

Administrative Public Meeting
May 29, 2025
Page 1

PARK CITY MUNICIPAL CORPORATION
ADMINISTRATIVE PUBLIC MEETING MINUTES
PLANNING DEPARTMENT
<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/88167820277>
May 29, 2025

STAFF:

Rebecca Ward (Virtual), Planning Director; Elissa Martin, Planning Project Manager; Meredith Covey, Planner I; Jaron Ehlers, Planner I.

PUBLIC:

Matt Brown, Tim Suter (Virtual), Ken Chartier (Virtual).

=====

The Planning Director called the meeting to order at 12:00 PM.

REGULAR AGENDA/PUBLIC HEARINGS/POSSIBLE ACTION

71 Daly Avenue – Extension of Historic District Design Review Approval – PL-25-06516 – The Applicant Requests a One-Year Extension of Approval of HDDR to Construct a Rear Addition to a Single-Family Dwelling Designated as a Significant Historic Structure Located in the Historic Residential -1 Zoning District.

Planning Project Manager Elissa Martin noted that this item will be continued to the June 5, 2025 Administrative Public Hearing.

At 12:00 PM, the Planning Director opened a public hearing. There was no public input.

At 12:00 PM, the Planning Director closed the public hearing.

MOTION: The Planning Director **CONTINUED** the Extension of Historic District Design Review Approval to June 5, 2025.

243 Woodside Avenue – Modification to Historic District Design Review Approval – PL-25-06444 – The Applicant Proposes to Modify a Historic District Design Review (PL-23-05841) to Increase the Depth of the Porch from Six Feet to Ten Feet.

Administrative Public Meeting
May 29, 2025
Page 2

Planner Meredith Covey presented the application and explained that the modification involved extending the depth of the porch size from 6 feet that was originally proposed to 10 feet in width. Planner Covey also indicated that after analysis, it was determined that the Applicant's proposed hybrid porch/deck extension does not comply with Porch and Deck regulations outlined in LMC § 15-13-8 (B)(2)(i), and LMC § 15-13-8(B)(2)(7), therefore staff recommended that the application for the proposed modification be denied.

Planning Director Rebecca Ward provided some options on how to proceed. The denial motion can move forward and if the applicant disagrees with this decision they can appeal it through the appeal process. Another option is to propose an Amendment to the code for flexibility with porches and decks on the front façade and see if that may be compatible in the Historic District. Then the application could be Continued to a later date. The Planning Director asked the applicant for input regarding the options.

The applicant Tim Suter replied that he interpreted the code's intent as to try to preserve the Historic District and presented some examples of other properties in the area of porches and decks that he estimated were of equal dimensions or bigger than his proposal, therefore he believes their proposed modification would be in line with maintaining the Historical Character of the area given his examples.

At 12:18 PM, the Planning Director opened a public hearing. There was public input.

Applicant's neighbor, Ken Chartier stated that they had a similar 10 foot deck as well and supported the design proposal of the applicant.

At 12:21 PM, the Planning Director closed the public hearing.

Planning Director Ward stated that porches need to be compatible with the building, style and respect the scale and proportions, specific to the scale and proportions found on historic buildings. The height of the porch needs to be similar to those found on historic buildings and follow the predominant pattern of them. The code is specific to historic porches along the street with traditional setbacks, orientation, alignment, along the streetscape or character area to reinforce the visual rhythm of the buildings and site elements. She also noted that there are specific regulations about minimizing decks when viewed from the primary public right of way, limiting the deck size and scale, and keeping decks on secondary facades.

The Planning Director mentioned that given the tie to the historic structures and the analysis of the historic structures, the memo prepared by the Historic preservation

Administrative Public Meeting
May 29, 2025
Page 3

consultant had been effective and helpful in clarifying and ensuring that regulations are applied to new homes throughout the historic districts, and if there is disagreement on this, there is an appeal process.

Planning Director Ward noted that the memo established that historically the decks were 4 to 5 feet, and the prior approval was for 6 feet, so an expansion of 10 feet does not meet criteria of the code.

Planning Director Rebecca Ward asked the applicant if he would be open to a 1 foot extension instead of the proposed extension and modify the current proposal. He could also opt to continue the discussion to a later date, or if preferred, move forward with the denial instead.

The applicant responded that he wished the Planning Director would listen to the rest of his arguments before moving forward with the denial, or perhaps a fast denial would get him faster to a variance process. He stated that he disagrees with the assessment and believes this is an overreach of the guidelines. He also noted that he will make comments about the purpose of the Land Management Code and will state that the consultant report needs to be thrown out. The applicant also indicated that he will do everything he can to get the denial thrown out.

Planning Director Rebecca Ward clarified with the applicant that if he was trying to request an exception from the Land Management Code through a Variance, there are five criteria that is reviewed by the Board of Adjustment and this is a different process than the Appeal Process. Additional information can be sent to the applicant regarding those processes for their review and staff will follow up with the applicant to move through the process that he decides on.

MOTION: The Planning Director **DENIED** the Modification to Historic District Design Review Approval in accordance with the Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Conditions of Approval.

The applicant asked if the application could be denied even if the facts in the staff report were wrong. The Planning Director replied that the decision was based on the information that had been provided and asked if there was a specific finding of fact that the applicant found to be incorrect. The applicant stated that the 5 foot deck next door written in the staff report was 10 feet, as indicated by the input of that home owner. Planning Director Ward clarified that the determination was based on the Findings of Fact 1 through 19 in the Final Action letter, not the staff report. She also noted that the Final Action letter outlined the existing code as it applied to 243 Woodside.

Administrative Public Meeting
May 29, 2025
Page 4

Findings of Fact

1. 243 Woodside Avenue is in the Historic District.
2. 243 Woodside Avenue is Lot 2 of the 239 Woodside Replat Lot Line Adjustment recorded with Summit County on July 25, 2007.
3. On February 14, 2024, the Planning Commission approved a Steep Slope Conditional Use Permit for the construction of a new Single-Family Dwelling (SFD).
4. On March 7, 2024, the Planning Director approved a Historic District Design Review (HDDR) for the new SFD.
5. On February 19, 2025, the Applicant applied to modify the HDDR to extend a six-foot-deep covered porch to extend to 10 feet in depth with an uncovered deck along the front façade.
6. Goal 15 of the Park City General Plan is to preserve the integrity, mass, scale, compatibility and historic fabric of the nationally and locally designated historic resources and districts for future generations.
7. Objective 15B is to maintain character, context, and scale of local Historic Districts with compatible infill development and additions.
8. 243 Woodside Avenue is in the HR-1 Zoning District.
9. The purposes of the HR-1 Zoning District include preserving present land uses and character of the historic residential areas of Park City and encouraging construction of historically compatible structures that contribute to the character and scale of the Historic District.
10. The Land Management Code (LMC) does not define “porch.” LMC § 15-15-1 states that words not defined in the LMC “shall have a meaning consistent with Webster’s New Collegiate Dictionary, latest edition” and Webster’s defines “Porch” as “a covered area adjoining an entrance to a building and usually having a separate roof.”
11. LMC § 15-13-8(B)(2)(i) establishes the following for new residential porches in Historic Districts:
 - a. Porches shall be used to define front entrances. Porches typically cover the entrance, and usually extend partially or fully across the main façade. Over-scaled, monumental and under-scaled entries shall be avoided.
 - b. Porches on primary and secondary facades shall be compatible with a building’s style and shall respect the scale and proportions found on historic buildings.
 - c. The height of porch decks shall be similar to those found on historic building(s) in the Historic District.

Administrative Public Meeting
May 29, 2025
Page 5

- d. Locate porches on new infill construction in a way that follows the predominant pattern of historic porches along the street, maintaining traditional setbacks, orientation of entrances, and alignment along the Streetscape or character area to reinforce the visual rhythm of the buildings and site elements.
 - e. The height of porch decks shall be similar to those found on historic building(s) within the Streetscape or character area.
- 12. The Applicant proposes extending the covered porch to create an uncovered deck extension 10 feet in depth. LMC § 15-15-1 defines “deck:”
 - a. Platform Deck: open structure above the ground that is in the front yard, rear yard, or side yard of a site.
- 13. In 2023, Planning staff requested SWCA Lead Architectural Historian complete a technical memorandum to outline appropriate dimensions for compatible porches and decks in the Historic Districts. The technical memorandum states that although “the LMC provides some direction regarding historically compatible porches, balconies, and decks, the purpose of this technical memorandum is to review those guidelines and provide clarification and supplemental guidance.”
- 14. The technical memorandum establishes the following for porches:
 - a. A porch is a “structure attached to a building to shelter an entrance or to serve as a semi-enclosed space; usually roofed and generally open sided.”
 - b. Within the Park City Historic Districts, porches occur on the first and second levels of buildings and are covered structures.
 - c. Residential porch forms in Park City dating to the late 19th and early 20th centuries tended to be modest in both style and size, similar to the houses they fronted.
 - d. The 1889 Sanborn fire insurance map shows that most residences along Woodside, Park and Marsac Avenue had porches on the primary façade.
 - e. Second-story porches on residential structures tended to be tucked into the L- or T-shape of the house plan over a first-story porch. Roofs over second-story porches were often an extension of the main roof.
 - f. Historic residential porch forms associated with the period of significance and associated with the Historic Districts typically consist of simple designs ranging from basic entry coverings to linear porches attached to the primary elevation on the first or second level of the building.
 - g. Sanborn fire insurance maps and existing historic residential porches in the Historic Districts indicate typical porch dimensions are as follows:
 - i. Overall porch depths tend to be between 4 and 5 feet deep, with an average length of 12 feet on houses with L- or T-shaped plans.
 - h. A second-story porch may be present without a first-story porch but should

Administrative Public Meeting
May 29, 2025
Page 6

be inset into the body of the building and always covered.

- i. Typical porch coverings include a shed or hipped roof.

15. On November 8, 2023, as part of the HDDR process, the proposed SFD was reviewed by the Design Review Team with the City's historic preservation consultant and Planning staff. The Applicant's original proposal contained a porch that did not comply with the requirements of LMC § 15-13-8(B)(2)(i) because:

- a. It was over-scaled.
- b. It did not respect the scale and proportions found on historic buildings, as demonstrated by the technical memorandum.
- c. It did not follow the predominant pattern of historic porches along the street, did not maintain traditional setbacks, and did not align with the streetscape or character area to reinforce the visual rhythm of the buildings and site elements.

16. Based on the review of the LMC requirements regarding porches, review of the technical memorandum, and consideration of the surrounding sites, the Planner sent comments to the Applicant requiring that the depth of the porch be reduced to no more than six feet. The Applicant updated their plans to comply with the LMC and reduced the depth of the porch to six feet.

17. The Applicant now requests staff modify the requirements of a six-foot depth to allow for the extension of the porch to create a hybrid covered porch and extended uncovered deck along the front façade.

18. LMC § 15-13-8(B)(2)(7) outlines regulations for decks in the Historic Districts:

- a. Decks shall be constructed in inconspicuous areas where visually minimized from the primary public right-of-way, usually on the tertiary façade.
- b. The visual impact of a deck should be minimized by limiting its size and scale. Introducing a deck that visually detracts from a new structure, or substantially alters a site's proportion of built area to open space is not appropriate

19. The technical memorandum establishes the following for decks:

- a. Decks may reach the second story of a house but generally have ground-level access by stairs or an elevated walkway.
- b. Decks are open structures without roofs, may or may not have railings, and are designed for use as exterior living space.
- c. Existing residential decks in the Historic District were constructed after the period of significance for the Mining Boom Era Residences Thematic District and are not considered contributing characteristics or elements for the district.

Administrative Public Meeting
May 29, 2025
Page 7

Conclusions of Law

1. The Applicant's proposed hybrid porch/deck extension does not comply with the porch regulations outlined in LMC § 15-13-8(B)(2)(i) because:
 - a. It is over-scaled.
 - b. It does not respect the scale and proportions found on historic buildings, as demonstrated by the technical memorandum.
 - c. It does not follow the predominant pattern of historic porches along the street and does not align with the streetscape or character area, which contains non-complying decks and rooftop decks.
 - d. Creating a hybrid porch/deck does not reinforce the visual rhythm of the buildings and site elements.
2. The Applicant's proposed porch/deck extension does not comply with the deck regulations outlined in LMC § 15-13-8(B)(2)(7) because:
 - a. It is proposed to be constructed in a conspicuous area where visually maximized when viewed from the primary public right-of-way.
 - b. The visual impact of the deck extension is not minimized in size and scale. Introducing a deck that visually detracts from a new structure is not appropriate.

The Park City Administrative Public meeting adjourned at 12:32 PM.

Approved by Planning Director:

Signed by:

E4E79E75E143478...