



**PARK CITY MUNICIPAL CORPORATION
HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD MEETING
MARSAC MUNICIPAL BUILDING
COUNCIL CHAMBERS
445 MARSAC AVENUE
PARK CITY, SUMMIT COUNTY, UTAH
MINUTES OF AUGUST 5, 2026**

BOARD MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE: Lola Beatlebrox – Chair, Puggy Holmgren, Douglas Stephens, Dalton Gackle, Randy Scott

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

1. CALL TO ORDER

Chair Lola Beatlebrox called the meeting to order at approximately 5:00 p.m.

2. ROLL CALL

Chair Beatlebrox conducted a roll call of the Board Members present.

3. MINUTES APPROVAL

A. Consideration to Approve the Historic Preservation Board Meeting Minutes from July 1, 2026.

MOTION: Board Member Holmgren moved to APPROVE the Historic Preservation Board Meeting Minutes from July 1, 2026. Board Member Gackle seconded the motion.

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

4. STAFF AND BOARD COMMUNICATIONS AND DISCLOSURES

A. Historic District Grant Program Update.

Planning Director, Rebecca Ward, reported that there is a Staff Communication document included in the Meeting Materials Packet. It summarizes previous Historic Preservation Board discussions about updates to the Historic District Grant Program. It also outlines next steps. This document has been provided for informational purposes, but she can also answer Board Member questions. It is anticipated that there will be a Joint Work Session in the fall with the Historic Preservation Board and City Council. At that time, there will be a discussion about the changes that will be made to the Historic District Grant Program.

Board Member Stephens stated that he is confused about the requirement for two competitive bids for grant requests over \$10,000. There could be some difficulty obtaining two competitive bids, and he worries about placing a burden on grant program applicants. Chair Beatlebrox believed this requirement was discussed because it will ensure that whatever is presented to the Board is realistic. Board Member Stephens pointed out that it can be difficult to obtain two competitive bids. He is unsure this extra step is necessary. Director Ward clarified that there can be additional discussion during the Joint Work Session.

5. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS

There were no public communications.

6. REGULAR AGENDA

A. Thaynes Mine Site (PCA-S-98-PCMR-1) – Historic District Grant Application – The Applicant Requests a \$21,989 Grant for Repair and Upgrades of the Thaynes Mine Shaft and Cages. PL-26-06973.

Planning Project Manager, Elissa Martin, presented the Staff Report and explained that this is a Historic District Grant Application for the Thaynes Mine Site. The Thaynes Mine Site is located at the southeast corner of Park City Mountain near the Jupiter Access, Hoist, Thaynes, and Single Jack runs. She reported that the Significant Historic Site was constructed circa 1937 and contains the Thaynes Mine Hoist House, Conveyor Gallery, and Fire Hydrant Shack, which were designated as Historic Structures on the Park City Historic Sites Inventory. Manager Martin shared images of the site from 2009 and 2024.

After heavy snow loads in the winter of 2023, the roof collapsed. On August 7, 2024, the Historic Preservation Board approved a Material Deconstruction application to remove the historic roof materials. Additionally, the Historic Preservation Board awarded a Historic District Grant to support the work needed to remove the roof and stabilize the Hoist House.

On January 2, 2026, the Planning Director issued a Historic District Design Review (“HDDR”) Waiver Letter for the Thaynes Mine Preservation Project. On January 7, 2026, the Historic Preservation Board awarded a Historic District Grant for \$24,950. This was for comprehensive repairs to the Mine Site Hoist House, Garage Door Façade, Shaft Tower, Watchmen Shed, Fire Hydrant Shed, and Ore Shed Façade. The current grant application for the Thaynes Mine Preservation Project is for repairs to the mine shaft and cages.

The estimated cost of the project is \$74,589, and the funding request is \$21,989, which would be sourced from the Citywide General Fund for Fiscal Year 2026, which has a balance of \$22,186. The mine shaft and cages represent an important era of transition. Manager Martin explained that the Thaynes Mine Site was the last mine complex constructed before mining operations ceased in Park City and the ski industry began to emerge. She noted that the mine shaft became iconic for its adapted use as a ski lift operation back in the 1960s.

Manager Martin reported that the proposed scope of work includes eligible work items under the category of "Restoring Historic Features." The proposed scope of work is as follows:

- Structural framing;
- Foundation repairs;
- Enclosing and protecting existing shaft openings; and
- Preserving and stabilizing the historic shaft structure.

The analysis in the Staff Report describes how the project meets the Historic District Grant Program evaluation criteria, which is based on the Fiscal Year 2026 criteria. Staff recommends the Historic Preservation Board review and score the Historic District Grant application for the Thaynes Mine shaft and cages, conduct a public hearing, and determine whether a grant should be awarded for this Historic District Grant application.

Brian Buck gave his zip code as 84098 and explained that he is the Project Manager for The Friends of Ski Mountain Mining History. He is responsible for executing the plans to preserve the Thaynes Mine facility. He thanked the Historic Preservation Board and Planning Staff for considering the grant application. Mr. Buck shared information about the history of the site and the mine shaft. This is a unique facility, and there is a desire to honor the history.

When the building collapsed, the roof and walls fell in, which exposed the front of the shaft tower. Mr. Buck explained that the shaft and cages are now vulnerable to weather conditions as well as potential vandalism. The intention is to protect the shaft and cages from those risks. This will be done by adding a new structure, which will be placed against the shaft tower and will meet the same roofline as the old building. It will extend out from the shaft tower approximately 6.5 feet. That will be built and then covered with the same corrugated metal that is present on the rest of the building to make it look like it was part of the original building. He wants visitors to be able to connect with the history of the site.

The cost of the project is approximately \$75,000 and there has been just under \$22,000 requested through the Historic District Grant Program. The grant funding will be meaningful and he believes the Historic Preservation Board will be pleased with the final outcome.

Board Member Stephens asked about the \$47,136 in the Citywide General Fund that is mentioned in the Staff Report. Manager Martin clarified that there was already a grant awarded from that fund, so the remaining balance in the Citywide General Fund is \$22,186. Discussions were had about the applicable Fiscal Year and the application submittal date. Manager Martin confirmed that this application was submitted in Fiscal Year 2026.

Board Member Puggy Holmgren asked about visitation to the site after the restoration work is complete. Mr. Buck reported that the shaft tower and headframe are not suitable for public visitation, because there is not compliance with the safety codes that are in place. The shaft itself is 1,760 feet deep and the top 100 feet of that is what collapsed. There was an engineering firm hired to determine how to close the top of the shaft so it would not continue to collapse. There was an engineering study and design paid for. There was then work

done with the Utah Division of Oil, Gas, and Mining, who has a program to close abandoned mine shafts and tunnels across the state. The shaft is now permanently closed.

The Historic Preservation Board reviewed the Historic District Grant application against the Evaluation Criteria Scorecard for Fiscal Year 2026. Chair Beatlebrox gave this application a high score, with a total of 16 points. She is in favor of awarding the grant to this project. Other Board Members expressed support for the grant and the work that is proposed.

Board Member Dalton Gackle disclosed that he works for the Park City Historical Society, which is the parent organization of The Friends of Ski Mountain Mining History. However, he is not involved in this project. His employment will not impact his decision on the item.

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

MOTION: Board Member Holmgren moved to APPROVE the Historic District Grant Application for the Thaynes Mine Site (PCA-S-98-PCMR-1) for \$21,989, which will be used for the repair and upgrades of the Thaynes Mine Shaft and Cages, based on the following:

Background:

1. On August 7, 2024 the HPB reviewed and approved the Applicant's request for Material Deconstruction to remove the historic roof materials of the Hoist House, which had collapsed from heavy snow loads in previous years, and to restore the Hoist House to its 1937 form, with the condition that an Engineer's Report be submitted and approved by the Planning Director and City Engineer, outlining required stabilization for the rehabilitation of the Hoist House, and evaluation of the potential to restore the 1937 form and later additions.
2. On February 5, 2025, the FOSMHH provided an update to the HPB regarding the progress on the roof removal and the completion of the condition of approval to submit an Engineer's Report, which was Subsequently approved by the Planning Director and Chief Building Official
3. On August 7, 2024, the HPB reviewed and approved a Historic District Grant to remove and replace the 1937 Thaynes Hoist House roof and to stabilize, rehabilitate, and restore the 1937 Hoist House.
4. On February 5, 2025, the FOSMHH provided an update to the HPB regarding the progress on the roof removal and the condition of approval to submit an Engineer's Report. The Planning Director and Chief Building Official reviewed the Engineer's Report, Physical Conditions Report and Historic Preservation Plan and approved the restoration work.
5. On January 2, 2026, the Planning Department issued a Historic District Design Review waiver letter to rehabilitate the Thaynes Mine Hoist House and

headframe, including repairs and upgrades to the mine shaft enclosure and cages.

6. On January 7, 2026, the HPB approved a Historic District Grant application for \$24,950 for repairs to the Thaynes Hoist House 1937 form, garage door façade and the shaft tower.

Findings of Fact:

1. The Thaynes Mine Hoist House, which contains the mine shaft enclosure and cages, is designated a Significant Historic Site on Park City's Historic Sites Inventory.
2. On June 22, 2026, the Park City Museum and FOSMMH submitted a Historic District Grant Application for Fiscal Year 2026 Quarter 4 funding to assist with the cost of repairing the mine shaft enclosure and cages, including:
 - Structural Framing, including installing new steel columns and beams (wide flange, channel, HSS).
 - Foundation repairs, including new concrete column bases and footings, with reinforcement dowels drilled and epoxied into existing slabs and walls.
 - Existing shaft openings will be enclosed and protected as part of the structural repairs.
 - Preserving and stabilizing the historic shaft structure and any additions will use original parts and equipment.
3. The Applicant's proposed repairs and upgrades to the Historic Mine shaft enclosure and cages focus on "Restoring Historic Features" through structural stabilization and repair, which is an eligible work item that meets the Historic District Grant Program requirements.
4. The total cost of the scope of work described in the Historic District Grant Application is \$74,589 and the matching funding request is \$21,989.
5. The grant funding will be sourced from the Citywide General Fund Fiscal Year 2026, which has a current balance of \$22,186.
6. The proposed scope of work meets the following evaluation criteria according to the Fiscal Year 2026 evaluation criteria matrix:
 - a. Preserving character defining elements of the Structure – the Applicant's project description explains that the mine shaft and cages are character defining elements of the overall Thaynes Mine Site, as they are an iconic reminder of Park City's transition from a mining town to a ski destination.

- b. Enhancing historic features and elements of the Structure and/or site – restoring the mine shaft and cages will enhance the historic Hoist House and Shaft Tower.
- c. Proposed design and scope of work uses best practices for the treatment of historic materials -- the Applicant proposes “Quality Assurance and Inspection” measures as part of their scope of work.
- d. The scope of work specifies that the restoration of the mine shaft and cages will use original parts and equipment, which would meet criteria for prioritizing restoration of historic features rather than replacing historic features in-kind.

Conclusions of Law:

- 1. The proposed repairs and upgrades to the Historic Mine shaft enclosure and cages are eligible for Historic District Grant funding, according to the Grant Program requirements.
- 2. The HPB determined the grant request qualifies for a Historic District Grant award in the amount of \$21,989.

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 one year 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 Stephens seconded the motion.

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

7. **WORK SESSION**

A. **Land Management Code Amendments – The Historic Preservation Board Will Conduct a Work Session Regarding Proposed Amendments to the Historic District Regulations for Material Deconstruction Criteria in Section 15-11-12.5. PL-26-06781**

Manager Martin presented the Staff Report and explained that this Work Session item relates to Land Management Code (“LMC”) Amendments. The proposed amendments are in Section 15-11-12.5 – Historic Preservation Board Review for Material Deconstruction.

The purpose of the Historic Preservation Board, in part, is to preserve the City’s unique historic character and encourage compatible design and construction through periodic updates to the Historic District regulations. On December 3, 2025, the Historic Preservation Board had a Work Session that reviewed the priorities for historic preservation that were identified in the 2025 General Plan. Strategy 50 calls for regularly assessing and evaluating Regulations for Historic Districts and Historic Sites in the LMC for consistency and potential modifications that further preservation efforts while supporting a degree of flexibility.

The Historic Preservation team recommendations for potential updates to LMC Section 15-11-12.5 - Historic Preservation Board Review for Material Deconstruction include:

- Re-integrate core preservation principles into the evaluation criteria;
- Provide specificity regarding compliance with LMC Chapter 15-13 - Regulations for Historic Districts and Historic Sites;
- Clarify the definition of Material Deconstruction;
- Clarify the Historic Preservation Board review of modifications to Historic Materials, while Staff review is limited to the repair of Historic Materials.

On December 17, 2015, the City Council adopted Ordinance 15-53, establishing 15-11-12.5 - Historic Preservation Board Review for Material Deconstruction. Before that time, review of Material Deconstruction was an Administrative Review conducted by Staff. The standards of review were originally outlined in the Historic District Design Guidelines and included core principles of preservation, rehabilitation, restoration, and historic integrity. The Design Guidelines were codified in 2019 and the core principles moved to the definitions section.

Based on the Staff research that was conducted, the Historic District regulations and guidelines of peer communities integrate core principles in standards of review, including:

- Preservation;
- Rehabilitation;
- Restoration;
- Historic Integrity; and
- Period of Significance.

These concepts are pertinent to Staff and Historic Preservation Board review of Material Deconstruction requests. Staff recommends re-integrating them into Chapter 15-11 to support the Staff and Historic Preservation Board reviews of Material Deconstruction.

Manager Martin reviewed the Staff recommendations. Additions to a Historic Structure should be reviewed through the lens of the definition for rehabilitation to ensure that portions or features of the Historic Structure which convey historical, cultural, or architectural values of the site are preserved. Staff also recommends that historic materials approved for removal be salvaged and incorporated back into the site, either to make repairs to other facades of the Historic Structure or to be integrated elsewhere on site. This will promote the core principle of preservation. The definition of preservation mentions reusing materials.

Staff recommends that modifications, such as removing windows or architectural features added at a later time, should be reviewed through the lens of restoration and the Historic Structure's period of significance. Right now, the Staff Report tends to include an analysis of the period of significance, but this is not explicitly required in the standards of review.

Staff recommends incorporating the overarching core principle of historic integrity in the standards of review for Material Deconstruction to ensure a Historic Site retains its status as a Significant or Landmark Site. Within the concept of historic integrity, Park City Municipal Corporation recognizes seven aspects or qualities, as defined by the National Park Service:

- Location;
- Design;
- Setting;
- Materials;
- Workmanship;
- Feeling; and
- Association.

Manager Martin posed the following questions to the Historic Preservation Board:

- Does the Historic Preservation Board concur with Staff that Material Deconstruction requests should be evaluated based on the definitions and criteria for rehabilitation, preservation, and restoration?
- Does the Historic Preservation Board support incorporating the seven criteria for historic integrity into LMC 15-11-12.5 to evaluate Material Deconstruction requests?
- What additional information or analysis does the Historic Preservation Board need from applicants and/or Staff to effectively evaluate Material Deconstruction requests?

Manager Martin reported that 15-11-12.5 requires compliance with LMC Chapter 15-13. However, the requirement is vague and should be amended to specify applicable subsections in Chapter 15-13. For instance, for residential Significant or Landmark Historic Sites and commercial Significant or Landmark Historic Sites, all of the applicable regulations

in 15-13-2(A) - Universal Regulations, 15-13-2(B)(2) - Primary Structures, and 15-13-2(B)(4) - Additions to Primary Structures could be included. These additions could add specificity.

Planner II, Meredith Covey, explained that another recommendation is to update the definition of Material Deconstruction. Right now, there is one definition in the Definitions section, and the purpose of Material Deconstruction is referenced in Chapter 15-11. The proposal is to amend the definition to better align with the purpose and reference the updated definition in Chapter 15-11. She shared the proposed language for the amended definition:

- Material Deconstruction:
- - The removal of Historic Material for the purpose of repairing or replacing Historic Materials that are beyond repair, or to accommodate an addition, new construction, or structural upgrades. In some cases, deconstruction may be used for salvaging and reusing construction materials or building components of a Historic Site, or to remove non-historic materials from a historic site or structure to achieve restoration.

Discussions were had about the proposed definition. Chair Beatlebrox stated that the language is precise and makes a lot of sense. Board Member Randy Scott agreed that it is thorough. Planner Covey reported that there are amendments proposed to clarify that the Historic Preservation Board would review any Material Deconstruction requests that modify historic materials. The Staff review would be limited to repair and routine maintenance.

- Planning Director review includes routine maintenance, including but not limited to:
 - Re-Roof;
 - Chimney repair;
 - Foundation repair;
 - Repair of the following:
 - Historic wood features;
 - Historic Site features.
 - Removing or replacing non-historic features.
- Historic Preservation Board review includes:
 - Removal of Historic Material to accommodate new additions, new construction, or structural upgrades;
 - Modifications to historic window and door openings.

Chair Beatlebrox thought the proposal made sense, because the purview of the Historic Preservation Board is to ensure that historic material is saved whenever possible. Board Member Stephens stated that he wants to think through potential unintended consequences. He shared an example scenario and asked about the process. Director Ward reported that under the draft code, if there was a proposal to change a historic façade and open a new window, even if it was secondary or tertiary, that request would be brought to the Board. For something like a minor repair caused by water damage, there would be a Staff review. Even

for minor repairs, the current code requires public notice and a public hearing, but that could be revised so there was a Waiver Letter. Additional example scenarios were discussed.

Director Ward reported that in Chapter 15-13, there is some discretion allowed, but it is possible to add additional clarification to the language. Board Member Gackle asked if there is a formal definition for the word "repair". Director Ward denied this, but noted that it has been discussed. Planner Covey believed Board Members would like there to be additional clarification so it is clear that repair of unusable historic material and replacement of unusable historic material on a minor scope would continue to be under Staff review.

Director Ward provided clarification about the presentation slide on historic integrity, which shows the seven aspects. In the Staff Report, it was noted that the City Attorney's Office recommends taking the word "feeling" out and replacing it with something more specific. The recommended language in the Staff Report was "period association." Board Member Gackle pointed out the "feeling" is already defined by the National Park Service.

Senior City Attorney, Mark Harrington, does not mind if there is a cross-reference to the National Park Service definition of "feeling," but he would strongly recommend that the proposed language be used. It will be difficult to have an objective standard for review if the word feeling is used. Chair Beatlebrox expressed concerns about the term period association. She noted that not every property that is historic will have the same kind of aesthetics. She suggested that the term period character be used instead of period association. Attorney Harrington likes the distinction and expressed support for this.

Board Member Stephens asked that Staff bring back example scenarios to illustrate how the review process will work in the future. He wants to better understand how the National Park Service items will fit into the evaluation process. Chair Beatlebrox agreed that Board Members would like to see some examples where the aspects have been applied. Board Member Scott added that it will also be beneficial for applicants to see example scenarios.

Staff and Board Members further discussed potential scenarios. Manager Martin agreed that having prepared examples will be beneficial and will provide additional clarification. Board Member Stephens stressed the importance of providing clarity to applicants, Staff, and the Historic Preservation Board. Director Ward confirmed that during the next Work Session on this item, there will be additional clarification provided. Manager Martin reported that there was a project she worked on recently where there was a rear addition. No modifications were proposed to the historic structure with the exception of material removal for the addition. In a case like that, the period of significance would likely not be considered.

Manager Martin reported that for the next Work Session, Staff will bring several examples forward. Different projects can be shared, and there can be discussions about how each project would work under the new regulations. Board Member Stephens wants to understand what will be expected of the Historic Preservation Board when various projects come forward. Manager Martin believed there was Board consensus on the Material Deconstruction definition, which was confirmed. There also appears to be support to add specificity regarding modifications that clarify applicable sections of code in Chapter 15-13.

Manager Martin asked if there are any additional topics the Board would like to discuss at the future Work Session. This was denied. Board Members reiterated that there is a desire to see project examples so there can be more clarity about the process moving forward.

Board Member Stephens asked if there is clarity about the expectations for historic windows. He is not sure that he has ever seen a historic window that could be restored according to the National Park Service guidelines. Manager Martin stated that it is a rare occurrence that a historic window comes forward with historic materials. There are generally requests to replace a window in a historic location, but there has usually already been a replacement with something newer. Board Member Stephens asked if enough clarity has been provided. Manager Martin reported that the code currently requires historic windows to be repaired, if possible. If something is beyond repair, then there are replacement options to consider. It is possible for Staff to look into this further and provide additional information to the Board.

Chair Beatlebrox mentioned The Centennial House and asked if there is an update that will be shared with the Historic Preservation Board. Director Ward reported that the Historic Preservation Consultant, Stantec, has been working with the applicant. It is possible to provide a Staff Communication for Historic Preservation Board review at the September meeting. There are still a few more months of construction before the historic materials are brought back to the site, but progress is continuing to be made. She reiterated that a formal update will be shared with the Historic Preservation Board at the next scheduled meeting.

8. ADJOURNMENT

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

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

The Historic Preservation Board Meeting adjourned at 6:00 p.m.