



**PARK CITY MUNICIPAL CORPORATION
HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD MEETING
MARSAC MUNICIPAL BUILDING
COUNCIL CHAMBERS
445 MARSAC AVENUE
PARK CITY, SUMMIT COUNTY, UTAH
MINUTES OF SEPTEMBER 4, 2024**

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

EX OFFICIO MEMBERS: Rebecca Ward, Planning Director; Lillian Zollinger, Planner III; Dave Thacker, Chief Building Official; Mark Harrington, City Attorney

1. ROLL CALL

Chair Randy Scott called the meeting to order at 5:02 p.m. and conducted a roll call. All Board Members were present, with the exception of Board Member Puggy Holmgren.

2. MINUTES APPROVAL

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

MOTION: Board Member Hodgkins moved to APPROVE the Historic Preservation Board Meeting Minutes from August 7, 2024. Board Member Beatlebrox seconded the motion.

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

3. STAFF AND BOARD COMMUNICATIONS AND DISCLOSURES

Planning Director, Rebecca Ward, reminded those who want to participate remotely to sign in with their full names on Zoom. There were no additional communications shared.

4. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS

There were no public communications.

5. **CONTINUATIONS**

- A. **732 Crescent Tram – Determination of Significance and Material Deconstruction – The Applicant Requests Modifications to 2017 and 2018 Historic Preservation Board Determinations Regarding Additions to the Landmark Historic Structure, and Requests Material Deconstruction to Accommodate a Basement Addition and Addition on a Secondary Façade. PL-23-05741.**

Director Ward informed the Board that the recommendation is to continue the item to the next Historic Preservation Board Meeting. This is to allow the applicant additional time to update their plans to reflect a compliant transitional element and single-car garage and to complete a Structural Report for the proposed lifting of the Landmark Historic Structure to accommodate a basement addition. The next meeting is on October 2, 2024.

MOTION: Board Member Hutchings moved to CONTINUE the application for 732 Crescent Tram to the October 2, 2024, Historic Preservation Board Meeting. Board Member Beatlebrox seconded the motion.

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

6. **WORK SESSION**

- A. **Comprehensive Update to the General Plan – The Historic Preservation Consultant will Provide an Overview of the General Plan Project and Discuss the Historic Preservation Elements with the Board for Initial Input.**

Planner III, Lillian Zollinger, shared information about the current General Plan. She reported that the General Plan was adopted in 2014. There is currently an update in process, as it has been 10 years since the last General Plan was adopted. She explained that there is a desire to look at what was written previously, what was implemented, and what there is a desire to change or implement moving forward. Goal #15 of the General Plan talks about preserving the integrity, mass, scale, compatibility, and historic fabric of the nationally and locally designated historic resources and districts for future generations. There are several objectives listed in the General Plan related to that goal.

Planner Zollinger reviewed the Community Planning Strategies. 15.1 states: "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." The last survey was conducted and completed in 2016. 15.2 states: "Review Park City's Historic Sites Inventory and update as necessary or every two years." Planner Zollinger reported that the last large update was done in 2021. She added that updates are ongoing.

15.4 states: "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.” There have been updates this year and there are illustrations in progress to be added. 15.9 states: “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.” Planner Zollinger stated there are LMC amendments in progress for consistency regarding development on sensitive lands.

15.10 specifically highlights the Historic Preservation Board’s Historic District Grant Program as well as the establishment of a revolving loan fund. Planner Zollinger reported that there is an ongoing grant program, but a revolving loan fund has not been established. 15.12 has to do with lot sizes in Old Town. She noted that this was completed last year and there are now minimum and maximum lot sizes established.

Planner Zollinger reviewed some of the City Implementation Strategies. 15.15 relates to parking passes. She explained that the Parking Department is working on residential permit updates to assist with that enforcement. 15.17 states: “Continue Historic Preservation Board annual award for exemplary historic preservation.” Planner Zollinger reported that this continues to be done each year. As for 15.19, which relates to ridgelines and hillsides, she noted that Steep Slope Regulation updates are currently in progress.

Goal #16 in the General Plan is to maintain the Historic Main Street District as the heart of the City for residents and encourage tourism in the district for visitors. Planner Zollinger referenced the Main Street Area Plan that was recently launched. She next shared the goals, strategies, and objectives that were previously encouraged in the 2014 General Plan. If there is anything there that should be highlighted, changed, or implemented moving forward, she asked that Board Members share some preliminary comments.

Board Member Jack Hodgkins referenced 15.11. It looked like there was support for the adaptive reuse of historic buildings and structures. He would like to see that expanded to encourage adaptive reuse of a lot of the current buildings and infrastructure. Board Member Alan Long mentioned 15.5, which has to do with the preservation of City-owned historic properties that are on resort land. He is not sure what those structures are or how many there are, but it might be interesting to have a timetable to go along with the opening of the Olympics. There could then be a presentation or an event at some of these historic structures. Tying something into the Olympics would set a clear end date.

Susie Petheram explained that she is part of the team working on the General Plan. She shared presentation slides with the Historic Preservation Board. The team associated with the General Plan update was reviewed. It is led by Design Workshop and the team also includes WSP, Fehr & Peers, and FFKR. She explained that FFKR, which is the firm she is with, supports the historic preservation component of the General Plan update.

The overall project vision provided during the request for proposal (“RFP”) spoke about a desire for Park City to remain an authentic and welcoming community with a small-town character. A lot of those values are captured in the current General Plan. Ms. Petheram noted that the new General Plan should review and potentially update the four key values stated in the 2014 General Plan and the five pillars from the 2020 Vision. It should ideally

be a concise and accessible document that is set up for successful adoption and has a clearly defined path to implementation. She noted that a lot has been accomplished by the City and Historic Preservation Board with the goals, objectives, and strategies that were set out in 2014. The intention is to set up the next level of success.

Ms. Petheram shared the 2014 General Plan Four Key Values as well as the Vision 2020 Five Strategic Pillars. She reviewed the project schedule with the Board. It is set out over five phases with a targeted ending in September 2025. During the process, three opportunities to meet with the Historic Preservation Board have been identified. It is proposed that there will be another presentation to the Board in January 2025 after the initial round of engagement has been conducted. At that time, it will be possible to discuss some of the ideas and feedback that has been received from the community as it relates to preservation. In April, there could be some draft language to review with the Board.

The engagement windows were set up so there are three different levels of engagement. The first is project awareness building and values identification. Ms. Petheram explained that this includes one-on-one interviews with the City Council, Advisory and Technical Advisory Committee Meetings, an online community survey, a project launch open house, and a project website. The second round of interaction looks to refine some of the ideas and translate them into alternatives. Lastly, in the final engagement window, there will be draft and final plan sharing. Ms. Petheram reviewed the Key Eras Framework, which includes mining, skiing, and the Olympics. It is important to consider the three eras during the General Plan update and think about strategies that can help to support preservation goals or objectives related to each one of those eras.

Ms. Petheram reviewed the next steps for the project. In September, there will be one-on-one City Council interviews as well as a Technical Committee Meeting and a Technical Advisory Board Meeting. Other Board Meetings include the Forestry Advisory Board, Public Art Advisory Board, and Recreation Advisory Board. In October, the statistically valid survey will be launched. The intention is to include some questions that gauge community interest and support in preservation and how that balances with growth and development. There should be a few questions that resonate with the Board.

The goals, objectives, and strategies of the current General Plan were discussed. Ms. Petheram asked what the Board feels the priorities are in the General Plan update. Board Member John Hutchings asked for additional information about the one-on-one City Council interviews. Ms. Petheram explained that the team will sit down with each of the Council Members to capture any of their specific priorities for the General Plan update.

Board Member Hutchings was curious about the survey and how much full-time residents in Old Town care about historic preservation. Ms. Petheram stated that the survey will cover all of the General Plan topics as a whole. Through that survey, it will be possible to determine what people in certain areas think compared to other areas. That will provide some good insight to the City. In general, there is normally a strong participation level. Work will be done with Y2 Analytics, which will develop a survey audience that represents the population of Park City as a statistically valid sample using their outreach methods.

Board Member Beatlebrox believes the survey will not be distributed to all homeowners. Instead, it will be sent to a segment of the residents. Ms. Petheram confirmed this and explained that this is how Y2 Analytics has done past surveys for General Plan projects. There will be other opportunities for outreach where everyone is invited to participate.

The goal of the survey is to receive a representative sample of respondents. Director Ward reported that throughout the General Plan process, there will be many opportunities for community members to weigh in during community meetings and other outreach efforts. In addition to the Advisory Committee established for the General Plan, there will be the creation of an Advisory Committee for each of the 10 neighborhoods in Park City, which includes Old Town. This will ensure there are neighborhood-specific perspectives.

Board Member Long noted that the world will be watching Park City during the future Winter Olympics. He does not know how the General Plan will factor into this, but he feels it is important for the City to consider what will be highlighted. There are many wonderful elements, such as the eras that were mentioned earlier. Ms. Petheram thanked the Historic Preservation Board for their time and input so far. Chair Scott expressed gratitude for the information shared and acknowledged that this is a significant project.

7. REGULAR AGENDA

1. 36 Prospect Avenue – Material Deconstruction – The Applicant Requests Material Deconstruction for an Addition to a Landmark Historic Structure. PL-24-06186.

Planner Zollinger presented the Staff Report and explained that the application is for Material Deconstruction at 36 Prospect Avenue. She shared an area map and the Sanborn Maps to illustrate how the site has developed over time. After 1889, there was an addition, and the site developed as it is seen today. She pointed out the addition of an accessory building. Additional images were shown to the Board. 36 Prospect Avenue is a Landmark Historic Site and is a one-story frame T/L cottage that was constructed circa 1889. An addition was constructed to the south of the cottage sometime before 1900.

The applicant is proposing to lift the historic structure to accommodate upgrades to the foundation and restore the front façade windows. Planner Zollinger pointed out that in the 1940s photograph, there is no window, and at some point, it was added at the top near the roof. A window on the left side of the structure was increased in height. The applicant is proposing to remove that top window and bring the left window back into compliance with the 1800s rendition. The applicant is proposing to restore the exterior siding.

Planner Zollinger reviewed the proposed Conditions of Approval, as listed in the Staff Report. She explained that the Historic Preservation Board is reviewing the proposed lift of the historic structure for basement foundation upgrades, the restoration of the front façade windows, and the restoration of the exterior siding. The plans will be updated to comply with the Historic Regulations and reviewed under a Steep Slope Conditional Use Permit and

Historic District Design Review. Director Ward clarified that the proposed plans are going through modifications. The applicant is aware that the accessory structure cannot be attached to the historic structure without a transitional element and that any accessory structure will go through the Historic District Design Review and Steep Slope Conditional Use Permit. The only scope being reviewed is the lift of the historic structure, restoration of the windows, and the exterior siding. The accessory building is separate and the applicant is aware of the revisions required for that component.

Board Member Beatlebrox believed the purview of the Board is the lifting of the building and the accessory proposal will come forward at another time. Director Ward clarified that since the accessory proposal does not involve a historic building, it will be processed as part of a Historic District Design Review application. It will also require Planning Commission review because it is proposed on a steep slope. That will be a separate process. The Historic Preservation Board's purview does not include new accessory buildings on historic sites. She explained that the way the garage is located on the site, it would not meet the transitional element requirement and must be separated.

Board Member Hodgkins asked about the windows on the structure. It sounds like the windows in question are not historic and there is a desire to remove those. He wondered why Historic Preservation Board approval is needed for that. Director Ward explained that it is because the removal will impact historic materials and will require the matching of historic materials. Additionally, she noted that the proposal is to go back to the original siding type rather than rehabilitate the structure with the current siding. Material changes to the exterior façade have been proposed. Board Member Beatlebrox asked if the accessory building is historic. Director Ward noted that the applicant can provide details.

Director Ward asked whether there is documentation to outline when the accessory building was constructed on the site. Sarah Kia from Faulkner Architects stated that the small shed structure was not in the Historic Registry Report and was not documented as being historic. It also appears to be made with more modern construction. Chair Scott pointed out that there is a rectangle that appears in the 1907 Sanborn Map. It appears in the pictures to be a small shed. Erin Kryszak introduced herself as the owner of the property. She noted that the Sanborn Map building is much smaller and is in a different location. Planner Zollinger shared the Sanborn Map and Chair Scott referenced the small rectangle. Ms. Kryszak stated that the materials for the accessory building are modern.

Greg Faulkner introduced himself to the Board. He explained that the intention is not simply to replace windows on the front façade. The idea is to restore the building back to the original style from the first photograph shown. There is a desire to match the siding, which is a layered siding with vertical siding behind it. The siding currently on the building is not historical in pattern. He reiterated that the intention is to reference the original design. The same details, such as the windows inset with an additional piece of trim, have been proposed. It will ideally look as much like the original house as possible.

Mr. Faulkner understands the guideline that talks about not having metal windows. That is understood because there is no desire to have the windows look modern or like aluminum.

However, to create the thin line, he wants to use painted steel windows that would be the same exact finish to the exterior that a wood-clad window might be, except that the mullion will be very thin, like in the original cabin with single-pane glazing.

The siding is to be replaced and painted opaque to match the original cabin. The trim would match that. Mr. Faulkner reported that the current roofing material is shakes and it is not in good shape. The applicant would like to propose weathering steel to be fire-resistant as well as to protect the historic structure. Mr. Faulkner informed the Historic Preservation Board that the intention is to restore the structure to the historic design and make sure the home is still usable on the inside for the property owner.

Chair Scott asked about the original siding. Mr. Faulkner explained that at first, it was believed to be lap siding, but it appears that there is vertical board siding applied behind, and then the horizontal boards are spaced. The intention is to match that. Chair Scott does not believe the Board can make a determination on the window trim and roof, as that relates to the Planning Department design guidelines. However, he appreciates the details about the siding that have been shared. It was noted that Board Member Holmgren joined the Historic Preservation Board Meeting at approximately 5:55 p.m.

Mr. Faulkner shared additional details about what is proposed. He noted that the house comes with a grandfathered wood stove. The proposal is to put the chimney back in its original location. It was clarified that those details are not being considered by the Board. Director Ward stated that she was unaware that relocating the chimney was part of the proposed scope. If it is part of the scope and it is a historic chimney, then it would need to be included in the evaluation. Ms. Kryszak clarified that the chimney is there already and is made out of brick. The idea is to have a square steel chimney that would match the roof. Director Ward explained that if the chimney will be staying in the same location, then the materials would be part of the Historic District Design Review process.

Board Member Beatlebrox asked about the current shake roof. She wanted to know if it was historic material. Director Ward explained that with some of the historic roofs in the Historic Districts, there is an avenue to work with the Chief Building Official to replace the roof with something that would be more compliant with the Wildland Urban Interface requirements. Due to the historic site, it could be something that is retained, but there have been some allowances to update materials. Board Member Beatlebrox pointed out that there is a shake-look material that is available and asked if that had been considered. Director Ward noted that with the new Wildland Urban Interface Code, these types of materials are encouraged to be something that is a little more resilient to fire. Since it is a historic site, the applicant could work with the Chief Building Official to keep the roof materials as they are, but it might require reductions in landscaping and other mitigations.

Chief Building Official, Dave Thacker, reported that the Wildland Urban Interface Code, as adopted, has provisions and allowances for historic structures. The structure is evaluated as well as the surrounding area to ensure that safety is prioritized. There is a provision that allows for shake shingles in certain instances. That would require a Class A type of roof, which is a fire-resistant assembly that puts together the roof so the shake shingles are less

susceptible to ignition. In addition, gutters are allowed, but work is done to mitigate and minimize any potential impacts. Mr. Faulker pointed out that it may be difficult for the homeowner to receive fire insurance with real wood roof singles.

Board Member Hodgkins wondered whether there is a roof option that looks more historic. Chair Scott stated that it is part of the design guidelines, so he assumes that will be part of the process. Director Ward confirmed this. Ms. Kryszak reported that there are examples of standing seam roofing on historic structures in Park City. Chair Scott believes the Board needs to rely on the expertise of the Planning Department. They will work with the applicant to ensure that all requirements are fulfilled. Ms. Kryszak explained that she has looked at many roofing materials. She grew up in Park City and understands that preservation is important. While she looked at the faux wood shingles, those did not look realistic. Mr. Faulkner noted that work will be done with the Planning Department.

Board Member Hutchings wanted to clarify what the Historic Preservation Board is considering with this application. He believes the only items the Board is considering are lifting the historic structure and the restoration of the windows. Director Ward added that the siding will also be considered by the Board at this time. The roof, chimney, and accessory building will not be considered by the Historic Preservation Board.

Discussions were had about the window materials. Ms. Kryszak reported that the windows are not historic, as the current windows are not the original windows. Mr. Faulkner explained that the intention is to make the structure look more like the original design by removing anything that has been added over the years, such as the window in the attic area. Board Member Hutchings asked if the applicant is seeking Historic Preservation Board approval to take the window in front away and revert the window on the left back to the original size. This was confirmed. It was clarified that the Board is considering the lifting of the structure, the two windows discussed, and the siding material.

Chair Scott opened the public hearing.

Keith Aran explained that he learned about the specifics of the proposal during the Historic Preservation Board Meeting. While the shingle roof adds character, he understands the difficulties with fire insurance. He has seen some shingles made out of a different material that does not have a sheen, which might be an option to explore, as it might hold onto the historic character more. Mr. Aran stated that his original concerns when hearing about the project were related to height. Adding the two feet could impact the view of a lot of the other existing homes. He wondered whether this height is needed for the foundation or if there was simply a desire to have a taller basement. Retaining as much view line as possible is preferred for neighbors. Mr. Aran noted that there may have been lap siding on the house, based on the older photograph. The siding described might not be historic.

Mr. Aran informed the Board that with the last three homes that have done major renovations, his property has been impacted. He has lost tenants because of the work and has had damaged driveways. This is a difficult street to build on. He has a lot of concerns about the impacts on other properties as a result of the construction. Mr. Aran noted that

the home on the subject property is close to the street and expressed concerns about what is proposed. He wondered how the parking will be accommodated, as there is already a parking issue in the area. Allowing construction without adequate parking is a concern.

Chair Scott informed Mr. Aran that the Historic Preservation Board's purview relates to the historic material. Everything else goes through the Planning Department. Chair Scott informed him that there are still project details that need to be finalized and approved.

Sarah Coughtrie explained that she is a former tenant of 36 Prospect Avenue. She is surprised that the transitional element is not being considered by the Board because she knows that transitional elements have been discussed by the Historic Preservation Board previously. Ms. Coughtrie has two concerns about the proposal. She lived in the house previously and it seems that the home is not being maintained well currently. For instance, the landscaping and paint on the side of the house are not being maintained. As a result, she has concerns about such a complicated project. This house has always been a long-term community member rental. There have long been rental tenants in the home until this past spring when the tenants were unable to renew their lease because of the renovation. Ms. Coughtrie previously submitted a document to the Board.

Mike McGinley reported that he owns the property to the north of 36 Prospect Avenue at 32 Prospect Avenue. He is still not certain what is in the purview of the Historic Preservation Board. Mr. McGinley noted that he has been impressed with the intention and care the owner and the architects have taken so far. However, one of the diagrams shows the house on the north side is only a few feet from the structure. This is concerning to him because of the potential damage to 32 Prospect Avenue. He requested that if the project is approved for lifting, that contractors, subcontractors, and the owner be required to carry sufficient insurance and bonding so if there is damage, that damage can be addressed. He requested that specific language be placed in any approval.

Mr. McGinley noted that there have been a number of comments made about the steep slope towards the west side of the property line. Drainage and erosion is a concern and he requested that this be addressed through some language in the approval. For example, nothing being done will impact or erode the property on 32 Prospect Avenue. Mr. McGinley stated that he strongly supports the Historic Preservation Board and the attempts to maintain the character of historic structures in Park City. That being said, he is concerned about the bedroom that is proposed above the garage and the proposed garage itself. This does not appear to be in character with the area.

Lenord and Diane Pearson live at 44 Prospect Avenue. They are concerned that when construction begins, the hillside may shift and damage the foundation of their house. Mr. Pearson asked for information about the next steps in this process. Director Ward reported that the purview of the Historic Preservation Board is the first of many steps in this project process. Each public hearing as part of the review of this project will be publicly noticed. That includes mailing a postcard to property owners within 100 feet as well as posting notice to the property and posting notice in the Park Record, the Park City website, and the Utah Public Notice website.

Board Member Beatlebrox referenced the insurance concerns raised by neighbors. She wondered whether that is addressed in any of the procedures. Director Ward explained that historic structures have exceptions from setbacks. However, when there is construction proposed on a steep slope or within five feet of a property line, there are additional requirements as part of the Building Permit process.

There were no further comments. The public hearing was closed.

It was reiterated that the Historic Preservation Board is discussing raising the historic structure, restoring the front façade windows, and restoring the exterior siding. Director Ward reported that those items are summarized in the Draft Final Action Letter.

MOTION: Board Member Hutchings moved to APPROVE the Lifting of the Historic Structure at 36 Prospect Avenue, the Restoration of the Two Identified Windows, and the Restoration of the Historic Siding, according to the following Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Conditions of Approval:

Findings of Fact:

1. 36 Prospect Avenue is a Landmark Historic Site on Park City's Historic Sites Inventory.
2. According to the Historic Site Form, the one-story frame T/L cottage was constructed circa 1889. An addition was constructed to the south of the cottage sometime before 1900.
3. The Applicant proposes to lift the Landmark Historic Structure to accommodate upgrades to the foundation.
4. According to the Applicant's Physical Conditions Report, the wood frame construction appears to be built on a wood beam and grade system supported on hand-formed stone pilings. Improvements appear to include concrete Sonotube piers with wood girders and beams added. Tax cards indicate no foundation or only wooden sills from the original construction and the foundation has unreinforced piers, no seismic system, non-existing footings or unreinforced and not below frost depth, and lack of cohesive vertical and lateral structural foundation system informed by soils engineering.
5. The Applicant proposes to rehabilitate the Landmark Historic Structure with a fully engineered concrete foundation with perimeter foundation drainage.
6. LMC § 15-13-2(B)(2)(d)(2) requires the restoration of historic window openings that have been altered or lost over time and reconstructing of historic windows on primary facades based on physical or documentary evidence. A multi-pane window in the front gable was added sometime after 1940, and the Applicant proposes removing

this window to restore the front façade to its 1800s appearance. The small window on the south addition to the left of the gable was later replaced with a larger window. The Applicant proposes to restore the window to the smaller historic dimensions.

7. The Applicant proposes restoring the horizontal siding.

Conclusions of Law:

1. The proposal complies with LMC § 15-11-12.5 and § 15-13-2.

Conditions of Approval:

1. The new foundation shall not raise or lower the Landmark Historic Structure more than two feet from its original floor elevation.
2. The Landmark Historic Site shall be returned to its original grade following construction of the foundation. When the original grade cannot be achieved, generally no more than six inches of the new foundation shall be visible above final grade on the primary and secondary facades.
3. The site shall be regraded so that all water drains away from the Landmark Historic Structure.
4. A plinth or trim board at the base of the Landmark Historic Structure shall be added to visually anchor the Landmark Historic Structure to the new foundation.
5. Prior to Building Permit submittal, the Applicant shall submit a report from a professional structural engineer ensuring the structural soundness of the Landmark Historic Structure will not be negatively impacted by the lifting of the Structure to accommodate foundation upgrades.
6. The Landmark Historic Structure shall be secured and protected from adverse weather conditions, water infiltration, and vandalism before, during, and after the lifting process.
7. A written plan detailing the steps and procedures for lifting the Landmark Historic Structure shall be completed and approved by the Planning and Building Departments. This plan shall outline step by step the proposed work to lift the Landmark Historic Structure to ensure the least destructive method will be employed.
8. The wood facade shall have an opaque rather than transparent finish.
9. A financial guarantee shall be recorded prior to the submittal of a Building Permit to ensure compliance with the conditions and terms of the Historic Preservation Plan.

Board Member Hodgkins seconded the motion.

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

City Attorney, Mark Harrington, noted that the Board can informally suggest that the public comments regarding issues applicable to the Historic District Design Review or the Building Permit Review be forwarded to those respective departments for further evaluation. There was support for that approach from the Historic Preservation Board. Discussions were had about the two feet that the structure will be lifted through this process.

A. 64 Chambers Avenue – Determination of Significance – On August 7, 2024, the Historic Preservation Board Directed Staff to Prepare a Final Action Letter Approving the Applicant’s Request to Rehabilitate the Landmark Historic Structure to the 1900 Hall Parlor Form. PL-24-06158.

Planner Zollinger presented the Staff Report and explained that the subject property is located at 64 Chambers Avenue. On August 7, 2024, the Historic Preservation Board directed Staff to draft a Final Action Letter allowing the applicant to remove the 1900-1907 rear addition for the Landmark Historic Structure at 64 Chambers Avenue. The applicant is requesting to return the site back to the 1900 design and remove the addition.

Planner Zollinger asked the Historic Preservation Board to review the Final Action Letter. There is one Condition of Approval listed. Director Ward pointed out that the Condition of Approval places a time limit so action is required under the determination. Chair Scott noted that there was not a lot of information in the Meeting Materials Packet. Board Member Hutchings pointed out that in 2007, the Historic Preservation Board determined that the whole structure was historic. The request now before the Board is to reverse that prior determination. Planner Zollinger confirmed this. Finding of Fact #9 was reviewed.

Discussions were had about the last Historic Preservation Board review of the application. The majority of the Board suggested that removal of that section was appropriate because the parlor form was the most important aspect and is seen from the street. Planner Zollinger clarified that there was not a Draft Final Action Letter ready at the previous meeting, because there was a desire to receive direction from the Board. This Final Action Letter was drafted in favor of restoring the structure back to the 1900 design. Board Members expressed confusion about Finding of Fact #9, as the finding was not made on August 7, 2024, but would be made during the current Board Meeting. Director Ward reported that this was the direction the Board gave to Staff on August 7, 2024. A slight modification was made to the language in the Final Action Letter for clarity. The Board reviewed the rest of the Final Action Letter. No additional amendments were made.

MOTION: Board Member Beatlebrox moved to APPROVE the Final Action Letter for 64 Chambers Avenue, according to the following Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Conditions of Approval, as amended:

Findings of Fact:

1. 64 Chambers Avenue is a 4,125-square-foot Lot 2 of the Qualls Subdivision.
2. A hall and parlor home was constructed on the site circa 1885.
3. 64 Chambers Avenue was included in the 1984 National Register nomination. According to Roger Ropers:

Built c. 1885, the Evans L. Smith House at 64 Chambers is architecturally significant as one of 76 extant hall and parlor houses in Park City, 22 of which are included in this [multiple property] nomination. The hall and parlor house, the earliest house type to be built in Park City, and one of the three most common house types that were built during the early period of Park City's mining boom era, significantly contributes to the character of the residential area.

This house was built by at least 1889, as indicated by Sanborn Insurance Maps, but the exact date of its construction and the name of its original owner are unknown. This and surrounding property were purchased in 1877 by the Ontario Silver Mining Company, and it was not until 1948 that this property was granted by the mining company to Evans L. Smith. It was not unusual for houses to be built on mining property by Park City residents on the outskirts of town.

4. The Sanborn Maps show the original hall and parlor house constructed circa 1885 with a rear addition built between 1900 and 1907.
5. A 1982 Historic Architecture Survey for 64 Chambers Avenue found the structure was a typical example that contributes to the Historic District. The form notes the "Main house is contributory; wing should be viewed as qualified."
6. On May 21, 2007, the Historic Preservation Board reviewed a Determination of Significance application regarding the rear addition constructed between 1900 and 1907. The Applicant proposed lifting the Landmark Historic Structure to construct a new basement and garage.
7. The Board determined the rear addition is historically significant and could not be removed to accommodate the proposed upgrades and addition.
8. On June 5, 2024, the Applicant requested the Board reconsider their 2007 determination regarding the rear addition.
9. On August 7, 2024, the Board indicated the Landmark Historic Site at 64 Chambers Avenue would retain its Historic Integrity with the removal of the

1900-1907 rear addition and directed Staff to draft a Final Action Letter regarding this finding.

Conclusions of Law:

1. 64 Chambers Avenue retains its Historic Integrity and Landmark Historic Designation pursuant to Land Management Code Section 15-11-10 with the removal of the 1900-1907 rear addition.

Conditions of Approval:

1. This determination is valid for one year only and shall expire on September 4, 2025. The Applicant is responsible for timely submitting a complete code-compliant Historic District Design Review application within three months of this determination for review and Final Action.

Board Member Holmgren seconded the motion.

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

8. ADJOURN

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

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

The Historic Preservation Board Meeting adjourned at approximately 6:38 p.m.

Approved by _____
Randy Scott, Chair
Historic Preservation Board