



**PARK CITY MUNICIPAL CORPORATION
HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD MEETING
MARSAC MUNICIPAL BUILDING
COUNCIL CHAMBERS
445 MARSAC AVENUE
PARK CITY, SUMMIT COUNTY, UTAH
MINUTES OF OCTOBER 2, 2024**

BOARD MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE: Randy Scott - Chair, Lola Beatlebrox, Puggy Holmgren, Douglas Stephens, John Hutchings (arrived at 5:04 p.m.)

EX OFFICIO MEMBERS: Rebecca Ward, Planning Director; Becky Gutknecht, Public Improvements Engineer; Mark Harrington, City Attorney

1. ROLL CALL

Chair Randy Scott called the meeting to order at approximately 5:00 p.m. and conducted a roll call. It was noted that Board Member John Hutchings would be a few minutes late.

2. MINUTES APPROVAL

A. Consideration to Approve the Historic Preservation Board Meeting Minutes from September 4, 2024.

There was discussion about the Meeting Minutes from September 4, 2024. Board Member Puggy Holmgren made a motion to approve and Board Member Lola Beatlebrox seconded the motion. Board Member Douglas Stephens pointed out that he was not present at the last meeting and would abstain from the vote. With that abstention, there was not a quorum. It was determined that a vote would be taken on the motion when Board Member Hutchings arrived at the Historic Preservation Board Meeting. Shortly after the discussion, Board Member Hutchings arrived and the vote was taken.

MOTION: Board Member Holmgren moved to APPROVE the Historic Preservation Board Meeting Minutes from September 4, 2024. Board Member Beatlebrox seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed. Board Member Stephens abstained from the vote.

3. STAFF AND BOARD COMMUNICATIONS AND DISCLOSURES

Planning Director, Rebecca Ward, explained that there is updated information to share about Ontario Water Tank E. Public Improvements Engineer, Becky Gutknecht, is

planning to attend the Historic Preservation Board Meeting and can answer Board Member questions once she arrives. Director Ward reminded the Board that Ontario Water Tank E is not a historic site, but it is a historic resource that is identified in the Flagstaff Development Agreement. Last year, the City Council approved an engineering study to stabilize and preserve this water tank. The applicant proposes the following:

- Removing remnant roof pieces;
- Replacing the roof with internal structure support;
- Attaching cables with a large, galvanized plate to spread the load over a larger area, anchoring the cables to the ground with power pole guy wire components;
- Adding a stiffening angle inside the water tank to retain the shape;
- Reconstructing the hexagonal roof with the interior support of 4x4 posts and pre-cast footers.

The Board reviewed and approved the project, but requested a Condition of Approval:

- The applicant shall revisit the method of using cables to stabilize the water tank and shall explore a less intrusive method, to be reviewed by the City Engineer and Chief Building Official. Staff shall report back to the Historic Preservation Board on August 7, 2024, regarding the final method of stabilization determined to be least intrusive and effective in the long-term stabilization of the water tank.

Director Ward reported that she attended the site visit. The photographs shown in the presentation slides do not accurately capture the leaning of the water tank. The Engineering Department and Chief Building Official are supportive of the cabling that is proposed and find it to be an effective form of stabilization. Work is being done with the applicant to see that this is done before the snow falls this year. She reiterated that it was determined that the proposed cabling system would be the best approach for this structure.

The applicant representative, Doug Ogilvy, is present at the Historic Preservation Board Meeting. Board Member Stephens asked if the cabling was on the exterior. Mr. Ogilvy reported that the intention is to essentially put a strap around the top of the tank and have two guy wires come off of that. Something will need to be put on the wire that crosses the trail as a visual reminder. He explained that only one of the guy wires would cross the trail and it would be approximately 12 feet above. It was noted that Engineer Gutknecht has arrived at the meeting and can answer Board Member questions. Chair Scott stated that the Board will support whatever recommendation has been made by the engineers.

Board Member Stephens asked if this is less structurally sound because there is no water in it. Mr. Ogilvy reported that it is fragile. The tank has shifted, so time is of the essence to address the issue. Chair Scott thanked them for making this project a priority. Mr. Ogilvy noted that the contractor is on-site as of today working there. Director Ward reminded the Board that this has already been approved, but an update was requested.

4. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS

There were no public communications.

5. CONTINUATIONS

- A. **Silver King Coalition Mine Building (Parcel No. PCA-S-98-PCMR-1) – Historic District Grant Application – The Applicant Requests the Historic Preservation Board Consider a \$50,744 Grant to Repair Windows with Polycarbonate Plastic Sheets Sealed into the Mullions. PL-24-06273**

Director Ward reported that there will be some modifications made to this proposal. As a result, the request is for the Historic Preservation Board to continue it to a date uncertain.

MOTION: Board Member Hutchings moved to CONTINUE the Silver King Coalition Mine Building (Parcel No. PCA-S-98-PCMR-1) – Historic District Grant Application to a date uncertain. Board Member Holmgren seconded the motion.

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

6. REGULAR AGENDA

- 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 presented the Staff Report and explained that the item relates to 732 Crescent Tram. This request was before the Board in August 2024, and some updated information is now being shared. She reminded Board Members that the applicant is requesting Material Deconstruction and this is an unoccupied Landmark Historic Site that was built circa 1904 during the Mature Mining Era. The front façade faces the north rather than Crescent Tram Road. It was owned by Park City School District Superintendent Carl Winters from 1926 to 1938. During his ownership, there were a number of additions built.

The additions were shown in red on an image presented to the Board and are known as the “Winters Additions.” Director Ward pointed out A to the rear and B and C to the east. E is a root cellar and F is a second-story addition. In 2017, the previous property owner came to the Board with a proposal to rehabilitate the Landmark Historic Structure to its original 1900s form and the Board approved the removal of the “Winters Additions.”

Director Ward reported that only Addition A was removed. She shared an image of the structure, as it currently exists, with Addition A removed. The current property owner is requesting that the Historic Preservation Board allow for the rehabilitation of the Landmark Historic Site to the 1938 form, which includes the reconstruction of Addition A.

The applicant is also requesting Material Deconstruction to lift the Landmark Historic Structure for a basement garage and addition. The applicant submitted a letter from an engineer confirming that they would not request panelization, but would brace, stabilize, and lift the structure. This application has been pending since 2021. There has been a lengthy review process and the applicant still needs to go to the Planning Commission for a Steep Slope Conditional Use Permit. Additionally, subdivision approval is needed to create a lot for the historic site. Historic Preservation Board approval is required for the rehabilitation. Lastly, the applicant must complete a Historic District Design Review.

The regulations require a transitional element between what is historic and what is not. As a result, the applicant is looking for guidance from the Historic Preservation Board before revising the plans and moving forward through the review process. During the August 2024, Historic Preservation Board Meeting, a majority of the Board Members indicated support so long as this does not set a precedent. Director Ward acknowledged that this is an unusual application due to the "Winters Additions" and Addition A removal.

As the Staff Report outlines, the applicant has agreed to certain Conditions of Approval that have been discussed previously. For example, reducing the two-car garage to a one-car garage with the possibility of tandem garage parking. The intention is to reduce the visual impact of the garage on that façade. The applicant has already agreed to that condition. There is also a request that the transitional element be updated to provide that distance between the historic structure. Since this is a large uphill addition, there will be some additional length to separate the new addition. Director Ward reported that the new addition will need to be separated into modules that reflect the mass and scale of the historic structure. Those are items that the applicant continues to work through in revised plans. The applicant proposes to keep the root cellar and instead locate the transitional element more toward the rear along Addition C. The request is to remove approximately 60 square feet from Addition C to accommodate the necessary transitional element.

Director Ward noted that she can answer Board Member questions. Alternatively, the applicant representative, Bill Van Sickle, and the property owner, Tony Hynes, are both at the meeting. Board Member Stephens asked to further review the drawing that shows the different additions. He worked with the Division of State History a number of years ago and there was a similar situation. At that time, it was made clear that someone looking at the structure needs to be able to tell that there was an addition. He pointed out that in this case, the siding profile could be different. On the original house, there is a straight profile, but there could be a rounded profile instead. From the street, it would not be possible to tell the difference, but from a closer distance, it would be possible to determine that it was a more current addition. That is one way to address the situation.

Board Member Beatlebrox asked what Board Member Stephens meant by a rounded profile. Board Member Stephens stated that what is there is lap siding and historically that was a straight cut. More current applications of siding would be rounded. It would look almost exactly the same from a distance. Board Member Beatlebrox noted that the applicant wants to restore it to the 1938 look, so she is not sure why there needs to be a difference. Board Member Stephens pointed out that the historic material is gone. There is no desire to mislead anyone into thinking that the new addition is historic. It can look similar in terms of form and design, but it is important to see that it is not historic.

There was discussion about the transitional element. Director Ward explained that if the intention was to rehabilitate it to the original 1900s form, then a transitional element would be required. In this case, the intention is to rehabilitate to the 1938 form, so that will be a reconstruction and it is historic as far as where the transitional element will need to go. The Conditions of Approval recommend that the applicant work with a historic preservation professional in updating the Historic Preservation Plan, specifically for the reconstruction. She shared additional example images with the Board for reference and pointed out that the materials are offset in comparison with the original form. The reconstruction would preserve that. There would still be an appearance of something that was added later while not detracting from the appearance of the historic structure.

Board Member Stephens wondered whether the materials were offset because it was an addition. It was not uncommon for the footings to be better on the original house rather than on additions. It might have become slightly offset over time. Board Member Hutchings noted that there is a transitional requirement for additions. He understands that what is being discussed is not historic, because the addition has already been torn down and there is a desire to reconstruct it to rehabilitate the structure to the 1938 form.

Board Member Stephens believed there is agreement that the request is to reconstruct. He asked what Staff is looking for from the Historic Preservation Board. Director Ward explained that if the Board finds this Landmark Historic Site retains its historic integrity with the "Winters Additions," that would be the determination. The Conditions of Approval are drafted to reflect what is in the code for reconstruction as far as the as-builts. Some defining features set this apart from the original 1900s form. If the Board finds that this site retains its historic integrity as a Landmark Historic Site, with the "Winters Additions," then that also informs what the property owner will be required to brace and secure when they lift the historic structure. The Draft Final Action Letter would allow the applicant to move forward with their plans from the 1938 form with the transitional element. She reminded the Board that the applicant will still need to go through the Planning Commission and the Historic District Design Review process in the future.

The current determination on the property from 2017 under the previous property owner would require the applicant to go back to the 1900s form and remove the "Winters Additions." That would result in a very different outcome for the transitional element and the addition on the site. Director Ward explained that the applicant is looking for direction

on the year that the structure can be rehabilitated, which she pointed out is either the 1900s or 1938. From there, it is possible to move forward through the review process.

Board Member Beatlebrox reported that in 2017, the property owner wanted to focus on the 1900 design. Now, the new property owner wants to focus on the 1938 design. She believes 1938 is still a good look for this particular property and does not have a problem with what has been proposed. Chair Scott noted that there has been a change in ownership. Typically, the Historic Preservation Board would not support someone removing an addition and then coming back to rebuild the addition. This is an unusual situation. There are four items that the Historic Preservation Board needs to consider:

- The rehabilitation of the Landmark Historic Structure to 1938;
- The reconstruction of Addition A;
- The lifting of the Landmark Historic Structure to accommodate a basement addition;
- The Material Deconstruction of approximately 60 square feet of Addition C to accommodate a transitional element and addition.

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

Chair Scott asked the Board to review the four items. The first has to do with the restoration to the 1938 form. Board Member Hutchings thought this was a good project and believed the applicant was trying to do the right thing. However, the result makes him nervous that there could be a precedent set to tear down a historic structure and then come back to rebuild. He shared example scenarios from previous applications. Board Member Beatlebrox pointed out that there is a different owner involved now. The previous owner wanted to focus on the 1900s design but only got as far as tearing down the one addition. There is now a new owner who is interested in focusing on the 1938 design.

Board Member Stephens believes that the difference between this scenario and other previous scenarios is that this involves different owners. The addition will be built in the same place and the square footage will also be the same. Board Member Stephens noted that the new owner was not responsible for the previous changes made to the site. Addition A was removed legally. This process will make it possible for the new owner to rebuild the addition. It will restore the shape of the home so it looks like it did in 1938.

Board Member Hutchings asked the applicant to speak about the proposal. Mr. Van Sickle explained that what is proposed will afford them more square footage overall. It will make the main part at the front of the house more livable if the original footprint is used for the great room, kitchen, and dining room. Board Member Hutchings recognizes that Addition A was torn down with permission from the Historic Preservation Board. He acknowledged that it could also be put back with permission from the Board.

Board Member Holmgren remembers the original application well. She noted that Addition A was put in by Mr. Winters, who was a prominent historical figure in Park City. Chair Scott recalled that though the Board found Addition A to be interesting, it was not necessarily restorable. He reiterated that the change in property ownership has complicated matters. However, he stated that the addition will add a nice look to the house and will match historic photographs. In general, he is in support of the proposal.

There was additional discussion about the proposal. Chair Scott asked whether there is support for the lifting of the Landmark Historic Structure to accommodate a basement addition. Board Member Beatlebrox read the letter from the company and it was declarative that it could be lifted. The fact that the company does not want to panelize it, but lift it, is encouraging. Other Board Members agreed. Chair Scott asked about the Material Deconstruction of approximately 60 square feet to Addition C to accommodate a transitional element and addition. No concerns were expressed by the Board. It was noted that the Draft Final Action Letter referenced Addition A instead of Addition C.

MOTION: Board Member Hutchings moved to APPROVE the Reconstruction and Material Deconstruction at 732 Crescent Tram, in accordance with the Draft Final Action Letter, as amended, with the following Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Conditions of Approval:

Findings of Fact:

1. On January 23, 2021, the Applicant submitted a Historic District Design Review Pre-Application to rehabilitate the Landmark Historic Structure at 732 Crescent Tram, lift the Historic Structure to accommodate a basement addition, and construct an addition to the secondary façade on a Very Steep Slope. The proposed project requires Historic Preservation Board Material Deconstruction, a subdivision application, a Steep Slope Conditional Use Permit approval from the Planning Commission, and a Historic District Design Review approval by Staff.
2. The Applicant requests Historic Preservation Board approval to Rehabilitate the Landmark Historic Structure to the 1938 form and retain the Winters Additions, to Reconstruct Winters Addition A, to lift the Landmark Historic Structure to accommodate a basement addition, and to remove approximately 60 square feet from Winters Addition C to accommodate a transitional element and addition.
3. 732 Crescent Tram is an unoccupied Landmark Historic Site on Park City's Historic Sites Inventory, constructed circa 1904 during the Mature Mining Era (1894-1930). The site is unique in that the front façade faces north, not Crescent Tram Road. The property is accessed from a private driveway off Crescent Tram Road.

4. Staff research completed in 2016 concluded the Landmark Historic Structure was originally a one-room, single-cell house. An expansion was added to the rear of the house sometime before 1907.
5. Park City School District Superintendent Carl Winters purchased the home in 1926 and lived there with his wife and three daughters through 1938. During his ownership, several additions were constructed.
6. On March 1, 2017, the Historic Preservation Board reviewed a request to determine the Historic Significance of the Winters additions. A previous property owner requested the Board determine whether the additions constructed during Superintendent Carl Winters' ownership between 1926 and 1938, including Additions A, B, C, E, and F in the image below, could be removed for the rehabilitation of the Landmark Historic Structure to the early 1900s form.
7. On March 1, 2017, the Historic Preservation Board continued the discussion to April 5, 2017.
8. On April 5, 2017, the Historic Preservation Board found the Winters Additions "do not reflect the Mature Mining Era and do not contribute to our understanding of the broad patterns of our history" and that these additions do not meet the criteria for designating sites to the Park City Historic Sites Inventory.
9. On November 7, 2018, the Historic Preservation Board approved Material Deconstruction for the removal of the Winters Additions.
10. However, only Addition A was removed and the other Winters Additions remain.
11. The Applicant requests the Board approve the rehabilitation of the Landmark Historic Structure to 1938.
12. On August 7, 2024, a majority of the Board expressed support for retaining the Winters additions.
13. Reconstruction – The Applicant requests Reconstruction of Addition A. After Addition A was removed, the Applicant recorded a Boundary Line Agreement, reducing the size of the Landmark Historic Site from 0.15 acres (6,534 square feet) to 0.12 acres (5,227 square feet) and proposing to create two additional Lots to the south of the Landmark Historic Site.

- a. Reconstruction of Addition A requires the future proposed Lot configuration to increase again with the boundary shifting southward to comply with Setbacks.
- b. LMC Section 15-11-15 Reconstruction of an Existing Historic Building or Historic Structure outlines the criteria required for a Landmark Historic Site. In approving an Application for Reconstruction of the Historic Structure on a Significant Site, the Historic Preservation Board shall find the project complies with the following criteria:
 - i. The Historic Structure is found by the Chief Building Official to be hazardous or dangerous, pursuant to Section 116.1 of the International Building Code; and
 - ii. The Historic Structure cannot be made safe and/or serviceable through repair; and
 - iii. The form, features, detailing, placement, orientation, and location of the Historic Structure will be accurately depicted, by means of new construction, based on as-built measured drawings, historical records, and/or current or historic photographs.
- c. The Applicant's request is an outlier because the Applicant does not request Reconstruction of the Landmark Historic Structure; rather, they request Reconstruction of Addition A because of a 2017 Board determination to rehabilitate the Structure to the 1900s form and the current request – to rehabilitate the Structure to the 1938 form, with the Winters additions.
- d. The Applicant meets criteria three. As part of the Board's 2017 review, the form, features, detailing, placement, orientation, and location of the Historic Structure is accurately depicted with as-built measured drawings, historical records, and current and historic photographs.
- e. LMC Section 15-11-15(B) states the procedure for Reconstruction of Landmark Historic Structures shall be reviewed by the Board pursuant to LMC Section 15-11-12 Historic District or Historic Site Review. This Section of Code requires a full Historic District Design Review process, and the Conditions of Approval below require compliance.

- f. During the August meeting, a majority of the Board indicated support for the Reconstruction of Addition A as long as this does not establish precedent, and the Reconstructed form complies with the Historic District Regulations.
14. Material Deconstruction – Pursuant to LMC Section 15-11-12.5(A)(2), the Historic Preservation Board reviews Material Deconstruction to accommodate new additions, new construction, and structural upgrades.
15. The Applicant proposes bracing and lifting the Landmark Historic Structure, including the Winters Additions B, C, and F, and removing approximately 60 square feet of Addition C to accommodate a transitional element and addition.

Conclusions of Law:

1. The request to rehabilitate the Landmark Historic Structure to the 1938 form retains the Historic Integrity of the Landmark Historic Site pursuant to LMC Section 15-11-10(A)(1).
2. The proposed Material Deconstruction complies with LMC Section 15-11-12.5 Material Deconstruction.
3. The proposal, as conditioned, complies with LMC Section 15-13-2 Regulations for Historic Residential Sites.

Conditions of Approval:

1. The proposal requires a Plat Amendment, Steep Slope Conditional Use Permit, and Historic District Design Review application.
2. A Soils Report completed by a geotechnical engineer as well as a temporary shoring plan will be required at the time of Building Permit application.
3. The new foundation shall not raise or lower the Landmark Historic Structure more than two feet from its original floor elevation.
4. The Historic Site shall be returned to original grade following the construction of the foundation. When the original grade cannot be achieved, no more than six inches of the new foundation shall be visible above Final Grade on the primary and secondary facades.
5. The site shall be re-graded so that all water drains away from the Structure and does not enter the foundation.

6. A plinth or trim board at the base of the Historic Structure shall be added to visually anchor the Historic Structure to the new foundation.
7. The form, material, and detailing of the new foundation shall be similar to foundations of nearby Historic Structures.
8. The foundation shall not be concealed with masonry, block, plywood panels, corrugated metal, or wood shingles.
9. The Applicant shall submit a cribbing and excavation stabilization shoring plan reviewed and stamped by a State of Utah licensed and registered structural engineer prior to issuance of a Building Permit. Cribbing or shoring must be of engineer-specified materials. Screw-type jacks for raising and lowering the building are not allowed as primary supports once the building is lifted.
10. Historic Structures that are lifted off the foundation must be returned to the completed foundation within 45 days of the date the Building Permit was issued.
11. The Applicant shall request an inspection through the Building Department following the modification to the cribbing and/or shoring. Failure to request the inspection will be a violation of the Preservation Plan and enforcement action through the Historic Preservation Financial Guarantee or ACE could take place.
12. The proposed addition is a large, uphill addition. As a result, the transitional element shall comply with LMC Section 15-13-3(B)(4)(c)(5) Transitional Elements – Large Additions: The addition shall be visually separated from the historic building when viewed from the public right-of-way. Because the height of the new addition will exceed the height of the Landmark Historic Structure and is uphill, the addition shall be set away from the Landmark Historic Structure by a minimum of one-half the length of the least-wide historic elevation adjacent to the historic elevation to which the transitional element is attached.
13. Prior to submitting a Building Permit, the Applicant shall submit an updated Historic Preservation Plan prepared by a Qualified Historic Preservation Professional as defined in LMC Section 15-15-1 to verify that the proposed plans accurately reflect the historic form, dimensions, materials, detailing, and roof pitch of the Winters Additions, indicated in the 2017 as-builts.
14. The volume of the addition shall be broken into modules that reflect the scale of the components seen on the Landmark Historic Structure pursuant to LMC Section 15-13-2(B)(4)(c)(4).

15. Final plans shall be verified to comply with the Historic Residential – 1 Zoning District requirements, including maximum building footprint and interior building height.
16. Final plans shall be limited to a single-car garage (with tandem garage parking possible) to comply with LMC Section 15-13-2(B)(5)(b)(2); the basement garage shall not extend beyond the exterior wall planes of the secondary façade and the garage opening shall be set back from the wall plane of the Landmark Historic Structure to diminish the presence of the garage. A single-vehicle garage door not greater than nine feet wide and nine feet high shall be used to access a basement garage addition and glazing on the garage door is limited to no more than 30%.
17. The new driveway width shall not exceed ten feet.
18. The Applicant shall complete and record a Financial Guarantee in a form approved by the City Attorney's Office and record the Financial Guarantee with Summit County prior to submitting a Building Permit.

Board Member Holmgren seconded the motion.

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

7. ADJOURN

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

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

The Historic Preservation Board Meeting adjourned at approximately 5:50 p.m.

Approved by _____
Randy Scott, Chair
Historic Preservation Board