**PARK CITY MUNICIPAL CORPORATION**
**HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD MEETING**
**SUMMIT COUNTY, UTAH**
**MINUTES OF MARCH 1, 2023**



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

**EX OFFICIO MEMBERS:** Gretchen Milliken, Planning Director; Caitlyn Tubbs, Senior Historic Preservation Planner; Mark Harrington, City Attorney

## 1. ROLL CALL

Chair Randy Scott called the meeting to order at 5:05 p.m.

## 2. MINUTES APPROVAL

### A. Consideration to Approve the Historic Preservation Board Meeting Minutes from February 1, 2023.

**MOTION:** Board Member Long moved to APPROVE the Meeting Minutes from February 1, 2023. Board Member Hodgkins 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

There were no Staff or Board communications and disclosures.

## 5. CONTINUATIONS

### A. 336/360 Daly Avenue – Relocation of Significant Structure – Park City Municipal Corporation Proposes to Relocate a Significant Historic Structure, a Single-Car Garage, From Its Current Site at 336/360 Daly Avenue. PL-23- 05537.

Chair Scott noted that 336/360 Daly Avenue was listed as a continuation. The packet requested that the item be continued until March 13, 2023. Senior Historic Preservation

Planner, Caitlyn Tubbs reported that the above item had come before the Historic Preservation Board during a Work Session in November 2022. There was a noticing mistake, so the item needed to be continued to the next meeting.

**MOTION:** Board Member Stephens moved to CONTINUE 336/360 Daly Avenue – Relocation of Significant Structure, to the Historic Preservation Board Meeting on March 13, 2023. Board Member Long seconded the motion.

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

## 6. REGULAR AGENDA

### A. 2023 Fiscal Year Historic District Grant Program - The Historic Preservation Board Will Review the 2023 Fiscal Year Grant Applications and Determine the Awardees.

Planner Tubbs shared information related to the Historic District Grant Program. Several local applicants had applied for financial assistance to work on preservation projects. She reported that the 2023 Fiscal Year Historic District Grant Program had been discussed during a Work Session last month. At that time, the proposed projects were reviewed and the grading rubric was examined. The Board Members decided to take the application materials and individually review the sites on their own time. At the current meeting, the Historic Preservation Board would determine the awardees and award amounts. Planner Tubbs overviewed background information. The grant program was established in 1987. Since then, the City had awarded tens of thousands of dollars to local historic preservation projects throughout Park City.

Planner Tubbs explained that the Historic District Grant Program is a 50/50 matching grant. The property owner is required to outlay the project costs. Once the work is completed, the City can reimburse up to 50% of those costs. For 2023, there were eight applicants and $100,506 of funding available. That funding was intended to cover both the Competitive and Emergency Grant Programs. She noted that there was additional information about the Emergency Grant Program included in the packet. Overall, $215,790 had been requested.

The funding sources for the grant came from the General Fund, Main Street RDA, and the Lower Park Avenue RDA. Planner Tubbs shared a chart with the Board that outlined the amount of money available in each of those funds as well as the amount of money requested in those areas. The demand exceeded the supply of funding available in all categories. This was a fairly competitive year for grant funding.

The 2023 Fiscal Year Historic District Grant Program applications were reviewed. The first was 690/698 Park Avenue. The buildings are Landmark Structures on the Park City Historic Sites Inventory. The property owner requested $16,290 to replace the roofs on both structures. It is located in the Main Street Redevelopment Area (“RDA”).

The next application was 1128 Park Avenue. It is also a Landmark Structure on the Park City Historic Sites Inventory. The building is in the Lower Park Avenue RDA and the request was for $113,000 for projects such as repairing and restoring windows, repointing masonry, repairing and replacing the roof, exterior paint, upgrades to the mechanical and electrical systems, insulation, porch reconstruction, and restoring historic features.

The third application was for 22 Prospect Street. It is a Landmark Structure on the Park City Historic Sites Inventory. The request was $8,000 from the Main Street RDA to sand, prep, caulk, and paint the exterior as well as repair and replace the facia and trim on the house. The fourth application was 40 Sampson Avenue. It was listed as a Significant Structure on the Park City Historic Sites Inventory. The request was for $15,000 from the General Fund to prep, prime, paint, and stain exterior doors, screens, thresholds, deck railings, and a coal shed. The fifth application was 408 Main Street. It was also listed as a Significant Structure on the Park City Historic Sites Inventory. The request was for $15,000 for interior demolition, exterior closure, roofing, and electrical.

The sixth application was 517 Park Avenue. It was listed as a Landmark Structure on the Park City Historic Sites Inventory. The request was for $18,500 for historic material preservation and reconditioning, structural demolition, framing, exterior finish carpentry, new windows, waterproofing, roofing, as well as exterior and interior paint. The seventh application was for Thaynes Mine Hoist House. It is a Significant Structure on the Park City Historic Sites Inventory. Planner Tubbs explained that it is outside the boundaries of both the Lower Park Avenue RDA and the Main Street RDA. As a result, the funding source would be the General Fund. The request was $15,000 to facilitate the removal of some asbestos TSI insulation as well as debris cleaning. The last grant application was for Silver King Mine Hoist House. It was listed as a Significant Structure on the Park City Historic Sites Inventory. The request was for $15,000 to remove asbestos TSI insulation and to facilitate some soil and debris cleaning.

Planner Tubbs was available to answer additional questions about the applications and the amounts requested. Once the Historic Preservation Board decides on the awardees and the amounts awarded, a recommendation would be forwarded to the City Council for final approval. The item was scheduled to be discussed on April 4, 2023. The reason a recommendation would be forwarded to City Council was that a lot of the grant applications were asking for money that was in excess of $5,000. Anything over that amount needed to be approved by the Council.

Planner Tubbs noted that in the packet, there was an example of a percentage-based score from Staff. The percentage-based scores were utilized in prior years to determine the amount of funding to recommend for various applications. During prior meetings, Board Members identified concerns about percentage-based funding not covering all of the project needs. Additionally, the Board had received comments from prior awardees stating that the amounts received were not significant to the project. As a result, Board

Members expressed interest in awarding the full amount of requested funding to the most compelling projects instead.

Chair Scott noted that he reviewed the previous Meeting Minutes. There had been a lot of good discussion during the Work Session about the grant program. He wondered if there needed to be a public comment period on the item. Planner Tubbs reported that it was not noticed as a public hearing but the Board could take public comment if desired. There was no one in chambers but there might be someone online who was interested in providing additional information about the projects. Board Member Stephens suggested asking for public input after the Board discussions.

Chair Scott noted that at the last Historic Preservation Board Meeting, there were comments about different types of requests. For instance, buildings that wanted funding to paint versus buildings that want to bring back historic features. He felt it was important to understand how the different types of applications should be addressed. Board Member Holmgren pointed out that sometimes when an application includes paint or roof repairs, it is because there is a true hardship. Chair Scott believed the new application form that was discussed would allow applicants to share additional reasons for the request. That would provide the Board with additional information in the future. However, that had not been done with the current batch of applications. As a result, it made it more difficult to determine whether there was a hardship.

Board Member Beatlebrox pointed out that the criteria and scoring made it possible to evaluate the current batch of Historic District Grant Program applications. She suggested that the Board look at the scores for each project and create an average. Board Member Hodgkins referenced the rankings from City Staff and noted that his own rankings came out in the same order. It was possible to order the applications and determine where the priorities were. Board Member Stephens noted that the role of the Historic Preservation Board is to protect historic structures in the community. He was not sure there was a way to determine the financial needs of the applicants, but that was something worth considering. Board Member Hodgkins pointed out that financial need is not part of the application process in the current year. As a result, it did not make sense to focus on financial need as criteria when that was not part of the actual application. It was something the Board could consider moving forward.

Chair Scott agreed that certain criteria should be considered during future grant cycles. The current discussions would make it possible to finetune the application process. Board Member Hodgkins agreed. He did not feel that the applications received during the current fiscal year were specific enough about the historic pieces and whether historic materials would be used for replacement. Additional information related to the applications would have been beneficial. He wanted to see more detailed descriptions of the proposed work in the future. Chair Scott noted that this is a learning opportunity for the Historic Preservation Board. After looking at the City Staff application rankings, he found that his own rankings were fairly close with some differences near the bottom. The top four were identical to the ones presented by Staff.

Board Member Hodgkins believed some of the applications he ranked on the lower end might have been stronger if some of the pieces unrelated to historic preservation had been removed.  This was a historic grant, so hopefully, in the weighted rating system, the applications that address preservation issues would rise to the top.  Chair Scott acknowledged that there was a learning curve.  He was still not certain about the best way to approach the application process and make recommendations but suggested seeing whether the Historic Preservation Board was aligned on priorities.  From there, it would be possible to look at the average scoring of the individual priorities.

Board Member Hodgkins noted that the grant program offered a 50% match.  It would make sense for projects that scored well to be given the requested amount rather than a partial amount.  Board Member Stephens believed that last year the decision wasn't only based on the score but also on the size of the project and what had been requested.  He suggested that the Board focus on priorities instead.  If the Board felt strongly that there was a good project, it made sense to fund the full requested amount. After the Historic Preservation Board Meeting discussions, there would be a better idea of what the Board was looking for from the applications.  Three or four years ago, the Historic Preservation Board tried to restart the grant program in order to focus on historic restoration.  Chair Scott suggested reviewing each application through the lens of preservation.  The items could be ranked according to the level of preservation.

Board Member Stephens pointed out that there might be agreement about the highest-ranked applications.  He asked that there be a discussion about the rankings.  From there, the Planning Department could share information about the amount of emergency funding needed.  Board Member Hodgkins believed guidance was needed about the funds each application was related to.  For instance, some were tied to RDAs.  Board Member Beatlebrox liked the idea of sharing a top-five ranking.  Each Board Member could share their top five applications and then there could be follow-up discussion.

Board Member Stephens had a question about the 408 Main Street Project.  The request was for $15,000 for demolition and exterior closure.  He wanted to understand what exterior closure was.  Planner Tubbs explained that there would be improvements to the interior, so there could be some securing of the building as well as the installation of a new front door.  Board Member Stephens wondered if the new front door would be more historic than what was there currently.  Planner Tubbs reported that it would be the same design as the door that was there already.

Board Member Stephens wanted to know if it was possible to give an applicant more than what was requested as long as it was within the 50%.  Planner Tubbs stated that in prior years, the Board supported the $15,000 maximum award.  However, in recent years, the Board indicated that this was something that might need to be reconsidered. The Board could award more than what was requested by the applicant.  Board Member Stephens pointed out that some of the applicants only requested $15,000 because the assumption was that $15,000 was the maximum. Planner Tubbs clarified that the application form stated that there was a $15,000 request limit.

Board Member Hodgkins noted that there was reference in the packet to awardees who received over $25,000. The language was as follows: “Any grant awarded over the amount of $25,000.00 would require the property owner(s) to grant a façade easement in favor of Park City Municipal Corporation (PCMC).” There seemed to be some conflict within the language as there was reference to a $15,000 cap but $25,000 was mentioned. Planner Tubbs reported that in prior years, the cap had been $15,000, but the Board had also chosen to award more than $15,000. The Board had the power to award more than $15,000 if they decided it was a project with merit. Board Member Stephens explained that in the early days of the grant program, there were occasional applications that received $25,000. One year, there was even a grant for $50,000. All of those required façade easements.

The Board Members shared their highest-rated applications for the 2023 fiscal year. Board Member Beatlebrox reported that the following received 15 points each:

- Thaynes Mine Hoist House;
- Silver King Hoist House; and
- 517 Park Avenue.

Following that, 1128 Park Avenue received 13 points. She explained that she only looked at the historic items on the list, including repairing and restoring windows, painting the exterior, reconstructing porches, and restoring historic features. That work totaled $42,000. She clarified that this would be the City portion. The next application on the list was 22 Prospect Street.

Board Member Stephens shared his rankings. The top three were:

- Thaynes Mine Hoist House;
- Silver King Hoist House;, and
- 517 Park Avenue.

After that was 1128 Park Avenue and then 22 Prospect Street. He was neutral on the remaining applications, although he did not think that 690/698 Park Avenue warranted the funds and had placed it in the last position. Chair Scott shared his rankings: Silver King Hoist House, Thaynes Mine Hoist House, 517 Park Avenue, 1128 Park Avenue, and 22 Prospect Street. He noted that 22 Prospect Street was tied with 40 Sampson. He had 690/698 Park Avenue ranked last, as he did not feel the project made sense for preservation funds.

Board Member Hodgkins shared his rankings as follows:

- Thaynes Mine Hoist House;
- Silver King Hoist House;

- 517 Park Avenue;
- 1128 Park Avenue; and
- 22 Prospect Street.

Board Member Holmgren shared her rankings as follows:

- Thaynes Mine Hoist House;
- Silver King Hoist House;
- 22 Prospect Street;
- 1128 Park Avenue; and
- 517 Park Avenue.

Board Member Long reported that his rankings were as follows:

- Silver King Hoist House;
- Thaynes Mine Hoist House;
- 517 Park Avenue;
- 1128 Park Avenue; and
- 22 Prospect Street.

Based on the rankings, it seemed there was a lot of overlap and the Board Members were more or less on the same page. Some of the orders were different, but the top five seemed to be the same. Board Member Hodgkins was in alignment with Board Member Beatlebrox about the funding of 1128 Park Avenue. He wanted the focus to be the historic preservation items. Planner Tubbs clarified that for that item, it would be $42,000 for the windows, paint, porch, and architectural feature reconstruction.

Board Member Hodgkins asked about the funding available for the top five applications. Planner Tubbs offered to do some quick calculations to determine the numbers. Based on her calculations, for the Lower Park Avenue RDA, there would be a deficit of $3,400. For the General Fund, there would be $8,736 left. For the Main Street RDA, there would be a shortfall of $3,500. She clarified that this was if all five of the top choices were funded in full. Board Member Hodgkins wondered if it would be possible to take the $8,736 from the General Fund and distribute it to cover the deficits in the Lower Park Avenue RDA and Main Street RDA. Planner Tubbs confirmed this. It was possible to move funding from the General Fund to the other RDAs, but it was not possible to move funding from the RDAs around. It would be possible to fund all five.

Board Member Stephens pointed out that there needed to be money left over for emergencies. Planner Tubbs reported that if all five projects were funded in full, there would be approximately $1,000 left over in the emergency fund. That needed to last until the end of June 2023. The contingency needed to come out of the General Fund. Board Member Beatlebrox noted that $10,000 was suggested for emergency funds in the packet. She wondered if she felt that was an appropriate amount. Planner Tubbs explained that $10,000 was more of a placeholder. There had not been a request for emergency grant funding for historic structures so there had not been a need for a funding reservation. It was an example number.

Board Member Beatlebrox believed that 22 Prospect Street had some emergency-related needs. There had been a lot of issues over the course of the last several years. Repairs were necessary there, so she felt that 22 Prospect Street was an application that needed to be prioritized. That funding would come out of the Main Street RDA. 40 Sampson Avenue would come out of the General Fund but it was not ranked in the Historic Preservation Board top five. However, it was close to 22 Prospect Street based on the points received. Chair Scott noted that it was higher on his score sheet as well. He felt that application should be further discussed. Board Member Beatlebrox pointed out that if Thaynes Mine Hoist House and Silver King Hoist House were not fully funded, it would be possible to award something to 40 Sampson Avenue.

Board Member Hodgkins believed that other applications were more pressing, such as 22 Prospect Street, which had some deferred maintenance needs that were important to address. He did not believe the 40 Sampson Avenue application indicated there was significant deterioration. It had to do with exterior paint, screens, and doors. As a result, he had not scored as high as other Board Members. Board Member Stephens agreed with the comments shared by Board Member Hodgkins.

517 Park Avenue was discussed, which was within the Main Street RDA. Board Member Hodgkins felt he had a better understanding of what needed to be done there. Board Member Beatlebrox reported that she emailed Planner Tubbs previously about the score sheet. It stated that the proposed design and scope of work uses best practices for the treatment of historic materials. 517 Park Avenue seemed to fit that criterion but she noted that the application did not specifically ask for details about best practices. Most of the applicants were at a disadvantage because the application didn't specifically ask for that detail. Board Member Hodgkins pointed out that the Board knew more about 517 Park Avenue and 1128 Park Avenue beforehand.

Chair Scott discussed the emergency funds. It sounded like the City had not needed to utilize the emergency funds in recent years. That being said, there was a record amount of snowfall happening and historic structures typically did not do well in those conditions. It might be worthwhile to have some emergency funds available to address recent weather conditions. Board Member Hodgkins wondered whether there should be a reduction to the amount awarded to 1128 Park Avenue since it was a much higher ask. There was discussion regarding the calculated dollar amounts. Board Member Stephens explained that he accounted for $15,000 for the first four projects, which totaled $60,000. The Board could think about what should be done with the remainder of the funds. For instance, money for the fifth-highest-ranked project and the Emergency Fund.

Board Member Stephens wondered if the General Fund money would be lost if it was not spent. Planner Tubbs confirmed this. Board Member Stephens wanted to know if it was possible to provide additional funds to applicants in the event the emergency funds were not utilized by the end of the fiscal year. In May 2023, it could be possible for the Historic Preservation Board to reallocate any remaining funds. Planning Director, Gretchen Milliken explained that if the money is not spent, it will go away but the grant program would not be penalized the next year. The same amount would be awarded again. She explained that if the Board wanted to award the unused Emergency Funds, there needed to be clarity about where the funds would go. If there were no emergencies Staff could move quickly to allocate the funds as desired.

Board Member Hodgkins suggested that the Board hold off on allocating the remainder of the General Funds, which was $8,736. It would be possible to award more of that later if there were no emergencies. There was discussion regarding the Lower Park Avenue RDA and Main Street RDA. Board Member Stephens believed 1128 Park Avenue was a good project but he was not sure it was a better project than Thaynes Mine Hoist House and Silver King Hoist House. Board Member Beatlebrox pointed out that 1128 Park Avenue had been neglected over time and was in poor shape. It was a very good project and worth considering. She reported that Thaynes and Silver King would likely come back to the Board in the future because this was just the start of what was planned. All that could be accomplished in 2023 was the asbestos abatement. That needed to be done first before seeking other funding.

Board Member Stephens had a question related to the different funds. The Main Street and Lower Park Avenue RDAs are separate entities outside of Park City Municipal Corporation. He wondered if those funds were lost in the budgeting process. Planner Tubbs clarified that those funds are part of the budget but they were separate accounts within the overall City budget. The funding was intended to focus on the betterment of those specific RDA areas. Board Member Stephens wondered whether those funds could carry over to the next year. Director Milliken was not certain but offered to find out the answer for Board Member Stephens. City Attorney, Mark Harrington suggested asking budget and finance for the specifics.

Board Member Stephens believed RDA money would carry over. Those were tax increment funds from increases in property taxes. When the program started many years ago, there was a lot of money in the Lower Park Avenue RDA, because it continued to carry over. Board Member Hodgkins asked about emergency funds in the RDAs. Board Member Stephens explained that if an emergency occurred on Lower Park Avenue or Main Street, those funds could be utilized to cover the emergency costs where applicable. Board Member Hodgkins felt it made more sense to have the emergency funds in the General Fund so an emergency could be addressed anywhere. Board Member Stephens expressed support, as the funds would be less restricted.

Director Milliken summarized comments from the Historic Preservation Board. It seemed that the intention was to have a $10,000 emergency fund that would carry over year after year. Board Member Stephens did not believe that was accurate. The Historic Preservation Board felt the emergency funds should come from the General Fund. It was the easiest fund to use, as there were no restraints. Board Member Hodgkins liked the suggestion from Director Milliken. If next year, there was set emergency funding that the Board did not have to consider when allocating funds for the grant, that would be beneficial. If the $10,000 was not needed, it would roll over, and if it was needed, it would be spent. That could become a different budget line item.

Board Member Stephens pointed out that both Thaynes and Silver King were from the General Fund. Both were asking for $15,000 each. He suggested that both be fully funded and the remaining $8,736 be left as a contingency. The Board could determine where that money should be allocated if there was not an emergency that required funding. In the future, the Planning Department could request a $10,000 emergency fund. Other Historic Preservation Board Members were supportive of that suggestion.

The only project in the Lower Park Avenue RDA was the 1128 Park Avenue application. Board Member Hodgkins wondered whether the $38,600 available in that fund should be awarded or if a partial amount should be awarded. Board Member Beatlebrox believed it made sense to award the full amount available as it was a very visible property. Other Board Members agreed that this was the best decision. Board Member Stephens asked about the façade easement. Board Member Hodgkins pointed out that it would be required since $38,600 was over the $25,000 referenced in the language.

Chair Scott believed the outstanding items related to 517 Park Avenue and 22 Prospect Street. Those were both part of the Main Street RDA. There was $23,170 available in that fund. 517 Park Avenue had requested $18,500 and 22 Prospect Street had requested $8,000. Board Member Stephens noted that for 22 Prospect Street, some of the requests had to do with repainting the house and some with restoration. It would be possible to allocate $18,500 to 517 Park Avenue and allocate the balance in the Main Street RDA to 22 Prospect Street. Board Member Hodgkins was fine with that approach. Other Board Members expressed their support for the suggestion.

Based on the recommendations from the Historic Preservation Board, all of the money, aside from the remaining $8,736 in the General Fund, had been allocated. That $8,736 could be set aside to handle emergency needs. Planner Tubbs confirmed that the Board was looking to fully fund the $18,500 request for 517 Park Avenue and utilize the remainder of the Main Street RDA funding for 22 Prospect Street, which was $4,670.

Board Member Stephens asked about the $8,736 in the General Fund that would be lost at the end of the fiscal year if there was no emergency need. He felt the Historic Preservation Board needed to provide some direction on how to spend that money if there was not an emergency. That way, the allocation could be handled administratively. He suggested allocating the remaining money to the two hoist projects. Both Thaynes Mine Hoist House and Silver King Hoist House had requested $15,000 because that was historically all the grant program had permitted. However, the project would cost a lot more than that and would be seen by many people in the community. There was support for allocating the additional monies to those projects.

Attorney Harrington asked that the Historic Preservation Board forward the various recommendations to the City Council by motion and vote. Planner Tubbs read the finalized amounts and the awardee addresses into the record, which were as follows:

- Silver King Hoist House (fully fund the request for $15,000);
- Thaynes Mine Hoist House (fully fund the request for $15,000);
- 1128 Park Avenue (award $38,600);
- 517 Park Avenue (fully fund the request for $18,500);
- 22 Prospect Street (award $4,670); and
- Emergency Fund ($8,736 – to be split evenly among the Silver King Hoist House and the Thaynes Mine Hoist House in the event it is not spent).

**MOTION:** Board Member Hodgkins moved that the Historic Preservation Board forward a recommendation of APPROVAL for the 2023 Fiscal Year Historic District Grant Program recommendations, which were as follows:

- $15,000 for Silver King Hoist House;
- $15,000 for Thaynes Mine Hoist House;
- $38,600 for 1128 Park Avenue;
- $18,500 for 517 Park Avenue;
- $4,670 for 22 Prospect Street; and
- $8,736 for an Emergency Fund (amount to be split evenly among the Silver King Hoist House and the Thaynes Mine Hoist House in the event it is not spent).

Board Member Beatlebrox seconded the motion.

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

Board Member Beatlebrox suggested that there be a future Work Session discussion on the Historic District Grant Program criteria. This would ensure there was more clarity moving forward. Planner Tubbs confirmed that this could be arranged. Chair Scott asked that Board Members submit comments about the process. Those comments could be summarized by City Staff and included in a future Meeting Materials Packet.

Planner Tubbs reminded the Board that the recommendations would move forward to the City Council for final action. That would take place at the April 4, 2023, City Council Meeting. Board Members were invited to attend the meeting.

## 7. ADJOURN

**MOTION:** Board Member Holmgren moved to ADJOURN the Historic Preservation Board Meeting. Board Member Hodgkins seconded the motion.

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

The Historic Preservation Board Meeting adjourned at 6:25 p.m.

Approved by __________________________________

Randy Scott, Chair
Historic Preservation Board