



**PARK CITY MUNICIPAL CORPORATION  
HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD MEETING  
MARSAC MUNICIPAL BUILDING  
COUNCIL CHAMBERS  
445 MARSAC AVENUE  
PARK CITY, SUMMIT COUNTY, UTAH  
MINUTES OF MARCH 4, 2026**

**BOARD MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE:** Douglas Stephens – Chair, Puggy Holmgren, Katie Noble, Lola Beatlebrox, Dalton Gackle, Randy Scott (attending virtually)

**EX OFFICIO MEMBERS:** Rebecca Ward, Planning Director; Elissa Martin, Project Planning Manager; Jacob Klopfenstein, Planner II; Mark Harrington, Senior City Attorney; Meredith Covey, Planner II; Dave Thacker, Chief Building Official; Becky Gutknecht, Assistant City Engineer; Lillian Zollinger, Planner III

**1. CALL TO ORDER**

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

**2. ROLL CALL**

All Board Members were present with the exception of Board Member John Hutchings.

**3. MINUTES APPROVAL**

**A. Consideration to Approve the Historic Preservation Board Meeting Minutes from February 2, 2026.**

**MOTION:** Board Member Holmgren moved to APPROVE the Historic Preservation Board Meeting Minutes from February 2, 2026. Board Member Beatlebrox seconded the motion.

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

**4. STAFF AND BOARD COMMUNICATIONS AND DISCLOSURES**

Board Member Gackle reported that he is a liaison to the Board for Preservation Utah. Preservation Utah recently released the nomination form for their annual Most Endangered List for places around the State. If anyone is interested in nominating a place in the State or in Summit County, it is now possible for that nomination to be made.

There were no further Staff or Board communications and disclosures.

## 5. **PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS**

Chair Stephens opened the public communications portion of the meeting.

*Rick Sanders* stated that he lived at 1120 Woodside Avenue for a long time, and during the Olympics, he built another place in Wyoming. He pointed out that if 1060 Woodside Avenue is moved further to the corner of the lot, it will impact both pedestrians and vehicle traffic. As far as an addition, he is not sure that would be appropriate on the lot.

There were no further public communications.

## 6. **WORK SESSION**

### A. **Historic District Grant Program – The Historic Preservation Board Will Provide Feedback to Staff on Improvements to the Grant Program, Specifically Regarding the Annual Funding Amounts Allocated to the Redevelopment Areas and the Citywide General Fund.**

Planner II, Jacob Klopfenstein, and Project Planning Manager, Elissa Martin, presented the Staff Report and explained that this Work Session item is related to the Historic District Grant Program. Planner Klopfenstein reported that the program started in 1987 and it awards grants for the rehabilitation and preservation of Significant and Landmark Historic Structures in Park City. The mission statement of the program was read aloud and is as follows:

- The Park City Historic District Grant Program is designed to financially incentivize the preservation, rehabilitation, restoration, and reconstruction of Historic Structures and Sites in order to create a community that honors its past and encourages historic preservation.

Historic District Grant Program funds are awarded in three different funds. There are two Redevelopment Area (“RDA”) funds, which includes the Lower Park RDA and Main Street RDA. Grant requests for sites that are not within those RDAs are dispersed from the General Fund. Planner Klopfenstein stated that the funding has been the same since at least 2015:

- Citywide General Fund: \$47,136;
- Lower Park Avenue RDA: \$50,000;
- Main Street RDA: \$30,000.

The funding runs concurrently with the Fiscal Year for the City. The current funding cycle ends on June 30, 2026, and the next funding cycle for Fiscal Year 2027 begins on July 1, 2026. Planner Klopfenstein shared a map of the area and noted that the RDA locations

are indicated in different colors. The green represents the Lower Park Avenue RDA and the yellow represents the Main Street RDA. He reiterated that sites that do not fall within the RDA boundaries would be dispersed from the General Fund. Another map was reviewed. Planner Klopfenstein explained that the green points shown on the map represent Landmark Historic Sites and the purple points shown on the map represent Significant Historic Sites.

Planner Klopfenstein reported that there are more Historic Sites within the Main Street RDA than there are in the Lower Park Avenue RDA. Since there are more Historic Sites in the Main Street RDA and outside of the RDA zones, more grant requests will require funds from the General Fund and the Main Street RDA than the Lower Park Avenue RDA. Staff recommends the Historic Preservation Board consider increasing the grant amounts that are available for sites outside the RDA boundaries and within the Main Street RDA. The recommendations from Staff were shared with the Historic Preservation Board:

- Citywide General Fund: \$27,864 increase (\$75,000 total);
- Lower Park Avenue RDA: no increase (\$50,000 total); and
- Main Street RDA: \$45,000 increase (\$75,000 total).

Board Member Puggy Holmgren asked where the additional funds would come from. Planner Klopfenstein explained that this would be part of the budget request that is made to the City Council each year. Manager Martin reported that there has been some research conducted and it is possible to look into alternative sources for program funding in the future.

Planner Klopfenstein explained that there is a desire to receive feedback from the Board during the Work Session discussion. The Historic District Grant Program is currently only available for Landmark and Significant Historic Sites. When the City updated the General Plan last year, one of the recommendations was to incentivize the preservation of historic resources associated with the Ski Era, such as A-Frame dwellings from the 1960s and 1970s. Planner Klopfenstein reported that the Historic Preservation Board can consider expanding the eligibility for the grant program to include those Ski Era resources.

The current criteria for Historic District Grant Program evaluation was provided. Planner Klopfenstein posed the following question to the Board for consideration and discussion:

- Does the Historic Preservation Board find the current evaluation criteria provides a meaningful evaluation of the grant applications or would the Historic Preservation Board like to discuss potential updates during the Work Session in April?

Chair Stephens suggested that the Board first discuss the proposed funding increases. There was Board Member support for the increases mentioned. Board Member Katie Noble reported that she ran the numbers for inflation and the funding is 86% less now than in the 1980s when the program was started. With this adjustment, it will be 78% of what used to be budgeted for historic preservation. She expressed support for what has

been proposed. Board Member Randy Scott was supportive of the proposal, but noted that it might be a difficult year to make this request since tax revenues will be down. Planning Director, Rebecca Ward, reported that the next step involves coordination with the budget and finance teams. This item can then be forwarded to the City Council for their consideration.

Board Member Scott mentioned funding in the Lower Park RDA. In Fiscal Year 2024, there was \$38,600 used, and in Fiscal Year 2025, there was nothing used. He proposed some be pulled out of the Lower Park RDA, because there are not as many relevant properties there as in the other areas. Director Ward stated that this can be considered within the limitations of the funds. There can be additional information brought back to the Board.

Planner Klopfenstein reiterated the earlier question about evaluation criteria. Board Member Holmgren mentioned the A-Frames and noted that those are now within the 50-year criteria. She asked if the 50-year criteria will remain. Planner Klopfenstein believed the 50-year time horizon is one of the reasons that preservation of the Ski Era resources was mentioned in the General Plan. He asked Board Members for feedback about whether there is support to expand the grant program so Ski Era resources will be eligible to receive future grants.

Chair Stephens asked to have a more robust discussion about the Historic District Grant Program criteria in April. There is a desire to further consider the evaluation criteria. He noted that there have been concerns about whether the Board has the information needed to evaluate competing grants. Board Member Noble also wanted to discuss this further at the next Work Session. Planner Klopfenstein asked if there are items that appear to be missing from the rubric. Board Member Gackle mentioned the timeliness of the project, as that was something that was debated during a previous Historic District Grant Project discussion. Planner Klopfenstein confirmed that the urgency of the work can be added.

There was Board Member support to discuss the evaluation criteria further at the next Work Session. Planner Klopfenstein noted that he can look into other jurisdictions with a similar program to see what their criteria looks like. Information will be brought back to the Board.

Planner Klopfenstein explained that the next topic of discussion has to do with the type of work that is eligible for a grant. He shared a list of eligible work for the grant program:

- Repairing/restoring/replacing windows;
- Repointing masonry;
- Repairing or replacing roofs;
- Painting exterior;
- Electrical updating;
- Upgrading mechanical systems;

- Upgrading insulation;
- Reconstructing historic porches;
- Restoring historic features.

Planner Klopfenstein shared a list of work that is ineligible for the grant program:

- Acquisition costs;
- New additions;
- Landscaping/flatwork;
- Interior remodeling/new finishes;
- Interior paint.

The following question was posed to the Historic Preservation Board for consideration:

- Does the Historic Preservation Board find the scope of eligible work helps achieve the goals of the Historic District Grant Program or would the Historic Preservation Board like to re-evaluate qualifying projects?

Chair Stephens reiterated that there should be a more robust discussion during the Historic Preservation Board Meeting in April. Some of the comments the Board has made about the program have had to do with increased visibility in the community. Board Member Lola Beatlebrox mentioned the list of eligible items. Electrical updating and updating mechanical systems do not necessarily fit within the evaluation criteria. Most of the grants that come to the Historic Preservation Board do not include only electrical updating or updates to mechanical systems, but it is important to consider the evaluation criteria in that context.

Board Member Gackle would be interested in having a discussion about landscape work. There was a previously approved grant that had a historic retaining wall. He wondered how that would fit into the list of eligible work. There might need to be something added to the list for the replication or restoration of historic features in the landscaping. Planner Klopfenstein believed there is a desire for the list to match what the rubric is seeking to evaluate. Chair Stephens suggested that the future Work Session discussion consider what the Historic District Grant Program is trying to encourage. Board Member Gackle noted that environmental factors could be considered in eligible work, such as mold removal and remediation. Planner Klopfenstein summarized the Board Member feedback provided.

Director Ward noted that it is possible outline the current application process during the next Work Session. Board Member Noble pointed out that a grant application can sound like a challenging process. It would be meaningful to make it clear to property owners this is actually a fairly straightforward process. Board Member Holmgren stated that many are unaware that there is a grant program. She stressed the importance of communication.

Manager Martin mentioned the Duval Study from 2018. There were many recommendations made at that time for the improvement of the Historic District Grant Program. A lot of those recommendations have been implemented since then, but there are still some that have not been. She asked the Board for feedback on those items, which includes the following:

- Establish a communications strategy to raise awareness of the Historic District Grant Program;
- Establish a regular annual cycle of reporting to the Historic Preservation Board, Mayor and City Council, and the public;
- Create a database of projects to track from the time of the award to when the grant is paid out. (Planning Staff has started to do this);
- Define a target list of investment priorities/locations where the Historic District Grant Program can make a difference and review it annually.

Planner Klopfenstein posed another question to the Historic Preservation Board:

- What other information would the Board like to see for the next Work Session regarding the Historic District Grant Program?

Chair Stephens reported that there is a desire to look at how Ski Era properties would fit into the Historic District Grant Program, because those do not fit in smoothly at this point. He noted Ski Era designs are broader than A-Frames. Planner Klopfenstein thanked the Board for their feedback and confirmed that there will be preparation ahead of the next Work Session. Board Member Gackle shared a suggestion to increase the visibility of the program. It is possible for a grant recipient to be given a small plaque that is displayed on the home. If others in the neighborhood see that plaque, it could increase awareness of the grant program. Board Member Holmgren noted that there were previously signs placed in front of properties when the grant was awarded, so that is something that could be explored.

**B. External Siding Materials in the Historic Districts – The Historic Preservation Board will Review and Provide Feedback on the Draft Master List of Materials and Finishes.**

Manager Martin presented the Staff Report and explained that the next Work Session item is related to external siding materials in the Historic Districts. Land Management Code (“LMC”) 15-13-2 and 15-13-8 allows alternative or non-historic siding materials on new residential infill in the Historic Districts, if included on the Master List of Non-Historic Materials and Finishes on file with the Planning Department. On December 3, 2025, the Historic Preservation Board established the Materials Advisory Committee, which is comprised of design professionals, the City's on-call Historic Preservation Consultant, a Historic Preservation Team Planner, and two Historic Preservation Board Members. The Committee is tasked with selecting siding materials and finishes that meet baseline criteria for durability, sustainability, and compatibility with Park City's residential Historic

Districts. The Committee met on December 16, 2025, January 14, 2026, and February 10, 2026.

The alternative siding materials must meet some baseline performance measures for longevity, energy performance, durability in the climate, fire resistance, environmental benefits, and compatibility with the character of the Historic Districts. There are prohibited materials listed in the Architectural Design Guidelines in LMC 15-5-5. While these are materials prohibited across the board, they are specifically enforced in the Historic Districts.

Over the past several weeks, the Materials Advisory Committee has been developing a framework for evaluating new materials. Manager Martin shared the diagram that has been created. There were discussions about aesthetics, the compatibility of the material, and whether the material would be appropriate in the Historic Districts. The diagram makes it possible to evaluate a material in a more objective manner. Two categories were created: those that imitate natural wood in image, texture, or both, and those that do not.

Manager Martin further reviewed the draft diagram with the Historic Preservation Board. The right side focuses on the category of materials that imitate wood. The left side focuses on the category of materials that does not imitate wood. There are also sections of the diagram that focus on durability and sustainability. The Committee is currently working on identifying the specific thresholds for each performance measure identified under durability and sustainability by researching the technical data sheets for products that have been identified.

The durability characteristics identified by the Materials Advisory Committee include:

- Warranty period (lifespan);
- Water absorption;
- UV exposure/image fade;
- Freeze/thaw resistance;
- Corrosion (salt exposure);
- Impact resistance; and
- Fire resistance rating.

The sustainability characteristics identified by the Materials Advisory Committee include:

- Recycled content;
- Impact on environment during manufacture process;
- Impact of disposal/end of life; and
- Energy performance (this can be tricky with all of the variables).

Manager Martin reported that newer ways are being developed to evaluate the sustainability of a product. This includes a “declare label,” which is a label for building

products that is designed to help specifiers quickly identify products that meet their project requirements. A common product disclosure is an Environmental Product Declaration (“EPD”).

For compatibility, the LMC was used for guidance. Manager Martin shared the following:

- May not diminish historic character, must appear similar in appearance and profile to historic siding, and be applied as traditional materials were historically; it is not appropriate to introduce artificial patterns;
- Exterior elements must be of human scale and compatible with neighboring Historic Structures and reflect the character of the Historic District;
- Materials must be compatible in scale, proportion, texture, finish, and color to Historic Structure materials;
- Primary siding material shall appear similar to those on Historic Structures in the streetscape or character area.

There is work being done to reach Committee consensus on stone masonry. Manager Martin asked for Historic Preservation Board feedback on this. She explained that stone masonry was not used on residential mining era buildings, but it is a traditional material used in other eras and in other places. The LMC was updated in 2019 to prohibit stone masonry from being used on facades in the Historic District. While there are examples of homes in Old Town that have stone masonry around the garage facade, that would not be allowed now. New, non-traditional composite materials were not used historically and therefore could be considered, if compatible. There can be Board Member discussion about this.

Manager Martin reported that there are materials being discussed that come in different sizes and have different ways of being applied. Many composite materials are applied as large panels. There have been some discussions about application at the Committee level, but there is no consensus at this time. The question is whether alternative materials should be allowed to be applied in a more modern way or if there should be a requirement for them to be applied in a more traditional manner. Manager Martin asked for Historic Preservation Board feedback on the Master List diagram and the direction of the Committee at this point.

It was noted that several Committee Members are present at the meeting to share comments and material samples. Chair Stephens asked to discuss stone masonry. On the presentation slide, one of the images is stone masonry, but one of the images is slate. He does not believe that it fits into the stone masonry category. It seems like there are two issues being considered: new infill construction and additions to historic homes. Manager Martin reported that the code states that additions and residential infill should be differentiated from the historic structures so the contrast is clear. Materials can help contribute to that differentiation. The slate material is something there was a lot of back and forth about at the Materials Advisory Committee level, because it can be applied as a composite panel. It could potentially be applied in a way that would look more like a

panel rather than masonry. She asked the Board to think about new materials being applied in a non-historic manner.

Board Member Beatlebrox expressed concerns about vertical siding, but asked to hear from the Committee Members who have attended the meetings. She is open to hearing different perspectives. Cole Knight explained that he is representing Elliott Workgroup. If there is a desire to expand the material palette to imitate and blend in with the materials, that is a stark contrast to expanding the material palette so there is a broader array of materials that would allow someone to better differentiate what is historic versus non-historic. Receiving clarification from the Historic Preservation Board about that objective would be meaningful. Mr. Knight would be in favor of materials being used to differentiate from the historic elements.

Chair Stephens agreed that it makes sense to think about what there is a desire to accomplish. Board Member Beatlebrox stated that other historic places have asked for a differentiation. Mr. Knight explained that there seems to be a hesitancy to head in that direction, because of the fear that something will look out of place. It is possible to look at this issue in a more nuanced way. There could be a modern material applied in a modern way, but it could be in a scale and format that still references historic patterns and scales.

Board Member Noble discussed the stone masonry. It could be the texture of the stone that is the difference between a historic look and a more modern look. It was reiterated that there have been different opinions expressed in the Materials Advisory Committee about texture, proportions, and additions. Chair Stephens believed there needs to be a more fluid process, because materials are changing more often now. There can be additions and amendments made in the future, but there should be some consideration of the Historic District Design Review (“HDDR”) process. There can be feedback provided about the approval process.

Board Member Scott expressed appreciation for the work of the Materials Advisory Committee. He understands that designs have nuance, but he agrees with the other comments shared by Board Members. It makes sense for the historic portion of the structure to remain historic and for there to be interesting design concepts with the additions. One issue he has relates to materials and longevity. He is hoping the Committee can discuss tried and tested materials that will continue to look good over time. Chair Stephens asked what other feedback Staff would like to hear from the Board. Manager Martin stated that the durability and sustainability performance measures are easier to determine thresholds for. As for compatibility, this can continue to be discussed at a Committee level. However, there are some limitations with the code, so that will need to be considered by Planning Staff.

Director Ward stated that the work of the Materials Advisory Committee opens up the door for a new framework of review for the materials. If there is consensus on the materials for additions to historic homes and new infill, the provisions of code that would

need to be amended to facilitate more flexibility for the materials on the list could be highlighted. Board Member Noble thanked Committee Members for their efforts. Even though the diagram looks simple, it is a product of a lot of work, discussion, and thought. It will provide more clarity moving forward. Manager Martin added that the Historic Preservation Consultant has been very helpful during this process. She expressed appreciation to all involved.

Mr. Knight asked about stone masonry for an exterior cladding material. Right now, it is his understanding that there is no restriction on that as a cladding material in the HR-1 Zoning District. It is not listed on the prohibited materials, so under the current code, someone could clad an entire house in stone. The Materials Advisory Committee has expressed some apprehension about that becoming more common. It might make sense to establish a limit on the percentage of stone cladding or stone brick. He asked for Board Member feedback about stone as an exterior cladding material. Generally, when it is applied, it is done in a more modern cut and pattern so it is easily differentiated from historic architecture. This is also true with brick. It is unlikely that a modern brick would be mistaken for a historic one. Chair Stephens is not certain that the Historic Preservation Board is able to provide clear direction about that at this time. It could be further considered at a future meeting.

Manager Martin reported that at the next Committee Meeting, there can be more of a focus on the code language. Mr. Knight offered to do some research and provide examples of common historical techniques versus modern construction techniques. Chair Stephens acknowledged that there needs to be clarity so designs do not have to be redone. In addition, there needs to be clarity in the HDDR process about how to evaluate submissions.

**C. 1060 Woodside Avenue – Relocation of a Landmark Historic Structure – The Historic Preservation Board Will Conduct a Work Session to Review the Applicant's Request to Relocate a Landmark Historic Structure. PL-25-06673.**

Planner II, Meredith Covey, presented the Staff Report and explained that this Work Session item is related to 1060 Woodside Avenue. She reported that 1060 Woodside Avenue is a Landmark Historic Structure in the HR-1 Zoning District. Late last year, the property owner went through the Plat Amendment process to combine the three lots that the home sits on to reflect the existing conditions. The Sanborne Maps show that there was a previous home in 1889, which was closer to the street. By 1929, there was a home shown on maps that was located further away from Woodside Avenue. The City had a third-party Historic Preservation Consultant, Stantec, analyzing the year of construction for the existing home.

Planner Covey reported that the Stantec analysis found that the home was constructed around 1929, but there were substantial changes made to the structure in the 1970s, including the dormers and addition on the side. As part of the Work Session, Staff is

requesting input from Board Members about whether the addition contributes to the historic site. The applicant is also requesting input on their request to relocate the structure. The 1970s addition was not built in compliance with the code in effect at the time and does not qualify for the setback exceptions, unless the Historic Preservation Board determines the addition contributes to the historic integrity of the Landmark Historic Structure.

LMC 15-11-10(A)(1) lays out the requirements for a building, either attached or detached, to be designated to the Historic Sites Inventory as a Landmark Site. It must be at least 50 years old and retain historic integrity in terms of the location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association, as defined by the National Park Service for the National Register of Historic Places. It must be significant to local, regional, or national history, architecture, engineering, or culture associated with at least one of the following:

- An era that has made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history;
- The lives of persons significant in the history of the community, state, region or nation;
- The distinctive characteristics of type, period, or method of construction or the work of a notable architect or master craftsman.

The addition on the home is at least 50 years old and reflects the era of construction in the 1970s. Prominent figures in Park City history, Carl and Ruby Winters, lived in the home and were the owners when the addition was constructed. The following questions were posed:

- Is more information needed to determine whether the 1970s addition contributes to the historic integrity of the site?
- Please provide input to the applicant on whether the Historic Preservation Board may consider the 1970s addition to be historic.

Planner Covey noted that the applicant is requesting feedback on relocating the structure. The LMC requires Historic Preservation Board approval to relocate a Landmark Historic Structure. The Historic Preservation Board must find all of the following conditions are met:

- A licensed Structural Engineer has certified that the Historic Building(s) and/or Structure(s) can successfully be relocated and the applicant has demonstrated that a professional building mover will move the building and protect it while being stored;
- The proposed relocation will not have a detrimental effect on the structural soundness of the building or structure.

The applicant has provided information from a Structural Engineer to confirm that the structure could be relocated, but not that it is a necessity. Additionally, under the LMC, the Historic Preservation Board must find that one of the following has been met:

- The relocation will abate demolition; or
- The Planning Director and Chief Building Official find that the relocation will abate a hazardous condition at the present setting and enhance the preservation of the structure.

The Chief Building Official and Planning Director found that the relocation is not necessary to abate the hazardous condition at the present setting. If the Historic Preservation Board agrees with the applicant that it is necessary, the remaining question for the Board is whether the relocation enhances the preservation of the structure. The following question was asked:

- Is more information needed to determine whether the Landmark Historic Structure meets the requirements for relocation?

The applicant team is present at the Historic Preservation Board Meeting and the property owners are attending the meeting virtually. Bill Van Sickle from Van Sickle Design and Drafting introduced himself to the Board and explained that he represents the client.

There has been a discussion about the ability to lift the home and put a new foundation underneath. In addition, there is a desire to move it forward and remove it from the rear setback requirements. The proposal is to move it 9 feet to the west, but at the very minimum, to get it out of the required 10-foot setback, it would need to move 4.9 feet to the west. Part of this discussion is about whether there is support to move it 9 feet. If there is no support for the 9 feet, the question is whether there is support to move the home at least the 4.9 feet. This would move the home into compliance with the setbacks on the lot. Mr. Van Sickle reported that one of the reasons for the proposed relocation has to do with fire abatement. The concern is that plans could be made to lift the home and put it on a new foundation only to be told that the non-historic addition is not allowed to be maintained.

Justin Keys was present on behalf of the owners, who are attending the meeting virtually. His clients have made a substantial investment in the property already and are looking to make a more substantial investment. The intention of the Work Session discussion is to receive feedback from the Historic Preservation Board so there is no time and money spent on something that the Board ultimately will not support.

The first question has to do with the addition in the back. Mr. Keys reported that it is non-compliant and there is a desire to make it compliant. For whatever reason, this building was constructed far back from Woodside Avenue. When looking at moving a structure, it is important to consider what this does to the streetscape. All of the other structures are much closer to Woodside Avenue and are aligned with the historic depth. Shifting it 9 feet will bring it back into prominence on Woodside Avenue, the way that other homes on the street are. This will also bring it into compliance with the rear setback. Mr. Keys

believed the addition is historic, since the historic nature of the home has to do with the previous owners.

The property owners, Rudd and Corrine Davis, introduced themselves to the Board. Ms. Davis thanked the Historic Preservation Board for their time. She is interested to hear Board Member perspectives in order to better understand what can be done with the home.

Chair Stephens asked the Historic Preservation Board to discuss the addition. He requested more information about the date of the addition. Planner Covey reported that the consultant, Stantec, determined that it was built around the 1970s. That determination had a lot to do with the materials that were used on the outside. Chair Stephens asked how the determination about the addition will impact the structure being lifted. Planner Covey explained that if the addition were determined by the Board to be part of the Landmark Historic Structure, then if the home was lifted and moved, it would be treated as if it was part of that Landmark Historic Structure. Right now, the rear addition is within the rear setback. There is a provision in code with an exemption for historic structures. Those are allowed to exist within the setbacks. Since the rear addition is not part of the historic structure at this point, it is technically not in compliance with the code and is considered non-compliant.

It was determined that Carl Winters built the addition as part of a family project. Chair Stephens noted that there was another house he lived in as well. Board Member Beatlebrox does not believe this particular property has been discussed by the Historic Preservation Board before. Additional discussions were had about the 1970s addition. An image of the addition was shared for reference. Board Member Noble noted that the roof is very specific to 1970s resort era construction in Park City and is something that is being torn down in a lot of other areas. This has a unique feature that is specific to 1970s architecture.

Board Member Holmgren feels the addition is historic. Board Member Gackle noted that it cannot be a Landmark Historic Structure in two different ways, as it has to be from one era. In this case, there is the 1970s addition and the 1929 structure. Board Member Beatlebrox believed it would be considered a 1929 structure with a 1970s addition. It is the family that lived in the home that makes this notable and historic. Board Member Gackle asked if this would change the designation from Landmark to Significant. Director Ward denied this.

Chair Stephens asked to review the tax photographs from the 1940s. Board Member Scott believed that what makes this a Landmark Historic Structure has to do with the Winters family. Chair Stephens does not believe the original designation was made because of who lived in the home. It had to do with the age of the home. Board Member Beatlebrox noted that there is a picture in the Meeting Materials Packet that shows lap siding. Planner Covey reported that the picture currently being shared with the Board shows the structure in the 1940s. This is the earliest photo the City has, but Stantec

included some other images of the materials in the Materials Analysis that was submitted. She clarified that part of what happened to the second story in the 1970s was that it was converted into living space. That is when the dormer was added. Discussions were had about the changes made at that time.

Chair Stephens is inclined to believe the 1970s addition in the rear is not a significant part of the structure. Board Member Scott agreed. Board Member Gackle felt the ideal restoration would be to bring the house back to what the tax photograph looked like, which does not include the addition. Mr. Keys read from the Historic Sites Inventory Historic Site Form: "The house at 1060 Woodside does not closely align with any of the common house types built during the historic Park City mining era, though it was built during that time period." It was built during the Mature Mining Era, but did not look like any other buildings from that time. This house is considered special because the Winters family lived there.

Board Member Gackle noted that this is a unique architectural style in Park City, so he is more interested in that than the fact that the Winters family lived there. From what he could see on the form, the Winters family were not the original owners. Chair Stephens asked if there is agreement from the Board about the status of the 1970s addition on the rear. Board Member Gackle explained that he is torn, because this house is similar to the house on the south corner of Park Avenue and Heber Avenue. There is the Ski Era and Original Mining Era there, which is unique. There is a similar situation in this case with two different eras.

Board Member Noble requested more information about the addition. She would also like to look at it in person to see if the transition is truly an example of 1970s architecture. Chair Stephens believed the question is whether the 1970s addition is a strong example of Ski Era architecture from the 1970s or if it was simply an addition intended to create additional living space. Board Member Noble thought it was important for the Historic Preservation Board to understand the structure better before providing a clear answer about the addition.

Planner Covey reported that the second portion of the Work Session discussion has to do with a request to relocate the structure closer to the street. Mr. Keys reiterated that there is a desire to move it forward to bring it into alignment with the other homes on the street.

Board Member Beatlebrox mentioned radon and fire hazards, which indicate that there are hazardous conditions to consider on the site. Mr. Keys reported that there is a narrow rear setback. There is a 10-foot minimum setback, but this is approximately 5 feet back from the rear lot line. Chair Stephens reminded those present that under the LMC, the Historic Preservation Board has to find that one of the following is met:

- The relocation will abate demolition; or

- The Planning Director and Chief Building Official find that the relocation will abate a hazardous condition at the present setting and enhance the preservation of the structure.

In order to approve relocation of the structure, one of those two items must be met. Chair Stephens reported that the Chief Building Official did not find the location would abate a hazardous condition. He found the hazardous conditions could be abated in place. Board Member Gackle believed the relocation request has more to do with the streetscape and a potential new addition than hazards. Chair Stephens did not believe the structure was significantly out of place. Board Member Gackle did not feel the items in the LMC were met. It is not under threat of demolition and the Chief Building Official made a determination.

Board Member Noble mentioned an earlier comment that relocation would help to address the fire risk. It was noted that there is also radon that needs to be considered. Mr. Keys added that shifting it forward will meet the setback. The Board further discussed setbacks. Chair Stephens reported that there are other ways to mitigate the fire risk beyond relocation.

Chief Building Official, Dave Thacker, reported that the Residential Code is the code that governs this. It does not pay attention to setbacks specifically, but the distance from property lines and how that pertains to the structure. In this case, the rear yard of the property is 5 feet from the property line, which does not require any specific fire resistance rating. If it is less than 5 feet, that is when fire resistance rated construction comes into play. At that point, it pertains to projections, such as a roof overhang. Where this structure is currently located, it is code compliant without requiring any type of fire resistance rating at that 5-foot distance from the property line. Chair Stephens thanked him for providing this clarification.

Planner Covey summarized the Historic Preservation Board discussion. For the 1970s addition, there is not necessarily a finding from the Board that it would contribute to the historic integrity. She asked if there is more information the Board would like for a future meeting or site visit. This was denied. Chair Stephens did not believe relocation would either abate demolition or that the Chief Building Official found the relocation would abate a hazardous condition. Board Member Noble stated that she would like additional information. She would appreciate a site visit in order to better understand the conditions.

Director Ward noted that the roof form stayed the same from 1929 when the second story addition was added, with the exception of the dormer. Chair Stephens explained that when the Historic Preservation Board is considering an item, there is also thought given to whether a precedent is set for other projects. This is a large lot and there might be other solutions that have not been explored. Making the addition on the rear Significant might limit future design opportunities. The Board is looking to the LMC for direction on this matter and based on that review, it does not appear possible to move forward with the proposal, as one of the two criteria are not met. Mr. Keys noted that some Board

Members felt this could be contributing and others felt there was not enough information to make a determination.

Mr. Van Sickle explained that there is a desire to find a way to move forward so it is possible to lift the home and set it on a new foundation, but still allow the homeowners to keep the addition. From there, the intention is to add a small addition. Mr. Keys explained that the addition encroaches approximately five feet into the setback, so if it is not historic, it has to be removed if the structure is modified. The dormer on the front is what provides the ability to have habitable space in the attic. Removing those features if they are not historic impairs the ability for the owner to improve the structure. The Board further considered the proposal.

Board Member Noble stated that the requirements for moving the house are not met under the code. However, it sounds like there is a request to have the 1970s addition receive a Landmark Designation. Mr. Keys explained that at minimum, it would be possible to lift it, put it in the new basement, mitigate the radon, and set it back in the same location. Additional discussions were had about the footprint of the house and what has been proposed.

## 7. **REGULAR AGENDA**

### A. **1304 Park Avenue – The Historic Preservation Board Will Provide a Recommendation to the City Council on the Location of a Fence in the Right-of-Way at 1304 Park Avenue.**

Planner Covey presented the Staff Report and explained that this item relates to 1304 Park Avenue. The applicant is proposing to replace a fence in the right-of-way. Any structures within the right-of-way require an Encroachment Agreement. The City Council reviewed this proposal on November 18, 2025, and requested that the Historic Preservation Board provide input on the location. This led to some Work Session discussions about fences and other updates to the LMC. Staff is continuing to work through some of those Code Amendments and conduct research. In the meantime, it made sense to allow this project to move forward.

The applicant installed the fence 4 feet from the sidewalk without HDDR approval. Planner Covey shared an image of what was installed and noted that it covers the manhole cover. The applicant Site Plan was shared. The green line shows the edge of the sidewalk, the red line shows the fence, and the blue line shows the property line. She explained that the property line is 12 feet behind the sidewalk and the proposed fence encroaches into the right-of-way by approximately 8 feet 10 inches. That provides the 4-foot snow storage easement that Public Works and Engineering have discussed in the past. Both are supportive of that setback to mitigate snow storage concerns. However, the Engineering Department would require the fence to jog around the manhole cover for access.

Historically, the fences in the Historic District were set right against the sidewalk, but now there are a variety of locations for fences. Some are closer to the sidewalk and some are further. Planner Covey shared example images with the Board as well as a photograph of the previous fence at 1304 Park Avenue. There was a bit of a setback from the sidewalk and it did not follow the continuous line to the adjacent property. The Board is being asked to forward a recommendation to the City Council. There are several different options:

- The City Council allow the fence to be located 4 feet behind the sidewalk as proposed to account for snow storage concerns;
- The City Council require the applicant to locate the fence approximately 5 feet behind the curb to follow a straight line;
- The City Council require the applicant to locate the fence directly behind the sidewalk to mirror the location of historic fences;
- The City Council disallow the construction of a fence within the right-of-way.

Board Members further reviewed the images included in the presentation slides. Board Member Beatlebrox noted that during the Work Session discussions about fences, it was stated that a fence that can be seen through is preferable, but this particular fence is dense. Planner Covey clarified that the applicant installed the fence without HDDR approval from the Planning Department. If the City Council did allow for the fence to be in the right-of-way, there would still be a requirement that the applicant go through that process. As part of that process, there needs to be compliance with code requirements for fences, which involves a solid to void ratio. The new fence would be required to come into compliance.

Board Member Beatlebrox feels the fence needs to be out of the right-of-way. She asked whether the applicant would need to remove and replace the fence. Planner Zollinger explained that there is a two-step process in this case because the fence was built without the proper approvals. Board Member Gackle would rather see the fence in a more historic location. Assistant City Engineer, Becky Gutknecht, stated that openness does not necessarily help with snow storage. Whether it is a completely closed or partially voided fence, it is still not possible to push snow through with a plow, as it would damage the fence.

Chair Stephens pointed out that in this instance, the property line is at the front of the house. On City-owned property, the 4-foot setback for snow makes sense. Board Member Gackle would prefer the fence not to jog, so the 5-foot option might be preferable to the 4-foot option. Discussions were had about the location of the water meter and the manhole cover. Board Member Scott stated that the fence needs to be in compliance. Board Member Gackle asked whether the length of fence would make a notable difference as far as snow storage. Assistant Engineer Gutknecht clarified that while one individual property does not necessarily make a difference, incremental improvement over time can make a difference.

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

Director Ward mentioned the fence that is installed on the property currently. The recommendation is not to keep that, but to install a fence that is more like the design that was there previously. There seems to be consensus from the Board to update the code to make sure it is clear that there is a desire for more openness moving forward. That will be part of the recommendation shared with the City Council. The final recommendation that is needed from the Historic Preservation Board relates to the fence location at this property.

The Board discussed whether the recommendation should be for 4 feet or 5 feet. Director Ward stated that at 4 feet, there would be a jog in the fence. Chair Stephens suggested that 4 feet be the minimum, but the motion could state that there cannot be a jog in the fence. Board Member Noble asked if it would be possible to place a gate where the manhole cover is located in order to provide access without a jog in the fencing, which was confirmed. Assistant Engineer Gutknecht confirmed that a gate might be a solution, but that would need to be explored. Chair Stephens expressed concerns about accessing the area in the winter.

Director Ward explained that anything that goes into a City right-of-way requires an Encroachment Agreement. If there is utility work that needs to be done, but there is no access to the area, then the Encroachment Agreement could be removed. She noted that if there is a desire to allow a gate where the manhole is located, it could be made clear in the Encroachment Agreement that the gate will be removed if it does not remain operable.

The Historic Preservation Board further discussed the possible recommendations. Board Member Beatlebrox thought it was simpler to state that it should be located approximately 5 feet behind the curb to follow a straight line. That language is simple and clear for all involved. Planner Covey reported that the recommendation is only for this site. There will be future Work Sessions held so the Board can further discuss the Code Amendments.

**MOTION:** Board Member Beatlebrox moved to RECOMMEND that the City Council require the applicant to locate the fence approximately 5 feet behind the curb to follow a straight line, and to update the fence to be able to see through it, with spacing that is one half the width of the board. Board Member Holmgren seconded the motion.

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

**B. 322 Main Street – Material Deconstruction – The Applicant Proposes a Rooftop and Rear Addition and Changes to the Front Facade of the Landmark Historic Structure in the Historic Commercial Business District. PL-24-06265.**

Manager Martin presented the Staff Report and explained that this is a Material Deconstruction request at 322 Main Street. She reported that this is related to the Red Banjo Pizza building. The building is located at 322 Main Street and is a Landmark Historic Site in the Historic Commercial Business Zoning District. The existing building was constructed circa 1900 after the original building burned down in the fire of 1898. She shared an image of the reconstructed building circa 1900 with the original façade, which had six evenly spaced wood arches on the upper story and two symmetrical storefronts with storefront windows, inset doors, and glazed transoms. The building underwent subsequent renovations, starting with a drastic change in the 1940s and 1950s. The building was clad in masonry veneer and tile and there were modifications made to the storefront windows.

There was a subsequent renovation in the 1960s with the era of the Red Banjo Saloon. The last major renovation was in 1976, during the Recreation and Tourism Era. The 1900s façade was brought back and the second story balcony was added. There have also been changes made to the storefront windows. In 1979, the building was listed on the National Register of Historic Places as part of the Park City Main Street Historic District. The Historic Site Form notes that it retains its historic integrity as a Landmark Historic Site. Manager Martin explained that because of all the changes over time, Planning Staff requested analysis by Stantec for a detailed site history and recommendation. Based on the Historic Preservation Consultant analysis, the recommended period of significance is 1976.

Manager Martin noted that the request for Material Deconstruction includes the following:

- Remove historic roof form (non-historic material) to accommodate a rooftop addition for expanded dining;
- Remove 320 square feet of the rear siding and the historic chimney to accommodate rear addition on Swede Alley for expansion of restaurant and two new dwelling units;
- Restore Historic Structure to 1976 form and modify primary facade to install windows;
- Side walls reinforced, facades maintained.

Material Deconstruction applications must comply with LMC 15-13. The majority of the requirements in this section of code are reviewed as part of the full HDDR, which requires Planning Director Final Action during an Administrative Public Hearing. The relevant sections that apply to this Material Deconstruction request include the Rooftop Additions and Rear Additions sections of the code as well as the subsection on windows in the Requirements for Primary Facades. The Rooftop Additions information was provided:

- Up to one story in height is allowed;
- Recessed from the primary character-defining facade to preserve the perception of historic scale, height, and facade of the historic structure;
- Recessed from the facade to a distance that is at least equal to the height of the historic facade or beyond the midpoint of the structure to ensure the rooftop addition is minimally visible from the right-of-way.

The proposed rooftop addition is one story in height and is recessed from the front façade, which meets the requirements of this section of code. The proposed rear addition on Swede Alley, which would necessitate the removal of approximately 320 square feet of the rear wall and brick chimney, complies with the requirements outlined in LMC 15-13-3(B)(4). Manager Martin reported that the addition must be reduced in scale as it approaches Swede Alley to maintain pedestrian character. The addition must also be subordinate and complementary to the Main Street façade, providing both a service access and a secondary access. The design must be simple in detail and complement the character of the historic building.

The rear addition would also necessitate the Material Deconstruction of the historic chimney. Pursuant to the LMC, historic chimneys and their decorative features are important character-defining features of historic buildings and shall be preserved and maintained. The applicant proposes to repurpose the chimney bricks to be used decoratively in the building. Staff finds that because this proposal meets the requirement of a rear addition along Swede Alley, the Material Deconstruction of the chimney should be approved. It was noted that the applicant proposes removing portions of the second story siding on the primary façade within the existing arches to install windows. Manager Martin posed the following questions:

- Does the Historic Preservation Board find Material Deconstruction of portions of the second story primary facade may be allowed, pursuant to the LMC?
- If so, Staff recommends a Condition of Approval be added to require that the Material Deconstruction of the second story materials be limited to windows that meet the solid to void ration of Historic Commercial Buildings as part of the HDDR.

Manager Martin shared additional images with the Board. She reported that Material Deconstruction applications must also be evaluated through the lens of Historic Integrity, as defined by the LMC. She shared seven criteria the Board will need to consider. Staff recommends the Board review the Material Deconstruction request for 322 Main Street to:

- Remove the historic roof form to accommodate a rooftop addition;
- Remove approximately 320 square feet of the historic siding and the brick chimney on the tertiary wall to accommodate a rear addition;
- Excavate 1 foot 6.5 inches deeper for upgrades to the foundation;

- Consider removal of portions of the second story historic material on the front facade to install windows.

Staff recommends the Historic Preservation Board conduct a public hearing and consider approving the Material Deconstruction based on the Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Conditions of Approval outlined in the Draft Final Action Letter. It was noted that Planner III, Lillian Zollinger, and the applicant representative, Bryan Markkanen are present.

Board Member Gackle asked for information about how the primary façade windows will look if the changes are approved. Mr. Markkanen explained that there will be a reliance on Planning Staff. There was an initial option that would not meet the criteria, so there has been some work done to update that for compliance. Board Member Gackle wanted to know if the applicant will return the windows to the 1900s look. Mr. Markkanen reported that the upper row windows are not replaceable, because the deck is now part of the historic 1976 version of the building. The proposal is to add some upper-level windows. The windows will not be replaced to look like any former iteration of this building, but will be replaced to something similar. Discussions were had about the visibility of the rooftop patio. Mr. Markkanen added that the existing chimney is proposed to become a decorative feature.

Chair Stephens asked if there are any issues with Material Deconstruction of the rear siding. There were no Board Member concerns. Chair Stephens next asked about Material Deconstruction on the second story on the front façade. He pointed out that the windows will be discussed more specifically during the HDDR process. Manager Martin shared information about a Condition of Approval listed in the Draft Final Action Letter.

Chair Stephens opened the public hearing.

*Roxanne Toly* shared comments on behalf of her family. The family roots in Park City go back to 1860. There is a deep understanding of how important history is to the community. In 1962, her parents started the Red Banjo, and today it is the longest running family-owned business. For more than 60 years, Red Banjo has been a place where locals, visitors, and families come together to celebrate birthdays, ski days, and everyday moments. Her family is ready to build on this legacy and create the next chapter of the Red Banjo. The vision is to expand the restaurant to accommodate more guests while continuing to honor the history of the community. She shared additional information about what is envisioned on the site. This is an owner-operated small business and there are no plans to ever sell the property.

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

**MOTION:** Board Member Holmgren moved to APPROVE Material Deconstruction at 322 Main Street, as this complies with LMC 15-11-12.5, 15-13-3, and 15-2.6, according to the following:

**Findings of Fact:**

1. 322 Main Street was constructed in 1899 to replace a building previously destroyed by the 1898 Park City fire. The wood-frame, one-part commercial block building facing west to Main Street was rebuilt to house a saloon in the south half and a confectionary in the north half.
2. An 1899 historic photograph indicates the primary façade had a decorative cornice, six evenly spaced wood arches on an upper story with no fenestration, and two symmetrical storefronts with storefront windows, inset doors, and glazed transom.
3. The façade of 322 Main Street was altered multiple times from the 1920s through the 1970s.
4. The building shifted to a single tenant by 1929 and operated as a pool hall.
5. Starting in 1945, it was operated as a tavern.
6. In the 1940s, the building façade was clad in tile at the first floor and brick veneer at the upper story. The glazed storefronts were removed and a centered double door was installed. The arches on the upper floor were covered.
7. In 1962, it became the Red Banjo first operating as a bar and then as a pizza restaurant, and the following year, was renovated.
8. It appears the 1960s renovation occurred when the building was used as the Red Banjo Saloon; the masonry and tile cladding was removed and most of the façade was covered in vertical boards. No windows are apparent on the building façade and there is an inset door.
9. In 1976, the structure was renovated and the cladding was removed, uncovering and restoring the upper floor six arches. On the ground floor, two 24-light windows were added to flank central double doors. A balcony supported by wood posts was appended to the façade. The building's dentiled cornice appears to have been retained throughout its history. The building retains its 1976 appearance.
10. According to the Intensive Level Survey, Red Banjo is the oldest continuously operating restaurant in Park City.

11. The 2019 Park City Main Street Historic District Boundary Increase National Register of Historic Places nomination includes a context for a Recreation and Tourism Era (1964-1980).
12. The 1960 Olympic games in Squaw Valley, California, led to a substantial increase in skiing and resorts across the United States.
13. In 1963, the United Park City Mines opened Treasure Mountain Resort (now Park City Mountain Resort).
14. Park City businesses shifted to cater to growing tourism and many owners began renovating their historic buildings. Concurrently, the City was embracing heritage tourism and was increasingly marketed as a historic mining town.
15. Pursuant to Land Management Code (LMC) § 15-11-12.5, the Historic Preservation Board reviews Material Deconstruction to accommodate additions, new construction, and structural upgrades. Material Deconstruction must comply with LMC Chapter 15-13 *Regulations for Historic Districts and Sites*.

**Material Deconstruction of Historic Roof Form:**

16. According to the Applicant's Physical Conditions Report, the structure of the roof is "being held up by a system of wood trusses that transfer loads to a centerline of beams and columns (lengthwise) and exterior walls. These members look to be in good condition though inspection by visiting the attic space was not explored." The Applicant proposes to remove the roof and retain the existing beam structure as a decorative feature and "[t]he existing truss system will be incorporated as possible with roof boards removed and used decoratively in other parts of the building." The roof's non-historic TPO membrane will be removed.
17. LMC § 15-13-3(B)(4)(d) outlines requirements for rooftop additions:
  - a. Up to one story in height is allowed.
  - b. They must be recessed from the primary character-defining façade to preserve the perception of the historic scale, height, and façade of the historic structure.
    - i. They must be recessed from the façade to a distance that is at least equal to the height of the historic façade or beyond the midpoint of the structure to ensure the rooftop addition is minimally visible from the right-of-way.

18. The request for Material Deconstruction is to remove the roof form to accommodate an additional story. Approximately 515 square feet will provide a 20.5-foot setback from the primary historic façade, a distance that is equal to the 20.5-foot height of the historic façade.

**Material Deconstruction of Historic Rear Wall and Chimney:**

19. There are no Setback requirements in the HCB Zoning District. As a result, whether a Swede Alley addition is connected to or adjacent to the Landmark Historic Structure, the existing side and rear façades will not be visible from rights-of-way.
20. According to the Applicant's Physical Conditions Report, the walls date to approximately 1900. The wall parallel to Swede Alley is "lasting and likely original covering is a wood drop novelty or dutch drop siding" and the wall parallel to Main Street "also employs drop novelty or dutch drop siding. When the building changed business operations from a bar to a pizza restaurant, a row of glass block was removed (or covered) and original siding exposed. With the restaurant switch, a deck was also added to the façade. On this façade, on both levels, faux columns were applied directly to the siding with arch projections walls on the deck level added to simulate a windowed effect. At a later date, a door was added to one of the arched areas to allow access to the deck."
21. Regarding protection of Historic Structures, LMC § 15-13-3(B)(4)(a) outlines regulations for additions to primary commercial structures:
  - a. They should be considered only after it has been demonstrated that the proposed use cannot be accommodated solely by altering interior spaces.
  - b. They shall be considered with caution and only on non-character-defining facades, usually rear.
  - c. They should be visually subordinate to historic buildings when viewed from the right-of-way.
  - d. They shall not require significant removal of historic material.
22. LMC § 15-13-3(B)(4)(c) states that a transitional element is not needed for commercial structures if the new addition is visually differentiated from the historic structure as viewed from the right-of-way through a shift in wall plane, a change in material or pattern, or by using other design elements. Additionally, in-line additions may be appropriate when the joint between the historic structure and new addition is not visible from the right-of-way.
23. The Applicant proposes leaving the south and north walls as is when the renovation occurs and upgrading the wall structures. The mural on the

north façade will remain as is (it is inaccessible) and no new window openings on secondary facades are proposed.

24. LMC § 15-13-3(B)(4)(e) outlines requirements for rear additions fronting Swede Alley:
  - a. They must be reduced in scale as they reach Swede Alley to maintain the pedestrian character.
  - b. They must be subordinate and complementary regarding public access and streetscape or character area amenities. Rear entrances shall accommodate both service activities and secondary access.
  - c. The facades shall be simple in detail and complement the character of the building's primary entrance on Main Street.
25. The applicant proposes leaving the rear foundation wall in place and removing approximately 320 square feet of the historic siding along Swede Alley. The rear wall includes a non-historic metal door with a half lite and three non-historic windows with double pane lites and composite construction, likely installed in 2008 or thereafter when the Historic District Grant was awarded for rear window replacement.
26. The addition will be required to comply with LMC § 15-2.6-7 *Swede Alley Development Criteria*, which establishes a step down toward Swede Alley at an angle of 45 degrees to a maximum height of 24 feet at the edge of the right-of-way and the final design must be simple in detail and complementary to the Main Street facade.
27. The rear wall includes a non-historic metal door with a half lite and three non-historic windows with double pane lites and composite construction, likely installed in 2008 or thereafter when the Historic District Grant was awarded for rear window replacement.
28. LMC § 15-3-3(B)(4)(j) states historic chimneys and their decorative features are important character-defining features of historic buildings and shall be preserved and maintained.
29. The Applicant's Physical Conditions Report notes the chimney on the rear wall is not documented but is very likely historic because "[s]tandard red brick was constructed as 16" square with infill brick used to connect to the structure. One could envision it being used as part of a heating system for the building in years past." The Applicant's Historic Preservation Plan states that the chimney could be retained but would be absorbed into the building and de-constructed. Rather, they propose retaining the bricks to

be used decoratively in the building. The metal component on top of the existing roof will be removed.

30. Because the proposal meets the requirements of rear additions along Swede Alley, the Material Deconstruction of the chimney is approved.

**Material Deconstruction to Excavate an Additional 1-foot 6.5 Inches in Depth:**

31. LMC § 15-13-3(B)(2)(a) requires the historic placement, orientation, and grade of a historic building to be retained and that historic foundations not be covered with new materials.
32. The Applicant's Physical Conditions Report notes the foundation consists of concrete masonry unit (CMU) blocks and the blocks may not be grouted for structural advantage. The Applicant proposes a separate structural system inside the existing CMU block walls and therefore complies with the LMC.
33. LMC § 15-3-3(B)(2)(a) states a basement addition shall generally not raise the historic structure more than two feet. The Applicant proposes excavating an additional 1-foot 6.5-inch deeper for the foundation upgrades and basement, but the historic structure will remain at its existing height.

**Material Deconstruction of the Upper-Level Primary Façade for New Windows:**

34. The Landmark Historic Structure windows on the front façade have undergone significant modifications over the years.
35. LMC § 15-13-3(A)(2)(b) states primary façade elements such as windows shall be preserved and maintained in their original location on the façade and interior changes that affect the appearance of the primary façade shall be avoided. However, LMC § 15-13-3(A)(2)(f) states that historic window openings that have been altered or lost over time be restored, but it is not appropriate to change the position, proportions, or dimensions of historic window openings. "When no physical or documentary evidence of original windows exists, replacement windows typically shall be of wood and shall complement the style of the historic structure."
36. The building no longer retains integrity of materials, workmanship, and design from its original appearance, and therefore, it is not significant as an 1899 commercial building in Park City. Rather, 322 Main Street retains its appearance from the 1976 renovation, completed during the City's era of recreation and tourism during the 1960s and 1970s when many mining era buildings were renovated to support increasing tourism.

37. Any removal of historic material associated with the second story must comply with the requirements of the LMC reviewed as part of the Historic District Design Review.

**Conclusions of Law:**

1. The Material Deconstruction complies with LMC § 15-11-12.5 *Historic Preservation Board Review for Material Deconstruction*.
2. The Material Deconstruction complies with addition regulations outlined in LMC § 15-13-3.
3. The Material Deconstruction complies with LMC Chapter 15-2.6 *Historic Commercial Business District*.

**Conditions of Approval:**

1. Final building plans and construction details shall reflect substantial compliance with the Historic Preservation Board March 4, 2026, approval for the Material Deconstruction of 322 Main Street. Any changes, modifications, or deviations from the approved plans that have not been approved in advance by the Planning and Building Departments may result in a stop work order.
2. The applicant is responsible for notifying the Planning and Building Departments prior to making any changes to approved plans.
3. Any changes, modifications, or deviations from the approved scope of work shall be submitted in writing for review and approval/denial in accordance with the applicable standards by the Planning Director or their Designee prior to construction.
4. The Applicant shall obtain HDDR approval from the Planning Director, or their Designee, prior to submitting a Building Permit application.
5. The excavation shall not raise or lower the Significant Historic Structure more than two feet from its original floor elevation.
6. The Historic Site shall be returned to original grade following the construction of a foundation. When the original grade cannot be achieved, generally no more than six inches of the new foundation shall be visible above Final Grade on the primary and secondary facades.
7. The site shall be re-graded so that all water drains away from the Structure and does not enter the foundation.

8. Historic materials removed from the Structure that are salvageable or in otherwise good condition shall be used to repair/replace irreparable materials on the Site.
9. The addition's height and Floor Area Ratio shall comply with LMC 15-2.6, Historic Commercial Business Zoning District regulations.
10. The applicant shall provide the City with a Financial Guarantee, in accordance with LMC § 15-11-19, to be recorded with the Summit County Recorder's Office prior to submitting a Building Permit application.
11. The Material Deconstruction of the second story materials be limited to windows that meet the solid to void ratio of historic commercial buildings as part of the Historic District Design Review (HDDR).

Board Member Beatlebrox 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 Beatlebrox seconded the motion.

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

The Historic Preservation Board Meeting adjourned at approximately 7:49 p.m.