



**PARK CITY MUNICIPAL CORPORATION
HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD MEETING
MARSAC MUNICIPAL BUILDING
COUNCIL CHAMBERS
445 MARSAC AVENUE
PARK CITY, SUMMIT COUNTY, UTAH
MINUTES OF DECEMBER 3, 2025**

BOARD MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE: Douglas Stephens - Chair, Randy Scott, Lola Beatlebrox, Katie Noble, Dalton Gackle (arrived at 5:15 p.m.)

EX OFFICIO MEMBERS: Rebecca Ward, Planning Director; Assistant City Attorney, Luke Henry; Project Planning Manager, Elissa Martin; Meredith Covey, Planner II; Troy Dayley, Public Works Director; John Robertson, City Engineer; Mark Harrington, Senior City Attorney; Jacob Klopfenstein, Planner II

1. CALL TO ORDER

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

2. ROLL CALL

A roll call was conducted. Board Member Dalton Gackle, Board Member Puggy Holmgren, and Board Member John Hutchings were absent. All other Board Members were present.

3. MINUTES APPROVAL

A. Consideration to Approve the Historic Preservation Board Meeting Minutes from November 17, 2025.

Board Member Scott reported that he was not present at the last meeting. As a result, he would abstain from the vote on the Meeting Minutes from November 17, 2025.

MOTION: Board Member Beatlebrox moved to APPROVE the Historic Preservation Board Meeting Minutes from November 17, 2025. Board Member Noble seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously with one abstention. Board Member Scott abstained from the vote.

4. STAFF AND BOARD COMMUNICATIONS AND DISCLOSURES

There were no Staff or Board communications and disclosures.

5. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS

There were no public communications.

6. WORK SESSION

A. Open and Public Meetings Act Training.

Assistant City Attorney, Luke Henry, conducted Open and Public Meetings Act training with the Historic Preservation Board. Under State Law, there is a requirement for a public body to complete Open and Public Meetings Act training once a year. He shared a training video with the Board. It explained that the Open and Public Meetings Act is the State Law that ensures government actions and deliberations are openly conducted. An open and public meeting is when a public body quorum meets to discuss or act on government business. This includes meetings sometimes referred to as workshops, executive sessions, regular meetings, public hearings, electronic meetings, and emergency meetings. Open and public meetings do not include chance or social meetings. A public hearing is a type of open and public meeting where citizens have a reasonable opportunity to speak. Public hearings happen when a government adopts a budget, imposes or increases taxes or fees, or transfers money from an enterprise fund. These meetings have extra notice requirements.

An electronic meeting is a type of open and public meeting that is convened electronically. The governing body must adopt a resolution, rule, or ordinance allowing and governing electronic meetings. An emergency meeting may be held to discuss an urgent matter due to unforeseen circumstances. In order to hold the meeting, the best notice feasible must be provided. It needs to include the time, location, and topics to be considered, and an attempt must be made to contact all governing body members. A meeting may be closed to discuss:

- The character, competence or health of an individual;
- Collective bargaining;
- Litigation;
- Certain real property transactions;
- Security personnel, devices, or systems deployment;
- Investigations of criminal misconduct; and
- Private or protected information per the Utah Procurement Code.

A closed meeting may be held only if a quorum is present and the meeting was properly noticed. Two-thirds of the governing body present at the meeting need to vote "Yes" to close a meeting. During a closed meeting, there are certain things a governing body cannot do, such as approve an ordinance, resolution, rule, regulation, contract, or appointment. It is not possible to vote unless it is a vote on a motion to end the closed portion of a meeting.

When a governing body closes a meeting, the following must be publicly announced and entered into the Meeting Minutes of the open meeting: the reason for holding the closed meeting, the location where the closed meeting will be held, and the vote of each member.

Regular open and public meetings require 24 hours' notice. The public notice includes the meeting agenda, date, time, and place. Public meeting agendas need to include reasonably specified topics to be considered, with each topic listed under a separate item on the meeting agenda. The governing body may not consider a topic in an open meeting that was not on the agenda. If a new topic, not on the agenda, is raised by the public during an open meeting, the governing body may discuss the topic. However, final action may not be taken on the new topic during that meeting. Entities holding regular meetings scheduled in advance over the course of the year need to provide annual notice of the meeting schedule for the year. The notice must include the date, time, and place for each meeting. Information about noticing was shared. Typically, posting on the Utah Public Notice website is handled by the Records Officer, Recorder, or Clerk, but it is the responsibility of the governing body to ensure notice is provided. Written minutes and a recording are kept of all open meetings.

Written minutes include the date, time, and place of the meeting, the names of members present and absent, the substance of all matters, names of citizens providing comments, the substance of the comments provided, any information a member requests be entered into the minutes or recording, and a record of each vote taken. The recording must be a complete and unedited record of all open portions of the meeting and be labeled with the meeting date, time, and place. All or part of an open meeting may be independently recorded by any person in attendance if the recording does not interfere with the conduct of the meeting. Pending minutes means written minutes of an open meeting in draft form, subject to change before being approved by the public body that held the open meeting. Pending minutes must contain a clear indication that the governing body has not approved the minutes, such as a "draft" or "pending" watermark. Approved minutes means written minutes of an open meeting that were approved by the public body. Pending minutes, approved minutes, and recordings are considered public records under the Government Records Access and Management Act ("GRAMA").

Any individual who publicly presents information related to an item on the public body meeting agenda must provide a copy of the information for inclusion in the public record. Pending minutes must be made available to the public within 30 days. Within three business days after approving written minutes of an open meeting, approved minutes and public materials must be made available on the Utah Public Notice website, the primary office for the entity, and the entity website. Within three business days after holding an open meeting, an audio recording of the open meeting must be made available to the public for listening.

Attorney Henry explained that the Open and Public Meetings Act ensures that public business is done openly and transparently. There were no Board Member questions.

B. External Siding Materials in the Historic Districts – The Historic Preservation Board will Select Members to Participate on the Materials Advisory Committee and Provide Input to Staff on the Preliminary List of Materials.

Chair Stephens reported that the remaining items on the Work Session portion of the agenda

will be discussed at the current meeting, but there will also be additional discussions in the future. It was noted that Board Member Gackle joined the meeting virtually at 5:15 p.m.

Planning Project Manager, Elissa Martin, shared background information with the Board. She reported that the City Council approved Land Management Code (“LMC”) amendments on June 5, 2025, which removed the opacity requirement for wood siding and established a new process for evaluating alternative siding materials. The latter included the creation of an Advisory Committee to help develop a Master List of allowed siding materials for use on new residential buildings in the Historic District. On August 6, 2025, the Historic Preservation Board conducted a Work Session to review the adopted amendments to the LMC and identify next steps for implementation. At that meeting, it was determined that Staff would publish an online application for design professionals, requesting their participation on the Advisory Committee. The application was available from September to mid-November. During this time, the City contracted with an on-call Historic Preservation consultant and executed a task order for the consultant to participate on the Committee. The goal of the current Work Session is to establish the Advisory Committee Members and review the preliminary materials list. Board Member feedback can be provided.

The Advisory Committee will be comprised of at least three design professionals, but it is possible to have more than three. There will be two Historic Preservation Board Members selected to participate on the Committee. The Advisory Committee will also include three members of Staff from the Planning Department’s Historic Preservation Team. In addition, the on-call Historic Preservation consultant will participate on the Advisory Committee.

The Advisory Committee is tasked with selecting siding materials and finishes that meet baseline criteria for durability, sustainability, and compatibility with the Historic Districts. The time commitment for Committee Members should be no more than six to eight hours over the next two to three months. The online application asked design professionals to supply information about their experience and knowledge of siding materials. There were four applications submitted by design professionals. Manager Martin explained that the Advisory Committee would evaluate materials for the following:

- Durability:
 - Establish a routine tracking system to evaluate installed materials over time.
 - Minimum 50-year lifespan;
 - Durable in the Park City climate;
 - Fire Resistance rating.
- Sustainability:
 - Energy performance;
 - Environmental benefit;
 - Recycled content;
 - Cradle to Grave impact or life cycle impact of a product.
- Compatibility:
 - Materials should not diminish historic character and must appear similar in appearance and profile to historic siding;
 - Distinction between “compatibility” and “mimicking.”

Staff has begun to compile a list of the various types of siding materials that exist, which is included in the Meeting Materials Packet as Exhibit A. At this point, the list is a work in progress. It will continue to be refined and expanded with the input of the Advisory Committee. There is also a desire to hear Historic Preservation Board feedback on the list.

The timeline to complete the Master List of materials and finishes was reviewed. Manager Martin reported that the intention is for the Historic Preservation Board to review the draft list at the meeting on February 4, 2026. By March 4, 2026, the final version of the Master List would ideally be brought to the Historic Preservation Board for consideration and adoption. The list should be reviewed on an annual basis to ensure it remains updated.

The Staff recommendation is to review the applications submitted by the design professionals and select at least three individuals to serve on the Committee. In addition, the recommendation is that up to two Historic Preservation Board Members be selected to participate on the Advisory Committee. The Historic Preservation Board is also asked to review the preliminary list of materials and finishes in order to provide feedback to Staff.

Chair Stephens asked who from the Planning Department would serve on the Advisory Committee. Manager Martin reported that there are four employees on the Historic Preservation Team. Chair Stephens asked if three Staff representatives on the Committee might be too many. The outside consultant seems to make a lot of sense. Manager Martin asked the Historic Preservation consultant team to introduce themselves to the Board.

Kelly Holland introduced himself and explained that he is an architect in Salt Lake City. He has a background in both architecture and historic preservation. Izabella Nuckels is in the office in Austin, Texas, with Emily Reed. Ms. Nuckels is a historic preservation specialist, and her background is in architectural conservation and historic architectural materials. Ms. Reed has a wealth of knowledge and experience managing projects for municipal clients. Chamonix Larsen is the Principal at Stantec and is part of the Salt Lake City team. She is also an architect. It was noted that Ms. Reed is unable to speak to the Board due to audio issues, but her resume has been sent out. Chair Stephens asked if this is the firm that has been contracted for on-call historic preservation services, which was confirmed. He thanked the representatives for their time.

Manager Martin reported that the applicants for the Advisory Committee are attending the meeting both in-person and virtually. Melissa Grant introduced herself to the Historic Preservation Board. She is an interior designer, and she started getting involved in preservation four years ago through the Salt Lake chapter of Preservation Utah. She has done some volunteer work and also worked on historic homes in Salt Lake and Park City. The second applicant, Chimso Onwuegbu, has primarily worked in Park City since 2000. He has worked on historic homes as well as some infill projects in Old Town.

Bryan Markkanen has been working as an architect in Park City for approximately 15 years. He has worked on at least a dozen projects in Old Town. Cole Knight has worked in Park

City for close to a decade in architecture. He cares about the architectural fabric of the City and would love the opportunity to serve on the Advisory Committee that is being formed.

Planning Director, Rebecca Ward, reported that Staff is looking for two Historic Preservation Board Members to be selected for the Committee and for the appointment of other Committee Members. Manager Martin reiterated that there is no reason to limit the number of design professionals. Whatever number the Historic Preservation Board feels is best can be selected. Chair Stephens thought it made sense to have as much input from the design community as possible, so he would like to see all four applicants be on the Committee. Other Board Members agreed and felt all four of the design professionals should be included. It was noted that the Advisory Committee will not be considered a public meeting.

Discussions were had about the Board Members who will serve on the Advisory Committee. It was noted that Chair Stephens and Board Member Katie Noble are interested. Board Member Scott pointed out that there could be an alternate selected in case one of the Board Members is unable to attend a meeting. This would ensure there is always Historic Preservation Board representation. The Board considered language for a motion.

MOTION: Board Member Scott moved to CREATE the Advisory Committee, which includes four design representatives (Melissa Grant, Chimso Onwuegbu, Bryan Markkanen, and Cole Knight) as well as two Historic Preservation Board Members (Douglas Stephens and Katie Noble). Board Member Noble seconded the motion.

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

Manager Martin asked if there is a desire to review the preliminary list of materials included in the Meeting Materials Packet. Chair Stephens believed a review would be appropriate after the Advisory Committee has met. There can be a draft version brought back.

C. **Fences in Historic Residential Zoning Districts – The Historic Preservation Board will Discuss the Location and Types of Fences Allowed in Historic Residential Zoning Districts. PL-25-06769.**

Planner II, Meredith Covey, explained that the above item pertains to fences in Historic Residential Zoning Districts. In November, the Engineering Department brought 1304 Park Avenue before the City Council, requesting an Encroachment Agreement into the Park Avenue right-of-way. A fence had previously been located in front of the historic home but had been removed as part of the construction that took place on site. The previous fence that was on site was not historic. As part of this request, the Engineering Department recommended that the fence not be installed in the same location to leave room for a four-foot snow storage easement. This would change the location of the fence in relationship to the other fences on the streetscape and change the current pattern.

As a result of this request, the City Council is looking for information from the Historic Preservation Board to guide future requests for fences at historic sites. Planner Covey reported that the City Council is requesting Work Session input on the following items:

- The location of fences in context of the Historic Structure and streetscape;
- Snow storage easements and the location of fences within a streetscape;
- The types of materials and styles of fences to be allowed; and
- How to balance the impact of fence installations on aesthetics, public safety, and snow removal in the Historic Districts.

Planner Covey shared example images of historic fences and historic homes taken from the 1940s in Park City. In the Historic Zoning Districts, fences are allowed in the front setback if they are not taller than four feet, and in the side and rear setbacks if they are not taller than six feet. Fences are allowed on corner lots as long as they are less than three feet within 25 feet of the intersection. The LMC notes that new fencing should reflect the style of the building to which fencing is associated with when viewable from the primary public right-of-way. New wood and metal fencing should reflect the traditional designs and patterns. Some of the allowed materials are wood, metal, or a combination of both. Prohibited materials include vinyl and plastic. As far as the styles allowed, simple welded wire, metal, and wood styles are allowed. The following questions were posed:

- Are there potential updates to the LMC to clarify fence types and materials, especially for those installed in the front yard?
- Should the City Council allow fence installations within City right-of-way that may impede snow storage easements for Historic District streetscape compatibility or should snow storage easements be prioritized with the understanding that over time, as fences are replaced, they will come into alignment?
- Should there be different materials and styles of fences allowed for Historic Sites versus non-historic sites?

Chair Stephens mentioned the example photographs. He noted that the fences shown were all fairly open in contrast to the fence on Park Avenue. It was noted that a solid fence is more difficult when it comes to snow removal. Planner Covey recapped the comments provided, which indicated that there might be opportunities to include openness standards. Discussions were had about a potential solid to void ratio that might be appropriate.

The third question from Staff was discussed by Board Members. Chair Stephens believed fencing should be allowed to be the same whether there is a historic or non-historic site. Board Member Lola Beatlebrox thought the fences should be compatible but did not believe they needed to be exactly the same when there is a new installation. Board Member Gackle referenced earlier language about the distinction between compatibility and mimicking.

There was discussion about snow storage. Chair Stephens noted that snow storage changes depending on the street. Information about snow storage was shared with the Board. Example scenarios were provided to highlight the different conditions that exist in various areas. The goal is to have enough snow storage to maintain it until it can be hauled away. Ideally, there would be enough on-site snow storage that hauling it away would not be necessary, but density has created that situation. Chair Stephens asked for Planning

Department feedback on snow storage. Director Ward explained that during the Plat Amendment process, there is a requirement to have a 10-foot-wide snow storage easement along the right-of-way. Once it is platted, it is within the discretion of the City Engineer to make a determination about what structures can be within that easement. She pointed out that a lot depends on the context of the area and how the snow is managed in that location.

Director Ward reported that if more room for snow storage is established now, eventually there will be compatibility along the streetscape. As for where the fences were located historically, this was not something considered. The compromise could be an open fence and some flexibility within the snow storage easement. Director Ward noted that the City Council will review fences with input from the City Engineer. The Historic Preservation Board has been asked to provide input and guidance at this time. That way, when requests come in from the Historic Districts, there will be a clear understanding of the Board recommendation. Chair Stephens thought fences should be looked at in the same context as additions to historic homes. For instance, there should be consideration of the surrounding homes and built environment. It makes sense to consider materials as well.

Board Member Beatlebrox noted that wood and metal have been the predominantly used materials for historic homes. She asked if Chair Stephens would be open to other materials for fences. Chair Stephens clarified that he is most concerned about the construction of the fence and the longevity of the materials used. There is also support for some openness. Board Member Scott wondered whether this issue could also be approached from a design perspective. There could be some interesting concepts that provide additional options.

The Board further discussed the snow storage easement needs. Chair Stephens noted that if someone came in with an application right now, there would be a requirement for the fence to be 10 feet back from the property line for the snow storage easement. However, the fence next door might have an existing fence on the property line. There could be some inconsistency created. Board Member Noble pointed out that a design element where it was possible to move the posts would present some challenges, especially with consistency.

Chair Stephens pointed out that the Historic Preservation Board is attempting to provide some direction to the City Council. Board Member Noble does not mind accommodating the snow easement or the fact that fence lines could be different. When a property is replatted, it makes sense for the fence to accommodate the snow easement. Chair Stephens asked if the Planning Department will weigh in on this matter ahead of the City Council discussion. Director Ward explained that when the Engineering Department takes these types of applications to the City Council, the Planning Department conducts a review to make sure there is compliance with guidelines and regulations. There is some coordination.

Chair Stephens asked if the Building Department has to approve a fence. Director Ward reported that any fence that is four feet in height in the Historic District requires a Building Permit. Chair Stephens pointed out that every road is a little bit different and so is the way that snow is removed. It seems like there will need to be a conversation between the City Engineer and the Planning Department to determine what is appropriate on each street.

Director Ward explained that the City Council is looking for input on the policy. If the consensus of the Historic Preservation Board is that the code should be reviewed and updated, then that can be communicated. Right now, the requirement is that the fence cannot exceed four feet in height and it should be compatible with what was seen historically. It is possible to better define the language so there is more clarity provided to applicants.

This item will return to the City Council in January. As part of that, a Historic Preservation Board recommendation can be included. It would be specific to 1304 Park Avenue, but also to the issue of fences in general. If there is specific input for the property and the question of distance from the right-of-way, then that can be communicated. In addition, the City Council can be informed that the Board is interested in updating the code. There seems to be some consensus about openness. Chair Stephens asked if the fence for 1304 Park Avenue was already installed. Director Ward reported that it was installed without approval.

City Engineer, John Robertson, stated that the main concern that was raised by the City Council was the location of the fence specifically with respect to the back of the sidewalk. Chair Stephens asked where the property line is located. It was stated that the property line is about where the fence line is located. Chair Stephens thinks 10 feet from the curb makes sense in this case but noted that it is a different issue than 10 feet from the property line.

Director Ward asked if what was installed on the property being discussed is 10 feet from the curb, which was denied. Engineer Robertson reported that it is closer. It was noted that some houses are located right next to the sidewalk, so there needs to be flexibility.

Chair Stephens noted that the Historic Preservation Board is being asked to share specific recommendations on the 1304 Park Avenue property. In this case, 10 feet from back of curb for the snow storage makes sense. Director Ward summarized some of the Board Member comments. The recommendation could be that the fence be removed, this fence process take place, and then a new fence be proposed. Chair Stephens pointed out that there a lot of variables that need to be considered. Board Member Scott was not ready to make a recommendation at this time. Board Member Gackle does not know that he agrees the fence has to be 10 feet from the back of the curb in this case, because that would essentially tell the homeowner that a fence is not permitted until there are future discussions.

Board Member Noble thought some sort of formula might make sense. It could consider how far a house was from the curb. There could be a ratio or percentage. It seems unfair to not allow people to have fences when those have historically been allowed on a property. She noted that there might need to be more time allotted to determine what a formula might look like. Board Member Beatlebrox agreed. Director Ward believed the recommendation is for Staff to come back to the Historic Preservation Board to explore criteria that could be established for fences. This could provide some guidance. In addition, the code could be updated relative to the quality of materials and the openness of fences in the front yard. In addition, there could be evaluation of a formula or something that considers site-specific scenarios. Discussions were had about the timeline so there could be further evaluation.

Director Ward reported that there will be a Staff Communication provided to the City Council for the December 18, 2025, City Council Meeting. It can outline the Historic Preservation Board discussions and what the plan is moving forward. Board Member Gackle asked what will happen to the fence at 1304 Park Avenue in the meantime. Director Ward reported that this was discussed at the last City Council Meeting. At this time, it is proposed to remain until the matter is resolved. It is possible for the Staff Communication to state that the current fence is not something the Historic Preservation Board would recommend be approved.

Engineer Robertson stated that there is a larger discussion that has to happen regarding policy. He mentioned the amount of effort it takes the Public Works crews to remove snow. The decisions made impact the time and effort that the crews put in. Chair Stephens noted that there are different factors that need to be taken into account, such as the amount of snow that falls each year. There is an opportunity to have a broader discussion.

Engineer Robertson mentioned an earlier comment from Board Member Noble where she was not as concerned about consistent fence lines. He asked if there is consensus on that. He wanted to know if some Board Members would prefer there to be consistency. Chair Stephens believed there should be some consistency in the fence line down the street. There should be some relationship with the sidewalks. Board Member Scott requested additional information before he makes a recommendation. Chair Stephens reiterated a desire for openness. Board Member Noble stated that it would be helpful for the Board to know more about the areas where snow removal tends to be most problematic.

The Historic Preservation Board took a short break before continuing with the agenda.

D. 2025 General Plan Implementation of Historic Preservation – The Historic Preservation Board will Review the Historic Preservation Strategies and Actions Outlined in the Implementation Matrix of the 2025 General Plan and Provide Input to Staff on Prioritization of Ongoing Strategies and Near-Term.

Manager Martin shared information about the 2025 General Plan implementation of historic preservation. On September 25, 2025, the City Council adopted the 2025 General Plan, which is a comprehensive, community-driven framework to guide development, growth, and land use policy. It is grounded in four core community values, which are as follows:

- Small-town feel;
- Sense of community;
- Natural setting; and
- Historic character.

One of the five overarching themes identified in the General Plan is community character. This is focused on protecting Park City's history, unique look, feel, and sense of place. The General Plan calls for annual review by the Historic Preservation Board and Planning Commission, with implementation recommendations forwarded to the City Council for final prioritization. The purpose of this Work Session item is to provide an overview of the near-

term and ongoing strategies as well as some of the other implementation ideas. Manager Martin clarified that this is not the last time the Historic Preservation Board will discuss this.

The General Plan includes an Appendix, which is where all of the implementation strategies and actions are listed. There are 18 historic preservation strategies listed in the General Plan Implementation Matrix. Staff has grouped the strategies into five categories:

- LMC updates;
- Research and document historic resources;
- Protect historic resources from environmental and physical damage;
- Historic District Grant Program updates; and
- Outreach, education, and recognition.

For the LMC updates, there are three main strategies identified in the General Plan:

- Strategy 5I (long-term) calls for establishing a range of options to incentivize the preservation of the documented historic resources associated with the ski era;
- Strategy 5O (on-going) calls for regularly assessing and evaluating the regulations for Historic Districts and Historic Sites in the LMC for consistency and potential modifications that further preservation efforts while supporting a degree of flexibility; and
- Strategy 5P (near-term) calls for refining the LMC based on periodic review of newly constructed infill projects for suitability and compatibility of infill development within the Historic Districts.

Within those strategies are a number of actions. Manager Martin explained that a few actions will be focused on during the Work Session. The actions in progress are as follows:

- Action: Evaluate possible improvements to new infill development regulations to ensure compatibility with historic districts:
 - June 2025: LMC updates included improvements to Steep Slope Conditional Use Permit ("SSCUP") requirements;
 - Forthcoming LMC illustrations to clarify lot and site requirements and compatibility with historic massing, dwelling volume, building height, and roof forms.
- Action: Ensure regulatory consistency and up-to-date standards relative to materials and best practices for sustainability:
 - June 5th: LMC updates and current implementation of new processes to evaluate materials and best practices for sustainability.

Manager Martin next reviewed some of the actions for prioritization identified by Staff:

- Action: updates to support preservation of ski era structures, including financial incentives and regulatory exceptions.

- Action: Update the LMC to require more detailed mitigation plans during construction to prevent damage to historic resources.
- Action: Evaluate streetscape standards to reflect the historic nature of Park City's older neighborhoods and urban form in relation to walkability.
- Action: Explore possible LMC updates or other methods to incentivize reuse and renovation of historic structures rather than demolition.

There are three main strategies identified for research and documenting historic resources:

- Strategy 5A: Develop a clear understanding of the ski era resources in Park City.
 - Action: Conduct a Reconnaissance Level Survey and Intensive Level Survey to document ski era resources;
 - Action: Collaborate with the Park City Museum to research the significance of ski era resources in Park City and explore ways to commemorate their importance.
- Strategy 5B: Confirm the key resources and sites related to Park City's Olympic host legacy.
 - Action: Create an online resource to provide information on Park City Olympic host sites and their locations.
 - Action: Collaborate with the Utah Olympic Legacy Foundation or other local groups to develop a comprehensive inventory of Park City's Olympics resources and sites.
- Strategy 5C: Continue to document and monitor Mining Era resources, especially in Park City's residential and business districts.
 - Action: Identify potential Mining Era resources not currently on the Historic Sites Inventory and clarify why they are not included (e.g., removal requested, insufficient documentation, etc.)
 - Action: Streamline the current Historic Sites inventory into an online, searchable database using GIS or other location-based tools.
 - Action: Update the knowledge of identified Mining Era residences with additional details to further the understanding of their importance and contribution to Park City's history.

Chair Stephens asked for clarification about the strategy related to ski era resources. Manager Martin reported that this would not only look at the historic ski resources connected to mining structures but also structures within Old Town that are from an era not currently listed in the Historic Sites Inventory. There are some that are not identified as historic but could potentially be identified to encourage preservation of those structures. Chair Stephens wondered whether the City Council has weighed in on this. Manager Martin reported that it is identified in several places in the General Plan. She believes there has been a conversation about this matter, and it is a priority for the City moving forward.

Senior City Attorney, Mark Harrington, reported that there are some challenges associated with expanding historic designations without owner consent. As a result, the current direction in the General Plan is incentive based. Board Member Noble reported that by

2030, there will be 560 homes that are 50 years old outside of the Historic District. Right now, there are 450 structures within the Historic District. She asked if there is anything that can be done with those homes as far as the inventory and incentivization. Attorney Harrington stated that it is unlikely the City can expand protection to those types of properties. However, it is possible to create a classification and offer certain incentives.

Director Ward reported that the Planning Commission is also reviewing the General Plan. During their Work Session in October 2025, there was a discussion about the challenges. Some of the older homes outside of the Historic Districts are being demolished for new infill. There are concerns that some of the new infill is not compatible with the surrounding neighborhoods. As a result, the Planning Commission has identified compatibility components outside of the Historic Districts as a priority. When it comes to the designation of new structures to the Historic Sites Inventory, that requires the consent of the property owner. The City is prohibited from regulating design components on any single-family or duplex for districts established after 2021. The State has enacted certain prohibitions.

Board Member Gackle noted that Old Town is already established as a Historic District, so it is possible to regulate there. He added that properties could theoretically be added to the Historic Sites Inventory. Director Ward clarified that there can be additions with the property owner's consent. Chair Stephens asked if someone would be able to demolish an A-frame within the existing code. This was confirmed. Chair Stephens wanted to understand why the code is not more restrictive on that. Director Ward reported that the historic sites are designated and codified. Right now, the eras include the following: Settlement and Mining Boom, Mature Mining Era, and Mining Decline and Emergence of Recreation Industry.

Director Ward noted that there are structures that were built in the 1960s, 1970s, and 1980s that were true to the architectural style of the time. When someone comes in to renovate or remodel those homes, the design guidelines require a 2:1 ratio window and so on. The guidelines might not work for that type of architecture. One potential incentive could be the creation of a section of code that allows design flexibility for structures built during that era. Board Members discussed possible incentives and the existing grant program. Board Member Scott believed the ski era is not only based on age, but style. Board Member Gackle confirmed that there are a number of factors, such as age, architectural style, and the cultural impact and prominence. The transition from mining to skiing is part of the City history.

Chair Stephens asked for examples of the architectural style outside of an A-frame. Board Member Scott mentioned one that was recently taken down at 1011 Park Avenue. Board Member Gackle reported that there are A-frames, modified A-frames, shed styles, and chalet styles. There are many different style examples. Manager Martin continued to review strategies with the Board. She shared information about the protection of resources:

- Strategy 5K: Proactively work to protect historic mining sites and structures from both physical and environmental damage.
 - Action: Establish an annual (or other regular recurring) wildfire mitigation process, to clear vegetation around/adjacent to historic mining sites.

- Action: Establish strategies to counteract and prevent vandalism of remote mining sites and structures.
- Strategy 5M: Proactively work to protect Old Town's historic resources from wildfire damage.
 - Action: Collaborate with Rocky Mountain Power on efforts to underground power lines.
 - Action: Prioritize Old Town and the City's historic districts for undergrounding completion.

For Historic District Grant Program updates, the strategy identified in the General Plan is:

- Strategy 5H: Continue to incentivize adaptive re-use of historic buildings.
 - Action: Continue to offer the program, as well as research, identify, and utilize other financial incentives for historic preservation efforts or adaptive re-use.

For outreach, education, and recognition, there are many strategies and actions included in the General Plan. Staff recommended the following actions for prioritization:

- Action: Expand education, outreach, and recognition efforts by establishing an annual event designed to celebrate exemplary preservation efforts.
- Action: Provide a regular means to educate and inform property owners about the benefits and opportunities of historic preservation.
- Action: Create educational and promotional materials for Ski Resort and Olympic eras featuring the intersection of Park City's mine sites and resort activities.
- Action: Expand educational materials, including a guided walking tour, online resources, and additional forms of recognition.

The Staff recommendation for the Work Session is to review the ongoing and near-term strategies and actions identified in the 2025 General Plan related to historic preservation and provide input on the prioritization of efforts. Manager Martin reported that the Staff Report outlines what Staff thinks would be a good prioritization of these strategies and actions. The request is to receive some preliminary Board Member feedback. She reiterated that there will be future Work Sessions to further refine the prioritization list.

Board Member Scott asked about Strategy 5C. Director Ward reported that the Meeting Materials Packet that will be published for the December 18, 2025, City Council Meeting will be forwarded. There will be opportunities for potential new evaluations of structures within the Empire Pass/Flagstaff area through some modifications to the Development Agreement and some new funds to help restore and rehabilitate some of the structures. There will be some opportunities in 2026 to take a look at what is currently designated and work on possibly updating historic site forms to include some of the accessory buildings that may not be identified or associated with the mine sites. Discussions were had about incentives.

Board Member Scott expressed support for the priority order that has been shared. Board Member Gackle likes the action items that have been identified. Chair Stephens mentioned

the items under LMC updates. He feels the highest priority should be properties that are more than 50 years old, where the style of the architecture does not work with the guidelines.

Board Member Gackle expressed support for a survey of ski era inventories. Manager Martin acknowledged that there are overlapping strategies and actions related to historic ski era resources. Chair Stephens pointed out that a structure that is older than 50 years does not necessarily need to be in the Reconnaissance Level Survey, but some architecturally significant homes might need to be. Staff could spend time researching those.

Board Member Gackle assumed the Reconnaissance Level Survey would involve a consultant. He noted that a Reconnaissance Level Survey is broader while an Intensive Level Survey is more specific. The first survey is used to identify what the deep dive will focus on. Chair Stephens does not believe the Reconnaissance Level Survey should be so broad that money is spent on a consultant. He is not sure that is the best use of resources.

Manager Martin reported that the LMC updates prioritized the evaluation of streetscape standards to reflect the historic nature of Park City's older neighborhoods and urban form in relation to walkability. This could be valuable in the near term. Additional discussions were had about the LMC updates section. Chair Stephens would like to consider what could make the Historic District Grant Program more successful. There might be an opportunity to focus more on Main Street. He would like to continue to evaluate the grant program. The items related to protection of resources were reviewed. Board Member Gackle expressed support.

Discussions were had about the outreach, education, and recognition items. Chair Stephens asked if these are items Staff is working on already or is planning to work on. Manager Martin believed there has been work on a guided walking tour. As far as the annual event is concerned, this is something the General Plan identified as a possible action. Staff was thinking that would dovetail well with Historic Preservation Month and the Historic Preservation Award.

Board Member Gackle noted that there might be an opportunity to partner with Park City Museum. Manager Martin asked whether the museum has implemented a guided walking tour in the past. Board Member Gackle reported that there are walking tours for Main Street and Park Avenue. There is usually a Historic Architecture Preservation Tour in the summer for members. The Main Street and Park Avenue tours are open to anyone who signs up. There is also work being done with the Chamber to create a Mining Site walking tour. Chair Stephens thought it made sense for there to be collaboration with the museum.

Director Ward reported that the Preservation Utah app has audio walking tours that can be downloaded for some historic sites in the City. It would be beneficial to create a resource that outlines what is available to community. Manager Martin thanked the Historic Preservation Board for their feedback on the strategies and actions. She reiterated that this agenda item will be discussed again at a future Work Session. Next time, she suggested the focus be on the LMC updates. The other strategies can be the focus at a different time.

7. **REGULAR AGENDA**

A. **2026 Regular Meetings – Consideration to Adopt the Historic Preservation Board Regular Meeting Dates for 2026.**

Director Ward reported that the 2026 meeting schedule is included in the Meeting Materials Packet. The meetings are scheduled to take place on the first Wednesday of each month. Chair Stephens asked if July 1, 2026, and September 2, 2026, will work for Board Members, as those dates are close to holidays. Board Members expressed support for those dates.

MOTION: Board Member Beatlebrox moved to ADOPT the Historic Preservation Board Regular Meeting Dates for 2026. Board Member Scott seconded the motion.

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

B. **939 Empire Avenue – Historic District Grant – The Applicant Requests a \$9,805 Grant to Repair the Failing Historic Stone Retaining Wall of the Landmark Historic Site. PL-25-06703.**

Manager Martin presented the Staff Report and explained that this is a Historic District Grant application for 939 Empire Avenue. This building was constructed circa 1897 during the Mining Boom era (1872 to 1929). It is a Landmark Historic Site in the Historic Residential – 1 Zoning District. The stone retaining wall, steps, and path are historic to the site, according to the Historic Sites Inventory form. The retaining wall that runs the length of the front yard is deteriorating and crumbling. On November 26, 2025, a Historic District Design Review waiver letter for the reconstruction of the retaining wall was issued for the reconstruction.

The funding request is for \$9,805, which would be used to repair and reconstruct the historic stone retaining wall. The property is within the Lower Park Avenue RDA, which has a balance of \$50,000 for Fiscal Year 2026. The grant application is the first submitted for Lower Park Avenue for Fiscal Year 2026. If awarded, the Lower Park Avenue RDA would have a remaining balance of \$40,195. Restoring historic features and repointing masonry are work items eligible for grant funding. LMC 15-13-2(B)(1)(d) states: “Historic retaining walls shall be preserved to be greatest extent possible and historic retaining walls should be repaired with materials that closely approximate the original.” The Grant Final Action Letter requires work to be carried out in accordance with the LMC standards for preservation and repair of historic retaining walls, and best practices recommended by the Historic Preservation consultant, in their November 25, 2025, Memo to the Planning Department.

Staff recommends that the Historic Preservation Board review and score the Historic District Grant Program application for 939 Empire Avenue, open a public hearing, and determine whether a grant should be awarded. Chair Stephens asked if this is for the entire wall. It was clarified that the work covers the section in the front, which is to the right of the stairs.

Board Member Beatlebrox noted that she gave this application a score of 16. She commented that this is an excellent project. What the contractor is planning to do is

impressive. Board Member Scott gave this a score of 14 and he supports the proposal. Board Member Noble scored this as 14 as well. It does not look like there is enough stone, so she wondered what it will be filled in with. She would like the stone to substantially match the historic stone. Manager Martin reported that there is a condition in the Historic District Design Review waiver letter. According to the consultant, the best practice is to source replacement stone from local areas or make sure there is a match to the existing stone.

Chair Stephens wondered why the wall failed to begin with. He also wanted to know if this requires a permit since it is under four feet. Manager Martin explained that the wall is extremely old. She shared information about the scope of work included in the memo. There is a condition in the best practices memo that calls for some reinforcements. Director Ward reported that a Building Permit will be required. She noted that the applicant is attending the meeting virtually and is available to answer outstanding Board Member questions.

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

MOTION: Board Member Gackle moved to APPROVE a \$9,805 Historic District Grant for 939 Empire Avenue, a Landmark Historic Site, to repair the existing stone retaining wall at the front of the property, based on the following:

Findings of Fact:

1. The Applicant submitted a Historic District Grant Application in Fiscal Year 2026, Quarter 1 to assist with the cost to repair the stone retaining wall at 939 Empire Avenue, a Landmark Historic Site known as the Haumann House, constructed circa 1897, during the Mining Boom era.
2. The stone retaining wall runs the length of the Front Yard and is deteriorated and unstable; according to Land Management Code § 15-13-2(B)(1)(d), Historic retaining walls shall be preserved to the greatest extent possible and Historic retaining walls should be repaired with materials that closely approximate the original.
3. Pursuant to the Historic District Grant Program requirements, restoring Historic features and repointing masonry are work items that are eligible for grant funding.
4. The November 26, 2025 Historic District Design Review waiver letter for the proposed work to reconstruct the retaining wall, includes requirements for the work to comply with standards for preservation and repair of historic retaining walls, according to Land Management Code § 15-13-2(B)(1)(d) and best practices recommended by the City's Historic Preservation on-call consultant, in their November 25, 2025 Memo to the Planning Department.

Conclusions of Law:

1. At the December 3, 2025, Historic Preservation Board meeting, the Board determined the grant request qualifies for a Historic District Grant award.
2. On November 26, 2025, the Planning Department issued a Historic District Design Review (HDDR) waiver letter for the repair work in compliance with Land Management Code Sections 15-11-12(A)(3) *Historic District or Historic Site Review* and Section 15-13-2 *Regulations for Historic Residential Sites*.

Conditions of Approval:

1. Improvements shall be completed in compliance with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and the requirements of the HDDR Waiver Letter, dated November 26, 2025 (Attachment 1).
2. Work shall adhere to best practices and Conditions of Approval outlined in the Historic Preservation Memo, dated November 25, 2025, which is included as an attachment to the HDDR Waiver Letter.
3. The grantee shall maintain the architectural significance of the structure, retain and/or restore the historic character of the structure, preserve the structural integrity of the structure, and perform normal maintenance and repairs.
4. The grantee shall complete the work funded by the Historic District Grant within one year of approval of the grant application.
5. The Applicant shall submit a photograph of completed work to Planning Staff.
6. The grantee shall submit proof of payment to the Planning Department for disbursement of funds within 30 days of final inspection.
7. Prior to issuance of the grant, the grantee shall agree to and execute a five-year lien with the City in a form approved by the City Attorney's Office and record such lien with the Summit County Recorder's Office. Should the property be sold within the five-year period, the grantee is responsible for repaying the City a pro-rated amount of the grant disbursement. If the property is sold within one year, 100% of the awarded funds shall be paid back to the City.
8. 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 prior to construction.

Board Member Beatlebrox seconded the motion.

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

C. 218 Sandridge Road – Request for Modification – The Applicant Requests a Modification to the February 7, 2024, Material Deconstruction Approval (PL-23-05692) for Material Deconstruction of the Historic 1889 and 1907 Roof Forms of a Significant Historic Structure in the Historic Residential – 1 (HR-1) Zoning District. PL-25-06745.

Planner II, Jacob Klopfenstein, presented the Staff Report and explained that the application is a Request for Modification at 218 Sandridge Road. The applicant is requesting Material Deconstruction of 1889 and 1907 era roofs of the Significant Historic Structure. This is part of a larger project where the applicant is refurbishing and remodeling the Significant Historic Structure, constructing an addition, and constructing a detached accessory building at the site. Planner Klopfenstein shared a graphic supplied by the applicant. The red and orange sections shown are the 1889 and 1907 portions of the structure. The structure has undergone several later additions in the 1940s and 1960s. However, only the 1889 and 1907 roof portions will be discussed during the Historic Preservation Board Meeting.

At the Historic Preservation Board Meeting on November 17, 2025, the applicant was requesting a modification to the original Historic Preservation Board approval from February 2024. That request was to deconstruct and reconstruct the two roof forms. Staff recommended denial of that request, and the Board continued the discussion. The applicant has now implemented some temporary framing on the exterior of the historic structure, which is being referred to as an exoskeleton. The intention is to temporarily brace the walls and roof of the historic structure, which were at risk of collapsing. Some photographs of the exoskeleton were shared. Planner Klopfenstein pointed out the 1889 and 1907 portions.

The applicant is requesting Material Deconstruction of the 1889 and 1907 roofs as opposed to deconstruction and reconstruction. Staff finds the proposal for Material Deconstruction complies, as conditioned, with LMC Section 15-11-12.5 – *Historic Preservation Board Review for Material Deconstruction*. As part of reviews for Material Deconstruction, Staff and the Board evaluate proposals against the *Regulations for Historic Residential Sites* in LMC Section 15-13-2. Staff finds the request complies, as conditioned, with that section.

Planner Klopfenstein reviewed the Conditions of Approval outlined in the Draft Final Action Letter. The exoskeleton has already been completed but other conditions relate to rebuilding the 1889 and 1907 roof forms in the same historic location, form, and dimensions on the historic structure. The applicant is required to protect and preserve all salvageable historic materials at the site, with assistance from the City's Historic Preservation consultant.

Staff recommends that the Board review the requested modification to the Historic Preservation Board's approval for 218 Sandridge Road for Material Deconstruction of the 1889 and 1907 era roofs of the structure and consider approving the proposal based on the Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Conditions of Approval in the Draft Final Action Letter. At the previous meeting on November 17, 2025, the Historic Preservation Board opened and closed the public hearing. There does not need to be another hearing opened.

Board Member Noble asked to review LMC 15-11-12.5. Planner Klopfenstein reported that during the last discussion, the section of code the request was made under for deconstruction required a finding from the Chief Building Official that the structure was unsafe under the International Building Code. This section does not have that requirement.

Director Ward shared information about Material Deconstruction, which is the disassembly of structures for the purpose of salvaging and reusing as many of the construction materials or building components as possible. In some cases, this can be to remove non-historic materials from a historic site or to remove historic construction materials that are beyond repair. The definition provides clarity and there are also Conditions of Approval listed.

Director Ward reported that the Historic Preservation consultant will be on site to make recommendations for best practices. Board Member Beatlebrox liked that Stantec will be on the site. Board Member Scott noted that Staff did an excellent job outlining the differences between the proposal from the November meeting and the current proposal.

MOTION: Board Member Scott moved to APPROVE the Modification to the Historic District Design Review, based on the following:

Procedural History:

1. 218 Sandridge Road is a Significant Historic Site on Park City's Historic Sites inventory.
2. On November 1, 2023, the Historic Preservation Board approved the Material Deconstruction of the 1941 roofline of the Historic Structure.
3. On February 7, 2024, the Historic Preservation Board approved the applicant's Material Deconstruction request to remove 48 square feet of 1940s-era siding on the southern façade of the building and to remove 64 square feet of the 1889 roof form.
4. On January 6, 2025, the Applicant entered into a Cash Deposit Agreement in accordance with the City preservation policy outlined in LMC Section 15-11-9 to ensure protection of Historic materials throughout construction and compliance with the approved Historic Preservation Plan.
5. On September 8, 2025, the City issued Building Permit #25-0638 for 218 Sandridge.
6. On October 28, 2025, the Applicant filed a Modification application to:
 - a. Remove the Historic 1907 roof form and reconstruct it with proper structuring and new standing seam-metal roofing, salvaging all possible salvageable Historic Materials, and

- b. Remove the Historic 1889 roof form and reconstruct it with proper structuring and new standing seam-metal roofing, salvaging all possible salvageable Historic Materials.
7. On November 17, 2025, the Historic Preservation Board conducted a public hearing and continued the Applicant’s Material Deconstruction request to December 3, 2025.
- a. The Applicant initially requested approval for the full deconstruction of the roofs. Staff did not find that the Applicant’s initial request complied with LMC § 15-11-15 Reconstruction Of An Existing Historic Building Or Historic Structure.
 - b. Board members discussed with the Applicant and recommended that a Material Deconstruction request reviewed by the board under LMC § 15- 11-12.5 would be more appropriate for the Applicant to pursue moving forward.

Findings of Fact:

- 1. The Material Deconstruction proposal to reconstruct the 1889 and 1907 roof forms of the Historic Structure complies, as conditioned, with Land Management Code Section 15-11-12.5 *Historic Preservation Board Review For Material Deconstruction*.
 - a. The Applicant seeks a modification to the February 7, 2024 Historic Preservation Board Material Deconstruction approval (Exhibit C) for Material Deconstruction of the Historic 1889 and 1907 roof forms.
 - b. Pursuant to LMC § 15-11-12.5, the Historic Preservation Board analyzes proposals for Material Deconstruction involving Historic Sites for compliance with LMC § 15-13-2 *Regulations For Historic Residential Sites*. These standards are outlined below with Staff analysis:

LMC § 15-13-2 Requirement	Analysis
LMC § 15-13-2(A)(3): The historic exterior features of a building should be retained and preserved.	The Applicant proposes replacing the non-Historic standing seam metal roof on the 1889 and 1907 roof forms and protecting Historic materials within the roofs and salvaging Historic material within the roof forms. The Applicant does not propose any additional changes to Historic exterior materials except for the changes approved by the Historic Preservation Board on February 7, 2024 (see Exhibit C).

	<p>Condition of Approval 3 requires the Applicant to protect and preserve all original Historic Materials that are found to be salvageable within the roof forms.</p>
<p>LMC § 15-13-2(A)(6): Deteriorated or damaged historic features and elements should be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration or existence of structural or material defects requires replacement, the feature or element should match the original in appearance, dimension, texture, material, and finish. The applicant must demonstrate the severity of deterioration or existence of defects by showing that the historic materials are no longer safe and/or serviceable and cannot be repaired to a safe and/or serviceable condition.</p>	<p>The Applicant proposes replacing the non-Historic standing seam metal roof on the 1889 and 1907 roof forms and protecting and preserving salvageable historic material within the roof forms.</p> <p>Condition of Approval 3 requires the Applicant to reuse all original Historic Materials that are found to be salvageable. Condition of Approval 4 requires that any replacement materials shall match the original in appearance, dimension, texture, material, and finish.</p>
<p>LMC § 15-13-2(A)(10): New construction such as new additions, exterior alterations, repairs, upgrades, etc., should not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the historic site or historic building.</p>	<p>The applicant does not propose exterior alterations that would destroy Historic materials. Condition of Approval 4 requires that any replacement materials shall match the original in appearance, dimension, texture, material, and finish.</p>
<p>LMC § 15-13-2(B)(2)(e)(1): Avoid removing or obstructing a historic building's elements and materials when installing gutters and downspouts.</p>	<p>Condition of Approval 5 prohibits the Applicant from obstructing Historic elements of the Structure when installing gutters and downspouts for the roof.</p>
<p>LMC § 15-13-2(B)(2)(e)(2): When new gutters are needed, the most appropriate design for hanging gutters is half round. Downspouts shall be located away from architectural features and shall be visually minimized when viewed from the right-of-way.</p>	<p>Condition of Approval 6 requires the Applicant to use half-round gutters and visually minimize downspouts.</p>
<p>LMC § 15-13-2(B)(2)(e)(3): Water from gutters and downspouts shall drain away from the historic structure.</p>	<p>Condition of Approval 7 requires the Applicant to design gutters and downspouts such that water drains away from the Historic Structure.</p>
<p>LMC § 15-13-2(B)(2)(f)(1): Maintain and preserve historic chimneys and their decorative features as they are important character-defining features of historic</p>	<p>The Applicant proposes salvaging and reconstructing an exterior chimney above the Historic 1907 roof form.</p>

structures.	
LMC § 15-13-2(B)(2)(f)(3): Repairs to chimneys shall be made so as to retain historic materials and design.	The Applicant proposes salvaging and reconstructing an exterior chimney above the Historic 1907 roof form. Condition of Approval 4 requires that any replacement materials shall match the original in appearance, dimension, texture, material, and finish.
LMC § 15-13-2(B)(2)(f)(4): Chimneys shall not be covered with non-historic materials.	The Applicant proposes salvaging and reconstructing the chimney using the original Historic Materials.
LMC § 15-13-2(B)(2)(f)(5): New chimneys and stove pipes shall be of a size, scale, and design that are appropriate to the character and style of the historic structure.	The Applicant does not propose any new chimneys or stovepipes as part of the proposed roof reconstruction.

2. Staff published notice on the City’s website and the Utah Public Notice website and posted notice to the property on October 29, 2025. Staff mailed courtesy notice to property owners within 300 feet on October 31, 2025. The Park Record published courtesy notice on November 1, 2025.
3. The Historic Preservation Board opened and closed the public hearing for the modification request on November 17, 2025, and continued the item to December 3, 2025.

Conclusions of Law:

1. The proposal complies, as conditioned, with Land Management Code Section 15-11-12.5 *Historic Preservation Board Review For Material Deconstruction*.
2. The proposal complies, as conditioned, with Land Management Code Section 15-13-2 *Regulations For Historic Residential Sites*.

Conditions of Approval:

1. The Applicant shall implement a temporary framing and shoring exoskeleton to brace the walls of the Structure from the exterior prior to the Material Deconstruction of the roof forms.
2. The Applicant shall reconstruct the Historic 1889 and 1907 roof forms in the same Historic location, form, and dimensions on the Historic Structure.
3. The Applicant shall protect and preserve all original Historic Materials that are found to be salvageable within the roof forms. The City Historic Preservation consultant shall be present at the Site during the Material Deconstruction of

the roof forms to evaluate Historic materials that are to be protected and retained within the final construction.

4. Any replacement materials shall match the original in appearance, dimension, texture, material, and finish.
5. Obstructing or damaging any Historic elements of the Structure when installing gutters and downspouts for the reconstructed roof is prohibited.
6. The Applicant shall use half-round gutters and visually minimize downspouts from the public Right-of-Way.
7. The Applicant shall design gutters and downspouts such that water drains away from the Historic Structure.
8. All previous Conditions of Approval applicable to this project, including but not limited to Conditions of Approval from the Historic District Design Review (PL-23-05692), Material Deconstruction (PL-23-05692), Steep Slope Conditional Use Permit (PL-24-06059), and Plat Amendment (PL-24-06076) Final Action Letters for 218 Sandridge Road remain in effect.
9. The proposed work requires a Building Permit or revision to a Building Permit.
10. The proposed work requires a Final Inspection by both the Building and Planning Departments.
11. Modifications to the project require a modification application submittal to the Planning Department, payment of application fee, review for compliance with required standards, and Planning and Building Department approval.
12. This Historic Preservation Board approval shall expire one year following the date of this letter at 5:00 PM (MT). The Applicant shall obtain a Building Permit for the proposed work prior to that date. If a Building Permit for the proposed work is not approved before that date, this approval shall be voided, and the Applicant will be required to submit a new Modification application to pursue the proposed work.

Board Member Beatlebrox seconded the motion.

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

8. ADJOURNMENT

MOTION: Chair Stephens moved to ADJOURN the Historic Preservation Board Meeting. Board Member Beatlebrox seconded the motion.

Historic Preservation Board Meeting
December 3, 2025

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

The Historic Preservation Board Meeting adjourned at approximately 7:37 p.m.

Approved 01.07.2026