



**PARK CITY MUNICIPAL CORPORATION
HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD MEETING
MARSAC MUNICIPAL BUILDING
COUNCIL CHAMBERS
445 MARSAC AVENUE
PARK CITY, SUMMIT COUNTY, UTAH
MINUTES OF MARCH 6, 2024**

BOARD MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE: Randy Scott-Chair, Lola Beatlebrox, Puggy Holmgren, Douglas Stephens

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

1. ROLL CALL

Chair Randy Scott called the meeting to order at 5:01 p.m. and conducted a roll call.

2. MINUTES APPROVAL

A. Consideration to Approve the Historic Preservation Board Meeting Minutes from February 7, 2024.

MOTION: Board Member Holmgren moved to APPROVE the Historic Preservation Board Meeting Minutes from February 7, 2024. Board Member Stephens seconded the motion.

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

3. STAFF AND BOARD COMMUNICATIONS AND DISCLOSURES

There were no Staff or Board communications and disclosures.

4. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS

There were no public communications.

5. REGULAR AGENDA

A. 2465 Doc Holiday Drive – Material Deconstruction – The Applicant Requests the Historic Preservation Board Determine Whether a Second Story Rear Deck on a Significant Historic Structure Located in the Single-Family (“SF”) Zoning District May be Removed. PL-23-05940.

Senior Historic Preservation Planner, Caitlyn Tubbs, presented the Staff Report and explained that the application is for Material Deconstruction at 2465 Doc Holiday Drive. The property is located in the Prospector Neighborhood outside of the typical Historic District. It is at the intersection of Doc Holiday Drive and Buffalo Bill Drive. It is also across the street from a high school, an elementary school, and Kearns Boulevard. She shared an image of the existing historic structure. This is a two-story foursquare style building, which is not a typical historic form seen in Park City. However, it is still considered to be a historic building style. She noted that the home was originally constructed in 1911 in Coalville, Utah. It was relocated to the current site in 1978.

Planner Tubbs reported that the request pertains to the second-story rear-covered deck. She shared an image of the deck area. Background information was reviewed with the Historic Preservation Board. On August 28, 2023, the applicant's representative submitted a Building Permit and on August 30, 2023, Planning Staff flagged the Building Permit as being related to a Historic Structure. As a result, the project needed to go through the Historic District Design Review (“HDDR”) process before proceeding. At some point, the applicant's structural engineer determined that the deck was unsafe and it was removed. The lower deck is still present, along with the railings and the posts that had supported the second story, but the second story portion has been removed. Planner Tubbs stated that the current request is for Material Deconstruction approval to construct a shed roof covering over the lower level deck instead of rebuilding the second-story deck.

The 1929 Sanborn Fire Insurance Map was reviewed. Planner Tubbs noted that the map was of the subject property when it was still located in Coalville. It indicated that the second-story deck existed in 1929. Some additional articles and photographs were included in the Staff Report. All of those indicated that the second-story deck has been in existence since the home was built. Park City Municipal issued a Building Permit in 1981 and noted a guardrail would be required around the second-story porch in order to provide additional safety for the occupants. As a result, it is the determination of Staff that the second story deck contributes to the historic character of the structure. The second-story deck has been in existence from the time the home was constructed.

Since this appears to be an original part of construction and there is no note of it having been modified or removed during the relocation in 1978, Planning Staff recommends that the Historic Preservation Board review the proposed Material Deconstruction request, conduct a public hearing, and consider denying the request for Material Deconstruction.

Planning Director, Rebecca Ward, informed the Board that the applicant was unable to attend the meeting. A statement from the applicant was submitted as Exhibit B. Board Members reviewed the statement from Jack R. and Lorelei Clark. It explained that the non-original deck had rotted out and was deemed unsafe by the structural team at Ambition Living. The upper structure was demolished. The proposal is to replace the lower level overhang of the structure, per the designs attached in the email.

Board Member Beatlebrox asked about the reference to the “non-original” deck. Planner Tubbs explained that it was the understanding of the applicants that the deck is not original. However, when Staff conducted research, there was no time when the deck was not present. Chair Scott believed the applicants were likely referencing the materials. Board Member Beatlebrox stated that the two levels of decking and the guardrail were present historically. Board Member Douglas Stephens pointed out that the structure was moved. It was unlikely that the home was moved with the front porch and rear decks attached. Board Member Beatlebrox did not believe the way the structure was moved was relevant, because the porch and deck were shown in all photographs and maps.

Board Member Stephens asked whether a historic home from Coalville is still considered a historic home in Park City. He noted that the subject property is not located in the typical Historic District. Board Member Beatlebrox stated that it was moved in the past and is a historic building. Board Member Stephens agreed that it is a historic building. He simply wondered whether it is under the purview of the Historic Preservation Board. It is listed as a Significant Historic Site on the Park City Historic Sites Inventory, but due to the history, he believed it is a significant building in Coalville as opposed to Park City.

City Attorney, Mark Harrington, felt that Board Member Beatlebrox is correct. The issue of significance is not open for discussion, since it has been adopted under the Historic Sites Inventory. It appears that the consultant at the time recommended it to be listed because of its significance to Utah in general. Since it is on the list already, the significance is something that the Historic Preservation Board needs to accept unless there is a de-listing process. That being said, the Board can look at whether the rear façade and porch are part of that listing, as it might be relevant to the determination.

Board Member Stephens wanted to know if this is a historic porch. There is evidence that there was a historic porch there, but he wanted to know if there is evidence there was a historic porch brought from Coalville or if it was something added in 1978 when it was moved. Board Member Puggy Holmgren referenced a photograph from the 1920s. Board Member Stephens clarified that he was suggesting the historic porch was torn off, left in Coalville, and something new was rebuilt here when the home made it to Park City. If the front porch was constructed in 1978, it is likely that the rear porch was as well.

Chair Scott noted that the lower portion of the rear porch still exists. Board Member Stephens believed that would have been put in with the foundation when the house was moved. Board Member Beatlebrox stated that it was common in the early 1900s to have sleeping porches. Chair Scott believed the current discussion has to do with historic form

versus the presence of historic materials. Board Member Stephens did not doubt that there was a balcony on the rear of the building, but he is unsure if the materials themselves are historic. It is possible that a new porch was constructed in 1978.

Board Member Beatlebrox expressed concerns that a third-party structural engineer was used to determine the structural integrity and the inspection did not go through the City. Board Member Holmgren agreed with the concerns expressed, as the second-story deck was removed prior to the issuance of a Building Permit. Additional discussions were had about whether or not the materials were historic. Board Member Stephens did not feel the house would have been moved from Coalville with the front and back porches. The primary structure of the house was moveable, but the other elements were likely not. He pointed out that the applicants mentioned that the deck was not original to the home.

Chair Scott stated that it was not possible to determine whether the materials were historic. The structure clearly has a historic form. If there is non-historic material, he wanted to know if the matter is still under the purview of the Historic Preservation Board. He felt it likely still would be since the historic form is being discussed and this is a significant structure. Director Ward asked if a site visit would be beneficial to the Board.

The Board discussed when the structure was added to the Historic Sites Inventory. Board Member Stephens reiterated that it was a historic home, but non-historic material might be present. It is important to determine whether historic or non-historic material is being requested to be removed. Board Member Holmgren believed that removing the back porch would change the historic image of the house. She did not support removing the upper deck. Board Member Beatlebrox noted that it is visible from Buffalo Bill Drive.

Board Member Beatlebrox struggled with the fact that the homeowner had made the decision to remove the materials without speaking to the Planning Department. Chair Scott noted that Director Ward had mentioned a potential site visit. Board Member Beatlebrox asked Planner Tubbs about her visits to the site. Planner Tubbs clarified that she has not visited the site. To her knowledge, the materials that were removed are gone. Those were deemed hazardous by the applicant's engineer at some point. If it would help the Board to organize a site visit to view the existing front porch, that can be arranged.

Board Member Stephens asked to review some of the photographs included in the Meeting Materials Packet. The image from the Coalville site was compared to the Park City site. Board Member Stephens believed the decision has to do with whether historic material was actually removed. Chair Scott thought it made sense to conduct a site visit to better determine the existing materials. Additionally, there are three Board Members who were not present at the Historic Preservation Board Meeting. This is an important decision and it would be preferable to have additional input from the Board. Planner Tubbs noted that the applicant is hoping to have this matter wrapped up as quickly as possible, but she was sure there would be openness to a site visit with the Board. Board Member Stephens felt additional information was needed and a site visit was best.

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

There was discussion about motion language. Attorney Harrington asked if there is a desire to request that the applicant bring the engineer to the next meeting so direct testimony about the materials can be shared. Board Member Stephens believed whoever has direct knowledge of the removed materials should be present at the meeting. Board Member Holmgren wanted to understand how the materials were removed without a Building Permit. It is important to speak to whoever decided that could occur.

MOTION: Board Member Stephens moved to CONTINUE the Material Deconstruction of the second-story rear deck until the April 3, 2024, Historic Preservation Board Meeting, with the Planning Department making arrangements for a site visit. The Board requests that the experts who deemed the material unsafe be present at the next Historic Preservation Board Meeting. Board Member Holmgren seconded the motion.

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

B. Land Management Code Amendments – The Historic Preservation Board will Review Proposed Amendments to the Historic District Regulations Enacting Standards for Temporary Structures in Historic Districts and Defining Temporary Structures. PL-24-06001.

Planner Tubbs presented the Staff Report and explained that the item relates to Land Management Code Amendments. This item has come before the Board a few times and she believes it is now appropriate to make a recommendation. She shared the new standards for Temporary Structures in Historic Districts and background information.

On October 4, 2023, the Historic Preservation Board conducted a Joint Work Session with the Planning Commission to discuss Temporary Winter Balcony Enclosures. Both groups were supportive of the City enacting standards for temporary structures in the Historic Districts. Some draft standards were created. On December 6, 2023, the Board held a Work Session to review proposed design standards. On December 13, 2023, an additional Work Session was held with the Commission. Feedback from both the Board and the Commission has been incorporated into the draft ordinance.

On February 20, 2024, Planning Staff met with the Historic Park City Alliance (“HPCA”) to review the proposed amendments and gather feedback from community stakeholders. The draft ordinance was sent to the HPCA for their review and discussion. On March 1, 2024, the HPCA stated that they had no questions or concerns about the proposed standards for Temporary Structures in Historic Districts. Planner Tubbs reviewed some of the requirements, which included requirements for exterior materials. She explained that the materials would need to be of a high quality, non-reflective, neutral in color, and also be compatible with the materials that are utilized on the primary structure.

As for the glazing, there was feedback from the Historic Preservation Board that there was comfort with having additional flexibility in the window treatments for temporary structures with regard to tinting the glass or treating it with some other type of visual barrier, such as frosting or additional reflection. On the other hand, the Planning Commission disagreed and asked that the glazing requirements be the same as primary structures. They expressed a desire for the glass to be fully transparent and not treated.

Any lighting associated with the temporary structures would need to be dark skies compliant. There would be no additional ornamentation and no additional signage permitted on temporary structures. For roofing, the standards would require that roofing materials be clad in a material that has a solar reflectivity index of 35 or less. Additionally, the temporary structures would not be permitted to be connected directly to historic materials. There would need to be some sort of construction to protect those materials.

Planner Tubbs reported that work is being done with the Sustainability Team to develop some additional sustainability standards. Those kinds of standards could relate to sustainability best practices when it comes to the materials associated with the structures or sustainability measures related to construction or removal. She added that the proposed ordinance restricts the height and size of temporary structures to what is permitted in the underlying zoning district. The Planning Commission asked for some consistency in temporary structures so if a property decided to utilize a particular temporary structure, any additional structures must mirror the same architectural style or building type. For approvals, an administrative approval process would need to take place.

Staff recommends that the Historic Preservation Board review the proposed Land Management Code amendments, conduct a public hearing, and consider forwarding a positive recommendation of the amendments to the Planning Commission.

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

MOTION: Board Member Holmgren moved to forward a POSITIVE RECOMMENDATION to the Planning Commission for consideration on March 27, 2024, as outlined in the Draft Ordinance. Board Member Beatlebrox seconded the motion.

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

6. ADJOURN

MOTION: Board Member Beatlebrox moved to ADJOURN. Board Member Stephens seconded the motion.

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

Historic Preservation Board Meeting
March 6, 2024

The Historic Preservation Board Meeting adjourned at approximately 5:55 p.m.

Approved by _____
Randy Scott, Chair
Historic Preservation Board

Approved 04.03.2024