



**PARK CITY MUNICIPAL CORPORATION
HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD MEETING
MARSAC MUNICIPAL BUILDING
COUNCIL CHAMBERS
445 MARSAC AVENUE
PARK CITY, SUMMIT COUNTY, UTAH
MINUTES OF JANUARY 7, 2026**

BOARD MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE: Douglas Stephens - Chair, Randy Scott, Puggy Holmgren, Dalton Gackle, John Hutchings, Lola Beatlebrox, Katie Noble (arrived 5:17 p.m.)

EX OFFICIO MEMBERS: Rebecca Ward, Planning Director; Meredith Covey, Planner II; Becky Gutknecht, Assistant City Engineer; Elissa Martin, Project Planning Manager; Jacob Klopfenstein, Planner II; Mark Harrington, Senior City Attorney

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 Katie Noble was absent. Board Member Puggy Holmgren and Board Member Dalton Gackle were attending the meeting virtually.

3. MINUTES APPROVAL

- A. Consideration to Approve the Historic Preservation Board Meeting Minutes from December 3, 2025.**

MOTION: Board Member Holmgren moved to APPROVE the Historic Preservation Board Meeting Minutes from December 3, 2025. Board Member Scott seconded the motion.

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

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. **Fences in Historic Residential Zoning Districts – The Historic Preservation Board Will Conduct a Work Session for Proposed Amendments to the Land Management Code for Regulations for Fences in Historic Residential Zoning Districts. PL-25-06769.**

Planner II, Meredith Covey, presented the Staff Report and stated that the first Work Session item has to do with fences in Historic Residential Zoning Districts. She reported that Historic Preservation Board previously discussed this item on December 3, 2025. At that time, the Board requested additional information on potential amendments to the Land Management Code (“LMC”), design and materials that are compatible with snow removal, and where in Old Town snow removal is most challenging. The Planning Department worked with the Public Works Department and Engineering Department. The Public Works Department identified Lower Park Avenue and Crescent Tramway as the most challenging streets for snow removal. This is partially due to some of the fences along the streetscape.

The Public Works Department and Engineering Department have clarified that even when fences are designed to be open or have some element that would allow snow to be pushed through, that is not necessarily best practice. There is still the requirement that room be provided to allow for some snow storage. Planner Covey reported that the Public Works Department and Engineering Department have outlined three different considerations:

- Aligning fences with adjacent properties preserves streetscape continuity but may increase snow storage removal costs;
- Prohibiting fences within 10 feet of the sidewalk allows for ample snow storage but may change the streetscape character; and
- Fences 4 feet from the sidewalk/roadway may result in visual misalignment but will provide adequate snow storage.

Planning Staff completed research on peer communities and found that many of the peer communities researched have requirements for spacing between the posts to maintain openness. In addition, there are requirements that the fences are low to the ground. Some of the peer communities had regulations on height and openness when in front of historic structures. For example, when a fence was located between a historic structure and a street, the fence could be no taller than 42 inches in height and would need to be at least 50% open. Another peer community allowed fences to be within the front setback only if the City Engineer found it would not impede snow removal operations. Some communities did not allow fences in the front yard at all. When researching peer communities, painted wood and simple wire and wrought iron materials were allowed, but the materials had to complement the principal building. Materials were required to be durable and weather-resistant.

After combining this research with the Public Works and Engineering Department recommendations, some potential LMC amendments were drafted and are as follows:

- Location:
 - Fences shall be located outside of snow storage easements and a minimum of 10 feet from the back of the curb;
 - Fences are recommended to be placed in line with other fences on the streetscape when possible.
- Historic Structures:
 - The City Engineer may grant an exemption allowing for fences within 10 feet of the back of the curb, when consistent with the historic pattern of the street.
- Additional Regulations to Consider:
 - No fences are allowed within 10 feet of the roadway; the City Engineer may allow fences within 4 feet of the property line if they follow the historic streetscape and will not impede snow storage.
- Design:
 - Fences should be at least 50% void and shall have spacing between the pickets that is at least $\frac{1}{2}$ the width of the picket;
 - Should be compatible in design with historic homes on the streetscape.
- Materials:
 - Wood, metal, or a combination in a style seen historically is appropriate;
 - Untreated materials should be avoided.
- Historic Sites:
 - Wood fences shall be painted opaque;
 - Materials should be compatible with the historic structure.
- Non-Historic Sites:
 - Alternative materials may be considered by the Planning Department.

Board Member Beatlebrox noted that there are a lot of fences in town that are practically on the curb. She wanted to know what would be done about those fences. Planner Covey believed the fences would be allowed to remain, but if the property owner were to remove the fence, then there would need to be compliance with the updated LMC standards. Board Member Beatlebrox asked what would happen if the fence needed to be repaired. Planner Covey reported that non-compliant structures are allowed to be repaired if in a state of disrepair, but if there is removal, then the fence will need to come into compliance.

Board Member Beatlebrox shared an example scenario where a historic property was renovated and the fence needed to be removed for access. She wondered whether that would be an issue. Planner Covey reported that for historic structures, there are exemptions. If it was removed, it could be rebuilt in the same location if it was deemed historic or on a Historic Sites form. Chair Stephens asked whether there is variability in what has been proposed. It was clarified that 4 feet from the back of the curb or sidewalk is proposed. Sometimes, the property line is near the curb, and other times, it is located further back.

Board Member Holmgren believed homeowners are responsible for clearing the snow in front of their homes. It was reported that on Park Avenue, the City provides snow removal from Heber Avenue down. The snow is hauled away as soon as possible. What this easement does is allow for some on-site snow storage until it is possible to remove the snow.

It was noted that over the last 20 years or so, there has been a higher level of service provided to Park Avenue, Main Street, and Swede Alley in particular. However, it was pointed out that the storm has to finish before the equipment can be brought in to remove the snow. Sometimes, there is a two or three-day storm, so the on-site snow storage is needed until the crews can come in and remove snow. The service level has increased, but there needs to be snow storage available ahead of the snow removal process.

Board Member John Hutchings asked for additional information about the on-site snow storage. It was clarified that a path is opened for pedestrian use between the gutter and the property. Board Member Hutchings expressed appreciation for the work that is done. He has never experienced an issue with the fences and snow storage on a property. Staff clarified that the intention is not to lose what currently exists, but if more fences are installed, there could be a loss of the snow storage areas. The traffic pattern was discussed.

Board Member Noble joined the meeting at approximately 5:17 p.m.

Planner Covey reported that there are several questions outlined for the Board:

- Does the Board find the draft LMC updates reflect the Board's December input?
 - What is the most appropriate regulation for the location of fences?
- Are there additional LMC updates that should be researched and drafted by Staff?
- 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?

Chair Stephens asked to review the potential LMC amendments information in the presentation slides. Planner Covey explained that for both historic and non-historic sites, the material could be wood, metal, or a combination of both. Historically, wood fences were painted opaque based on the design guidelines from Park City in the 1980s. Chair Stephens pointed out that a lot of the snow that is pushed is heavy and wet. When this kind of snow pushes against the fence, it becomes harder to maintain. The moisture can get inside, freeze, and then the paint comes off. He does not want to force historic homeowners into a situation where there is a fence installed that could fail quickly due to the material. He is not sure that he is comfortable with wood fences being the only solution for historic homes.

Planner Covey clarified that the wood and metal, or a combination, would be allowed. It is possible to explore alternative materials for historic sites and do some additional research. Chair Stephens mentioned the list of the materials that are allowed for an addition to a historic home. It seems those same materials should be applicable to the fences. Board Member Beatlebrox noted that it is important to be mindful about the materials allowed.

Board Member Randy Scott shared comments about the location of a fence. He understands there needs to be space provided for snow removal services, but there is only snow for two or three months per year. Board Member Hutchings reported that Park Avenue

is a high-traffic area. There are a lot of fences on Park Avenue, and he understands why a homeowner would want one there for separation. He expressed appreciation for the snow removal efforts in the area, but has concerns about the impacts of the fence language.

Board Member Holmgren explained that she plans to put a small fence on her property, because people walk onto her porch and pick flowers. A fence reminds people that something is private property. Chair Stephens noted that the presentation slides mention that Lower Park Avenue and Crescent Tramway are the most challenging streets for snow removal. He pointed out that walkability is a priority for the community. Additional discussions were had about snow removal and homeowner responsibilities. Board Member Noble mentioned second homeowners on Park Avenue and potential impacts to walkability.

Chair Stephens reminded those present that the Historic Preservation Board has been asked to provide direction to the City Council about how to address fences in certain areas. Board Member Noble asked if the fence location is relevant from a historic perspective. She believed the role of the Board would be to guide the City Council with respect to historic consistency. Chair Stephens reported that the Public Works Department and Engineering Department have asked for guidance on snow storage and how it impacts the historic areas.

Assistant City Engineer, Becky Gutknecht, explained that there was a request for an Encroachment Agreement for a fence on Park Avenue. Since the fence would be placed within the City right-of-way, the request went to the City Council. Many of the fences on Park Avenue are within the City right-of-way. During the evaluation, the City Council saw that the proposed location, which would allow for the additional snow storage, would put that fence out of alignment with the other fences that are along the sidewalk. The City Council asked that this matter be brought to the Historic Preservation Board so there could be a discussion about whether it would be acceptable to have that offset or if there should be a continuous sightline. This is on the meeting agenda due to a City Council request.

Board Member Gackle commented that this is an interesting situation because the Historic Preservation Board normally looks at individual properties, but this is a broader discussion. The Board has an obligation to protect the historic streetscape. As a result, he would lean toward allowing fences on historic properties to align with their neighbors and/or where the fences have been located historically. He feels it is the responsibility of the Historic Preservation Board to protect the historic sightlines and the historic streetscape.

Board Member Hutchings asked whether 2 feet would be more appropriate than the 4 feet proposed earlier. It was clarified that 4 feet is ideal when there is a large-scale storm. Crescent Tramway does not have sidewalks currently, and the property lines encroach so far into the road that there is no area for on-site snow storage. It is one of the areas that is the most challenging when it comes to on-site snow storage during a storm. Planner Covey noted that it is possible to draft something that is specific to the challenging streets identified.

Assistant Engineer Gutknecht clarified that there are increasing issues seen on some other roadways, such as Daly Avenue. As an example, Daly Avenue does not currently have fences end-to-end, but is seeing more fences added over time. The reason for the broader

language is that it would apply to some of the locations that are not currently a problem but could become a problem in the future if there is no means of regulation in place.

Chair Stephens noted that on Daly Avenue, the homes are further back from the road, especially on the east side. Board Member Gackle reported that even though a lot of the homes on the east side are set further back, the fence lines are closer to the road.

Chair Stephens asked if there had been enough feedback provided by the Historic Preservation Board during the Work Session. Planner Covey summarized some of the discussion. When it comes to location, the Board would like to see location-specific amendments drafted. It is also possible to explore what location regulations might be needed on streets that have not been identified as challenging at this time, but might become challenging over time. Planner Covey mentioned the final question from Staff about whether the City Council should allow fence installations within the City right-of-way. Chair Stephens suggested that the additional information be provided to the Historic Preservation Board first.

B. General Plan Implementation – The Historic Preservation Board Will Review Strategies and Actions for Implementation of the 2025 General Plan Historic Preservation Focus Area and Forward a Recommendation to the City Council for Prioritization for 2026.

Project Planning Manager, Elissa Martin, presented the Staff Report and explained that this Work Session item relates to the General Plan implementation. She reported that the last Work Session on this item was held on December 3, 2025. At that time, the Historic Preservation Board reviewed near-term and ongoing General Plan implementation strategies and discussed prioritization. The General Plan lists 18 different historic preservation strategies in the Implementation Matrix, which Staff has grouped into

- LMC updates;
- Research and document historic resources (including Mining Era and additional Park City eras);
- Protect historic resources from environmental and physical damage;
- Historic Preservation incentives and updates to grant program; and
- Outreach, education, and recognition.

Staff recommended that the following prioritization of strategies and actions for the LMC updates:

- Update LMC with professional illustrations to clarify and reinforce standards;
- Establish compatible design standards and financial and regulatory incentives for ski era historic resources;
- Establish criteria to evaluate applications for Material Deconstruction, Panelization, Lifting, Reconstructing, and Demolition;
- Require more detailed mitigation plans during construction to prevent damage to historic resources;

- Evaluate streetscape standards and analyze the influence of site design; and
- Explore opportunities to incentivize reuse and renovation of historic structures.

Manager Martin reported that for strategies related to research and documentation, the Historic Preservation Board agreed with the staff-recommended prioritization:

- Update Historic Sites Inventory ("HSI") and create online GIS resource:
 - Update existing HSI forms to reflect accuracy and consistency of information;
 - Streamline HSI into an online searchable database using GIS mapping tools.
- Better understand ski era resources in Park City to offer incentives for restoration.

As for outreach, education, and recognition, the General Plan calls for the following:

- Establish an annual event to expand education, outreach, and recognition efforts:
 - Provide regular means to educate and provide resources for historic preservation.
- Create an online resource, such as an ArcGIS Story Map, to serve as a means for celebrating property owners' ongoing stewardship and preservation of the City's historic resources within the Historic Districts;
- Create an online guided walking tour to showcase historic sites and preservation effort within the Old Town Historic Districts and the historic mine sites.

At the Work Session on December 3, 2025, the Historic Preservation Board expressed support for the items under the protection of resources section, which includes the following:

- Establish a regular recurring wildfire mitigation process, and strategies to counteract and prevent vandalism of remote mining sites and structures;
- Support efforts to protect Old Town's historic resources from fire damage through the undergrounding of power lines.

The Planning Commission has also identified Strategy 5K as a priority for implementation in 2026, specifically by working to link Wildland Urban Interface standards with water-wise standards in the Municipal Code. During the last Work Session, the Historic Preservation Board agreed with Staff that the Historic District Grant Program should continue to be offered. In addition, there was agreement that there should be research and implementation of other incentives for historic preservation efforts or adaptive re-use. Manager Martin explained that during the current Work Session, there is a desire to receive a recommendation from the Historic Preservation Board that can be shared with the City Council. Staff is confident that most of what has been outlined in the Staff Report can be achieved this year. However, the professional illustrations will need to be budgeted for.

The Staff recommendation is for the Board to discuss the recommended General Plan strategies and actions for prioritization in 2026 and provide input regarding the following:

- Do the priorities listed in the Staff Report align with the Historic Preservation Board's prioritization of efforts to carry out in 2026?
- Is there anything that should be removed from this prioritization list?
- Is there anything that should be added to the prioritization list?
- Review proposed prioritization of the 2025 General Plan strategies and actions and consider forwarding a recommendation to the City Council regarding General Plan implementation priorities for historic preservation in 2026.

Board Member Gackle noted that this has been in front of the Historic Preservation Board during previous meetings. He likes the priorities listed and is in favor of forwarding this to the City Council. Board Member Scott agreed and expressed support for what is outlined. There was no formal vote taken, as this was scheduled as a Work Session item, but there was unanimous Board Member support to forward a recommendation to the City Council.

7. **REGULAR AGENDA**

A. **2026 Historic Preservation Award – The Historic Preservation Board Will Review Proposed Nominations for the 2026 Cindy Matsumoto Historic Preservation Award and Select Award Recipients. GI-25-00584.**

Planner II, Jacob Klopfenstein, presented the Staff Report and explained that this agenda item relates to the Historic Preservation Award. He shared background information with the Board. The award began in 2011 and it recognizes historic preservation projects that demonstrate exemplary implementation of the Historic District regulations. The award is named after former City Council Member, Cindy Matsumoto, and is the Cindy Matsumoto Historic Preservation Award. Awarded projects should have one or more of the following:

- Adaptive Re-Use;
- Infill Development;
- Excellence in Restoration;
- Sustainable Preservation;
- Embodiment of Historical Context; and
- Connectivity of Site.

Planner Klopfenstein reported that the award-winning project is commissioned to be depicted in an art piece. Those art pieces are then displayed on the second floor of City Hall. The award-winning project last year was 517 Park Avenue. Planning Staff has identified three nominees for Historic Preservation Board consideration. He clarified that these are all projects that were completed during 2025. The three nominees were reviewed.

7700 Marsac Avenue – Ontario Mine Water Tank E is the first award nominee. Planner Klopfenstein reminded Board Members that the Historic Preservation Board considered this project last year during the previous award discussions, but at that time, it was not quite complete. The Board determined it would be more appropriate to consider the project once it was fully completed. That work has since been completed, and the wood shingles have

been installed on the roof of the tank. Some additional background information about the project was shared. The Historic Preservation Board approved the Material Deconstruction of remnant roof materials and stabilization of the tank in 2024. Originally, the applicant proposed implementing cables on the outside of the tank for stabilization, but it was ultimately determined that this was not necessary, and internal bracing was implemented. Staff is putting this project forward as a nominee that exemplifies Embodiment of Historical Context and Excellence in Restoration. Some photographs were shared for reference.

The second award nominee is 1109 Park Avenue. Planner Klopfenstein stated that this is a Significant Historic Structure originally constructed in 1895. The Historic Preservation Board approved Material Deconstruction to remove an accessory structure and restore the site to its 1907 form on August 6, 2025. The applicant obtained Historic District Design Review ("HDDR") Waiver Letters to replace two doors, install wood columns on the porch, and implement additional landscaping in 2025. Staff felt this exemplifies Excellence in Restoration. Planner Klopfenstein shared several photographs of 1109 Park Avenue.

The third nominee is the Silver King Coalition Mine. This is a Significant Historic Site on the Park City Mountain Resort property. The Historic Preservation Board granted the Friends of Ski Mountain Mining History a grant on June 30, 2025, to help fund cleaning and prep work for the window restoration project. Friends of Ski Mountain Mining History restored 1,384 window panes on the interior and exterior of the building, and installed security screens behind the first-floor panes to deter trespassers. Staff felt this project exemplifies Excellence in Restoration and Embodiment of Historical Context. Planner Klopfenstein shared photographs to highlight the conditions before and after the restoration work.

The Historic Preservation Board is asked to select up to two members to serve on the Artist Selection Committee. The Committee will also include one member of the Public Art Advisory Board and one Historic Preservation Planner. After the Historic Preservation Board selects an award winner, Planning Staff will issue a request for proposal ("RFP") for the creation of the art piece. The Committee will evaluate the submitted proposals, interview interested artists and select an artist to create the piece. Planner Klopfenstein reported that the time commitment for the Committee is expected to be between three and five hours.

Staff recommended the Historic Preservation Board review the nominees for the 2026 Cindy Matsumoto Historic Preservation Award, open a public hearing, choose up to three awardees, and select up to two Board Members to serve on the Artist Selection Committee.

Board Member Noble expressed appreciation for the work that was done on the nominated properties. When she looked at the three nominees, the clear winner to her was the Silver King Coalition Mine. That project is consistent with the criteria. Board Member Gackle agreed that the Silver King Coalition Mine should be the top choice for the art piece. It is a meaningful transformation in a visible location. The 1109 Park Avenue nominee is also in a visible location and a lot of people will see that work. The Ontario Mine Water Tank E is not as visible as the other two, but it is meaningful that the project work was completed. He suggested that the Silver King Coalition Mine receive the art piece, with the other two nominees receiving plaques to recognize the efforts made and the overall accomplishment.

Board Member Beatlebrox agreed with the comments shared. Board Member Scott stated that all three are excellent candidates for the award but noted that the Silver King Coalition Mine project was large and had community investment. Board Member Gackle noted that in the last 15 years, only two other art pieces have been awarded to mining structures. Board Member Hutchings echoed many of the comments from other Board Members. He also likes the Ontario Mine Water Tank E project, given that the original proposal involved cables, but was reengineered. Chair Stephens also has a soft spot for the Water Tank project.

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

MOTION: Board Member Scott moved to AWARD the Silver King Coalition Mine – Window Restoration project with the art piece, with 1109 Park Avenue and 7700 Marsac Avenue – Ontario Mine Water Tank E as the runners-up, for the 2026 Cindy Matsumoto Historic Preservation Award. Board Member Beatlebrox seconded the motion.

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

Board Member Gackle asked if the Silver King Coalition Mine – Window Restoration project would receive a plaque in addition to the art piece. Planner Klopfenstein reported that there have not been plaques created for the award winners in the past. The applicant or owner of the building receives a print of the art piece, and the runners-up receive the plaque.

Don Roll asked to share a comment. He is fairly certain that both a plaque and an art piece were received for a previous Historic Preservation Award. Planner Klopfenstein shared a correction with the Board. There were two winners last year and he believes there were two plaques. If the Board would like there to be both an art piece and plaque for the award winner, this can be done. Discussions were had about the two Board Members who will serve on the Artist Selection Committee. Board Member Holmgren and Board Member Beatlebrox offered to serve on the Committee. There was Board Member support for this.

B. Thaynes Hoist House Mine Site – Historic District Grant – The Applicant Requests a \$24,950 Grant to Repair the Historic Mine Hoist House, Garage Door Facade, Shaft Tower, and Watchmen Shed of the Significant Historic Site. PL-25-06705.

Manager Martin presented the Staff Report and explained that there is a Historic District Grant application for the Thaynes Hoist House Mine Site. This is located at the southeast corner of Park City Mountain Resort and is one of the more remote historic mining sites. It is a Significant Historic Site and has several historic structures and remnants. The three structures that are designated on the Historic Sites Inventory include the Hoist House, Conveyor Gallery, and the Fire Hydrant Shack. She shared an image of the Hoist House.

The structures have been impacted by snow loads. In 2023, the Hoist House roof collapsed, which prompted an emergency grant funding request and Historic Preservation Board

approval for Material Deconstruction of the roof materials. That was approved on August 7, 2024. The Final Action Letter from August 7, 2024, included several Conditions of Approval, which have been met with subsequent submittals, including an update to the Historic Preservation Board from the applicant. This took place on February 5, 2025. On December 23, 2025, the applicant submitted an HDDR Pre-Application for the Thaynes Mine Site Preservation. That HDDR Pre-Application included the as-built drawings, construction plans, and physical conditions, as well as the Historic Preservation Plan.

On January 2, 2026, the Planning Director issued an HDDR Pre-Waiver Letter for the Thaynes Mine preservation project to repair the Mine Site Hoist House, garage door facade, shaft tower, watchmen shed, fire hydrant shed, and ore shed facade.

The funding request is for \$24,950, and that is 50% of the scope of work for the support stabilization of the 1937 Hoist House Structure with reinforced walls, new concrete pads, repaired windows, entry door, and reconstruction of the 1937 roof form, and installation of security equipment. The grant funding would be sourced from the Citywide fund, which currently has a balance of \$47,136. Manager Martin explained that this is the beginning balance of the fiscal year, as there have not been any grants approved yet from that fund.

Manager Martin shared an image with the Board. The gray shaded sections indicate where there is no restoration work proposed. Those parts of the structure were built after 1937 and are not proposed to be restored at this time. Manager Martin reported that the Historic Hoist House is clad in corrugated metal material and that much of the interior equipment remains intact. The building is in poor condition with broken windows, sections in various states of collapse, and no roof. Staff recommended that the Historic Preservation Board review and score the Historic District Grant application for the Thaynes Hoist House, open a public hearing, and determine whether a grant should be awarded. She noted that members of Friends of the Ski Mining Mountain History and the Park City Historical Society are present.

Board Member Beatlebrox stated that she filled out the form and gave it a score of 19 points. She is in favor of providing the grant so this work can be done. Other Board Members also expressed support to provide grant funding for the project. Board Member Gackle reported that he gave this a high score as well. While this is a significant portion of the Citywide fund, it is also a large project, so the requested cost seems to be justified. Chair Stephens pointed out that the fiscal year is halfway over at this point. He feels comfortable approving the amount that has been requested. He agreed that this is a meaningful project.

Chair Stephens opened the public hearing.

Don Roll lives in the 84060 zip code. On behalf of his colleagues, he expressed appreciation for the support the City has provided over the years. This grant will be a significant part of the Hoist House reconstruction. He thanked the Board and the City.

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

MOTION: Board Member Gackle moved to APPROVE a \$24,950 Historic District Grant to the Park City Historical Society and Friends of Ski Mountain Mining History for restoration work of the Thaynes Hoist House and facade of the historic ski era addition, based on the following:

Background:

1. On August 7, 2024, the Historic Preservation Board approved the Material Deconstruction of the historic roof materials of the Hoist House, including the roof materials of the later additions to the Hoist House, after the roof collapsed due to heavy snow loads in the winter of 2023.
2. On January 2, 2026, the Planning Department issued a Historic District Design Review-Pre Application waiver letter for the proposed Thaynes Mine Site Restoration scope of work.

Findings of Fact:

1. The Thaynes Mine Hoist House, Conveyor Gallery, and Fire Hydrant Shack are designated Historic Structures on Park City's Historic Sites Inventory, making up the Significant Historic Site.
2. The Applicant submitted a Historic District Grant Application in Fiscal Year 2026, Quarter 1 to assist with the cost of restoration efforts of the Thaynes Hoist House and ski façade addition, specifically to:
 - Straighten and reinforce the Hoist House walls;
 - Construct a new steel roof to withstand snow loads;
 - Repair and replace broken window panes with steel security grids;
 - Rebuild the historic skier subway garage door façade;
 - Protect the shaft tower with a weatherproof enclosure.
3. The total cost of the scope of work described in the Historic District Grant Application is \$49,900 and the funding request is \$24,950.
4. The grant funding will be sourced from the Citywide General fund.

Conclusions of Law:

1. The Historic Preservation Board determined the grant request qualifies for a Historic District Grant award in the amount of \$24,950.

Conditions of Approval:

1. Improvements shall be completed in compliance with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and the Conditions of Approval of the Historic District Design Review Pre-Application Waiver Letter, dated January 2, 2026.
2. 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.
3. The grantee shall complete the work funded by the Historic District Grant within two years of Building Permit issuance.
4. The Applicant shall submit a photograph of completed work to Planning Staff.
5. The grantee shall submit proof of payment to the Planning Department for disbursement of funds within 30 days of final inspection.
6. 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 Hutchings seconded the motion.

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

The Historic Preservation Board took a short break before hearing the next agenda item.

- C. **200 King Road – Appeal of Historic District Design Review Pre-Application Waiver Letter – The Appellant Appeals the Planning Director Approval to Install Two 15-Foot-Tall Poles Within the Platted Building Area Limits of 200 King Road, Lot 1 of the Treasure Hill Subdivision Phase 1 Plat, in the Historic Residential – 1 Master Planned Development Zoning District. PL-25-06730.**

Chair Stephens asked if there were any Board Member disclosures, which was denied.

Manager Martin explained that this item is an appeal of an HDDR Pre-Application Waiver Letter for 200 King Road. The Historic Preservation Board is the Appeal Authority for appeals of the Planning Director's final action regarding Design Guidelines for Historic Districts and Historic Sites. The Historic Preservation Board shall act in a quasi-judicial manner and review factual matters on the record, with deference to the Land Use Authority. The Appeal Authority shall determine the correctness of the Land Use Authority's interpretation and application of the plain meaning of the land use regulations. The Appeal

Authority shall interpret and apply a land use regulation to favor a land use application unless the land use regulation plainly restricts the land use application.

200 King Road is a vacant lot and is Lot 1 of the Treasure Hill Subdivision Phase 1 in the Sweeney Properties Master Planned Development ("MPD"). On August 23, 1990, the City Council adopted Ordinance No. 90-24, zoning the property HR-1-MPD. On August 26, 2025, the property owner of 200 King Road submitted an HDDR Pre-Application to install two 15-foot-tall poles on the property. On August 28, 2025, the Planning Director issued the HDDR Pre-Application Waiver Letter for the poles. The letter required the poles to be relocated to be within the platted building area limits. On September 26, 2025, the City issued Building Permit 25-2107 for the poles within the platted building area limits. On October 17, 2025, the appellant submitted "Appeal of a Land Use Determination," appealing the Building Permit, Allowed Use Review, and Architectural Review. On January 2, 2026, the applicant submitted a reply to the appeal. This is seen as Exhibit F in the Meeting Materials Packet.

Manager Martin reported that the purview of the Historic Preservation Board review is the appeal of the HDDR Pre-Application Waiver Letter. The first question for the Board to consider has to do with the timing of the appeal submittal. The LMC states that decisions by the Planning Director regarding the Design Guidelines of Historic Districts and Historic Sites may be appealed within 30 days after the day on which a written decision is issued. In this case, the written decision was issued on August 28, 2025. The appellant submitted the appeal on October 17, 2025, which is 50 days after the HDDR Pre-Application Waiver Letter was issued. However, because the City does not mail or post notice of HDDR Pre-Application Waiver Letter, the appellant argues they did not have notice until there was observation of the poles on October 13, 2025. The first question is whether the appeal was untimely and should be dismissed or if the date of construction constitutes notice.

Chair Stephens asked about the date of Building Permit issuance. Manager Martin explained that Building Permit issuance would not necessarily be part of the determination of the commencement period to submit an appeal. It would either be the date the HDDR Pre-Application Waiver Letter was issued, which was August 28, 2025, or the date of the construction. Chair Stephens noted that 30 days from the Building Permit issuance on September 26, 2025, would be October 26, 2025, and the appeal was filed on October 17, 2025. The appellant would be within the 30-day period when considering that kind of notice.

It was reiterated that there are no noticing requirements for an HDDR Pre-Application Waiver Letter. Chair Stephens determined that there should be comments shared by the appellants and applicant about the timing issue. Justin Keys and Wade Budge introduced themselves to the Historic Preservation Board. Mr. Keys explained that he represents the applicant, and Mr. Budge represents the appellant. There was agreement to concede this point.

The second question for the Historic Preservation Board is whether the Planning Director correctly approved the HDDR Pre-Application Waiver Letter. The Staff Report explains that the Planning Director approved the Pre-Application Waiver for the two 15-foot-tall poles at 200 King Road correctly. The poles are allowed in the HR-1-MPD Zoning District, as they are not considered a freestanding antenna, which is prohibited in the zone. Contrary to the

appellant's argument, neither a pole nor a camera is an antenna, nor do those constitute a telecommunications facility, according to the definition in the LMC. The galvanized pipe material used for the poles is compatible with the character of the Sweeney Properties MPD and complies with the regulations for Historic Districts and Historic Sites.

The appellant representatives, Mr. Budge and Jason Boal, introduced themselves to the Board. Mr. Budge and Mr. Boal are representing Pesky Porcupine, LLC, which is the property owner for 220 King Road. Tatiana Prince is an owner of Pesky Porcupine, LLC, and is in the audience in case there are questions she might need to answer. He thanked Mr. Keys for conceding the point about the timeliness of the submittal. Mr. Budge shared an image of one of the two poles and explained that the primary concern is that two poles have been constructed within the building limits. The two cameras are off the property line, but the arrows in the presentation materials denote where the cameras are pointing. Only one of the four cameras is pointed at the 200 King Road property. The other three are pointed at the 220 King Road site for the purpose of monitoring what is being done there.

The code contemplates a waiver of process, but not a waiver of the requirement that an applicant show the use is allowed in the zone. Mr. Budge mentioned 15-11-12 – Historic District or Historic Site Review and read the following language: “The Planning Department shall review and approve, approve with conditions, or deny all Historic District/Historic Site review applications involving an allowed use, a conditional use, or any use associated with a Building Permit, to build, locate, construct, remodel, alter, or modify any building, accessory building, or structure, or site located within the Park City Historic Districts or Historic Sites, including fences and driveways.” In this case, there was a waiver granted.

There has been a lot of discussion about telecommunication facilities and antennas, but in this instance, there is no use in the Use Table that mentions a security camera or pole camera. There is a use listed for a telecommunication facility. If there is a belief that this is a telecommunication facility, this applicant should have gone to the Planning Commission to move through the Conditional Use Permit (“CUP”) process, which did not happen.

Mr. Budge read from 15-1-8, which states: “No new use shall be valid on any property within the City unless the use is allowed.” In this case, there is a vacant site on 200 King Road and a site that is under construction on 220 King Road. There is no structure on 200 King Road to be protected with a security camera or for a camera to be attached. Instead, a pole has been installed. That is not an allowable use. The application states that the applicant applied for an outdoor surveillance system connected to a centralized video recording server. This indicates that there is a camera sending images to a server. Cameras have been attached to a pole, which is operating in a similar manner to an antenna. Mr. Budge argued that this is a telecommunications facility. That means there should be a CUP process so there can be appropriate mitigation measures, but a CUP was not pursued.

Mr. Budge asked the Historic Preservation Board to consider whether the use is allowed and whether the appropriate materials have been selected. He also requested that the Board consider the purpose of cameras that face a neighboring property. There are no improvements to protect, and the original location was proposed to be on the property line.

Mr. Budge mentioned the galvanized material. In the Staff Report, it is indicated that galvanized material is allowable and that chain link can be allowed in certain circumstances. However, if the use was allowed, there would need to be a more appropriate material.

Mr. Budge stated that this is not an allowable use, the materials are not appropriate for the site, and there are concerns about safety and privacy. At some point, these cameras will be looking into a bedroom, so other laws will come into effect concerning privacy. Board Member Hutchings asked if his argument is that attaching security cameras to a metal pole is not allowed, which was confirmed. It was also argued that the material is inappropriate.

Mr. Keys explained that he is present on behalf of the applicants, Susan Fredston-Hermann and Eric Hermann, who reside next door. The applicants own 200 King Road, which is vacant, but their home is right below that address. This is essentially their backyard, and they are full-time residents. 200 King Road has a driveway that runs through it that accesses 220 King Road. It is a non-exclusive driveway that is meant to service both 200 and 220 King Road. That is the driveway that all of the construction vehicles have used and is the reason a security camera was installed. This is a secluded location and there was a desire to see who was coming and going each day. The Hermanns wanted a recording in the event that something happened. The intention is simply to secure the property.

Mr. Keys commented that Staff did an excellent job analyzing the LMC in this instance. He explained that this is not an antenna, as a camera is not mentioned in the definition. He agrees that the HR-1 Zone is not a place where there should be large cell phone towers and antennas, because it detracts from the nature of the zone, but cameras are a different matter. Mr. Keys pointed out that many people have doorbell cameras to monitor who is coming and going from a home. He mentioned Exhibit F in the Meeting Materials Packet. On Page 4, there is a picture of a set of cameras similar to the cameras that have been installed. Those cameras were actually placed by Pesky Porcupine shortly after they acquired the property. Those cameras are pointed directly at the home of his client. Mr. Keys added that a use is an allowed use unless it is specifically prohibited by the code.

Board Member Beatlebrox mentioned a road that leads to the properties. She wanted to better understand the access in the area. Mr. Keys explained that when the Treasure Hill Subdivision was originally platted, 200 King Road was not adjacent to King Road. The developer determined that there needed to be access to 200 King Road, so there was a shared driveway easement across the back of 200 King Road to access 220 King Road. When his clients acquired 200 King Road, it was acquired subject to that easement.

Board Member Gackle asked if there is a rebuttal to the point about the materials used. Mr. Keys explained that the regulations that were noted are regulations regarding structures. There has not been a provision cited that governs this type of use. There are also galvanized poles throughout the HR-1 Zone, so he does not agree that the material is inappropriate in the area. Board Member Noble asked about the material of the actual cameras. Mr. Keys reported that the camera information is included in the application, but it is a type of plastic. Manager Martin clarified that the camera materials are not specifically regulated. There are regulations for lighting fixtures in a separate section of the code, but not for cameras.

Board Member Beatlebrox wanted to understand the primary purpose of the cameras. Mr. Keys reported that the primary purpose is to secure the rear portion of the client's property during the construction process, since there are people coming and going across the lot. Board Member Gackle asked if the cameras would be temporary and only there during construction. Mr. Keys stated that he would have to consult with his client. He does not believe the intention is for the cameras to be permanent, but to address immediate concerns.

Board Member Scott explained that he wants to clearly understand the purview of the Historic Preservation Board. Chair Stephens reported that the Board is currently acting as an Appeal Authority, which is different than what the Board normally does during Historic Preservation Board Meetings. He asked the City Attorney for additional clarification. Senior City Attorney, Mark Harrington, stated that the Board is looking at the two issues raised by the appellants in their Exhibit B submittal. The Historic Preservation Board is looking to determine whether Staff erred in their application of a definition or of the code.

Manager Martin reviewed some of the information in the Staff Report and reiterated that the Appeal Authority shall determine the correctness of the Land Use Authority's interpretation and application of the plain meaning of the land use regulations. The Appeal Authority shall interpret and apply a land use regulation to favor a land use application unless the land use regulation plainly restricts the land use application. The Board should be looking at whether the HDDR Pre-Application Waiver Letter was approved correctly or incorrectly. As for the appellant's argument that the poles and cameras constitute a telecommunication facility, there is information about telecommunications facilities included in the Meeting Materials Packet. It outlines what a telecommunications facility actually is, as defined by the code.

Planning Director, Rebecca Ward, reported that it was not only the zoning that was looked into. This property is part of the Sweeney Properties MPD, and it has also been platted. It is a vacant lot, but it is not only subject to the zoning setbacks, height, and those types of regulations. There are additional limitations and restrictions for this lot, including the building area limits. When the application was submitted, there was a review done for compliance.

Mr. Budge responded to some of the comments that have been made. He noted that there has not been an explanation provided by the applicant about the orientation of the cameras. Three of the cameras are pointed at the appellant's property at a height of 15 feet. It seems appropriate for the appellants to monitor their own property, but the reason this matter is before the Historic Preservation Board is that there was an application for a permanent structure with footings buried deep into the ground. As for the use, it would be a different matter if this were an accessory use. However, in this case, the structure on this property is the pole and the camera. He shared the Use Table and reiterated the different concerns.

Mr. Keys reported that this is an ancillary use. He reiterated that the appellants put a camera up before there were any structures on the property. The appellants had a desire to secure their property, and that is also what is happening in this case. He added that the cameras are not a telecommunication facility and requested that the actions of Staff be confirmed.

Director Ward shared 15-2.2-2 – Uses information with the Historic Preservation Board. Allowed uses include accessory uses. The definition of an accessory use is incidental or subordinate to the primary use. Mr. Budge reported that the camera on the client's property is attached to a pre-existing structure and is only pointed at their own property. That is different than installing 15-foot poles and having cameras pointed at a neighboring property. In this instance, there is no accessory use on the property because there is no primary use.

Chair Stephens suggested that the Board discuss the materials first. Board Members did not have an issue with the galvanized pipe material that was used. Chair Stephens pointed out that there is typically galvanized metal used on mining buildings not far from this property. Chair Stephens does not believe there was an error with the materials. The Historic Preservation Board agreed with the waiver letter on the materials used.

Chair Stephens noted that the Board will next discuss the use. Board Member Noble stated that her concern is the definition of a telecommunications facility. The question is whether a camera is a similar communication signal to a radio or television. The purpose of radio and television is for something more publicly used, while the purpose of a security camera is most often for private use. She takes issue with where the cameras are pointed, but noted that this is not within the purview of the Historic Preservation Board. She does not believe this is a telecommunications device because it is intended for private use. Board Member Hutchings does not believe this would be considered a telecommunications device. Other Board Members agreed that what has been described is not a telecommunications device.

Board Member Gackle explained that he is trying to wrap his head around this being accessory to a primary use, because there is nothing on the property. Chair Stephens understood his point, but essentially, the accessory structure had been built before the primary structure. He is not sure if it is regulated within the code. For example, it might be possible to build a garage first and then build a house later. Chair Stephens does not believe that anything that has been presented indicates the Planning Director erred in the HDDR Pre-Application Waiver Letter. Board Member Noble expressed concerns about the precedent of having cameras placed everywhere. She does not believe that is a neighborly approach.

Board Member Gackle stated that a lot of the arguments presented were not fully relevant to the purview of the Historic Preservation Board. As for what is within the purview of the Board, he feels this is a fairly straightforward situation, and there appears to be consensus. Board Member Gackle encouraged there to be mediation between the two parties. Attorney Harrington reported that there is a Draft Final Action Letter included in the Meeting Materials Packet. Based on the Board discussion, the motion can be to deny the appeal, with direction to modify the Draft Final Action Letter to strike the timeliness provisions.

MOTION: Board Member Hutchings moved to DENY the Appeal of the HDDR Pre-Application Waiver for 200 King Road, based on the following, as amended:

Background:

1. 200 King Road is Lot 1 of the Treasure Hill Subdivision Phase 1, in the Sweeney Properties Master Planned Development (MPD), within the Historic Residential-1-MPD (HR-1-MPD) Zoning District.
2. On August 23, 1990, the City Council adopted Ordinance No. 90-24, zoning the property HR-1-MPD, which established specific Building requirements, Lot and Site standards, and design criteria for properties within the Sweeney Properties MPD.

Findings of Fact:

1. On August 26, 2025, the property owner submitted an HDDR Pre-Application to the Planning Department for the installation of two 15-foot-tall poles at 200 King Road.
2. On August 28, 2025, the Planning Director issued an HDDR Pre-Application Waiver Letter approving the two 15-foot-tall poles, pursuant to the requirements of the Land Management Code and Treasure Hill Subdivision Phase I Building Area Limits.
3. Land Management Code (LMC) § 15-1-18(E) states: “[a] decision by the historic preservation authority which is a decision by Staff regarding the Design Guidelines for Historic Districts and Historic Sites, may be appealed within 30 days after the day on which the historic preservation authority issues a written decision.”
4. Consistent with past practice and in accordance with the LMC, the Planning Department did not mail or post a notice of the HDDR Pre-Application Waiver Letter issued by the Planning Director on August 28, 2025.
5. The Appellant observed the finished poles at 200 King Road on October 13, 2025.
6. On October 17, 2025, fifty days after the Planning Director issued the HDDR Pre-Application Waiver Letter approving the two 15-foot-tall poles at 200 King Road, the Appellant submitted the “Appeal of a Land Use Determination” application to the Planning Department, appealing the “Building Permit, Allowed Use Review and Architectural Review.”
7. The two 15-foot-tall poles were approved within the platted Building Area Limits of Lot 1 of the Treasure Hill Subdivision Phase 1, in the HR-1-MPD Zoning District, which does not prohibit the installation of 15-foot-tall poles.

8. A pole is not an Antenna, pursuant to the definition of Antenna in LMC § 15-15-1 Definitions, which states that an Antenna is “[a] transmitting or receiving device used in Telecommunications that radiates or captures radio, television, or similar communication signals”.
9. Pursuant to LMC § 15-15-1 Definitions, a “pole” nor a “camera” is an “Antenna” nor do they, together, constitute a “Telecommunications Facility”, which consists of “Antenna, Equipment, Shelters and related Structures used for transmitting and/or receiving Telecommunications and/or radio signals.”
10. Pursuant to LMC § 15-13-8(A)(11), the Master List of Non-Historic Materials and Finishes pertains to external siding materials for use on new residential infill buildings and therefore is not applicable to poles.
11. 200 King Road is within the Sweeney Properties MPD and the HR-1-MPD Zoning District; properties in the HR-1-MPD Zoning District are bound by different standards than properties within the HR-1 Zoning District, pursuant to Ordinance No. 90-24; the galvanized pipe material used for the poles is compatible with the character of the Sweeney Properties MPD.

Conclusions of Law:

1. The Planning Director correctly applied the LMC in the August 28, 2025 HDDR Pre-Application Waiver Letter approving the two 15-foot poles at 200 King Road, according to the HR-1-MPD requirements, the Sweeney Properties MPD, and the Regulations for New Residential Infill Construction (and Non-Historic Sites) In Historic Districts (LMC § 15-13-8).

Board Member Scott seconded the motion.

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

8. ADJOURNMENT

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

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

The Historic Preservation Board Meeting adjourned at approximately 7:32 p.m.