materials could be discussed in the future.

Board Member Hodgkins stated that it would be possible to limit non-opaque finishes to wood. Chair Pro Tem Stephens believed the Board wanted to re-address the finishes and materials in more detail. Planner Tubbs stated that the matter could be revisited.

There was discussion about driveways. Assistant Planner Ward clarified that the illustrations shown there were not intended to be inserted into the code, but were for Board Member discussion. The driveway illustrations were Staff-made and were intended to further clarify what had been proposed. Board Member Hodgkins wondered why there was a desire to have more curb cuts on the street. Assistant Planner Ward reported that a lot of time was dedicated to driveways in the Historic Districts. The idea was to create a practical solution. Building Permits were often conditioned on compliance with the 12-foot width, but the 12-foot width did not have the flexibility needed. Board Member Hodgkins pointed out that Old Town wasn't flat and there were retaining walls. If the section that connected to the street was widened, it could compromise some of the historic retaining wall material that was seen in Old Town, which was his main concern.

Chair Pro Tem Stephens opened the public hearing.

Richard _____ was online but declined to be promoted to share a comment.

There were no comments. The public hearing was closed.

Board Member Hutchings moved to approve the changes to the Land Management Code that would allow two 10-foot driveways with an 18-inch separation. Board Member Holmgren seconded the motion. The Board voted in favor of the motion. Following the vote, Assistant Planner Ward asked whether the Board was also comfortable forwarding a recommendation for the non-substantive amendments with the removal of the opacity and illustration aspects of the proposal. Those elements could come back to the Board at a later date. City Attorney, Mark Harrington, asked that the motion be restarted and revoted on. There was discussion about appropriate language for the motion.

MOTION: Board Member Hutchings moved to forward a positive recommendation to the Planning Commission to APPROVE the ordinance, as amended, with the removal of the illustrations and the opacity regulations. Board Member Holmgren seconded the motion.

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

7. WORK SESSION

A. Temporary Structures Design Regulations – Work Session – The Historic Preservation Board Will Review Proposed Design Standards for Temporary Structures Including Tents, Alpenglobes, Enclosures, and Other Structures Erected on a Temporary Basis.

Planner Tubbs presented the Staff Report and stated that the Work Session discussion related to standards for temporary structures in Historic Districts. Following a Joint Work Session between the Historic Preservation Board and the Planning Commission, direction was received to look into some regulations for temporary structures within Historic Districts. The Planning Team had researched several comparable resort towns with Historic Districts within their boundaries and found that no other jurisdictions had Design Guidelines for temporary structures. Park City would be the first resort town to enact those types of regulations. As part of the newly proposed language, the standards for temporary structures had been based on the requirements for primary structures that already existed in the Design Guidelines. The standards were:

- Materials:
 - Durable, weatherproof materials that comply with the Architectural Design Guidelines be utilized;
 - Wall and roofing materials to be non-reflective;
 - Neutral colors are required and earth-tone materials are recommended;
 - No more than three different materials are permitted on any façade.

Planner Tubbs reported that all of the requirements were already enacted for primary structures. Those requirements were proposed to apply to temporary structures as well. Board Member Hodgkins asked if tents set up for events were in a different category, because those were up for hours or days as opposed to weeks and months. Planner Tubbs clarified that the standards would apply to all temporary structures, including tents, alpenglobes, and temporary winter balcony enclosures. Assistant Director Ward added that tents that were only up for a special event did not go through the same review process as those were permitted through Special Event Permits.

Board Member Hodgkins referenced the standard that stated wall and roofing materials needed to be non-reflective. He asked if that included windows as well. This was denied. Planner Tubbs explained that the language only related to the wall and roofing materials. There was a separate section related to glazing. Board Member Hodgkins pointed out that a temporary structure could have walls of glass. He wanted to know if that would be

considered a window or a wall. Planner Tubbs stated that it would fall under glazing. She next reviewed the glazing requirements for temporary structures:

- Glazing:
 - Glazing must be clear – no metallic, frosted, or tinted finishes permitted;
 - Solid-to-Void ratio to coincide with the primary structure;
 - Glazing shall be glass, acrylic, or plexiglass. Film glazing is not permitted.

Board Member Hodgkins asked for an example of film glazing. Planner Tubbs described a special event tent that had pre-fabricated windows cut into the side. Board Member Beatlebrox referenced language that stated, “The amount of glazing on a temporary structure shall coincide with the amount of glazing present on the primary structure.” She wanted to understand how that worked with a balcony like Riverhorse on Main. That language seemed to be fairly restrictive. Also, if all glazing was clear, the sun would shine through and could impact the user experience. Planner Tubbs discussed the ratio of glass to wall area. With a winter balcony enclosure, like the type found at Riverhorse on Main, the historic storefront had more expansive glazing than in a residential portion of the Historic District. More glazing on a temporary structure in the commercial district might be more appropriate and could be approved under the regulations. As for the comment about the clear glazing, someone using a structure that was primarily glazing might want to place curtains on the inside or have an internal shade structure in order to keep the sun and heat off of the occupants. If the Board felt Staff needed to revisit the language, that could be done. Board Member Beatlebrox wanted some flexibility.

Planner Tubbs noted that Staff could craft a subsection that related to temporary structures that were attached to primary structures as opposed to standalone structures. Board Member Hodgkins asked about language that pertained to the design if the decision was made to heat or cool the space. Chair Pro Tem Stephens thought it made sense to look into that and consider sustainability. Board Member Beatlebrox wanted to know if the language was talking about temporary structures on historic buildings or temporary structures in front of historic buildings. Alternatively, it could be discussing temporary structures on non-historic buildings. She stressed the importance of clarity. Planner Tubbs explained that as currently drafted, the language would pertain to all temporary structures in Historic Districts. She shared some other proposed requirements:

- Roofs:
 - Temporary structure roofs shall be pitched, gabled, pyramidal, shed, or flat roof forms; encouraged to match the roof form of the primary structure.
- Connection:
 - Temporary structures cannot be directly connected to historic materials.
- Lighting:
 - Lighting must comply with Architectural Design Guidelines;
 - Lighting must be Dark Skies compliant.
- Ornamentation and Signage:
 - No signage permitted on a temporary structure;

- Minimal decorations – banners, bunting, scrollwork, and finials not permitted.
- Location:
 - Temporary structures cannot be within public right-of-way unless associated with a Special Event Permit, Master Festival License, or Encroachment Agreement.

Planner Tubbs noted that there were a few questions for the Board to consider:

- Do the proposed standards address the Historic Preservation Board's concerns regarding the appearance of temporary structures?
- Are there standards or features Planning Staff should add to this code?
- Are there standards that should be modified or removed from this code?

Planner Tubbs reminded the Board Members that this was a Work Session discussion and there would be additional review before the matter moved forward to the Planning Commission or the City Council. Board Member Hodgkins asked if opaque or non-opaque material coverings would be required as he wanted to know if plywood would be acceptable. Planner Tubbs reported that the materials were referred to as “durable, weatherproof materials” that were listed in the Architectural Design Guidelines. Things like plywood and chipboard would not be appropriate for a temporary structure. The idea was for the temporary structures to look nice and fit in with the aesthetic of the Historic District. The materials also needed to be able to withstand the elements and use.

Board Member Holmgren asked if there were timeframes provided for the temporary structures. Assistant Planner Ward confirmed that applications were submitted for certain timeframes. Under the Building Code, the temporary structures could not be up for more than 180 days. Chair Pro Tem Stephens expressed concerns about the review process. He did not want anyone to be able to work around or avoid the Historic District Guidelines. Assistant Planner Ward explained that previously, temporary structures had not been required to go through the Historic District Design Review. What was proposed would ensure there was a clear process and requirements in place. There was discussion about the review process and the future renewal process.

Board Member Beatlebrox noted that next week there would be a walkthrough of Main Street and the Planning Commission would hold a Work Session afterward. She wondered how Board Members unable to attend would find out what was discussed during the Work Session. Planner Tubbs noted that after the walk and meeting, Staff could share a list of the sites that were visited during the walk and could also create a memo with highlights to pass along to Historic Preservation Board Members for review.

Assistant Planner Ward noted that one hand was raised online. Chair Pro Tem Stephens allowed for public input to be shared. *Richard _____* made an inappropriate comment and was disconnected from the Zoom call. No further comments were shared.

8. ADJOURN

MOTION: Board Member Hutchings moved to ADJOURN. Board Member Hodgkins seconded the motion.

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

The Historic Preservation Board Meeting adjourned at approximately 6:46 p.m.

Approved by _____
Randy Scott, Chair
Historic Preservation Board

Approved 01.03.2024