



**PARK CITY MUNICIPAL CORPORATION
HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD MEETING
MARSAC MUNICIPAL BUILDING
COUNCIL CHAMBERS
445 MARSAC AVENUE
PARK CITY, SUMMIT COUNTY, UTAH
MINUTES OF OCTOBER 1, 2025**

BOARD MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE: Douglas Stephens-Chair, Lola Beatlebrox, John Hutchings, Dalton Gackle, Puggy Holmgren

EX OFFICIO MEMBERS: Rebecca Ward, Planning Director; Jacob Klopfenstein, Planner II; Meredith Covey, Planner II; Lillian Zollinger, Planner III; Elissa Martin, Project Planning Manager; Mark Harrington, Senior City Attorney

1. CALL TO ORDER

Chair Douglas Stephens called the meeting to order at 5:00 p.m.

2. ROLL CALL

All Board Members were present with the exception of Randy Scott and Katie Noble.

3. MINUTES APPROVAL

A. Consideration to Approve the Historic Preservation Board Meeting Minutes from August 6, 2025.

MOTION: Board Member Holmgren moved to APPROVE the Historic Preservation Board Meeting Minutes from August 6, 2025, as presented. Board Member Gackle seconded the motion.

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

4. STAFF AND BOARD COMMUNICATIONS AND DISCLOSURES

Planning Director, Rebecca Ward, reported that the November 5, 2025, Historic Preservation Board meeting would be cancelled.

Board Member Gackle disclosed that as an employee of the Park City Museum, he had been in many meetings where item 6A was discussed.

5. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS

There were no public communications.

6. REGULAR AGENDA

A. Silver King Coalition Mine Stores Building – Material Deconstruction – The Applicant Proposes Deconstructing the Stores Building, a Significant Historic Site, and Salvaging Materials to be Used for Restoring the Main Mine Building. PL-25-06665.

Project Planning Manager, Elissa Martin, presented the Staff Report and indicated that the Silver King Coalition Mine is a Significant Historic Site listed on the Park City Historical Sites Inventory. The Historic Structures were built between 1894 and 1929 in the mature mining era, and the Stores Building was constructed circa 1910. The Applicant proposed the Material Deconstruction of the entire building. The historic materials would then be repurposed for use in the restoration of the adjacent Silver King Hoist House.

The Stores Building is reflective of its designated Historic Era. It is located northwest of and parallel to the Hoist House. The structure was approximately 140 feet long and 30 feet deep and clad in corrugated metal with two-over-two double hung sash type windows. Planning Manager Martin indicated that the windows had since been covered with metal panels to prevent vandalism.

The building was adapted for ski resort equipment maintenance and offices in the 1970s and used for those purposes until 1986. Heavy snowfall in the winter of 2018-2019 caused a portion of the roof to collapse. Emergency repairs and demolition of the collapsed portion were approved via a Historic Preservation Board Waiver Letter, which included conditions of approval to stabilize the portion of the building that was intact. Record snowfall in 2022 and 2023 collapsed a section of the roof. Photographs were displayed, indicating the past and current condition of the structure.

Planning Manager Martin reported that the complete Material Deconstruction of the Stores Building, including the remaining standing portion of the building, would constitute demolition and could not be approved by the Historic Preservation Board.

The Applicant's justification for full demolition was as follows:

1. When the Stores Building was converted to a ski resort maintenance and office building, its historic significance as a Mine Structure was minimized.
2. Decades of heavy snow loading caused all but 18 feet of the structure to collapse.
3. The Stores Building makes snow grading difficult where it is needed to allow snow unloading from the Silver King Hoist House.

Staff analysis determined that while the Stores Building had been reduced in size due to collapse and the interior had been stripped of remnants of mining activity, the intact portion of the Historic Structure may retain Historic Significance. The 2015 Preservation Plan for Historic Mining Resources at Park City Mountain Resort, prepared by SWC Environmental Consultants, described the Stores Building as “contributing to the overall experience of the Silver King Mine Site for visitors.” However, its utilitarian construction, plain appearance, and lack of interpretive plaque make it less visited and less significant to the experience than the adjacent Hoist House. The Preservation Plan provided a condition assessment of the Stores Building, as well as treatment recommendations for stabilization. The treatments recommended in the plan could be applied to the portion of the structure that is still intact in order to stabilize it.

Pursuant to Land Management Code (“LMC”) § 15-11-16, in order for demolition to take place on a Historic Structure, the Chief Building Official must make a determination based on International Building Code (“IBC”) standards for demolition. Planning and Building Staff performed a site visit to evaluate the condition of the Stores Building, and the Chief Building Official determined that the structure did not qualify for demolition. Staff then encouraged the Applicant to obtain an engineer’s report to evaluate if the standing portion of the structure could be stabilized and preserved.

There were three paths for demolition:

1. Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness for Demolition pursuant to LMC § 15-11-17.
2. Application for the removal of the Historic Site from the Park City Historic Sites Inventory.
3. Demolition could be approved by the Chief Building Official based on an engineer’s report indicating that the structure does not meet requirements outlined in IBC Section 16.

Based on its evaluation of Historic Integrity, Staff determined that Material Deconstruction of the collapsed portion of the Stores Building would not diminish the Historic Integrity of the Silver King Coalition Mine Historic Site.

Staff recommended that the Historic Preservation Board review the proposed Material Deconstruction, conduct a public hearing, and consider denying the request the demolish the remaining standing portion of the Stores Building but approving the salvaging of collapsed materials for use on the Silver King Hoist House subject to the Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Conditions of Approval outlined in the draft Final Action Letter.

Morgan Pierce spoke on behalf of the Applicant and indicated that the Friends of Ski Mountain Mining History has been working diligently on the Silver King Coalition Mine structures that were listed as Priority Structures in the 2015 Preservation Plan. The Stores

Building was not a priority project, and as such was not scheduled for preservation or stabilization. It was their position that the Structure lacked historic integrity and interpretive value and was in a state of physical degradation.

Project Manager, Brian Buck, presented photographs of the site and indicated that the Historic Site had been significantly modified. The Stores Building was previously connected to a Carpenter Shop, which connected to a Tramway that crossed Woodside Gulch. The other structures had since been removed, and Woodside Gulch was backfilled with earth. The building's appearance was modified in the 1970s with the installation of two modern garage doors. The interior was completely refurbished with a concrete floor on top of the original wood floor, modern appliances, plumbing, lighting, etc., to support its use as an equipment maintenance facility.

Mr. Buck stated that wood-framed structures like the Stores Building do not hold up to the elements, and old roofs are prone to damage from snow loads. When in use, the building was heated, so snow did not accumulate on the roof. Once it was abandoned, the roofs began to weaken from the snow load. He presented a drone photograph from 2019 after the eastern half of the Stores Building had collapsed. At that time, the Stores Building, Hoist House, and Change House were standing. The roofs of the Change House and Hoist House had since been repaired. The City approved the removal of the collapsed portion of the Stores Building at that time, with the condition that the remaining Historic Structure be stabilized and a new east wall be constructed to enclose the building.

Photographs from 2021 to the present were displayed. The new eastern wall was constructed in 2022, and steel cables were installed in the interior to strengthen the structure. Despite those repairs, that winter's record snowfall damaged the roof and walls. The damage was reported to the City, but repairs were not undertaken at that time. The following winter, snow further damaged the weakened building and caused the general collapse of the damaged portion. The north wall from the remaining garage door to the eastern wall was further damaged, as well as the southern wall, creating multiple potential entry points for trespassers.

Mr. Buck presented photographs of the building's interior and noted that no part of the interior or its contents related to the mine. The drop ceiling installed in the 1970s had collapsed, and the remaining insulation was contaminated with black mold. The building was also contaminated with rat and mouse droppings. Vandals had destroyed plumbing fixtures and windows and painted graffiti on some walls. The portion that is still standing includes two small rooms on the first floor and one room on the second floor. The general collapse of the roof was visible from the remaining upstairs room.

It was the Applicant's position that the building was generally unsound and posed a safety risk. The portion of the structure that was still standing was constructed in the same manner as the portion that had collapsed, which suggested that it was also likely to collapse unless major reconstruction was completed. Two broken purlins would likely collapse under a significant snow load. The current unsafe condition of the building prevented adequate

maintenance to prevent further collapse or eliminate unauthorized entry. In their opinion, the structure was dangerous and should be entirely removed.

The original structure was 136 feet long. The current structure was approximately half that size. Once the collapsed portion was removed, only 18 feet or 13% of the original Historic Structure would remain. The Applicant believed the remaining structure lacked Historic Significance or visual interest and had little integrity with the original Stores Building or Mine Site. They did not agree with Staff that the building should be preserved. Additionally, the building encumbered the resort from being able to control the depth of snow along the north side of the Hoist House.

A current photograph of the site was displayed, and Mr. Buck noted that extensive repairs had been made to the roof, windows, and interior of the Hoist House. The Applicant believed the collapsed Stores Building was structurally unsound, posed a safety risk, and could not be maintained in its present condition, and as such that it met the criteria to be deemed unsafe under IBC § 116.1. They proposed to conduct material deconstruction of the entire structure, including the portion that remained standing. All usable corrugated metal and wood timbers would be salvaged for use on the Hoist House, and unsalvageable materials would be disposed of off-site. Mr. Buck indicated that the building owner, resort, and structural engineer agreed with the proposal.

The Friends of Ski Mountain Mining History did not believe any other party would pursue renovation, preservation, adaptive reuse, reconstruction, or relocation of the Stores Building per LMC § 15-11-16. If they were not allowed to remove the entire building, they were concerned that it could remain in its current unsafe condition until it was eventually removed. They had saved multiple mining structures in Park City over the past 10 years, including the Hoist House. When work is completed on that structure, they will have invested \$1.6 million of public and private funds in that effort. They asserted that the remains of the historically insignificant Stores Building should not be given the same level of care. They asked that the Historic Preservation Board determine that the building should be removed down to the concrete slab and permits be issued for removal.

Board Member Beattlebrox stated that she was pleased the resort would ensure snow removal around the Hoist House. She asked why it was difficult to remove snow from the area between the two buildings. Mr. Buck stated that they use the same large equipment that is used on the ski slopes. They approach the front of the building and pull the snow away from the building, but there is not enough room to do so between the two buildings. Pushing the snow along the sides of the building would put stress on the walls of the Hoist House.

In response to a question from Board Member Hutchings, Mr. Buck stated that they had not considered requesting that the building be removed from the Historic Site Inventory. They had filed for multiple waivers and permits over the years, but had never requested that a structure be delisted because they believed it would be disingenuous to take the position that a building does not deserve to be on the Historic Site Inventory. They hoped to reach an understanding that would allow deconstruction within the next three weeks.

Board Member Beatlebrox stated that the LMC applies to buildings in Park City, but the subject Historic Structure was on a mountain in a very remote area. That area gets substantially more snow than it did in the past, and she was concerned that the situation was being measured against standards that did not apply to the specific situation.

Chair Stephens suggested that the Board consider the item as two separate issues: (1) material deconstruction of the collapsed portion of the building, and (2) the portion that is still standing.

Mr. Buck stated that in past meetings with Staff, the Friends of Ski Mountain Mining History had expressed concern that the remaining structure would continue to be open to unauthorized access during the removal of the collapsed portion. The roof is already compromised, and engineering studies would be required prior to any stabilization work. They were concerned about their liability during that time. Chair Stephens clarified that his intention was not to require two separate scopes of work, but rather that the Board consider the issue as two separate decision items.

Senior City Attorney, Mark Harrington, stated that the item should not be split into two separate motions. The Historic Preservation Board had preliminary consensus on Conclusion of Law 4 and should consider whether the other items outlined in the Final Action Letter should be approved or amended.

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

Chair Stephens asked Chief Building Official, Dave Thacker, to speak to the current condition of the Historic Structure. Building Official Thacker stated that Staff agreed that the collapsed portion of the structure needed to be remediated. He also agreed that the purlins on the remaining structure were broken. IBC §116.1 covers unsafe structures and whether the structure can be made safe, and in his professional opinion, the remaining structure could be made safe. Staff had hoped the Applicant would provide supporting documentation from an engineer, but that was not received. He was open to evaluating engineering reports that supported deconstruction. However, without that documentation, it was his determination that the building could be made safe.

Chair Stephens asked if the collapses were associated with the installation of the garage doors. He noted that the building had not been used since 1986, but snow loading did not cause collapse until 2019. Building Official Thacker indicated that he did not research the permit history for the Historic Structure, so he did not know if the doors were installed according to City Code at that time. However, the header above the garage door failed.

Board Member Beatlebrox asked who would be responsible for stabilizing the remaining building prior to Winter. Director Ward reported that a waiver letter would be issued with a Condition of Approval that the Historic Structure be stabilized and enclosed, as was done in

2019. If an engineer's report was received indicating that the Historic Structure qualifies for removal under IBC §116.1, deconstruction could be addressed at that time.

Board Member Gackle asked who was required to perform the work in 2019. Director Ward stated that the letter was issued to John Sale, then-representative for Park City Mountain Resort. Mr. Buck added that the resort removed the collapsed portion of the building, but the City paid for the new east wall. The resort and land owner had indicated that they want the building to be removed, and the Friends of Ski Mountain Mining History were willing to remove it. He did not know who would respond to a waiver because no one was willing to repair the structure.

Chair Stephens indicated that he understood the issue, but it was not within the Historic Preservation Board's authority to make decisions that do not comply with the Land Management Code. The Board typically considers removal of Historic Materials for buildings that will be restored. This was a matter of demolition of a potentially unsafe structure that would require City Council Approval and issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness for Demolition of Historic Structures ("CAD"). He noted that Staff had indicated the need for an engineering report in support of demolition.

Board Member Gackle stated that one issue with obtaining an engineering report was that someone would need to pay for the report, and the Friends of Ski Mountain Mining History had focused their efforts on restoration of the Hoist House. He agreed that the Board could not legally vote on demolition and suggested that the Applicant consider the option of applying to remove the specific structure from the Historic Sites Inventory. Chair Stephens agreed and noted removal was supported by the Applicant's assertion that the structure had no Historic Significance.

Mr. Pierce stated that the Friends of Ski Mountain Mining History were unwilling to incur the expense of an engineering report because there was no guarantee that deconstruction would be approved, even with the report. They believed the current path was appropriate, and they only had a few weeks left in the work season to complete deconstruction. If they were not allowed to move forward, it would be another year before work could begin. Board Member Gackle agreed that the timing was unfortunate because of the likelihood that more of the building would collapse over winter.

Board Member Beatlebrox indicated that the delay would also increase the potential for snow-related issues with the Hoist House. She believed common sense should allow the Board to make a decision that goes against the LMC.

Planning Manager Martin clarified that Staff recommended that the Board approve demolition of the entire collapsed portion of the building. That would allow snow removal equipment to access all but 18 feet of the Hoist House. Demolition of the collapsed portion could be completed immediately.

Board Member Gackle noted that the collapsed portion of the building could be supporting the remaining structure, and its removal could cause the rest of the building to collapse.

Director Ward reported that it was determined at the site visit that the remaining structure could be stabilized once the collapsed portion was removed. She noted that the Applicant could apply for a City grant to complete emergency stabilization work.

In response to a question raised by Chair Stephens, it was reported that no significant structural damage to the remaining Historic Structure was observed during the site visit.

Board Member Hutchings stated that he would vote to approve the removal of the collapsed structure, but was hesitant to approve the removal of the remaining Historic Structure because it would set a precedent and was outside the Historic Preservation Board's purview. Board Member Gackle agreed that the Board could not legally approve demolition regardless of the consequences.

Board Member Holmgren stated that she had not faced a similar issue in her time on the Historic Preservation Board, and she was not comfortable recommending deconstruction or demolition.

Chair Stephens stated that there was a viable path for the Applicant's preferred outcome, but it was not through the Historic Preservation Board process. He encouraged the Applicant to pursue those paths.

Attorney Harrington recommended that the Board review the proposed Final Action Letter and consider removing Conclusion of Law 1 through 3. They could also recommend expedited review of any additional applications regarding engineering or CAD. In response to a question raised by Board Member Beatlebrox, he indicated that the Board could recommend that Staff use emergency funds or that the City Council participate in the efforts in order to expedite the process.

Chair Stephens reopened the hearing for comment regarding the remaining Historic Structure. There were no comments. The public hearing was closed.

MOTION: Board Member Gackle moved to APPROVE Removal of the Collapsed Materials at the Silver King Coalition Mine Stores Building and DENY Demolition of the Standing Historic Structure, and to recommend that Staff consider use of emergency Funding and expedite the review process for any associated applications, according to the following:

Findings of Fact:

1. The Silver King Coalition Mine (SKCM) is a Significant Historic Site on the Park City Historic Sites Inventory, as established by Land Management Code (LMC) § 15-11-10.
2. The site is located on Parcel PCA-S-98-PCMR, in the Recreation Open Space (ROS) Zoning District.

3. The Stores Building is one of several Historic Mine Structures that make up the site, constructed during the mature mining era, as follows:
 - a. Boarding House – constructed c. 1895
 - b. Fire hose shack and stone wall – constructed c. 1900
 - c. Transformer House – constructed c. 1905
 - d. Water Tanks – constructed c.1894 - c.1906
 - e. Stores Building – constructed c. 1910
 - f. Change House – constructed c. 1910
 - g. Hoist House – constructed c. 1910
 - h. Boarding House Vault – constructed c. 1915
 - i. Mill Building – constructed c. 1921 (replaced the wood building that burned down)
4. Decades of heavy snow loading over the past few decades has caused all but 18 feet of the structure to collapse.
5. On October 15, 2019, an HDDR Waiver Letter was issued that included the following scope of work:
 - a. The applicant shall retain as much of the salvageable metal siding and materials as possible from the debris pile. Salvaged materials shall be stockpiled for future use on other mine structures within the property boundary.
 - b. The gabled end of the structure where the collapse occurred shall be shored up and clad using salvaged materials from the debris pile. The final appearance of the structure shall include consistent exterior siding on all elevations.
6. The Applicant proposes to deconstruct the Stores Building down to the concrete slab and repurpose the materials for use on the Hoist House.
7. Pursuant to LMC § 15-11-12.5, the Historic Preservation Board shall review Removal of Historic Material to Accommodate New additions, New Construction, or Structural Upgrades, in relation to Material Deconstruction.
8. The SWCA Preservation Plan provides a conditions assessment and a variety of treatment recommendations for the Stores Department Building based on a survey of the structure in 2015, when the building was largely intact.
9. The Preservation Plan discusses demolition as a potential treatment but recommends this only as a last resort and under specific circumstances, including when the resource lacks historic significance, poses a safety risk, lacks visual interest, has little physical integrity, or when no other options are feasible.

10. Pursuant to LMC § 15-11-16, “The Demolition or removal of Historic Buildings, Structures and Sites in Park City diminishes the character of the City’s Historic District and it is strongly discouraged. Instead, the City recommends and supports preservation, renovation, adaptive reuse, Reconstruction, and relocation within the Historic District. It is recognized, however, that economic hardship and other factors not entirely within the control of a Property Owner may result in the necessary Demolition of a Historic Building, Structure or Site.”
11. The Chief Building Official determined the structure does not qualify for demolition pursuant to Section 116.1 of the International Building Code.
12. Pursuant to LMC § 15-11-17, “with the exception of any Building or Structure falling under the purview of Section 116.1 of the International Building Code or undergoing complete renovation/reconstruction in compliance with this Chapter, no Building, other Structure or Site deemed to be Historic, pursuant to the standards of review set forth in Section 15-11-10(A)(1) or 15-11-10(A)(2) herein, may be Demolished without the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness for Demolition by an independent CAD Hearing Board appointed by the City.”
13. The Material Deconstruction of the collapsed portion of the Stores Building would not diminish the Historic integrity of the SKCM Historic Site, pursuant to the definition of Historic Integrity and criteria outlined in LMC § 15-15-1, as follows:

- a. **Location.** *The place where the Historic Site was constructed or the Historical event took place.*

The Stores Building is one of several historic Structures that were constructed at the SKCM Historic Site. While the collapsed portion of the building is in the same location where it was constructed, removing the materials of the collapsed portion of the Stores building would not diminish the Historic Integrity of the Site, as the remaining portion of the building along with several other Historic mining Structures, such as the Change Room, Hoist House, Mill Building and Transformer House remain in their original location, according to the SKCM HSI forms.

- b. **Design.** *The combination of physical elements that create the form, plan, space, Structure, and style of a Site. Design includes such considerations as the structural system, massing, arrangement of spaces, pattern of fenestration, textures and colors of surface materials, type, amount and style of ornamental detailing, and arrangement and type of plantings in the designed landscape.*

According to the HSI form, the Stores Building is steel and wood frame with a gable roof; the exterior clad in corrugated metal and the windows

are two-over-two double hung sash type windows that are now covered with corrugated metal. The collapsed portion of the building does not convey any distinctive design elements of the building.

- c. **Setting.** *The physical environment, either natural or manmade, of a Historic Site, including vegetation, topographic features, manmade features (paths, fences, walls) and the relationship between Structures and other features or open space.*

The HSI form describes the setting in the context of the existing site compared to the historic setting. The immediate area is an open expanse and not indicative of the site during the historic period when the Structure was amidst a dense complex of buildings and structures that are no longer extant.

- d. **Materials.** *The physical elements that were combined or deposited during a particular period of time in a particular pattern or configuration to form a Historic Site.*

The primary material on the exterior of the SKCM buildings is corrugated metal. The HSI form describes the general condition of the materials on the Stroes Building as “Poor, Boarded and deteriorated – not secured against entry”. The material deconstruction of the collapsed portion of the Stores Building would allow the materials, including corrugated metal sheets, to be salvaged and used for restoration of the adjacent Hoist House. The repurposing of collapsed materials from the Stores Building contributes to the Historic Integrity of the overall SKCM Site.

- e. **Workmanship.** *The physical evidence of the crafts of a particular culture or people during any given period of history, including methods of construction, plain or decorative finishes, painting, carving, joinery, tooling, and turning.*

The HSI form describes the building as lacking ornamentation and is a general utilitarian form, indicative of the historic mining period.

- f. **Feeling.** *A Site’s expression of the aesthetic of the Historic sense of a particular period of time. Feeling results from the presence of physical features that, taken together, convey the Property’s Historic character.*

The HSI form describes the building and surrounding buildings as conveying a limited sense of the mining activities in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. The removal of many of the other mine site buildings that originally made up the dense complex significantly diminishes the historic character.

- g. **Association.** *The direct link between an important Historic era or Person and a Historic Site. A Site retains association if it is in the place where the activity occurred and is sufficiently intact to convey that relationship to an observer.*

According to the HSI form, "The building is generally associated with the Silver King Mine but does not have a strong link with the well-known principal owners. Owners David Keith and Thomas Kearns were still involved with the mine operations when this building was constructed, but Albion Emery and John Judge died well before this building was constructed."

14. Staff published a notice on the City's website and the Utah Public Notice website on Wednesday, September 17, 2025. Staff mailed a courtesy notice to adjacent property owners on Wednesday, September 17, 2025. The Park Record published notice on Wednesday, September 17, 2025.

Conclusions of Law:

1. The Material Deconstruction of the collapsed portion of the Stores Building would not diminish the Historic integrity of the SKCM Historic Site, pursuant to the definition of Historic Integrity and criteria outlined in LMC § 15-15-1.

Board Member Hutchings seconded the motion.

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

- B. 405 Woodside Avenue – Material Deconstruction – The Applicant Proposes to Lift a Significant Historic Structure to Construct a New Foundation and Rear Addition in the Historic Residential-1 Zoning District. PL-25-06510.**

Planner III, Lillian Zollinger, presented the Staff Report and indicated that 405 Woodside Avenue is a Significant Historic Structure in the HR-1 Zoning District. The common T/L cottage was constructed circa 1901 on a 7,500-square-foot lot. A current photograph was displayed, indicating a guest house that was constructed to the south of the Historic Structure, as well as sheds and retaining walls.

The Applicant proposed to lift the Historic Structure to construct a new foundation, restore the front façade, and construct a rear addition. The front façade would be restored to resemble the 1940s tax photograph, including separating the front windows and removal of a small roof overhang over the front entrance. Non-historic siding would be removed and replaced with historically appropriate materials. The Applicant also proposed removal of a non-historic addition at the rear of the structure, as well as a section of wall on the Historic Structure to connect a transitional element to a new rear addition. Staff found that, as

conditioned, the proposal was in compliance with LMC § 15-13-2, Regulations for Historic Residential Sites.

Planner Zollinger reported that the Applicant had updated their plans since the Staff Report was published. The changes did not impact Historic Preservation Board review and would be reviewed and finalized at a later date. She then reviewed the proposed Conditions of Approval related to lifting the Historic Structure.

The Applicant, Jonathan DeGray, stated that he agreed with the Staff Report and all Conditions of Approval. In response to a question raised by Board Member Hutchings, he clarified that the water line runs behind the property and would not be affected by the construction.

Board Member Holmgren stated that it was a good project, and she appreciated that the façade would be restored to its original appearance. Chair Stephens noted that the upper casing on the front windows was unique.

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

MOTION: Board Member Hutchings moved to APPROVE the Material Deconstruction at 405 Woodside Avenue according to the following:

Findings of Fact:

1. 405 Woodside Avenue is a 7,500-square-foot Lot in the HR-1 Zoning District.
2. 405 Woodside Avenue is a Significant Historic Site on Park City's Historic Sites Inventory (HSI).
3. According to the HSI, the one-story T/L cottage was constructed circa 1901 and is part of the Mature Mining Era.
4. A separate guest house structure and small rear addition were constructed on the site after 1941 and prior to 1982. The front windows and porch were also modified prior to 1982.
5. The Applicant proposes lifting the Significant Historic Structure to construct a new foundation and rear addition.
6. The Applicant also proposes restoring the front façade windows and trim, restoring the front porch shed roof, replacing non-historic siding, and removing a non-historic rear addition.
7. The Development Review Committee reviewed the proposal on August 19, 2025, and required Conditions of Approval 18 and 19.

8. Staff published notice on the City's website and posted notice to the property on September 17, 2025. Staff mailed courtesy notice to property owners within 100 feet and posted notice to the property on September 17, 2025.
9. The Analysis sections of the Staff Report dated October 1, 2025, are incorporated herein.

Conclusions of Law:

1. The proposal, as conditioned, complies with the Land Management Code requirements pursuant to LMC § 15-11-9, Preservation Policy.
2. The proposal, as conditioned, complies with the Land Management Code requirements pursuant to LMC § 15-11.12-5 Historic Preservation Board Review for Material Deconstruction.
3. The proposal, as conditioned, complies with the Land Management Code requirements outlined in LMC § 15-13-2, Regulations For Historic Residential Sites.

Conditions of Approval:

1. Final building plans and construction details shall reflect substantial compliance with the Historic Preservation Board's October 1, 2025, approval for the lifting of the Significant Historic Structure and Material Deconstruction of 405 Woodside Avenue. Any changes, modifications, or deviations from the approved plans that have not been approved in advance by the Planning and Building Departments may result in a stop-work order.
2. The applicant is responsible for notifying the Planning and Building Departments prior to making any changes to approved plans.
3. Any changes, modifications, or deviations from the approved scope of work shall be submitted in writing for review and approval/denial in accordance with the applicable standards by the Planning Director or their Designee prior to construction.
4. The applicant shall obtain HDDR approval from the Planning Director, or their Designee, prior to submitting a building permit application.
5. The new foundation shall not raise or lower the Significant Historic Structure more than two feet from its original floor elevation.
6. The Historic Site shall be returned to its original grade following the construction of a 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.

7. The site shall be regraded so that all water drains away from the Structure and does not enter the foundation.
8. 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.
9. Prior to building permit submittal, the Applicant shall submit a report from a professional structural engineer ensuring the structural soundness of the Significant Historic Structure will not be negatively impacted by the lifting of the Structure to accommodate foundation upgrades.
10. The Significant Historic Structure shall be secured and protected from adverse weather conditions, water infiltration, and vandalism before, during, and after the lifting process.
11. A written plan detailing the steps and procedures for lifting the Historic Structure shall be completed and approved by the Planning and Building Departments prior to building permit issuance. This plan shall outline step by step the proposed work to lift the Significant Historic Structure to ensure the least destructive method will be employed.
12. The form, material, and detailing of a new foundation shall be similar to foundations of nearby Historic Structures.
13. 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.
14. Historic Structures which are lifted off the foundation must be returned to the completed foundation within 45 days of the date the building permit was issued. The Planning Director may make a written determination to extend this period up to 30 additional days if, after consultation with the Historic Preservation Planner, Planning Department, Chief Building Official, and City Engineer, she determines that it is necessary. This would be based upon the need to immediately stabilize an existing Historic property, or specific site conditions such as access, or lack thereof, exist, or in an effort to reduce impacts on adjacent properties. The applicant is responsible for notifying the Building Department if changes are made. If the cribbing and/or shoring plan(s) are to be altered at any time during the construction of the foundation by the contractor, the structural engineer shall submit a new cribbing and/or shoring plan for review. The structural engineer shall be required to reinspect

and approve the cribbing and/or shoring alterations within five (5) days of any relocation or alteration to the cribbing and/or shoring.

15. The applicant shall also 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.
16. Historic materials removed from the Structure that are salvageable or in otherwise good condition shall be used to repair/replace irreparable materials on the Site.
17. The guest house and southern structures shall be removed from the site prior to construction on the addition beginning.
18. Existing encroachments may remain so long as they are not removed. New structures must be reconstructed entirely on the property and out of the Right-of-Way.
19. Any modification of the area to the rear of the site, near the transmission line, requires a permit to ensure the water line is not undermined.
20. The applicant shall provide the City with a Financial Guarantee in accordance with LMC § 15-11-9 Preservation Policy in a form to be approved by the City Attorney's Office to be recorded with the Summit County Recorder's Office prior to submitting a building permit application.

Board Member Holmgren seconded the motion.

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

C. 180 Daly Avenue – Historic District Design Review Modification – The Applicant Requests a Modification to the Historic Preservation Board Material Deconstruction Final Action Letter for Additional Windows That Were Constructed on the Historic Structure. PL-25-06671

Planner II, Meredith Covey, reported that 180 Daly Avenue is a Significant Historic Structure in the HR-1 Zoning District and was constructed circa 1925. The Applicant requested a Modification to the Historic Preservation Board's July 1, 2020, Material Deconstruction approval for construction of a new foundation and lifting the structure by two feet. The Modification would add windows that were constructed but not included in the original approval.

Planner II, Jacob Klopfenstein, presented drawings of the north and west façades of the Historic Structure. One additional window was added on the north façade and two on the west façade.

Planner Covey reviewed the recommended Conditions of Approval and indicated that Staff recommended approval based on the Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Conditions of Approval as outlined in the draft Final Action Letter.

In response to a question from Board Member Hutchings, Chair Stephens clarified that the Historic Preservation Board was considering the item after the three new windows had been installed. If it had been part of the original request, they would have considered removal of the affected portion of the original structure, not installation of the windows. The question before the Board was whether they would have approved the Material Deconstruction on a tertiary façade at that time.

Board Member Beatlebrox indicated that the Applicant failed to notify the Planning Department of the change, and in so doing failed to comply with the terms of the Historic Preservation Plan. The Modification was necessary to bring the property into compliance.

Board Member Grackle asked if the application had missed the HDDR process as well and if there were any consequences for noncompliance. Director Ward stated that Historic Preservation Plans go through the HDDR process to ensure that they meet all requirements. The applicant then records a financial guarantee to follow the plan. If any changes are proposed, they must go through the built-in Modification process. In this case, a Modification request was not submitted before the windows were installed. Some minor Modifications may be approved by Staff, but in this case, the changes were found in the final inspection.

Board Member Hutchings asked what would happen if the Board did not approve the Modification. Director Ward stated that there was a financial guarantee to adhere to conditions that were not followed, and Staff would determine any penalties associated with noncompliance. If the Historic Preservation Board found that the Modification did not comply with the LMC, a restoration process would be required to remove the windows and restore the façade to its original appearance. Board Member Hutchings stated that he believed this was just an oversight, but it was important to emphasize that there could be penalties because they did not want other homeowners to intentionally make changes with a Modification request.

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

MOTION: Board Member Hutchings moved to APPROVE the Modification to Material Deconstruction at 180 Daly Avenue, according to the following:

Findings of Fact:

1. 180 Daly Avenue is Lot A of the Daly Delight Plat Amendment (Summit County Recorder Entry No. 1102316), approved by the City Council on July 12, 2018.
2. 180 Daly Avenue is designated a Significant Historic Site on Park City's Historic Site Inventory, and the Single-Family Dwelling (SFD) at the Site was constructed c. 1925 as part of Park City's Mature Mining Era (1894-1930), according to the Historic Site Form.
3. The Applicant's project involves remodeling and rehabilitating the Significant Historic Structure, including lifting the structure approximately 2 feet above its Historic elevation.
4. On July 1, 2020, the HPB approved the Applicant's Material Deconstruction request to remove the Historic foundation, construct a new foundation, and lift the structure approximately 2 feet from its original elevation to accommodate a new crawlspace.
 - a. The Applicant requests a Modification to the HPB Material Deconstruction Final Action Letter for additional windows that were constructed on the rear (west) elevation and side (north) elevation of the Historic Structure that were not included in the HPB's approval or the approved building plans.
5. The Planning Director approved the Applicant's Historic District Design Review on August 27, 2020.
6. The Applicant entered into an Encumbrance and Agreement for Historic Preservation for 180 Daly Avenue (Summit County Recorder Entry No. 1145206) on October 21, 2020, in accordance with the Historic Preservation policy requirements outlined in LMC § 15-11-9.
 - a. The Encumbrance and Agreement states that "all construction shall be completed according to the approved building plans on which the building permits are issued," and the Applicant agreed to ensure the project would be completed according to the approved Historic Preservation Plan, the HDDR, and the building plans.
7. The Planning Department approved the Applicant's building permit plans associated with the lifting and remodel project on October 29, 2020, through Building Permit 20-1334. The proposed plans complied with the HPB and HDDR approvals.
8. The property owner applied for a Historic District Grant in 2020 but did not obtain a grant during that funding cycle. However, the property owner applied

again and obtained an \$8,625 Historic District Grant during the 2021 grant cycle and a \$8,400 Historic District Grant during the 2022 grant cycle to repaint masonry, repair the roof, paint the exterior, upgrade mechanical equipment and insulation, reconstruct the porch, and restore Historic features of the structure.

9. On November 7, 2024, Planning staff failed a building inspection at the Site because multiple elements had not yet been constructed. During that inspection, Planning staff discovered exterior windows that had not previously been listed on submitted plans or approved through the Building Permit process. Following the November 7, 2024, inspection, Planning staff requested the Applicant submit a modification application.
10. The Applicant requested a re-inspection on June 3, 2025. Planning staff determined the Applicant was not ready for re-inspection at that time because the Applicant had not yet submitted a modification application.
11. The Applicant submitted the modification application on September 2, 2025
12. The Applicant seeks to modify the previous Material Deconstruction approval to accommodate additional windows constructed on the north and west elevations of the Significant Historic Structure.
 - a. The Historic Preservation Board reviews Material Deconstruction of Historic Materials to accommodate additions, new construction, and structural upgrades pursuant to LMC § 15-11-12.5(A)(2).
 - b. One additional window was installed on the north (side) façade of the Historic Structure and was not listed on the approved building permit plans.
 - i. The Applicant indicated that there was a non-Historic window removed in this location to be replaced with the current window. However, this window is not shown on the approved elevations. The Applicant's approved Building Permit plans indicate that the wood siding on this elevation is Historic material.
 - c. Two additional windows were installed on the west (rear) façade of the Historic Structure and were not listed on the approved building permit plans.
 - i. These windows on the west rear elevation were installed in an area that the Applicant indicated included Historic wood siding, according to the approved Building Permit plans set material.
 - ii. The Applicant's approved Building Permit plans stated that the existing Historic wood siding would remain on the structure and that Historic drop novelty siding would be restored on the rear elevation.

13. The proposal complies, as conditioned, with Land Management Code Section 15-13-2 Regulations For Historic Residential Sites.
 - a. The Historic Preservation Board reviews Material Deconstruction requests for compliance with LMC § 15-13-2 Regulations for Historic Residential Sites.
 - b. LMC § 15-13-2(B)(2)(d) outlines the requirements for windows on Historic Structures:

<p>1. Maintain and preserve historic window openings, windows, window surrounds, and decorative window features.</p>	<p>The Applicant did not modify any of the historic window openings on the Structure.</p>
<p>3. Avoid changing the position, proportions, or dimensions of historic window openings. It is not appropriate to create additional openings or remove existing historic openings on primary or secondary facades that are visible from the primary right-of-way.</p>	<p>The Applicant did not change the dimensions or proportions of historic window openings. The Applicant did not create additional window openings on the primary façade. The windows added on the north and west façades respect the historic size and scale of the historic windows on the home.</p>
<p>4. Maintain the historic ratio of window openings to solid wall.</p>	<p>The new windows do not dramatically alter the proportion of solid wall to window openings on the Historic Structure.</p>
<p>8. New window openings may be considered on secondary facades but only when placed beyond the midpoint. New window openings shall be similar in location, size, scale, type, and glazing pattern to those seen on the historic structure.</p>	<p>The new window openings on the north and west façades are located beyond the midpoint of the Structure. The new openings are similar in location, size, scale and type to those seen on the Historic Structure.</p>

<p>9. When no physical or documentary evidence of original windows exists, replacement windows typically shall be of wood and shall complement the style of the historic structure. When replacing non-historic windows, use designs similar to those that were found historically in Park City. Aluminum-clad wood windows are appropriate on non-historic additions or foundation-level windows. Vinyl and aluminum windows are inappropriate.</p>	<p>The Applicant will be required to submit verification of the window materials pursuant to Condition of Approval 5 to ensure they are of compatible materials.</p>
<p>10. New glazing shall match the visual appearance of historic glazing and/or be clear. Metallic, frosted, tinted, stained, textured and reflective finishes are generally inappropriate for glazing on the primary façade of the historic structure.</p>	<p>The glazing on the new windows is clear and matches the visual appearance of historic glazing.</p>

- c. LMC § 15-13-2(B)(2)(a) outlines the requirements for exterior walls of Historic Structures:

<p>1. Primary and secondary facade components, such as window/door configuration, wall planes, recesses, bays, balconies, steps, porches, and entryways, shall be maintained in their original location on the façade.</p>	<p>There were no windows added to the primary façade of the Historic Structure. There were a total of three windows added to the secondary façades of the Historic Structure. The windows are minor in scale and respect the solid-to-void ratio as well as the dimensions typically seen on Historic Structures.</p>
--	---

<p>2. Preserve and maintain historic exterior materials including wood siding (drop siding, clapboard, board and batten), frieze boards, cornices, moldings, shingles, etc., as well as stone and masonry. Repair deteriorated or damaged historic exterior materials using recognized preservation methods appropriate to the specific material.</p>	<p>Historic exterior materials have been removed from the Structure for the window openings. The Applicant has a Financial Guarantee recorded with Summit County to protect the Historic Material. The conditions of the Financial Guarantee will be reviewed after the Applicant finalizes and closes their building permit to determine the historic material removed without prior approval.</p>
<p>7. Vinyl and aluminum siding are prohibited in the Historic Districts. The application of synthetic or substitute materials, such as vinyl or aluminum, over original wood siding may cause, conceal, or accelerate structural damage and is not permitted. Removal of synthetic siding (aluminum, asbestos, Brick-Text, and vinyl) that has been added to a structure, followed by restoration of historic wood siding (or other underlying historic material), is highly encouraged.</p>	<p>The Applicant implemented wood siding on the Historic addition.</p>

14. Staff published notice on the City’s website and the Utah Public Notice website and posted notice to the property on September 17, 2025. Staff mailed courtesy notice to property owners within 300 feet on September 17, 2025. The Park Record published courtesy notice on September 17, 2025.

Conclusions of Law:

1. The proposal complies, as conditioned, with LMC Chapter 15-2.2 Historic Residential (HR-1) District.
2. The proposal complies, as conditioned, with LMC Section 15-11-12.5 Historic Preservation Board Review For Material Deconstruction.
3. The proposal complies, as conditioned, with LMC Section 15-13-2 Regulations For Historic Residential Sites.

Conditions of Approval:

1. Any further exterior changes to the Historic Structure or Historic Materials at the Site without prior approval from the HPB or Planning Department are prohibited.
2. The Applicant shall apply for a modification to the existing Historic District Design Review approval to reflect the changes to the approved plans.
3. The Applicant shall submit verification of the new window materials prior to Building Permit issuance to ensure they are wood or wood-clad aluminum.
4. The Applicant shall submit updated architectural plans and engineered drawings of the exterior elevations to be reviewed prior to Building Permit closure. The Building Permit must be closed prior to removing the recorded Financial Guarantee documents.
5. Review of the Financial Guarantee and historic materials removed prior to approval will be evaluated at the time the Applicant requests to remove the recorded Financial Guarantee documents.

Board Member Holmgren seconded the motion.

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

The Applicant, Jordan Yospe, stated that they own two Historic Homes, one on Daly Avenue and one on Main Street. Their licensed contractor suggested installing the windows, and he did not know that the windows were not approved until the final inspection. He suggested that the City communicate with homeowners regarding applications. His contractor stated that there were no restrictions on changes to the sides and rear of the home, and he relied on the contractor's word.

Board Member Beatlebrox stated that a letter was sent to Mr. Yospe, which very clearly stated that any changes to the Historic Preservation Plan must be communicated to former Historic Preservation Planner, Caitlyn Barhorst. Willemina Yospe stated that they totally depended on their contractor, which may have been naive on their part.

Chair Stephens thanked the Applicants for the information.

7. ADJOURNMENT

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

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

The Historic Preservation Board Meeting adjourned at approximately 8:55 p.m.