PARK CITY MUNICIPAL CORPORATION
HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD MEETING
SUMMIT COUNTY, UTAH
MINUTES OF APRIL 5, 2023

BOARD MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE: Randy Scott-Chair, Lola Beatlebrox, Puggy Holmgren, John Hutchings, Douglas Stephens, Alan Long

EX OFFICIO MEMBERS: Rebecca Ward, Assistant Planning Director; Caitlyn Tubbs, Senior Historic Preservation Planner; Mark Harrington, City Attorney

1. ROLL CALL

Chair Randy Scott called the meeting to order at 5:01 p.m. A roll call was conducted. All members were present with the exception of Jack Hodgkins, who was excused.

2. MINUTES APPROVAL

A. Consideration to Approve Historic Preservation Board Meeting Minutes from March 1, 2023.

MOTION: Board Member John Hutchings moved to APPROVE the Minutes of March 1, 2023, as written. Board Member Puggy Holmgren seconded the motion.

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

B. Consideration to Approve Historic Preservation Board Meeting Minutes from March 13, 2023.

MOTION: Board Member Hutchings moved to APPROVE the Minutes of March 13, 2023, as written. Board Member Douglas Stephens seconded the motion.

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

3. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS

There were no public communications.

4. STAFF AND BOARD COMMUNICATIONS AND DISCLOSURES

Assistant Planning Director, Rebecca Ward, provided an update on 1304 Park Avenue, which was before the Historic Preservation Board in November 2022. Staff was working with the applicant and property owner to preserve as much historic material as possible. She noted that it might be coming before the Board again in the near future.

Chair Scott walked by the property and noted that it was the one that was crushed. Board Member Holmgren commented that it was a mess and that many have called asking if she was okay.

Senior Historic Preservation Planner, Caitlyn Tubbs reported that Staff is working with IO LandArch and Kirk Huffaker to create illustrations for the Historic District Design Guidelines. A stakeholders' meeting was to be held on April 10, 2023, at 1:00 p.m. in the Planning Office. Planner Tubbs explained that the stakeholder meeting will include Staff and local architects. They would also like to have two volunteers from the Board participate in the meeting.

Board Members Stephens and Beatlebrox volunteered to participate in the stakeholders' meeting. Chair Scott asked to be tentatively included.

Planner Tubbs reported that on June 9, 2023, the Utah State Historic Preservation Office and Preservation Utah will collaborate on the annual Preservation Conference. She invited any Board Members who might be interested to contact her so they can be registered. Planner Tubbs noted that Board Member Beatlebrox already registered.

Chair Scott also serves on the Board for the Park City Museum and every year they issue Historic Preservation ribbons. They are getting to the point of the next era, which he identified as the Ski Era, and queried what they would do for the homes in the 60's that are not even on the Significant list. He noted that there is a list of 40 to 50 of those structures and one-third have already been demolished or will be demolished based on what is currently in Planning. He felt it was worth a Work Session to figure out what they were going to do.

Chair Scott stated that the Museum wants to recognize these homes as Ski Era homes, but noted they are sometimes recognized as something else. It would be great to be in lockstep with the City.

Board Member Holmgren believed there might be only one or two A-frames left. Board Member Stephens commented that he did one of them and it is still standing. Chair Scott stated that there are some amazing structures but also some that are not very attractive. He noted, however, that considering the Design Guidelines during that time, there were some really interesting features and he felt a discussion would be useful. Board Member Holmgren agreed, and stated it is part of the history and the future.

5. CONTINUATIONS

A. 445 Park Avenue - Material Deconstruction - The Applicant Seeks Approval for Material Deconstruction of a Portion of a Landmark Historic Structure to Facilitate the Construction of an Addition. PL-22-05133.

Planner Tubbs reported that the above item was noticed for a public hearing, and suggested that a public hearing be opened prior to a motion to continue.

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

MOTION: Board Member Stephens moved to CONTINUE 445 Park Avenue – Material Deconstruction, to May 3, 2023. Board Member Holmgren seconded the motion.

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

6. WORK SESSION

A. Historic District Grant Program Discussion - The Historic Preservation Board will Discuss the Historic District Grant Program and Provide Feedback Regarding the Eligible Projects, Application Form, and Funding Sources.

Planner Tubbs recalled that during the first meeting in March, they brought this year's Historic District Grant Program applicants to the Board for a recommendation. The Board selected five of the eight projects to receive financial awards. Last evening, the City Council voted to approve the Board's recommendations and each of the five projects received those awards. During the Council meeting, they also received feedback from some of the Council Members who had questions regarding the referral of awards over $5,000 to the City Council. They wanted to have some discussion about the benefit of providing these funds to individual property owners versus projects with a broader community benefit.

Planner Tubbs noted that Assistant Director Ward assisted in looking at the $5,000 referral level and they found that although that was never codified, it just fell into practice. What is codified now is that awards in excess of $25,000 are referred to City Council. She asked if the Board would be interested in eliminating the $5,000 marker and increasing it to $25,000. If they decide to make this change, it could then be implemented in the fiscal year 2024 grant cycle. Planner Tubbs reported that awards in excess of $25,000 are required to provide a façade easement, which would match up nicely with a new referral requirement at that level.

Planner Tubbs recalled prior feedback from the Board that it might be time to revise the list of eligible or ineligible projects. There were questions about whether items such as paint and repairing/replacing roofs were an appropriate use of these grant funds. She mentioned that if the Board was interested in adding items to the eligible projects list or moving currently eligible projects to ineligible, Staff would be happy to make those changes before they start advertising for the next grant cycle.

Staff also had questions about the evaluation criteria. In the past, there had been an annual theme. Some of the themes included garages and outbuildings and mining structures. Staff could advertise the grant funds for particular areas or types of structures that the Board would like to focus on.

Planner Tubbs stated that in prior Work Sessions, the Board mentioned wanting to prioritize applications from local primary homeowners, as opposed to properties that were managed commercially or that were not a primary residence. A suggestion offered by Board Member Stephens was to consider utilizing the grant funding opportunities to offset the cost of preservation best practices instead of standard industry practices. She provided an example of a roof repair that is consistent with the standard industry practice that would meet the Code; however, if the homeowner decides to go above and beyond and use historical material on the roof, the Board could possibly encourage that through an offer of these funds.

Board Member Beatlebrox expressed concern with including best practices as part of the scoring when best practices are not requested in the application. Planner Tubbs noted that was addressed in the Staff Report and stated that they would make sure that when they draft an application booklet, they request all of the appropriate materials to help the Board make those decisions. She acknowledged that they would need to beef up the areas where they ask applicants to provide solid examples of the preservation best practices they would use on the project.

Board Member Beatlebrox asked if those who receive the grants have to go through the Historic District Design Review ("HDDR") process. Planner Tubbs indicated that applicants are required to provide a copy of either an HDDR Waiver Letter or the HDDR Approval as part of the grant application.

Board Member Beatlebrox noted that if someone goes through the HDDR, the question about best practices would be moot because Staff would ensure that best practices are accomplished. However, because there could also be a waiver of the HDDR, the applicant would have to describe in the grant application what best practices they would employ. She stressed that this issue is difficult to score fairly because some of the grants have excellent detail, while others do not. She wanted to address this as well as whether they should consider financial need as an evaluation criterion.

Board Member Stephens explained that an applicant could go through the HDDR process without having to always use best practices. He recalled that there is a standard in the community of acceptable practices, which are not as onerous as best practices. He recalled that as they discussed this in the past, they looked at what tools they could give the Planning Department as a carrot to entice better practices on restoration projects from the construction industry, design industry, as well as in terms of materials. Board Member Stephens commented that an asphalt composition roof is not historic material, but it had been put on Historic houses. He mentioned the additional cost of installing more historic materials.

Board Member Stephens suggested starting the discussion in a different direction. He referenced the Grant Program back in the 1990s when there was an entirely different construction mentality. At that time, there was a lot more inventory than required restoration, and there was more of a desire to make sure that things were not destroyed or collapsed like they saw this last winter season. He also expressed surprise at the fact that there was not much excitement in what was being done yet they were trying to give away money. Board Member Stephens highlighted a couple of current issues that were different from the 1990s. He recalled that for a couple of years, they did landmark grants, which was a $50,000 grant awarded to one project. There were also a couple of $25,000 grants.

Board Member Stephens noted that a $50,000 grant was serious money but what was more important back then was that when the projects were completed, it might have only been a $400,000 home. Now, a $50,000 grant on a $2 million restoration is not that significant. He added that another element that was quite different in the 1990s was that they did not build throughout the winter so there would be a big push in the spring. He observed that now they are seeing projects starting and being constructed during all seasons. Board Member Stephens felt that currently, they were looking for better restoration, not just saving something. He suggested exploring the possibility of giving the Planning Department more discretion in giving out grants, and in using grants as a tool to entice better and more accurate restoration. They cannot do that if they are only doing it once per year. He noted that if someone was asking for too much money, applicants could bring it to the Board. He provided the example of an applicant wanting to replace a roof and Staff providing suggestions to help offset that cost. He also mentioned the replacement of the front doors.

Board Member Stephens felt it would at least get to the needs of when to do this and the opportunity when it is presented to a Planner. There would be time to bring the Board into the mix. He noted that the Board never has the opportunity to get back to the applicant and ask why they did not do something different. He noted that Staff had multiple chances during the planning process to consider alternatives, and by the time the project gets to the Grant Program, they have missed a lot of opportunities to come up with a better project as far as design that could elevate what the community expects in terms of a worthwhile design.

Board Member Holmgren agreed with these comments and proffered that perhaps they should consider quarterly grants and notice it to the public. Board Member Stephens wondered if they should require an application, and noted his suggestion was putting more responsibility on the planners to obtain final approval by the Board if it was less than $25,000. Board Member Holmgren felt that owners should be required to fill out some paperwork. Board Member Stephens agreed but noted he imagined it would not necessarily be a competitive process. Instead, they would give the Planning Department the tools to use. Board Member Holmgren agreed.

Board Member Stephens added that the applications could come before the Board for feedback during a regular meeting. He felt the more they saw that the more they would be able to provide Planner Tubbs more direction so that she could communicate with the applicant. He felt an “applicant” would be someone with a Historic home who applies for a Building Permit.

Board Member Beatlebrox felt that the most recent group of applicants had some really good and needed projects in terms of repairs of the façades. She mentioned the home on Prospector. She did not completely understand the different processes described by Board Member Stephens.

Board Member Stephens explained that his suggestion would put more responsibility on the Planning Department. Planner Tubbs would see everything that would come before them in the Historic District. If an applicant applied for an HDDR in the Historic District, they automatically would become eligible for a grant process. He mentioned that there were many more applicants in the 1990s and it was always a difficult process. Additionally, he stated that in the 1990s they were trying to save Historic properties, whereas now they were trying to entice a better sense of restoration on these properties. By the time an application comes before the Board, the Board cannot do that because the applicant would likely already have their HDDR.

Board Member Stephens stressed that the current process did not allow Planner Tubbs to entice applicants to go a different route. He noted that when they are talking about $5,000 to $25,000 on a $1 million project, there would be subtle nuances that they would ask owners to incorporate into their project.

Chair Scott understood this suggested process and noted that with the grant process now an applicant could request $5,000; however, submitting the request would not prevent that owner from moving forward. He expressed support for Board Member Stephens’ suggestion.

Chair Scott added that once the Budget is passed in July, they will know what they have to work with and can set aside a value for larger projects. He felt a grant could provide an owner with some good news and feedback on ways the City would be willing to help on a given project. He questioned whether it would be onerous on Staff, but added that it would provide Staff with something in their toolbox to help pull projects in the right direction toward preservation.

Board Member Hutchings suggested that if they make Planning Staff well aware of the Board's intentions, Staff could make suggestions as part of their review that could result in a grant from the City. He observed that if the homeowner was going to do some work, it made sense for them to do more work at that point. If they were aware that the City might be willing to help out financially, they might be more willing to take on more historic restoration elements with their project.

Board Member Stephens added that typically the homeowner and/or architect are involved when projects go through the HDDR process. He felt the homeowner and/or architect would be much more focused on how the project would add visually to the house and added that it could be as simple as the front door or front window. Any suggestions would then become part of the plans and the HDDR approval. The contractor could thereafter not come in and say the finish carpenter would not know how to accomplish something. He felt this would allow them to zero in on some very specific things on a project and create a more fluid design process by keeping it on a micro level.

Assistant Director Ward mentioned the weekly Design Review Team meetings that include a historic preservation consultant, which could present another opportunity to bring awareness to best practices that might be heightened beyond that required by Code.

Chair Scott remarked that there were not many different architects who come to these meetings. He added that Board Member Stephen's suggestion made a lot of sense.

Planner Tubbs understood that instead of Staff just analyzing the grant applications, the Board was leaning toward Staff reviewing the applications and making a recommendation to the Board for final approval. Board Member Stephens added that this would be on grants of $25,000 or less, which would keep it within the Board's approval. Anything over $25,000 would still come before the Board, but then go to City Council for final approval.

Board Member Stephens stated that Planner Tubbs could bring an application before the Board before the HDDR is approved. In that case, the Board could make a finding that the grant would be approved subject to an HDDR approval. He felt it would be important to not have another step in this process for the applicant; rather, it just needs to be part of the entire process. Board Member Stephens added that if the Board was looking at each application during each meeting that would also create an ongoing dialogue as opposed to a once-per-year discussion. It would provide Board feedback on what it would find acceptable and what they were trying to push. Board Member Holmgren especially liked the fact that this would be more than once per year.

Planner Tubbs asked if there were particular projects that the Board would want Staff to focus on for grant opportunities. Chair Scott stated that the theme was preservation, and they would not have one applicant given less priority because they were focused on windows or railings. Board Member Stephens offered that the theme could be improving the quality of restoration.

Board Member Hutchings felt that all of the projects of the Friends of Ski Mountain Mining History were worthy of backing by the Historic Preservation Board, and felt it would be good to reach out to them. Chair Scott noted they were significant beneficiaries of the last grant process.

With regard to decisions based on ownership versus non-ownership, Board Member Stephens felt that was a potential rabbit hole, and stated he would not know how they could enforce it afterward. Previously, they handled that similarly to an investment tax credit. He noted that only occurred on larger grants, and if the owner sold the property within five years, a certain percentage was required to be returned every year. He recalled that was enforced through a trust deed. Planner Tubbs explained that the trust deeds, the trust deed notes, and the preservation agreements were ongoing tools utilized for all of the grant recipients.

Chair Scott asked if they should review the eligible/ineligible list so that the Planning Department could have a good understanding of what the Board would be looking for in terms of grant opportunities. Board Member Stephens mentioned mechanical systems upgrading/updating, which could fall under the Emergency Repair Program, and stressed that the priority should be on what could be seen from the street. He added that would keep it simpler.

There was further discussion on striking mechanical systems from the eligibility list, and Board Member Holmgren commented that an owner living in a Historic home that would be eligible for a grant purchased the home; therefore, they could afford mechanical systems' repairs. She acknowledged there are times when it could be difficult, but people would not live in the house if they could not afford those types of repairs. The issue of exterior painting was a difficult one for Board Member Holmgren because she felt that if someone could not afford to paint their home they should find another place to live.

Chair Scott noted that the Board agreed to move mechanical systems to the ineligible list. It was noted that if a mechanical failure would damage the Historic Structure due to something like freezing pipes, it would then become an Emergency Repair issue that is outside of this process.

Board Member Stephens agreed with Board Member Holmgren's statements regarding exterior painting. There was discussion about putting roofs on the ineligible list. Board Member Holmgren offered that part of the issue with roofs was Emergency Repairs. She recalled an emergency that she encountered wherein she installed a green asphalt roof, which she would correct within the next two years by installing original shakes. She noted she could afford that and was not applying for a grant; however, she also felt that a roof could be considered if an owner was taking it back to the historic roof.

Chair Scott mentioned siding and the fact that while it could not be created, there is novelty drop siding to take it back to its historic look.

Board Member Long commented that in terms of eligibility or ineligibility, one size does not fit all and they would want to be as open to particular projects as possible. He provided the example of someone who is financially strapped and who owns a Significant Historic house in a high-profile area. If the owner could not afford to paint it and it was deteriorating, he queried whether they wanted to put themselves in a position where they could not do things in the future versus being as open to the projects as possible. He mentioned one of the mining projects on the mountain that needs to be heated so the public could visit. If they prohibit heating systems, he asked whether that would not give them the latitude to help them heat the project so the public could visit the wonderful restoration. He stated that there could be many factors to take into consideration, and mentioned the visibility of the project. He felt they could not have a one-size-fits-all approach, and he did not want to back themselves into a corner to the point where they could not help an owner.

Board Member Stephens did not disagree but cautioned that they need to be clear with the community about the direction of when it might be appropriate. Chair Scott added that an upgrade would need to impact the community. Board Member Stephens felt that this was a good point, however, he was unsure how it would be worded.

Board Member Beatlebrox expressed concern that successive projects would come in and the money would be gone. She noted in this past cycle, they were able to apportion the money because they had projects that they could compare and contrast. By giving out money as they go along, they would not know what projects would arise in the future.

Chair Scott suggested they limit it to a quarterly value. It was also suggested that it could be included as part of the Staff Report to provide the Board with a running tally of where they were in the budget. This way they would not be putting the full responsibility for the budgeting process on Staff.

Board Member Stephens hoped that if they could get enough visual impact and community impact out of it, they could receive a larger allocation for funding. He commented that this was the next generation of restoration in Park City, and it was about time. He questioned how much of a community value they were currently receiving from the detail on the restorations, and noted that the community value was a new level of restoration.

Board Member Beatlebrox was willing to try this approach, and they would have to work the process out as they go along. She asked Planner Tubbs for her thoughts on this approach. Planner Tubbs was happy to try this approach and emphasized that Staff already processed applications and wrote the Staff Reports for the Board. In response to an inquiry, she felt this tool would help and explained that when they sit down with applicants they often hear quasi-complaints about how much extra work was occasioned by the Design Guidelines. Having the additional incentive would be helpful.

Board Member Hutchings stated that they would need a six-month or quarterly budget. He asked whether this could create a situation where they might only have 10% of the budget left, and the Board has to reject a good project because they want to save money for the rest of the year. It was noted that this had always been the hardest issue because there are too many applicants and not enough money. Board Member Stephens commented that they were not looking to fund an entire project anymore, but were trying to add some dollars that could be seen from the street. Whenever they see a grant application, the Board must know what's left in the budget.

Chair Scott referenced the last application process where they gave dollars despite wanting to see line items. Board Member Stephens felt it could see a process going through the Design Review where Planner Tubbs might receive resistance to the railing, for instance. She could be really specific as to what would need to be done to receive grant funds.

Board Member Hutchings felt this was the primary advantage of this approach, and recalled his own project that was tailored during the design phase to receive as much money as possible.

Chair Scott asked if they should look at a six-month value once the budget is approved. Board Member Stephens felt they needed to re-evaluate every time they get an application. He predicted they would push back on someone requesting a lot of money. He noted that replacing two windows would not cost a significant amount of money. He did not foresee that the Board would grant $50,000 on a project when the grant budget was $100,000.

Chair Scott wanted to address windows and proffered the example of an owner who wanted to replace windows around the entire home. While the Board could not fund all of the historic wood windows, they could provide money for the primary and secondary façade and the owner could install Pella windows on the rear façade. It was noted there was also an issue with the trim around the windows.

Board Member Stephens felt it would help evolve the process between the Board, the Planning Department, and the applicants. He added that it would be more organic because they would be addressing it every month or two, instead of coming together once per year to try and figure it out.

Planner Tubbs stated that if the Board wanted more time to figure out this new system, they could do a six-month grant cycle that would be administered by the Board while Staff set up the Staff administered cycle. They could then address it quarterly thereafter.

Board Member Stephens suggested spending more time on this during another meeting to further discuss how this approach might function.

Board Member Holmgren asked if applicants are aware of the grant system. Planner Tubbs responded that applicants were aware sometimes. The typical homeowner comes in to finish a smaller project; however, sometimes with larger renovations the applicant is already aware of the Grant Program and inquires about it upfront.

Board Member Beatlebrox suggested flushing out the eligible list a bit more in each category, and providing examples of “excellent restoration” versus normal restoration. That way, people could get an idea of the quality the Board was looking for in each category. Planner Tubbs stated they could incorporate that into the application packet.

Board Member Long stated that Silver Star would not have been able to afford or undertake the restoration of the coal bin and the hopper if it wasn’t for the fact that they were able to receive a grant. The grants can make projects happen if people are aware of them. He wondered if they should proactively reach out to some of these structures that need renovation and let them know there are dollars available if they want to move ahead with restoration. He commented that Silver Star would have restored those structures far earlier had they known those funds existed.

Chair Scott thought about using emergency funds for snow removal.

Board Member Holmgren commented if the proposed restoration began with an “R” she was for it. She mentioned, “repair,” “restore,” “reconstruct,” and “repoint.”

Planner Tubbs understood the feedback as follows:

- They would not consider ownership;
- Discuss the offsetting of cost between preservation best practices and standard industry practices; and
- The annual theme would be preservation.

Based on feedback from City Council, she asked if there was a preference or whether there should be more consideration given to projects that have a broader community impact versus projects that impact the property owner.

Board Member Beatlebrox asked for examples, noting that they gave the mining projects more money this past cycle, and those projects had a broad community benefit. They want to make sure that what is being funded takes into account the viewpoint from the road, which is a community benefit.

Planner Tubbs commented that the examples used by City Council were for mining structures that, while on private lands, are publicly accessible. Council also mentioned private homes, especially along Park Avenue and Main Street. Park City has hundreds of thousands of visitors each year that go up and down the local Old Town streets, as well as the mining structures. The Board could argue there would be a broad community benefit to both types of projects. Chair Scott and Board Member Stephens agreed.

Planner Tubbs also noted that the Board discussed themes in future grant cycles, eligible versus ineligible projects, and the evaluation criteria. She asked for feedback on the creation and maintenance of a grant recipient database where they would retain data showing the address, the work done, the amount awarded, and some interior and exterior photographs. One of the benefits of this type of database would be they could host it online and it could be viewed publicly for research of the types of projects that received grants. They could also create a walking tour of projects the Grant Program helped to fund.

Planner Tubbs believed that the State's Historic Preservation Office had certified local government grants that were available. They would be able to utilize grant funding that would allow them to print brochures or maps for this type of walking tour. Board Member Stephens felt this would be a good idea and would provide information as to where this money is going. Board Member Long stated they would have to disclose that they were keeping this database and provide owners with the opportunity to opt-out. Board Member Stephens added that they should not include interior photographs.

Planner Tubbs stated they would disclose the database during the initial application process so the applicant was fully aware of the gathering and use of that data, and would have to agree to allow it to be included. Board Member Long stated that Multiple Listing Services now require that interior photographs that show a piece of art must be blurred because they do not have a right to that piece of art to reproduce it in that photograph.

Chair Scott did not have any feedback on additional submittal items. Planner Tubbs asked if there were any items noted during the last review cycle that might have been missing. She felt that expanding on the narrative and the line item requirements would clear that up.

Chair Scott liked the suggested approach discussed during this meeting and commented that it felt like it would become more of a conversation and application. He hoped there was an opportunity here. Board Member Holmgren felt there would be a kinder and more specific process.

There was a consensus to revisit this at a future Work Session, and Board Member Stephens suggested that Staff prepare a rough draft of what it would look like.

7. ADJOURN

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

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

The Historic Preservation Board Meeting adjourned at approximately 6:15 p.m.

Approved by ________________________________
Randy Scott, Chair
Historic Preservation Board