



**PARK CITY MUNICIPAL CORPORATION
HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD MEETING
MARSAC MUNICIPAL BUILDING
COUNCIL CHAMBERS
445 MARSAC AVENUE
PARK CITY, SUMMIT COUNTY, UTAH
MINUTES OF JANUARY 3, 2024**

BOARD MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE: Randy Scott-Chair, Lola Beatlebrox, Puggy Holmgren, Alan Long, John Hutchings

EX OFFICIO MEMBERS: Rebecca Ward, Planning Director; Caitlyn Tubbs, Senior Historic Preservation Planner; Jaron Ehlers, Planning Technician

1. ROLL CALL

Chair Randy Scott called the meeting to order at 5:05 p.m. and conducted a roll call. Board Members Holmgren and Beatlebrox appeared in Chambers. Chair Scott and Board Member Long participated remotely. Board Members Stephens, Hutchings, and Hodgkins were not in attendance at the beginning of the meeting.

Chair Scott reported that a quorum was present and the meeting could proceed as scheduled.

2. MINUTES APPROVAL

A. Consideration to Approve the Historic Preservation Board Meeting Minutes from December 6, 2023.

MOTION: Board Member Long moved to APPROVE the Historic Preservation Board Meeting Minutes from December 6, 2023. Board Member Beatlebrox seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Board. Chair Scott abstained as he was not present for the December 6, 2023 meeting.

3. STAFF AND BOARD COMMUNICATIONS AND DISCLOSURES

There were no Staff communications.

Chair Scott congratulated Planning Director, Rebecca Ward on being formally named the Park City Planning Director.

In furtherance of an email sent by Senior Historic Preservation Planner, Caitlyn Tubbs, Chair Scott announced that the 2023 Historic Preservation Award would be presented to the City Council on January 4, 2024, at 5:30 p.m. Planner Tubbs confirmed that the artist would unveil the artwork during that meeting.

4. **PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS**

There were no public communications.

5. **CONTINUATIONS**

- A. **218 Sandridge Road – Material Deconstruction – The Applicant Seeks Approval for Material Deconstruction of a Portion of a Significant Historic Structure to Facilitate the Construction of a New Addition and Detached Garage. PL-23-05692 (Continued from November 1, 2023 Meeting).**

Planner Tubbs reported that the above item was scheduled previously as well. Staff recommended the Board open a public hearing and continue the item to a date uncertain.

Chair Scott opened the public hearing. There was no public comment. The public hearing was closed.

MOTION: Board Member Beatlebrox moved to CONTINUE 218 Sandridge Road – Material Deconstruction, to a date uncertain. Board Member Long seconded the motion.

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

- B. **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 December 6, 2023)**

Planner Tubbs reported that Staff recommended the Historic Preservation Board (“HPB”) open a public hearing and continue the item until February 7, 2024.

Chair Scott opened the public hearing. There was no public comment. The public hearing was closed.

MOTION: Board Member Holmgren moved to CONTINUE 844 Empire Avenue – Material Deconstruction, to February 7, 2024. Board Member Long seconded the motion.

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

Planner Tubbs noted that Staff was planning to hold a site visit at 844 Empire on February 7, 2024, at 4:00 p.m. to allow the Board to look at the fire damage and the remainder of the interior of the home.

It was announced by Board Member Beatlebrox that Board Member John Hutchings joined the meeting in chambers.

6. **WORK SESSION**

A. **2024 Visioning - The Historic Preservation Board will Conduct a Work Session for 2024 Historic Preservation Visioning for Park City.**

Planner Tubbs reported that in 2014, the City's General Plan was adopted, and as part of that General Plan the historic character and the preservation thereof was identified as one of the four core values of the community. Staff intended to provide a summary of the recommendations made by the General Plan, and identify those that had been completed, those that were in progress, and those that had not yet begun. Staff also sought input from the Board on any priority projects or direction for Staff for the upcoming year.

Two goals were specifically outlined in the General Plan. Goal 15 was to preserve the integrity, mass, scale, compatibility, and historic fabric of the nationally and locally designated historic resources and districts for future generations. Planner Tubbs expressed that this calls for the preservation of the historic resources themselves and the overall character of the community as a whole as a mining town. Goal 16 was more specific to the commercial district, which was to maintain the historic Main Street District as the heart of the City for residents and encourage tourism in the district for visitors.

Planner Tubbs stated that the City completed several items outlined as proposed strategies in the General Plan. In 2016, the City obtained a Certified Local Government grant from the State Historic Preservation Office to complete intensive-level surveys for all of Park City's designated sites. Those intensive-level surveys were instrumental and required for property owners who want to nominate their structure to the National Register of Historic Places.

The City also entered into agreements with both Deer Valley and Vail Resorts to protect the mining structures under two separate Memorandums of Understanding. Planner Tubbs also noted the continued Historic District Grant Program and added that tweaks and changes had been made to ensure it meets the needs of the community to the best extent possible. She also noted the continued Annual Historic Preservation Awards and reminded those present that they would visit the most recent winners the following evening.

She mentioned that the City recently enacted Maximum Lot Sizes in residential areas in the Historic Districts, notably the Historic Residential – Low ("HR-L"), Historic Residential – 1 ("HR-1"), and Historic Residential – 2 ("HR-2") zones. Planner Tubbs reported that in 2015 and 2016, the City enacted the Main Street Vibrancy Ordinances to ensure that the Main Street District would be a vibrant and lively core where people can visit and shop.

In 2015, the City Council opened the Temporary Winter Balcony Enclosure Pilot Program, which was recently continued for an additional five years to allow an evaluation of potential design standards for Temporary Structures in Historic Districts. In terms of those items

currently in progress, Planner Tubbs noted the proposed text amendments regarding modifications to the Historic District Design Guidelines previously reviewed by the Board. Staff was also working on putting together some illustrations. She recalled the walking tour to view some Temporary Structures and the materials and lighting used for those structures. Planner Tubbs reported that Staff was also looking to return before the Board for a Work Session on appropriate materials and opacity in the Historic District.

Some of the items recommended by the General Plan that have not been addressed include an update to the Historic Sites Inventory every two years. Since the adoption of the General Plan, the Historic Sites Inventory was codified in 2017. All of the City's designated historic resources were adopted into the Code. Since that time, one structure was removed in 2018. No other properties had been designated to the Historic Sites Inventory since that time.

Planner Tubbs reported that in 2019, the State Legislature passed Utah Code Section 10-9a-503, which limited the expansion or creation of historic districts. The establishment or expansion of these districts now requires a citizen-led process, and that definition is codified in State Code. Utah Code Section 10-9a-534 also prohibited regulation of building design elements. Therefore, the City may only regulate design for districts or sites designated prior to 2021. Given these State Code requirements, she reported that Staff was unsure that updating the Historic Sites Inventory was a viable option; however, if the Board so directed, Staff could start working on a broad community outreach and education to see if there was support for individuals to initiate a citizen-led process to designate those structures. Without that outreach, this option might not be viable.

Planner Tubbs next addressed the proposition to establish a revolving loan fund. She noted the City initially started with the Historic District Grant Program to determine if there was an appetite for this, and the Grant Program had been highly successful with hundreds of thousands of dollars in grant funding awarded to local property owners. Recently, some members of the Board opined that the average income within Park City limits should be adequate to maintain historic resources such as painting a structure, replacing a roof, replacing windows, and similar costs associated with home ownership. They could best incentivize best preservation practices through the Grant Program; however, Staff understood that the Board was not interested in pursuing a revolving loan fund.

Board Members Hutchings and Beatlebrox did not recall discussing a revolving loan fund, and Planner Tubbs reported that it was discussed during some Work Sessions for the Grant Program. She explained that the Board's commentary during those discussions was that the average income for a Park City resident was so high that it would not make sense to offer taxpayer-sourced funding as a revolving loan fund.

Board Member Holmgren recalled the discussion well because she felt very strongly about this issue. She felt that the City should not be providing a loan to someone who can easily afford to paint a house.

Board Member Hutchings noted that a loan would have to be paid back, so if a homeowner needed the money they could borrow it. Planner Tubbs stated that if the Board wanted Staff

to look into this further, they could see if there might be qualification standards used by other municipalities. Many times when loans are offered for preservation purposes, they are offered at a very low or no interest rate. She echoed Board Member Holmgren's comments that the Grant Program was in place to incentivize preservation best practices.

Board Member Beatlebrox asked if a revolving loan fund with low or zero interest rates would put a burden on the City. She reiterated that she did not recall discussing this issue and expressed surprise that it was coming up. Planner Tubbs was unsure if there were any specific financial requirements for the City to pursue a revolving loan fund. Staff could review this with the Finance team and return with that information for the Board's consideration.

Board Member Holmgren commented that the City has enough on its plate without becoming bankers. Board Member Hutchings commented that Preservation Utah handled a lot of revolving loan funds for various municipalities in the State. He noted that people who could use the funds, and who could not otherwise perform work on their historic building are the ones receiving these loan funds. He added that the funds were not like a grant which is just money that keeps going out the door every year.

In terms of need, Board Member Hutchings stressed that the funds were not going to people who do not need them. He added that people who do not need the funds would typically not take out a loan that must be repaid. He would like to understand the opposition to a revolving loan fund and perhaps restart the discussions.

Board Member Long asked if there had been requests for a loan from the City. Planner Tubbs stated there had not necessarily been requests for a loan from the City; however, there had been requests for education on whether other entities offered loans similar to Preservation Utah. When they received those inquiries, Staff forwarded the property owner to the Utah State Historic Preservation Office or Preservation Utah to start that conversation. To her knowledge, there had not been a direct request for a loan from the City.

In response to Board Member Long's question regarding the rate charged by Preservation Utah, Board Member Hutchings reported that it depended on whose money Preservation Utah was managing, but it was greatly discounted.

Chair Scott assumed that someone at Preservation Utah could advise the City on what it would take to initiate something like this. He would like to at least look at the issue and noted that if it was a major burden then the timing might not be right. He recalled talking about projects that could qualify for a grant but did not recall discussing a revolving loan fund. He reported that a revolving loan fund could be interesting, especially as they think about other topics of what they want people to do as they look to improve their homes. He posited the possibility that a revolving loan fund could work for someone who did not have the capital to take care of certain projects. He felt it would be worth it to at least determine the amount of work it would take to set up. Planner Tubbs indicated that Staff could find additional resources and return with more information at a future Work Session.

Planner Tubbs next addressed annual training for City and members of the public. She stated that City Staff provides training to Staff, Boards, and Commissions; however, the training could be expanded to include additional educational opportunities for residents local business owners, and design professionals. Staff is looking into the resources needed to facilitate training. At this point, however, there had not been much motion on the additional education. Board Member Beatlebrox thought this was a good idea.

Planner Tubbs identified the last recommendation as the creation of a self-guided walking tour, which had long been supported but never completed. She stated it would be a fairly easy strategy to pursue. She explained they could create a self-guided walking tour and/or Staff-guided walking tour. Additionally, Staff could also coordinate with other community organizations that explore historic resources.

Board Member Long felt this was a great idea, and noted if someone was dropped off at Silver Star they could see seven different restored Historic Structures within a short stroll. Chair Scott added that the Museum had made some strides in this area by working with Friends of Ski Mountain Mining History as well as Main Street. He was aware that a lot of work had already gone into this and there were resources available that would not depend on the City to manage.

Board Member Holmgren stated that the Museum used to have self-guided walking tours with maps. Board Member Beatlebrox did not recall the Museum ever offering a self-guided walking tour. She recalled giving some tours while she was the Museum's Education Director and felt a self-guided walking tour would be great. She expressed that going to places designated with ribbons made a lot of sense so people would not have to wait for a walking tour guide.

Chair Scott commented that self-guided tours are on the project list, and noted the Museum had guided tours several times per week up and down Main Street and through the neighborhoods and the Glenwood Cemetery.

Board Member Hutchings added that Preservation Utah also hosts such tours for various communities around the State, and could perhaps set up this program for Staff.

Board Member Beatlebrox commented that when she worked at the Museum, she always thought it would be important to put advertising on all the buses so that people were aware there were walking tours or self-guided walking tours.

Board Member Long wondered if they could have a QR code on the buses. Board Member Hutchings added they could also have them at the beginning of a historic street.

Planner Tubbs next addressed the visioning component of the discussion, and explained that Staff wanted to hear from the Board about the following questions:

- *What is the HPB most proud of accomplishing?*

Board Member Hutchings mentioned bringing back the Grant Program and the most recent revisions to the Land Management Code. He would like to revisit some of those changes now that they have seen projects come through and felt that perhaps they could make some additional recommendations.

Board Member Holmgren mentioned bringing together the Land Management Code and explained that she was here on the very first Board when they started talking about it. She noted how unpleasant some of the builders and architects were just with the thought of changing anything. She mentioned the statement that this document was liquid and not set in concrete.

Board Member Long liked that the Board asked different artists for their artistic interpretation of some of the restorations. Additionally, he liked that the Board was given the opportunity to select an artist who actually created paints out of the materials found on the sites of the Historic Structures. He felt this was a wonderful way of showing not only what they preserve, but how they evolve.

Board Member Beatlebrox mentioned the restorations and improvements completed on some very difficult miners' shacks and stated they helped preserve these structures by going through the process. She stated that over the years, the Board has helped shape what Park City looks like today.

Chair Scott agreed and stated there had been a lot of consistency on the Board. He felt that each Board Member interprets the Land Management Code items very similarly and with the same level of intent. When needed, they have also been able to compromise in the spirit of preserving a building even though it might not be exactly what the Board wants to accomplish what they need to accomplish.

Board Member Beatlebrox agreed and added that the architects seemed to bring to the Board things they knew the Board would support because they know what the Land Management Code requires and the Board has been consistent. She felt there was an architectural partnership.

Additionally, Chair Scott stated that some of these projects were very difficult to interpret on paper or electronically, and the site visits were crucial to help the Board move the process along for the applicant and the Planning Department. Board Member Beatlebrox added that they were not theoretical; rather, the Board visits the sites and understands the challenges of a given project.

Board Member Holmgren was happy to see the care taken with the mining structures and stated it has made a huge difference in terms of the history of the community.

Planner Tubbs understood the comments as reflecting that the City had done a good job being responsive to the local property owners and design professionals and allowing flexibility in the expansion of these structures to accommodate modern family living needs,

while also preserving the historic materials and the structures themselves to the greatest extent possible.

She also noted the new ways to celebrate these structures through the Preservation Awards and the art pieces.

- *What about the City's preservation policies and procedures could be improved?*

Board Member Beatlebrox mentioned the structure on Empire Avenue with the three front façades and noted the conundrum because they could not figure out which façade was primary. She felt there needed to be some discussion about that because it was unfair to unique properties to have to try to figure it out.

Board Member Hutchings added the example of a building that historically faced downhill and the owners wanted to turn it around. He suggested better defining the historic modes of transportation and how people accessed their properties and using that to define what is the front versus the rear façade. He recalled that the mode of transportation was raised on the structure that has three sides.

Chair Scott stated they know the difference between a primary and secondary façade on a home in the middle of the block, whereas it could be different for a corner lot. He suggested defining it as it relates to the location of the home. Without those definitions, he felt they were just going off of their opinions, which was difficult to maintain for the applicant. Chair Scott felt they just needed to add more context and illustrations to the Land Management Code. He commented that there are structures in town that were just barely hanging on, and he wanted to be able to somehow bring a level of urgency to those properties with whatever means were available to ensure that the owner was doing something to prevent the structure from failing. Board Member Holmgren noted that there is a rule of no demolition by neglect.

Chair Scott was unsure if there was a specific process. If it was codified, it might require the City to provide notice before taking action. He mentioned there were a couple of structures that were close, and he wanted to make sure the City was doing what it can to prevent the failure of these buildings. He also wondered whether there was a way to strengthen these policies.

Board Member Beatlebrox felt they should really look at the procedures and what historically had occurred. She believed that notifications go out but are ignored. She stated that demolition by neglect had been a problem. She added that the Board was seeing the more difficult projects, as the easier projects have already been completed. She added that the people who are buying these properties seem to have the means to take care of them; therefore, the properties not yet purchased were the ones they should worry about.

Board Member Holmgren stated that she receives a notice when a house is going up near her. She suggested also providing notices of neglect to the neighbors so they can be aware that the City is aware of the issue and is trying to fix it.

Board Member Hutchings felt there were too many loopholes regarding transition elements when an owner adds an addition to a Historic Structure. He mentioned the example of the three-fronted building where the owner was able to put a relatively large addition. He suggested they carefully reconsider the purpose of a transition element, which is meant to allow the Historic Structure to be read and visualized for what it really is, and not part of something bigger. They want to let these structures become modern and lived in. He requested another Work Session on how to strengthen or change the language because many of the latest projects had not been required to have a transitional element.

Planner Tubbs understood that the Board was interested in studying more traditional methods of transportation within the City, and using the traditional mode or façade of arrival when determining which façade is primary. Applicants could then incorporate this information into the design. She also understood there was a desire to strengthen the transitional elements and the procedure for the enforcement of abandoned or neglected houses.

- *Are there items suggested by the General Plan that the City should avoid or continue avoiding?*

Board Member Beatlebrox expressed concern about the notion of people worrying about 1960s structures on the Historic Sites Inventory. In response to her inquiry requesting clarification, Planner Tubbs did not think Staff was necessarily opposed to it. However, with the recently enacted State statutes that prohibit the City from initiating expansion or creation of a Historic District on its own, they would need a citizen-led process. Because of this new State statute, the City cannot simply initiate an expansion or creation of a new District.

Board Member Hutchings asked if the City could redefine what is “historic” in a current district. He felt the current Historic Districts were set up for certain mining era periods. He wondered, for example, if they could also try and preserve early ski-era architecture within Old Town and require similar standards for those structures.

Director Ward stated that Staff could look into that and provide additional information as to what that would look like under the new State Code.

Board Member Holmgren observed that there were likely not many A-frames left.

Planner Tubbs stated that the General Plan noted the ski era architecture and the City might also want to consider the Olympic structures as well.

Board Member Hutchings noted that was tricky as there would be another Olympics coming soon, and wondered how they could emphasize and preserve the 2002 Olympics so its heritage would stand out and not get lost in the next Olympics. He stressed the 2002 Olympics were not 50 years ago, so while it would not typically be defined as historic, it was definitely a historic event that probably needed to be preserved.

Board Member Holmgren commented that the things that were used were the ski runs. Board Member Hutchings mentioned the signage.

Director Ward asked if there was interest in a Work Session on the revolving loan fund with information from Preservation Utah, in addition to how a loan might help incentivize property owners of dilapidated structures. She noted the Work Session could combine some of these topics.

Board Member Hutchings expressed that it was worth a discussion and mentioned that the State Historic Tax Credit was set up for residential work. He offered that a lot of the 1960s structures would qualify for that incentive, and he wondered how they could make people aware that this was available for those types of structures. He also mentioned working with the State or Preservation Utah to implement tax credits for something even newer, such as 20 years old. He commented that even in the 1980s Park City was a budding ski area, and perhaps there was value in preserving that development before it is lost like the A-frames.

Board Member Holmgren commented that the two A-frames of which she is aware were within a block of each other. With the limited number of A-frames, Board Member Beatlebrox posited that it would almost be like singling them out and could cause issues. There was discussion about other structures from the same time period that were not A-frames.

Board Member Holmgren suggested that the City let these homeowners know the direction of the City and be notified that the City does not want these houses torn down.

Board Member Hutchings proffered adding incentives for those structures to the Grant Program. Chair Scott commented on the Museum's research on ski area homes and structures and noted that the 7-Eleven on Park Avenue fell within that category.

Planner Tubbs understood that there was not necessarily a proposal or option that the City should outright avoid, but perhaps they should gather some information and look at the pros and cons of each one before moving forward.

- *Are there items suggested by the General Plan that the City has already worked on, or is currently working on that should be revisited?*

Chair Scott and Board Member Long reported that they did not have any input on this question.

Board Member Holmgren mentioned fixing the traffic, to which Board Member Beatlebrox agreed.

- *What tools or information can Staff provide to the Board to help facilitate discussions or analysis of projects?*

Planner Tubbs asked if there were any additional opportunities for conferences or classes that the Board would like to utilize.

Board Member Beatlebrox expressed that the communication between Staff and the Board had been better than ever.

Chair Scott wondered how they could collaborate with other towns that have the same issues as Park City. He mentioned that Staff usually does the equivalent of a field trip to another tourist town to look at best practices. He questioned whether it made sense to have Work Session discussions with a town like Telluride and create a top 10 list in terms of issues they could discuss. There was discussion about the City Tour, and Director Ward stated they re-started those. In terms of collaboration with other towns, she queried whether there would be interest in a remote meeting.

- *What are the HPB's preservation priorities for 2024?*

Board Member Holmgren responded that the items discussed during this Work Session were fabulous in terms of priorities. She mentioned that she was on the first HPB and this was the most cohesive group she had worked with. She also expressed that it had been an honor and pleasure to serve with this Board.

Planner Tubbs stated she would share her notes with the Board, and invited any further comments or suggestions.

Chair Scott asked if there was anything the Board should prioritize that would help the Planning Department. Planner Tubbs felt the Board had already helped Staff by identifying items for which they need to pay particular attention. She stated that helped Staff stay proactive and not reactive.

Board Member Hutchings felt there was a lot of momentum on Temporary Structures and assumed it would continue to move forward in 2024. Director Ward reported that Staff was currently involved in stakeholder outreach, and Temporary Structures was scheduled to come back before the Board in March for a Work Session. She added that Staff was currently working on developing recommended standards and criteria for panelization and reconstruction to ensure that those criteria are codified. Staff requested input from the Board as to whether there was interest in having Staff invest the time in those Code amendments. The Board responded in the affirmative.

7. **CLOSED SESSION**

- A. **The Historic Preservation Board May Consider a Motion to Enter Into a Closed Session for Specific Purposes Allowed Under the Open and Public Meetings Act (Utah Code Section 52-4-205) to Discuss the Deployment of Security Personnel, Devices, or Systems.**

There was no Closed Session.

8. **ADJOURN**

MOTION: Board Member Holmgren moved to ADJOURN. Board Member Long seconded the motion.

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

The Historic Preservation Board Meeting adjourned at approximately 6:15 p.m.

Approved by _____
Randy Scott, Chair
Historic Preservation Board

Approved 02.07.2024

Historic Preservation Board Staff Report

Subject: 2024 Visioning
Author: Planning Team
Date: January 3, 2024
Type of Item: Work Session



Background

In 2009, Park City held a Community Visioning process to determine the core values of the community in preparation for the 2014 General Plan. *Historic Character* was identified as one of the four main core values, among *Natural Setting*, *Sense of Community*, and *Small Town [character]*. The 2014 General Plan included [Goals, Objectives and Strategies](#) as well as [Detailed Strategies](#) for preserving the City's Historic Character. The City has implemented several of these strategies and the Planning Team is seeking feedback from the Historic Preservation Board regarding priority goals for 2024. The following Goals are outlined in the 2014 General Plan:

Goal 15 – Preserve the integrity, mass, scale, compatibility and historic fabric of the nationally and locally designated historic resources and districts for future generations.

Objectives

- 15A** Maintain the integrity of historic resources within Park City as a community asset for future generations, including historic resources locally designated on the Park City Historic Sites Inventory and its two National Register Historic Districts – the Main Street Historic District and the Mining Boom Era Residences Thematic District.
- 15B** Maintain character, context and scale of local historic districts with compatible infill development and additions.

- 15C** Increase local knowledge of historic preservation principles and accepted standards through increased public education and programming.
- 15D** Provide additional public education/programming to connect property owners and financial incentives in an effort to offset the high cost of restoration.
- 15E** Encourage adaptive reuse of historic resources.

The following planning and land use-related Strategies are outlined:

Strategy Number	Strategy
Planning Strategies	
15.1	Increase the City's documentation of historic sites by conducting Intensive Level Surveys of all historic sites included in the Park City Historic Sites Inventory.
15.2	Review Park City's Historic Sites Inventory and update as necessary or every two years.

15.3	Ensure all expertise (e.g. staff, museum, SHPO) is made available to property owners within the Historic Districts.
15.4	Review, annually, the Land Management Code (LMC) and Park City's Design Guidelines for Historic Districts and Historic Sites in order to maintain regulatory consistency.
15.5	Create a regional program to preserve the City's historic mining structures, specifically focusing on those that are on the resorts' property.
15.6	Analyze resources (sites and structures) that were built during the onset of the ski industry in Park City to consider inclusion within the Park City Historic Sites Inventory or as an architectural resource. This could be expanded to include analyzing the City's Olympic heritage sites as well.
15.7	Encourage pedestrian-oriented development to minimize the visual impacts of automobiles and parking on Historic Buildings and Streetscapes.
15.8	Periodically review newly constructed infill projects for suitability and compatibility of infill development within the Historic Districts. Identify issues that threaten the aesthetic experience of the districts and refine the Design Guidelines and/or LMC based on findings. The aesthetic experience should be measured from the pedestrian experience at the street frontage. In addition, the influence of site design and architecture should be analyzed in the review.
15.9	Continue to update review criteria for development on steep slopes to prevent incompatible mass/scale within the historic districts based on findings of periodic reviews of ongoing projects.
15.10	Promote and augment the Historic Preservation Board's Historic District Grant program, establish a revolving loan fund, and inform property owners of state and federal preservation tax credits.
15.12	Examine the lot sizes in Old Town to determine if a maximum lot size would provide more compatible mass and scale for new structures as well as additions to existing structures.
Implementation Strategies	
15.13	Conduct annual training related to historic preservation and design regulations for staff, boards, design professionals, commissions, and the public; include tours as a learning opportunity.
15.14	Create a self-guided walking tour of Landmark Structures within the local historic districts.
15.17	Continue Historic Preservation Board annual award for exemplary historic preservation.
15.18	Implement a historic district public outreach program to promote available incentives (local, state, and federal) for owners of historic resources.
15.19	Protect the ridgelines and hillsides from development.

Goal 16 – Maintain the Historic Main Street District as the heart of the City for residents and encourage tourism in the district for visitors.

Objectives

- 16A** Support “adaptive re-use” of buildings along Main Street through incentives to property owners and businesses.
- 16B** Limit uses within the first story of buildings along Main Street to retail and restaurant establishments that are inviting to the passing pedestrian. Uses that should be discouraged include office space, real estate show rooms, parking, etc.
- 16C** Utilize Main Street as a backdrop/setting for cultural events, festivals, and celebrations.
- 16D** Encourage public facilities and local oriented businesses to remain in the Historic Main Street District.
- 16 E** Encourage all infill, additions, and building alterations on Main Street to be compatible with existing Landmark and Significant buildings.

The following strategies were outlined:

Strategy Number	Strategy
Planning Strategies	
16.3	Educate business owners and property owners regarding the benefits of maintaining and preserving their historic structure, the Historic District Grant Program, state and federal preservation tax credits, and other funding opportunities.
16.4	Work with Historic Park City Alliance (HPCA) and the Park City Historical Society to address the needs and concerns of local business owners.
Implementation Strategies	
16.8	Encourage greater collaboration between the City, businesses, and property owners. Address challenges within adjacent residential neighborhoods.
16.10	Reexamine the City's existing Vertical Zoning Ordinance that requires commercial retail shops along Main Street; consider strengthening the ordinance.

The 2014 General Plan also included the following Detailed Strategies:

- 1) Encourage Adaptive Reuse of Historic Resources
- 2) Influence Streetscape through Lot Sizes, Setbacks, and Parking
- 3) Define Compatibility, Mass, Scale and Subordinate Design
- 4) Maintain Property Values within Historic District Designations
- 5) Create a Historic Preservation Toolbox

What We've Done

Since the adoption of the 2014 General Plan, the City has implemented several of the recommended strategies in support of the Plan's historic preservation goals. The following is a brief list of some accomplishments since the General Plan was adopted:

- Intensive Level Surveys of all designated historic resources completed;
- The City entered into agreements with Park City Mountain Resort and Deer Valley outlining mining structures and sites to be preserved; these agreements also set up funding mechanisms for the proposed work;
- The City has regularly awarded grant monies to owners of historic properties and provided education on available state and federal tax credits through the Utah State Historic Preservation Office;
- On October 26, 2023, the City Council enacted [Ordinance 2023-50](#) which set a maximum lot size for residential uses in the residential Historic Districts;
- The City continues to award the annual Preservation Award for exemplary historic preservation projects;
- On April 27, 2023, the City enacted [Ordinance 2023-19](#) which required additional studies and information for development on Very Steep Slopes and listed additional Vantage Points from which an analysis of the visual impact of proposed development would be required;
- The City has responded to input from local business owners and the HPCA and established a Pilot Program for seasonal enclosures on non-historic balconies in the HCB Zoning District. The City has also drafted proposed standards for Temporary Structures within the Historic Districts and will be reviewing such with Community Stakeholders before returning to the HPB and Planning Commission for review and recommendation;
- The City Council adopted [Ordinance No. 07-55](#) and [Ordinance No. 2016-02](#) to address diminished retail and restaurants and increased residential and office spaces along the HRC and HCB streetscape to protect the vitality and vibrancy of Main Street.

What We're Doing

Ongoing efforts recommended in the 2014 General Plan are as follows:

- The Planning Team is working on several LMC amendments including: illustrating the Design Guidelines, enacting standards for Temporary Structures in Historic Districts, and updating the driveway requirements in Historic Districts;
- The Planning Team is working through draft LMC amendments regulating the locations where vehicles may be parked in the Historic Districts as well as driveway and curb cut width maximums in Old Town;

- The Planning Team has conducted multiple Work Sessions with the HPB and Planning Commission since the adoption of the General Plan in 2014 to present recent infill structures or Historic Structures that have been modified. During these sessions, Staff also presented feedback received from the community for the Board's and Commission's consideration.

What Should We Do?

The following strategies have not yet been fully implemented; the HPB should opine on whether these strategies are worthwhile of revisitation during the 2024 General Plan update.

Number	Strategy	Discussion
Goal 15 – Preserve the integrity, mass, scale, compatibility and historic fabric of the nationally and locally designated historic resources and districts for future generations.		
15.2	Review Park City's Historic Sites Inventory and update as necessary or every two years.	LMC § 15-11-10 lists all Significant and Landmark sites designated to the Historic Sites Inventory and outlines the required criteria and process for designation. Properties may be nominated for consideration by the owner(s) of record or the Planning Department¹ and it is the City's policy that the Applicant have the owner(s) of record's permission to nominate the property. On August 3, 2017, the City enacted Ordinance 2017-42 which codified all Structures designated to the Historic Sites Inventory in the Land Management Code. Since that time, one property was removed from the Inventory under Ordinance 2018-20 and no additional properties have been designated. The Utah Legislature enacted Utah Code § 10-9a-503, limiting the expansion or creation of historic districts, effective May 14, 2019, if

¹ LMC [§ 15-11-10\(B\)](#) – “Any Owner of a Building (main, attached, detached or public), Accessory Building, and/or Structure, may nominate it for listing in the park City Historic Sites Inventory. The Planning Department may nominate a Building (main, attached, detached or public), Accessory Building, and/or Structure for listing in the Park City Historic Sites Inventory.”

		by a “Citizen-led process²” to establish or expand a local historic district with a minimum number of property owners approving of the designation. Additionally, Utah Code § 10-9a-534, <u>Regulation of building design elements prohibited</u>, only grandfathers local design regulation for local historic districts/designation in effect prior to 2021. If the City chooses to pursue this strategy, the Planning Team suggests a broad outreach program to determine whether local property owners are in support of additional voluntary or incentive-based designations. This could include providing education on ski-era architecture or the City’s Olympic heritage, both of which have been listed as turning points in the City’s history.
15.6	Analyze resources (sites and structures) that were built during the onset of the ski industry in Park City to consider inclusion within the Park City Historic Sites Inventory or as an architectural resource. This could be expanded to include analyzing the City’s Olympic heritage sites as well.	See above.
15.10	Establish a revolving loan fund	The City offers grant awards to owners of historic resources and structures. Members of the HPB have opined that the average income within Park City is adequate to maintain historic resources and find grant funding should be given only when the proposed work is

² Defined in UCA § 10-9a-503 as “a process established by a municipality to create a local historic district or area that requires: (A) a petition signed by a minimum number of property owners within the boundaries of the proposed local historic district or area; or (B) a vote of the property owners within the boundaries of the proposed local historic district or area.”

		considered a preservation best practice.
15.13	Conduct annual training related to historic preservation and design regulations for staff, boards, design professionals, commissions, and the public; include tours as a learning opportunity.	Planning Staff provides some annual training to boards and commissions. However, the City could also consider establishing an educational outreach program for design professionals, local businesses, and residents alike. This program could include walking tours (staff-guided or self-guided) and provide some background/context to the public outlining why historic preservation is vital to Park City.
15.14	Create a self-guided walking tour of Landmark Structures within the local historic districts.	The City could establish a variety of self-guided tours past Landmark Structures or Significant Structures and could consider coordinating with the Friends of Ski Mountain Mining History on organizing tours of some local mining sites.

218 Sandridge Road

PL-23-05692



Recommendation

(I) Open a public hearing and (II) continue the item to date uncertain.

Approved 02.07.2024



844 Empire Avenue

PL-23-05350



Recommendation

(I) Open a public hearing and (II) continue the item to February 7, 2024.

Approved 02.07.2024



2024 Visioning Session



2014 General Plan

Goal 15 – Preserve the integrity, mass, scale, compatibility and historic fabric of the nationally and locally designated historic resources and districts for future generations.

Objectives

15A Maintain the integrity of historic resources within Park City as a community asset for future generations, including historic resources locally designated on the Park City Historic Sites Inventory and its two National Register Historic Districts – the Main Street Historic District and the Mining Boom Era Residences Thematic District.

15B Maintain character, context and scale of local historic districts with compatible infill development and additions.

15C Increase local knowledge of historic preservation principles and accepted standards through increased public education and programming.

15D Provide additional public education/programming to connect property owners and financial incentives in an effort to offset the high cost of restoration.

15E Encourage adaptive reuse of historic resources.



2014 General Plan

Goal 16 – Maintain the Historic Main Street District as the heart of the City for residents and encourage tourism in the district for visitors.

Objectives

- 16A** Support “adaptive re-use” of buildings along Main Street through incentives to property owners and businesses.
- 16B** Limit uses within the first story of buildings along Main Street to retail and restaurant establishments that are inviting to the passing pedestrian. Uses that should be discouraged include office space, real estate show rooms, parking, etc.
- 16C** Utilize Main Street as a backdrop/setting for cultural events, festivals, and celebrations.
- 16D** Encourage public facilities and local oriented businesses to remain in the Historic Main Street District.
- 16 E** Encourage all infill, additions, and building alterations on Main Street to be compatible with existing Landmark and Significant buildings.

Completed

- Intensive Level Surveys
- Agreements with Resorts to protect Mining Structures
- Historic District Grant Program
- Annual Historic Preservation Awards
- Minor grammatical and spelling errors
- Enacted maximum lot sizes in residential Historic Districts
- Enacted Main Street Vibrancy Ordinances
- Established Temporary Balcony Enclosure Pilot Program

In Progress

- LMC amendments for parking, temporary structures, materials and opacity requirements in the Historic Districts
- Illustrate the Historic District Design Guidelines
- Updated Historic District Grant Program
- Annual Historic Preservation Awards

Approved 02-01-2024



Not Addressed

Update Historic Sites Inventory (Codified 2017)

Utah Code § 10-9a-503 limited the expansion or creation of districts
Requires “Citizen-led process” to expand or create a new district

Utah Code § 10-9a-534 prohibited regulation of building design elements
Can only regulate design in effect prior to 2021



Not Addressed

Establish a Revolving Loan Fund

PCMC offers a Historic District Grant Program

Average income within Park City adequate to maintain historic resources



Not Addressed

Conduct Annual Training for City and Public

PCMC provides training to City staff, Boards, and Commissions

This training could be expanded to include educational opportunities for Parkites, local businesses, and design professionals



Not Addressed

Create Self-Guided Walking Tour

The City could establish a variety of self-guided walking tours and could partner with other community organizations to explore historic resources



2024 Vision Q & A

Approved 02.07.2024

