

PARK CITY MUNICIPAL CORPORATION
HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD
MINUTES OF OCTOBER 7, 2020

BOARD MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE: Randy Scott, Lola Beatlebrox, Puggy Holmgren, Jack Hodgkins, John Hutchings

EX OFFICIO: Bruce Erickson, Caitlyn Barhorst, Mark Harrington

The Historic Preservation Board meeting was conducted virtually via Zoom. The public was able to submit eComments during the meeting.

ROLL CALL

Vice-Chair Scott called the meeting to order at 5:00 p.m. and noted that all Board Members were present except Doug Stephens and Tana Toly, who were excused.

Determination of the Health and Safety Risk under the OPMA

Vice-Chair Scott read the Determination of Health and Safety Risk under OPMA. Notice of electronic meeting and how to comment virtually. The meeting will be an electronic meeting without an anchor location as permitted by Utah Code Open and Public Meetings Act Section 52-4-207(4) as amended June 18, 2020, and Park City Resolution 18-2020 adopted March 19, 2020. The written determination of a substantial health and safety risk, required by Utah Code section 52-4-207(4) attached as Exhibit A.

The Historic Preservation Board Members will connect electronically. Public comments will be accepted virtually. To comment virtually, use eComment or raise your hand on Zoom. eComments submitted before the meeting date will be attached to the packet as appendices. eComments submitted on HPB meeting days will be read aloud. For more information on participating virtually and to listen live, please go to www.parkcity.org

Vice-Chair Scott read from Exhibit A, Determination of Substantial Health and Safety Risk. On September 2, 2020, the Board Chair determined that conducting a meeting with an anchor location presents a substantial risk to the health and safety of those who may be present at the anchor location. Utah Code Section 52-4-207(4) requires this determination and the facts upon which it is based, which include the percent of positive Covid-19 cases in Utah has been on the rise since May 27, 2020. Positive cases from testing have increased from 4.96% to 9.23% during the month of June, and COVID-19 patients in Utah hospitals have increased during the same time period. As of June 25, 2020, there have been 158 deaths in Utah due to COVID-19. Summit County has the third highest case rate of COVID-19 in the state.

This determination is valid for 30 days and is set to expire on November 7, 2020.

ADOPTION OF MINUTES

MOTION: Board Member Holmgren moved to APPROVE the minutes of September 2, 2020 as written. Board Member Beatlebrox seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS

No eComments were submitted and no hands were raised on Zoom.

STAFF/BOARD COMMUNICATIONS AND DISCLOSURES

Planner Barhorst reported that she would be printing copies of the Design Guidelines and that were adopted in May of 2019. The Board members could pick up their copies from the Planning Department. If any Board member preferred to have their physical copy mailed, they should let her know and she will mail it.

Planner Barhorst asked if the Board was interesting in doing a site visit to 1125 and 1129 Park Avenue on November 4th. The Board was interested in the site visit but after some discussion the date was changed to November 3rd at 5:00 p.m.

REGULAR AGENDA

- 5.A. 1128 Park Avenue – Historic District Design Review Historic Preservation Board Review for Material Deconstruction of a Landmark Historic Site – The Applicant is Proposing Material Deconstruction for the Landmark Historic Site consisting of removal of the rear wall and Historic shed addition to accommodate a New Addition. (Application PL-20-04484)

Planner Barhorst reported that the Material Deconstruction for the basement foundation was approved by the HPB on September 2, 2020. The item for discussion this evening, which is the material deconstruction of removal of the rear wall and historic shed to accommodate a new addition was continued to October 7, 2020, pending a site visit. The site visit was held on September 16th.

Planner Barhorst had provided a diagram in the Staff report showing the phases of the additions. She noted that the time of writing the Staff report, the proposal from the applicant was to restore the T-cottage footprint and the shed addition number 3/4 in the diagram was proposed to be removed, and a transitional element constructed off of that. Planner Barhorst reported that following additional site visits herself and during the site visit conducted by the HPB, it was

found that the shed addition is historic and contributes to the historic integrity of the Landmark site.

Planner Barhorst stated that after reassessing with the applicant, the current proposal is to restore the double-hung window as found in the photograph on the south exterior wall of the historic shed addition and maintain the existing footprint. The non-historic addition would be removed since it does not contribute to the historic integrity nor existed within the historic era. The exterior wall would be reconstructed, and a transitional element will be designed off of that wall, as opposed to the T footprint, as discussed at the last meeting.

Planner Barhorst recommended that the Planning Commission conduct a public hearing and continue the discussion on the redesign of the transitional element for the addition to the historic structure to November 4, 2020 for final action.

Planner Barhorst summarized that the Staff and the applicant agreed that the proposal would be updated to restore the existing south exterior wall of the shed addition, restore the double-hung window as seen in the framed in ghosted siding, to keep the existing footprint, and to construct the transitional element from the new addition.

Vice-Chair Scott understood that the HPB still needed to go through the process of deconstructing non-historic material. He asked if that was part of this meeting or whether they should continue everything until November 4th. Planner Barhorst clarified that she was recommending that the HPB continue to November 4th the discussion on where the transitional attaches to the historic structure. No final action was being requested this evening.

Kevin Horn, the project architect, stated that Planner Barhorst accurately laid out what was discussed yesterday; however, he thought they had agreed not to postpone final action for another month because there was nothing else to be discovered. Mr. Horn requested a ruling on removing the back piece so they could move forward with the project. Planner Barhorst explained that the Board needs to approve the specific design in the area of where it will be attached to the wall and the roof. She pointed out that the Staff had not prepared findings for action this evening. Therefore, if the Board took final action to approve this evening, the findings and conditions would still need to be ratified at the next meeting.

Mr. Horn asked if the process had changed. He thought the purpose of the HPB was to approve demolition, not the addition or the design. Planner Barhorst replied that the HPB reviews material deconstruction of historic material for the construction of new additions. Mr. Horn expected that the Board would be prepared to approve the deconstruction as described. In terms of rebuilding a wall that does not exist, he did not anticipate that going before the HPB. He

emphasized that the wall does not currently exist. Board Member Holmgren pointed out that it is still part of the footprint. Planner Barhorst stated that once the non-historic addition is removed, the footprint where the thick red wall is shown would be the exterior wall. The transitional element would come off of that. Planner Barhorst explained that the HPB still needs to review and approve where the transitional element will connect to the roof and that wall. Mr. Horn thought the previous slide showed what they need. He reiterated his request that the Board take action on that this evening so they could move forward.

Board Member Beatlebrox recalled from the previous discussion and the reason for the site visit was to determine whether or not the addition in the hatched area was historic and needed to be kept. She thought it was very clear from the site visit that it was completely open in Number 3 towards the back and that it was not historic. Ms. Beatlebrox stated that when there is nothing to remove, she did not understand how the Board would have a voice because the transitional element is part of new construction, which out of their purview.

Board Member Hodgkins stated that when he looks at the photos of the rear and visited the site, part of that wall may not exist, but he did not believe they could emphatically say it is not there. When he looks at the photos, he sees the roofline of the original historic 1895 house and the gable end still exists. In looking at the red shading on the drawings, the applicant was proposing demolition at the red line. Mr. Hodgkins stated that until they know exactly the plan, and if the applicant was proposing a demolition into that gable end, he thought it was important to know that.

Mr. Horn clarified that the applicant was not proposing to demolish anything on the gable that currently exists.

Director Erickson reiterated that there were no findings of fact, conclusions of law, or conditions of approval in place to approve action this evening. Secondly, there are two additions to the house on the south side. Number 5 goes away, Number 3 gets a new wall, and Number 4 is the window. Director Erickson was not clear on the gable end, but he understood from Mr. Horn that the gable end would not be touched.

Planner Barhorst stated that if there is no transitional element to be attached to the historic material, they would not need to come back to the HPB for review. Director Erickson asked if the entire south wall is new whether an HDDR review was sufficient. Planner Barhorst answered yes, as long as it does not attach the roofline at all.

Mr. Horn stated that they would be touching the gable end because that is where the addition and the transitional element attach. However, they do not intend to change the gable or interrupt the roofline of the gable. Planner Barhorst asked if

they would be attaching to the roofline of the historic shed addition. Mr. Horn answered yes. Planner Barhorst clarified that because of that, it would need to come back to the HPB on November 4th.

Director Erickson stated that the HPB could direct the Staff to come back with a recommendation for approval on November 4th based on the analysis of the south wall, and information with respect to the material deconstruction.

Mr. Horn remarked that they would probably do more exploration and examination of the rights of the applicant and the owner. He did not believe the comments and recommendation this evening reflected his understanding of the discussion with the Staff yesterday. Mr. Horn thought it was unfair for the Staff or the Board to ask the applicant to create the idea of something that does not exist. He was anticipating working off of what does exist. In addition to exploring their rights, he thought there needed to be better communication. Mr. Horn stated that every time he thinks they have reached a certain point, the target changes.

Director Erickson thought they made it clear in the conversation with Mr. Horn yesterday that he and Planner Barhorst were not the decision authority and that the decision lies with the HPB. He noted that Planner Barhorst agreed to modify her recommendations, but certain publication dates need to be met and the information needs to be provided to the HPB. He was open to having additional discussions. Director Erickson referenced Mr. Horn's comment about something that does not exist and asked if he was referring to the south wall. Mr. Horn referred to the hatched diagram. He pointed out that only a roof exists on Item Number 3. There are no existing walls. He clarified that he was talking about the south and east walls.

Planner Barhorst explained that the area shown in red is the theoretical exterior wall that no longer exists and will not be there. However, the transitional element still needs to be designed to come off of this facade in some sense because this is the wall that would be the exterior wall being discussed of the footprint. Since the transitional element will be attaching to the roof of the shed, it is historic material, and the removal must be approved by the HPB.

Mr. Horn understood the argument regarding the roof, but when talking about theoretical walls, he did not believe that was the purview of the HPB. Planner Caitlyn clarified that the HPB would be reviewing any historic material that will be removed for the transitional element, which is the roof.

Director Erickson explained that Planner Barhorst has an obligation to bring a Landmark structure back to the National Register Standards. If the wall needs to be reconstructed, it needs to be reconstructed in order to meet the national standards for a Landmark Structure.

Board Member Beatlebrox did not understand that the wall would be reconstructed. She thought there would not be a wall at all. Planner Barhorst replied that there would not be anything with the exception of areas that meet the transitional element criteria. There will be open interior floor space where there was an exterior wall at one time.

Vice-Chair Scott understood that the Board was looking at where there is involvement with historic material to the Landmark structure. There is nothing specific in the LMC regarding historic integrity as it relates to both the design and workmanship that needs to be honored in the process. He believed that is where the HPB gets involved.

Mark Alter, the homeowner, stated that if this was going to be continued for another month, he would like to discuss the possibility that Numbers 3 and 4 were not historic. Mr. Alter thought the 1929 map was clear that there is an indentation. In addition, Mr. Horn's exploration of the structures suggested that 3 and 4 was one contiguous structure and not an addition. Mr. Alter believed that the addition was added after 1929 and there is nothing to indicate when that occurred. Mr. Alter requested the opportunity to continue to explore that possibility as well in the next month. He thought they should go back to the 1865 original structure, which has been done with other properties.

Board Member Holmgren pointed out that at the very least, 3 and 4 would be 70 years old, which makes them historic.

Board Member Beatlebrox wanted to know whether Mr. Alter was asking to go back to the original request in view of the month delay. Mr. Alter replied that he was confused. He thought the exploration was done because this was not on the Sanborn map from 1929. He understood that the exploration was done to see whether 3 was or was not on the map.

Vice-Chair Scott replied that Mr. Alter was correct. When the Board met a month ago the applicant had two weeks to prepare for the site visit in terms of an interior demo to help the Board decide whether what they see is historic. In most cases they can stick their heads in a hole and use flashlights to make guesses. Vice-Chair Scott stated that in his opinion very little effort was put forth to help the Board fully understand what was going on.

Mr. Alter understood that the Board felt like they did not have a good ability to determine whether 3 and 4 are distinct or separate. He clarified that he was only asking if they provide the Board with enough visibility or deconstruction to make that decision, and if they determine that 3 and 4 is the same structure, whether that would support the original reason for the site visit and allow it to be removed.

Vice-Chair Scott remarked that initially the Board was not looking to distinguish whether 3 and 4 were created at the same time. The purpose of the site visit was to understand the construction differences between Number 2 and 3. He remarked that a lot of the similar surface materials, approaches to workmanship, etc. are fairly consistent with that era, but in his opinion, there was not enough deconstruction to make that determination. However, as they looked in the crawl space and looked from outside, there was enough evidence for the Board to believe it is historic. Vice-Chair Scott reiterated that there was not enough effort put into the interior demolition to make a different determination.

Mr. Alter asked if it would be worth doing additional deconstruction for another site visit, or whether the Board had made their decision and there was no point in doing another site visit.

Planner Barhorst stated that based on the analysis in the Staff report regarding the historic integrity of the shed addition, if they continue to evaluate the necessity of keeping that shed addition, she would recommend that the Board deny removal because it is still integral to the historic integrity of this Landmark site. Board Member Beatlebrox asked if that was a Board decision or just Planner Barhorst's recommendation. Planner Barhorst clarified that it was her recommendation to the Board.

Mr. Alter stated that if the decision was already made by the outside structure before the site visit, he questioned why the site visit was scheduled and action was delayed. Board Member Beatlebrox informed Mr. Alter that a decision had not been made prior to the site visit. The Board wanted to visit the actual site so they could be better informed for the discussion this evening and determine whether or not the shed addition was historic and needed to remain. Ms. Beatlebrox noted that Planner Barhorst's is only a recommendation. The Board itself has not had a chance to confer or make any determinations. That was the purpose of the discussion tonight.

Board Member Hutchings agreed with Ms. Beatlebrox. He asked if the Board needed to make a decision on whether or not Number 3 is historic. Planner Barhorst pointed out that it was an original option in the alternative section of the Staff report. Following the meeting with the applicant yesterday, she started her presentation this evening by noting that the proposal had changed. Planner Barhorst stated that they could go back to the original recommendation and make findings for approval or denial of the removal of the shed addition as proposed in the report. Planner Barhorst clarified that she did not have proposed findings, but she did have her analysis of the Design Guidelines that explain the compliance.

Board Member Hutchings stated that if the applicant was not proposing to remove the shed, he asked if the Board needed to make that finding. If the

proposal is to remove the shed, Mr. Hutchings assumed they would need to make that finding. Mr. Hutchings thought the question was whether or not the applicant was proposing to remove the shed addition.

Mr. Alter stated that they had planned to keep the shed originally. However, based on an earlier recommendation to remove it, they revised the plan to remove it. He thought that was the reason for the site visit. Mr. Alter stated that 1 and 2 are originally historic. Based on the 1929 map, there are questions because it does not reflect what is there now. Mr. Alter reiterated his previous question. Considering Planner Barhorst's recommendation and the determination that it looks historic from the outside, he asked if there was any point in doing more deconstruction and schedule another site visit to determine whether the interior construction elements between 2 and 3 were similar or different enough to justify removal.

Vice-Chair Scott thought that was potentially an option. He pointed out that a month ago the Board decided to have a site visit to determine whether 3 and/or 4 were historic. He emphasized that when they visited the site there was not enough interior demolition to make that determination. Vice-Chair Scott believed additional interior demolition needed to be done in order to make that determination. However, after seeing what they could from the crawl space and from outside, he thought it could be historic but there was not enough evidence to make a definitive determination.

Board Member Beatlebrox noted that with Crescent Tram, the Board decided they could remove some historic material and it would still be a Landmark building. She remarked that if they restore 1 and 2 it would still be a Landmark building. If they restore 1, 2 and 3 it is still a Landmark Building. She questioned the assertion tonight that 3 and 4 are integral to the historic nature of this Landmark building because they were added on. She thought the siding looked like it matched, but that did not mean that 3 and 4 were essential to this Landmark property.

Mr. Horn stated that if the Board will not be making a decision this evening, they would continue to explore it because they are allowed to preserve or restore to a period of time according to the LMC.

Board Member Holmgren stated that in reading through the Minutes of the last meeting, the Board had requested material deconstruction. She asked if that was done. Mr. Alter replied that at the last meeting they were proposing to remove 3 and 4. Planner Barhorst thought the terminology was confusing. The areas that were demo'd were 2 18" square holes cut in the ceiling to look at the roof structure in the Number 2 and Number 3 addition.

Board Member Holmgren reiterated her comment that those structures are 79 years old and that alone makes them historic.

Mr. Alter understood that different things were done at different times during different historic periods. He asked if there was a reason for one approach or another since both have been tried, and whether this project should go in the direction of mixing different periods versus sticking with the original mining shack that was built in 1895. Planner Barhorst replied that the original mining shack was only the footprint of Number 1.

Board Member Holmgren was not comfortable with the phrase “mining shack” especially since it was on Park Avenue. Having lived in Park City for a very long time, she has become a history buff. Ms. Holmgren stated that these houses were added on to all the time and the additions became an integral part of the home.

Mr. Alter clarified that he was asking what drives the decision for one approach versus the other since both have been used in the past.

Vice-Chair Scott remarked that each project has different applications. The decisions are sometimes made based on how the additions were added, the construction methods, and the materials used. Vice-Chair Scott stated that from a historic point of view, the HPB typically maintains the fact that an addition done within the era of the building is declared historic and requires additional time and consideration. That is how he views Numbers 3 and 4 because they cannot determine if it was done in 1929 or in 1912. That was the reason why exploratory demolition was requested for the site visit two weeks ago. Mr. Alter offered to do the necessary exploration demolition for another site visit to help the Board make a better assessment. He assumed that if they can find that it was added after 1929, it might not make sense to keep it even though technically it is over 50 years old.

Board Member Hodgkins asked what period the applicant was restoring to. If they were going back to 1907, he wanted to know why they were not removing Number 2. Mr. Alter clarified that he would like feedback on what the Board means by “period” and what would be the case for removing 3 and 4. He wanted to know how different in time they would need to be from Number 2.

Vice-Chair Scott thought it was hard to argue that 3 and 2 were not done at the same time because they show up together at the same time.

Planner Barhorst noted that wood shingles were visible in the cross gable of Number 2 when looking from Number 3. She stated that the wall was an exterior and the roof was exterior at some point. She believed that only the T-shape existed at some point prior to Number 3 being added. Planner Barhorst stated

that the Board can find that removing the shed addition is appropriate for restoration of this site. However, per the Staff analysis and reviewing the National Register Criteria and the form put together for the Thematic Mining Boom Era nomination, it specifically calls out the fact that in-period rear extensions are part of Park City's architectural vocabulary. In many cases, an extension represents a major alteration of the original house, it contributes to the significance of the house because it documents the most common and acceptable method of expansion of small Park City houses. Planner Barhorst thought Board Member Beatlebrox asked the right question when she asked if it would still be considered Landmark, per the criteria for the Historic Sites Inventory, if it is restored back to the T-shape.

Board Member Hodgkins remarked that another question is whether it makes the house non-eligible for the National Registry. He thought that that needed to be considered. The structure is extremely old for Park City. The original portion was constructed in 1895 and it is eligible for the National Registry. Mr. Hodgkins stated that he would not be doing his job if he approved something that makes the structure ineligible for the National Register. Mr. Hodgkins thought a volume at Number 3 was appropriate when talking about restoring it to a certain era that includes Number 2. Mr. Hodgkins noted that the wall may not be exactly where it was originally, but it could still be the original wall.

Planner Barhorst agreed. As it stands, there is no physical evidence to propose something that reflects the wall offset on the south facade that looks like the Sanborn map. The idea is that potentially the existing wall was the original configuration of that footprint. There is no evidence to show otherwise; however, the interior demolition could potentially tell a different story.

Board Member Hodgkins stated that during the site visit he noticed the root cellar under the original 1895 building. He knows they approved raising the building, but he wanted to know if the root cellar under the original building should come before the HPB for demolition if it is not being kept. Vice-Chair Scott thought Mr. Hodgkins made a good point. The Board typically has not discussed cellars.

Planner Barhorst stated that since the last meeting, the applicant provided the existing basement level floor plan at her request. She thought it was too late to go back on this one, but it is definitely something the Board can ask to review in future applications. Mr. Hodgkins did not agree that it was too late. The Board approved changing the elevation, but he did not recall that they agreed to demolish the basement wall. Planner Barhorst would double check the wording of the approval; however, she recalled that it did include removal of the historic basement foundation.

Mr. Horn thought it was always understood that the old foundation needed to be removed to place a new foundation. The idea of lifting the home was to put in a

modern foundation that will preserve the home, and that entails removing cellars or whatever material made up the previous foundation.

Mr. Alter needed to leave the meeting. He appreciated everyone's input. He understood that they would be exploring the question of Number 3 within the next month. Planner Barhorst stated that they could go back to the original recommendation in the Staff report to continue to explore the historic nature of the addition and make findings towards approval or denial for action at the next meeting.

Board Member Holmgren pointed out that the Board answers to the applicant, the Planning Department and the City Council. However, they also answer to every resident of Park City. They are appointed to protect the residents and to protect their history. She clarified that the Board was not being mean; they were just being thorough.

Director Erickson thought the Board was debating hypotheticals, which is difficult without additional evidence.

Vice-Chair Scott opened the public hearing.

No eComments were submitted and no hands were raised on Zoom.

Vice-Chair Scott closed the public hearing.

Director Erickson understood from the discussion that the Board would like additional exploration. He thought they needed additional evidence with respect to the Number 3 shed wall and whether or not it is appropriate to restore it to maintain historic integrity as indicated in the Staff report.

Board Member Hutchings asked if the Board needs confirmation on what the applicant was requesting. For example, if they were asking to remove that section as non-historic, the Board needs to make a finding. Mr. Hutchings thought the first direction was for the applicant to identify what they want to do.

Board Member Beatlebrox noted that there is the original proposal and a revised proposal that was made yesterday. She thought it was either/or and asked why they could not consider both proposals simultaneously. Ms. Beatlebrox stated that if the Board decides that 3 and 4 are historic and cannot be demolished, the applicant still needed to have their second proposal approved. If they wait until the next meeting to consider a second proposal, a decision could be delayed again and that would be unfair to the applicant.

Board Member Hutchings asked if the applicant could present an alternative proposal to be considered if the Board finds that the shed addition is historic.

Planner Barhorst thought she could formulate a recommendation with options for final action, as well as findings of facts, conclusions of law, and conditions of approval for proposals with the shed remaining and without the shed, to be finalized on November 4th. Board Member Hutchings agreed with Ms. Beatlebrox that continuing to delay was unfair to the applicant and they should try to prevent it as much as possible.

Board Member Hodgkins was curious as to how well this application has been researched. He asked if Planner Barhorst had discussions with the Park City Museum. Planner Barhorst answered yes. Mr. Hodgkins asked if there were photos from the hilltop where they could see the back of this house. Planner Barhorst stated that she looked at all the cross-canyon photos available with no luck. Typically, they do not go that far down Park Avenue. She offered to try to find more photographic evidence with regards to the period in question with the shed existence.

Board Member Holmgren stated that she has an old photo taken from the top of Rossi Hill that was aimed at her house. She thought they might be able to see something with a heavy magnifying glass. It shows Park Avenue in the area of 1128 Park Avenue. Ms. Holmgren offered to have the photo blown up and send it out.

Vice-Chair Scott favored Ms. Beatlebrox's suggestion for having Option 1 and Option 2. He understood that it would take some effort on the part of the applicant, but it would be more efficient if the applicant was willing to do it.

Vice-Chair Scott asked if the Board should give the applicant some direction in terms of what exploratory would help. Director Erickson stated that Planner Barhorst could provide direction to the contractor.

The Planning Department would schedule a date for the site visit and notify the Board. She thought they could do it the end of next week if the demolition could be done by then. Planner Barhorst noted that she needed to publish a public notice in the Park Record, which is only published on Saturday and Wednesday.

Mr. Horn stated that he would be gone October 19-25. Mr. Hutchinson noted that he was unavailable next Thursday and Friday. Planner Barhorst stated that she would work on some dates and email the Board members.

Planner Barhorst that the motion this evening was a request by the HPB for additional exploratory demolition and an additional site visit following the demolition; and to continue the discussion for final action on November 4th for both proposals. Board Member Hutchings understood they were doing another exploratory and site visit at the request of the applicant. He noted that the Staff report indicated that the proposal was not to remove 3 and 4. Vice-Chair Scott

stated that the proposal was to do additional exploratory interior demo because there was not enough evidence to determine that it was not historic in nature. Planner Barhorst clarified that nothing in the Staff report that went out on Friday was changed. Vice-Chair Scott clarified that the only alteration to the recommendation is to have a site visit at a time to be determined.

Board Member Holmgren appreciated that Planner Barhorst had included the detail of the National Registry of Historic Places. It was easy to read and very enlightening.

MOTION: Board Member Holmgren moved to Continue the discussion for material deconstruction at 1128 Park Avenue to November 4, 2020, with a request for additional exploratory demolition and an additional site visit following the demolition on a date to be determined; as well as the alternative proposal dated October 6, 2020. Board Member Hutchings seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

The Historic Preservation Board Meeting adjourned at 6:16 p.m.

Approved by _____
Douglas Stephens, Chair
Historic Preservation Board