



**PARK CITY MUNICIPAL CORPORATION  
HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD  
MINUTES OF NOVEMBER 2, 2022**

**BOARD MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE:** Randy Scott-Chair, Lola Beatlebrox, Puggy Holmgren, Jack Hodgkins, Douglas Stephens, Alan Long

**EX OFFICIO MEMBERS:** Gretchen Milliken, Planning Director; Rebecca Ward, Assistant Planning Director; Caitlyn Tubbs, Senior Historic Preservation Planner; Mark Harrington, City Attorney; Julie Schultz, Executive Office Administrator

**1. ROLL CALL**

Chair Randy Scott called the meeting to order at 5:02 p.m. He conducted a roll call of the Board Members present.

**2. MINUTES APPROVAL**

**A. Consideration to Approve the Historic Preservation Board Meeting Minutes from September 7, 2022.**

**MOTION:** Board Member Beatlebrox moved to APPROVE the Minutes of September 7, 2022, as written. Board Member Holmgren seconded the motion.

**VOTE:** The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Board. Chair Scott abstained from the vote as he was not present at the September 7 meeting.

**3. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS**

There were no public communications.

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

Planning Director, Gretchen Milliken reported that the old Historic District Design Guidelines included illustrations and photographs to assist with navigation of the Guidelines. She reported that they did not add illustrations as part of the 2019 update to the Guidelines. Staff would be releasing a Request for Proposals ("RFP") for someone to review the Historic District Design Guidelines and create illustrations or other types of graphics to help users navigate the Guidelines more easily.

## **5. WORK SESSION**

### **A. Relocation of Significant Structures at 336/360 Daly Avenue.**

Senior Historic Preservation Planner, Caitlyn Tubbs reported that the structures at 336 and 360 Daly Avenue include a single-cell cabin and single-car garage on the west side of Daly Avenue. She referenced the full background timeline in the packet that illustrated the histories of the properties.

Planner Tubbs stated that in 1896, a cross-wing home was constructed on the site, formerly known as 332 Daly Avenue. According to the Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps, the single-cell cabin was constructed between 1900 and 1907. In 1941, the single-car garage appeared on the Sanborn Maps. She noted that in 1984, the cross-wing home was unfortunately demolished, and in 1996, the Historic District Commission approved a request to demolish the chicken coop, the garage, and the single-cell cabin on the site.

She presented a photograph showing that the demolition never took place and reported that the approval expired in 1997. The property sat dormant for approximately one or two decades and in 2015 the Historic Preservation Board ("HPB") reviewed a Determination of Significance and found that the single-cell cabin and the single-car garage are Significant Structures.

Planner Tubbs reported that in May 2017, the HPB held a public hearing and approved a request to relocate the garage, however, that relocation never occurred and the approval expired in 2018.

Planner Tubbs stated that the current owner of 336 Daly Avenue is looking to develop the property and build a Single-Family home; however, the single-car garage encroaches into the property by five to six feet. For the owner to develop the property and remove the encumbrance of the building, the owner asked that the City consider relocating the structure. She reported that the Historic District Design Guidelines list the required standards to relocate or reorient a Historic Structure. She listed the standards as follows:

- The integrity and significance of the structure cannot be diminished through the course of the relocation;
- The structural soundness cannot be impacted;
- The relocation process cannot start until the building has been secured and protected from vandalism, weather, or any other sources of outside damage;
- The new setting shall be compatible with the original setting and the building should be oriented on the site in the same way; and
- The resources should be moved in one piece whenever possible.

Planner Tubbs noted that as part of the 2017 stabilization of the structures, a study was conducted of the garage that found that it was stable enough to be relocated in one piece. A survey was not done on the single-cell cabin, so it was unknown whether it could be

relocated in one piece or if panelization would be necessary. She explained that no decision was requested tonight; rather, Staff was seeking Board feedback to determine which type of application the City would need to make to relocate either the garage alone or the garage and the single-cell cabin together. She asked for feedback from the Board on relocation of one or both of these structures. Planner Tubbs noted that as of July 2022, the City owns the land to the south. If the Board found it appropriate to relocate one or both structures she asked if they should be relocated to the City-owned property.

If the Board did not feel that the City-owned property is an appropriate site to relocate the structures, Planner Tubbs also requested feedback on whether the Board would support panelizing the structures to store them until a more appropriate site is identified. This would allow the property owner to continue with development of the property.

Board Member Long referenced the Engineer's Report from 2016 that concluded that the garage could be relocated without being dismantled. He asked if the conclusions in the report were current. Planner Tubbs believed it was still current and noted that additional reinforcement had been done on the structure since that time. They would want to confirm that the conclusions from the report are still valid.

Board Member Hodgkins recalled that the Board previously approved moving the garage only and asked why they would deviate from that approval. He questioned why they would consider completely relocating the structures. He noted that the prior discussion found that the simplest solution would be to move the garage as little as possible given that it encroaches on the adjoining property by approximately 18 inches. He questioned why they should consider a completely different location for the structures.

Planner Tubbs explained that when Staff looks at the possibility of relocating a Historic Structure, they look at the full context of the site. Since both accessory structures were built together and located and utilized by the same property for so long, they lend context to one another. In the past, Staff considered relocating the garage only; however, she commented that if the property owned by the City was found to be not appropriate for these structures, Staff felt it made sense to relocate both structures together. Staff's recommendation was to relocate the garage only to limit disturbance on the site. However, if the site was determined to not be appropriate for that relocation, they would want to maintain as much of the historical context as possible for both structures.

Board Member Stephens noted that the auxiliary building is already on the City-owned property to the south. He agreed with Board Member Hodgkins' comments; however, while he felt that moving the garage would satisfy the needs of the owner who wants to develop her property, it would not satisfy the City's needs for preservation. If the garage were moved, the City would be responsible for maintaining these structures. Board Member Stephens referenced the Sand Ridge garage where the City took the responsibility for restoration at a notable cost.

Senior City Attorney, Mark Harrington, stressed that the question is whether the Board has a preference for preserving the structures in the context of the site, notwithstanding that the context is fractured by the fact that the underlying structure that these buildings are related to no longer exists. The other option for the Board was to prioritize functional use of them as a trailhead or a more historic location rather than simply existing as stand-alone accessory buildings.

Board Member Beatlebrox recalled that the Board wanted both structures to be preserved and liked the fact that they were on the original street. If a structure is moved slightly, it should remain on its original street because it shows buildings from that era where miners actually lived. She was in favor of this many years ago and was delighted that some of the building had been reinforced since the Board felt it was very important to preserve. Her preference was to move the garage onto the City property, where the City could maintain it. Board Member Holmgren agreed and felt that the two structures should be kept together because it shows how they lived.

Board Member Hodgkins asked why they would have two structures in a non-original location when the solution provides for them in the original location as best as possible. Board Member Stephens added that they could also keep the structures in the same orientation and location as one another.

Chair Scott agreed with Board Member Beatlebrox and preferred to move only the garage. He understood that the garage was for the house that was demolished, yet the context with the two remaining structures is important to maintain. He supported moving only one of the structures, if possible, and allowing the City to preserve and maintain them. He stressed that the structures belong on Daly Avenue and should remain together.

Planning Director Milliken raised the issue of looking at the structures in the long term and asked the Board if adaptive reuse was something that would be considered. She noted that these structures have been stabilized and will be good for a while but she did not feel they would last forever in the current situation. Staff generally raised the idea of adaptive reuse, and one idea was whether the structures could be turned into tiny homes for use as affordable housing.

Board Member Holmgren observed that when HPB first began, they discovered that many of the sheds and outbuildings in Park City are falling down. She referenced the committee called Save Our Sheds. They have given historic awards to several owners who saved their sheds and garages and this should be kept in mind. These structures are part of the City's history.

Board Member Stephens felt that if they could come up with an adaptive reuse the buildings would last longer. It would also make more sense to maintain them if they were being used.

With regard to panelization, he stated that neither building will need to be panelized to be moved a short distance.

Board Members Hodgkins commented that adaptive reuse would be the preferred solution in terms of preservation because it would give the structures a new life and a reason for maintaining upkeep. He noted that the key to adaptive reuse would be that the buildings maintain their historic essence.

Chair Scott agreed with the stated comments and preferred that adaptive reuse be considered because it would provide an opportunity for education and awareness in the community.

Planner Tubbs recapped the comments and understood that the Board's preference was to relocate only the garage and keep it with the single-cell cabin on Daly Avenue. She also noted that there was support for continued rehabilitation of the structures and a further discussion for adaptive reuse in the future.

Board Member Hodgkins emphasized that relocation of the garage should be as minimal as possible to satisfy the needs of removing it from the adjacent property while keeping it in largely the same location.

## **6. REGULAR AGENDA**

### **A. 1304 Park Avenue - Material Deconstruction- The Board Will Review a Final Action Letter for Material Deconstruction to Accommodate an Addition. PL-21- 05028.**

Assistant Planning Director, Rebecca Ward, reported that the above matter had been before the Board several times previously. The applicant made revisions from full panelization to proposed partial panelization. On July 6, the Final Action Letter outlined the denial of partial panelization. Staff drafted a Final Action Letter that incorporated the Board's input from July 6 that would approve material deconstruction for removal of Panel D and non-historic siding material so that the structure could be lifted for the construction of a basement addition and rear addition. Staff was seeking ratification of the Final Action Letter to ensure that it incorporated the Board's determination. She noted that Staff added a section on approval of material deconstruction. In addition, because the previous letters were denials, there were no Conditions of Approval. As a result, the standard Conditions of Approval were added to the Final Action Letter that included the financial guarantee and the standards for lifting the structure.

Chair Scott mentioned that based on his review of the bullet points, he did not disagree with the Letter. Board Member Hodgkins agreed that it was a good summary of the discussions but was curious about the City's involvement going forward. He asked if inspections would be required throughout the deconstruction process to ensure that it is consistent with the requirements set forth in the Final Action Letter.

Assistant Director Ward explained that the applicant is currently going through the full Historic District Design Review process. Part of that involved finalizing the Historic Preservation Plan. The financial guarantee will be recorded prior to the applicant's submittal of the Building Permit so that the process can be tracked in compliance with the requirements of the Code.

Board Member Beatlebrox expressed no concerns with the document. Board Member Stephens agreed and added that it was a good resolution to a long process for the applicant.

Chair Scott opened the public hearing. There was no public comment. Chair Scott closed the public hearing.

**MOTION:** Board Member Hodgkins moved to APPROVE the Final Action Letter, attached as Exhibit A to the Staff Report, as written. Board Member Holmgren seconded the motion.

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

**7. ADJOURN**

The Historic Preservation Board Meeting adjourned at approximately 5:45 p.m.

Approved by \_\_\_\_\_  
Chair  
Historic Preservation Board