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

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

EX OFFICIO MEMBERS: Gretchen Milliken, Planning Director; Aiden Lillie, Planner; Mark Harrington, City Attorney; Julie Schultz, Executive Office Administrator

1. ROLL CALL

Planning Director, Gretchen Milliken announced that Chair Randy Scott and Board Member Douglas Stephens were absent and excused. A quorum was present, however. Because there was no Chair, the attending Board Members were required to vote in an Acting Chair for this meeting.

MOTION: Board Member Puggy Holmgren nominated Board Member Lola Beatlebrox to serve as Acting Chair for this meeting. Board Member Jack Hodgkins seconded the motion.

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

Chair Beatlebrox called the meeting to order at 5:06 p.m.

Chair Beatlebrox read the following statement:

> The Chair issued a written determination that because of the public health emergency, conducting a meeting with an anchor location presents a substantial risk to the health and safety of those who may attend in person. This determination is based on the ongoing risks and infection rates statewide and in Summit County. For these reasons, this meeting will be an electronic meeting without an anchor location.
>
> Public comments will be accepted virtually. To comment virtually, use eComment or raise your hand on Zoom. Written comments submitted before or during the meeting will be entered into the public record but will not be read aloud. For more information on attending virtually and to listen live, please go to www.parkcity.org.

Chair Beatlebrox conducted a roll call and confirmed the presence of the Board Members in attendance.

2. MINUTES APPROVAL

Director Milliken noted that the Agenda referenced approval of Planning Commission Meeting minutes. That designation would be corrected to reflect that the minutes attached for approval were those of the Historic Preservation Board.

A. Consideration to Approve the Historic Preservation Board Meeting Minutes from January 5, 2022.

MOTION: Board Member Holmgren moved to APPROVE the Minutes of January 5, 2022, as written, with the correction of the title on the Agenda. Board Member John Hutchings seconded the motion.

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

3. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS

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

4. STAFF/BOARD COMMUNICATIONS AND DISCLOSURES

Director Milliken raised the issue of returning to in-person meetings but felt that the full Board should be present before making any determination in that regard. Board Member Hodgkins asked if there were any criteria or guidance for their consideration of whether to return to in-person meetings. Director Milliken confirmed that the decision would be up to the Board and the final determination by the Chair.

Chair Beatlebrox inquired as to whether the determination could be made offline. City Attorney, Mark Harrington explained that it would technically be the decision of the Chair, who would have discretion as to how to obtain input to make that determination. He suggested a Work Session discussion to obtain the collective input; however, ultimately, the Chair could consider whatever data or input he or she deemed appropriate in making the determination. Attorney Harrington would not suggest email as a way to obtain input from the Board Members.

City Planner, Aiden Lillie, reported that Summit County re-activated its Certified Local Governments status with the State Historic Preservation Office and would like an introductory meeting with the Park City Historic Preservation Board with a focus on more connectivity between the City and the County. She commented that the County Board would be called the Historic Landmarks Commission of Summit County.

5. CONTINUATIONS

There were no continuations.

6. WORK SESSION

A. Historic District Grant Program – The Historic Preservation Board Will Review the 2023 Historic District Grant Program's Scope, Mission, and Requirements.

Planner Lillie explained that they closed the Fiscal Year ("FY") 2022 Grant Program with a total of $126,970 awarded to applicants. During this cycle, Planning Staff and the Historic Preservation Board ("HPB") identified a few flaws in the Grant Program, as well as opportunities to better administer and achieve the goals of the Program as they head into FY 2023. She stated that this Work Session would focus on re-evaluating the scope of the Grant Program, determining the criteria and evaluation methods, and exploring other opportunities that could be implemented. Planner Lillie referenced the Staff Report, which contained the specific recommendations and other information pertaining to the Grant Program. She focused on the Staff recommendations contained therein.

She explained that Staff recommended that the HPB determine the specific scope of work for the FY 2023 Competitive grant cycle as well as the Emergency grants cycle. The questions posed were as follows:

- Whether routine maintenance should qualify for Competitive funds;
- Whether studies performed on historic sites to determine necessary work could qualify for these funds;
- Should projects in process qualify for funds; and
- Should the award of funds have a cap, and if so, what cap should be set to better administer the Grant Program.

Planner Lillie stated that Staff recommended that the HPB determine the Grant Program's mission. She explained that the current Mission Statement reflects that fund shall be for sites listed on the Historic Sites Inventory. Staff adjusted some of the language but would like input from the Board. Staff recommended that the guidelines contained within the Grant Program be updated to create a clear and transparent scoring system as recommended in the Duval Study. Planner Lillie reminded the Board that Duval is an independent consultant that was retained by the City in 2018. Duval concluded that the Grant Program would benefit from a clear and transparent scoring system where the applicant, the HPB, and Staff were aware of what they were looking for and how it would be graded. She reported that Duval also recommended upgrading grant eligibility.

Planner Lillie explained that Staff recommended that the HPB determine the requirements under the Grant Program. Currently, based on an analysis of the previous Grant Programs, there were discussions that a façade easement should be required for certain properties that receive funds over $25,000.

Additionally, for the FY 2022 Program, the Final Action Letter provided that an awardee must agree to enter into a lien agreement with the City that states that if the property were to be sold within one year, 100% of the funds would need to be returned. A certain percentage of the funds would need to be returned if the property was sold within five years.

Planner Lillie stated that Staff was requesting input on these requirements, as well as required application materials and timing. There have been numerous discussions regarding making this process easy for applicants.

She noted that currently, grants under Category A (Repair), are run continuously throughout the year. Category B (Competitive) grants are run annually. To better administer the grants, Staff felt that a bi-annual Grant Program would benefit the Category B grants.

Planner Lillie next stated that Staff recommended the HPB provide input on community outreach. Staff provided a number of recommendations in this regard, including the creation of a database of grant-supported projects. She explained that the Final Action Letter suggests the requirement for "before" and "after" photographs, which Staff felt would provide a benefit and provide better outreach by creating better awareness and by building community knowledge and engagement.

Chair Beatlebrox invited comments and questions from the Board. Board Member Hutchings suggested continuing this discussion until Chair Scott and Board Member Stephens were present. Board Member Holmgren agreed.

Board Member Hodgkins noted that they would not be making any final decisions at this meeting and felt that feedback from those present would be helpful. He added that when they start talking about specifics, he would expect recommendations from Staff. He added that there was a time constraint to complete this project before applications were due for this fiscal year. Planner Lillie stated that currently, applications would open in May 2022. Staff recommended that the Program be opened bi-annually in February and August.

Planner Lillie acknowledged questions regarding the recommended grading system raised by Chair Beatlebrox. She clarified that the questions raised were related to the FY 2021 grant application evaluations, whereas the recommendations were made after the Duval Study included in the April 2021 Work Session. She explained that the packet for this meeting contained preliminary ideas as to what they would want the Competitive Grant Program to look like. She referenced Exhibit A to the Staff Report and indicated that it could be included in a future Work Session Staff Report.

Chair Beatlebrox explained that she comes from the background of being a grant writer and has served on the State Division of Arts and Museums as a grant reviewer. She was therefore used to utilizing criteria that usually adds up to a score of 100, to differentiate between different proposals. She stated that they need to sit down with everything in front of them and examine what Duval originally recommended versus what was currently proposed to hash out what the criteria should be for Competitive grants. She felt that Repair grants should be for either emergency or regular repairs and were easier to evaluate.

Chair Beatlebrox stressed that the Competitive grants need to have very clear criteria and each proposal needs to be differentiated from the others. She could see why simpler criteria could be better, but it would be difficult to evaluate that virtually. She felt it was important to evaluate the applications by rolling up their sleeves and hashing out what is important.

She also felt that in addition to Staff grading, the HPB should go through the applications and provide their scores because there seemed to be a disconnect between how they viewed the grant applications.

Chair Beatlebrox stated that she would vote to postpone the discussions, as suggested because they need to have these discussions together to arrive at something that could get communicated properly to applicants.

Board Member Hodgkins mentioned that last year there were a lot of partial awards, which surprised him. He questioned whether they would still be looking at partial awards. Chair Beatlebrox stated that this had not been addressed and referenced the Duval Report that found that applicants generally felt that the "drop in the bucket" approach was not helpful.

Chair Beatlebrox stressed that they need to determine whether Competitive grants would involve substantial outlays of money.

Board Member Hodgkins stated that it should be clear how many points would be awarded for each criterion. He envisioned that once all the scoring is done, the stronger applicants would be known and at some point, they have to draw the line in terms of the awards given.

Chair Beatlebrox commented that a binary scoring process does not work because you could have several applicants with the same score, but with far different projects. Board Member Hodgkins added that it was clear that some proposals could not meet some of the criteria. He stated that the process had to involve grading and acknowledged that Staff has tried to address this issue.

Planner Lillie stated that with respect to applicants receiving partial funds, the majority of the applicants were not aware of the cap and requested funds that exceeded the available funds of $127,000. As Staff reviewed the applications, every applicant met the criteria for things such as exterior painting. She stated that it would be helpful through these Work Sessions to evaluate specifically what the criteria should be, which would aid in awarding funds and allow applicants to do something great on their site.

Planner Lillie added that to determine the criteria and meet the goals of the Grant Program, the HPB should lay out what it wants these projects to look like and what work would be acceptable under the Competitive category.

Board Member Hodgkins asked about caps on the awards. Planner Lillie explained that there was a previous cap of $15,000, which was set by Staff following discussions with the Board. Moving forward, Staff would like to set an official cap that the Board feels would be appropriate. Board Member Holmgren added that the prior discussions regarding a cap also included discussions of instituting a “sunset clause” that would revert the monies into the fund if the applicant either did not use the funds or did not fulfill the requirements within a certain period of time. Currently, the grants are open-ended.

Planner Lillie noted that there is a deadline included in the published information packet that informs applicants that the project must be completed by the end of the fiscal year. She clarified that during this last fiscal year, the pandemic impacted the ability of people to finish their projects, so Staff provided these applicants with six-month extensions.

In response to an inquiry from Board Member Hodgkins, Planner Lillie stated that the previous cycle required that applicants begin their work in June 2021. Therefore, several applicants could not start work until that start date; however, many applicants had larger projects where they were constructing significant additions that were already approved, but the specific work included in the grant application had not yet been started. She indicated that whether projects in progress could qualify for a grant is something that Staff has recommended be addressed.

Board Members Hutchings and Hodgkins both expressed their view that projects that an owner would undertake regardless of the award of grant funds, and which begin before the grant cycle, should not qualify. Board Member Hodgkins added that considering the need for owners to obtain Planning Department approval and line up contractors, the proposed timeframe seemed too short and perhaps consideration should be given to extending the amount of time that the money could be spent.

Planner Lillie stated that the grant cycle that opened in May 2021 gave applicants until June 2023 to complete their projects. She added that applicants were advised of the awards in November 2021, which would give them approximately 1½ years to complete their projects. She added that if the Board wanted to extend that time, they could work with the Finance and Accounting Departments to determine where to put that money during the extension.

Board Member Hodgkins commented that they might consider giving the option for an extension for certain circumstances. Board Member Hodgkins supported the idea of an extension option.

Board Member Hutchings asked about the grant category for Studies and whether it included items like a Physical Conditions Report. Planner Lillie answered in the affirmative and explained that they received an application for a study to be done on the Thanes Headframe to determine what work needed to be done to stabilize the mining structures. This was the first application seeking funds for a Study.

Board Member Hutchings expressed his support for funding studies such as the Thanes Headframe; however, a Physical Condition Report is a requirement for projects on historic homes, which he equates with something like a Building Permit. He felt that this type of report should not qualify for funds because it is a usual part of the application process.

Chair Beatlebrox expressed that it should be about the outcome because a study could be completed without doing anything else. She felt that having the best project with the best outcome was worth more than simply funding a study.

Board Member Hodgkins stated that he would not like to see a homeowner receive a grant to have a study completed on what is and is not historic about their home, and then use that study before the Board. He did not like the idea of providing funding to homeowners to develop information that could be used against an HPB determination.

Chair Beatlebrox invited discussion on whether routine maintenance should qualify for Competitive funds. Board Member Hutchings referenced the list contained in the Packet and questioned why the City should pay for someone to paint their house. He added that electrical, mechanical systems, insulation, and similar types of repairs are regular home maintenance items regardless of whether the home is historic. He added that roof repairs should also be considered regular house maintenance.

Board Member Hutchings added that items such as replacing windows, masonry, reconstructing historic porches, and features would be the types of projects that the money should go toward.

Board Member Hodgkins agreed and suggested setting amounts for maintenance items. He acknowledged the difference in cost between a normal window replacement and a window replacement that must conform to historic requirements. He suggested that Repair funds could be for the difference between a normal maintenance cost and the cost because something is historic. This would also apply to roof repairs or maintenance. With respect to porch replacement, if the home has a historical porch, the repair or maintenance costs make sense under this category. He stressed that if the maintenance or repairs is no different than for any other homeowner and the home just happens to be historic, he did not think it should be funded at all. Board Member Hutchings agreed.

Chair Beatlebrox stated that it made sense that if there were a Repair and Emergency and Routine Maintenance Section for this program that is where much of this would be included. The Competitive grants would be for big projects. Board Member Holmgren added that speaking from experience, there would need to be Routine and Emergency funds. She required an Emergency grant approximately 10 years ago when her roof slid off.

Chair Beatlebrox clarified that there are currently grants for Emergency Repairs and asked how much was available for that category. Planner Lillie stated that currently all funds are pulled from the same pool of money. She invited discussions on whether certain funds should be allocated to the different categories. She noted that applications for repairs tended to involve smaller projects. Planner Lillie referenced her exhibit in which she separated the eligibility categories.

Planner Lillie returned to the suggestion of removing certain types of routine maintenance from Competitive grants. Board Member Hutchings confirmed that he felt certain types of work should be eliminated altogether. Board Member Hodgkins agreed and asked how the

Competitive grants were allocated between the two grant cycles. He also asked if certain percentages of the annual funding were set-aside for Emergency Repair grants.

Planner Lillie responded that the caps were instituted as the Grant Program has gained traction over the years. The intent was that the caps would better allocate the funds over the grant cycles. She suggested that the questions raised by Board Member Hodgkins might support moving to only one round of grant applications. She noted that in recent years, they were seeing more grant applications for Repairs and felt that they would see more as Repair grants were separated from Competitive grants. As Competitive grant applications come in, it would be up to the Board to determine how much money it would be willing to award and to how many applicants.

Board Member Hutchings noted that the Grant Program had become more popular, which has changed his thoughts on how it should be administered. He recounted that when he went through the grant process for his home approximately five years ago, there were very few applicants, and they were awarded significant funds (which they ultimately did not take) simply because that money was available. He added that if they were getting the full scope of applicants and could spend all of the money in the first round, he would suggest an annual award. He would also tailor the qualifying criteria more toward directly preserving the historic material as opposed to upgrades. Board Member Hutchings commented that all of it benefits the community, but the preservation of historic material is what people would see from the street and that would provide a community benefit.

Board Member Holmgren referenced Chair Beatlebrox's suggestion of a checklist being clear and easier to follow, which would make a significant difference as well. She expressed that she would lean toward one grant application per year. It was noted by Board Member Hodgkins that an annual award would also give everyone the same amount of time to complete their projects.

Planner Lillie mentioned that there were one or two other grant programs in the State that award funds only for work on the façade, whereas Park City's Grant Program is framed to help with structural items such as insulation and electrical. She expressed that if the Board is comfortable with narrowing down the scope that would be helpful for Staff.

In preparation for the next Work Session, Planner Lillie invited the Board to consider what they specifically want to see in the Competitive scope and what might be an appropriate cap. Chair Beatlebrox suggested that it would be helpful to have the past scoring examples from 2020 and 2021 and compare those to the new proposal. She noted that there were a number of items not included in the proposal, and by comparing them side by side, it would help to direct focus on what is important, what kind of scoring they need, and how they could make it meaningful to applicants.

Planner Lillie agreed that it would be beneficial to study the newly proposed scorecard against the prior scoring. She added that a prerequisite includes an approval that ensures consistency with the Design Guidelines. She indicated that Staff would try to publish the next Staff Report on this item in sufficient time to allow the Board to study the information prior to the next Work Session.

Planner Lillie invited feedback on the Mission Statement. She read the proposed amended Mission Statement as follows: “The Park City Historic District Grant Program is designed to financially incentivize the Preservation, Rehabilitation, Restoration and Reconstruction of Park City’s Historic Resources to support a community that honors its past and encourages Historic Preservation.”

Board Member Hutchings liked the proposed amended Mission Statement. Board Member Hodgkins asked why Staff proposed changing “Historic Structures” to “Historic Resources.” Planner Lillie explained that this change would allow homes that have reached their historic age, but that are not yet designated on the Historic Sites Inventory, to either be elevated from Non-Contributing to a Significant Site or be able to receive funds even though their homes have not been included as a Historic Structure or Site on the Historic Sites Inventory.

Chair Beatlebrox noted that the Mission Statement did not specifically state “Historic Sites Inventory,” so she would consider “Historic Structures and Sites” as a generic term. She felt that “Historic Resources” was too broad.

Planner Lillie asked if using the term “Park City’s Historic Buildings” would be more appropriate. She noted that from a Staff perspective, the term “Historic Structures and Sites” was not a defined term in the Land Management Code and referenced the Historic Preservation provisions in Chapter 15-5 of the Land Management Code. She invited feedback on how to make that more restrictive.

Board Member Hodgkins suggested not capitalizing the term so that it would not be seen as defined. He understood that the import of the language was to expand and incorporate any building that is 40 or 50 years old and Contributory. Planner Lillie explained that the current designation of Contributory was strictly determined through intensive level surveys or reconnaissance level surveys performed over the last several decades. This Mission Statement would, therefore, include Non-Contributing Structures that were either deemed Not Significant by those surveys but might be in the future. She offered the example of a home that was left off of the Historic Sites Inventory because of significant changes but a new owner wanted to restore some of the historic elements.

Board Member Hutchings referenced the criteria included in the Grant Program and stated if they use the broader term “Resources,” they would want to ensure that funds were not given to projects that should not receive them. It was noted by Board Member Hodgkins that “Historic Inventory” did not include early ski era buildings and funds should be available for those sites to try and preserve them as they become more significant pieces to the City’s history.

Board Member Holmgren referenced A-frame structures and Board Member Hodgkins expressed that it would be great to be able to provide funds to preserve those that remain.

Planner Lillie stated that they would work on the language and potentially just remove the capitalization that had been included in the prior Mission Statement.

Chair Beatlebrox closed the Work Session.

7. REGULAR AGENDA

A. 2022 Annual Cindy Matsumoto Historic Preservation Awards -- The Historic Preservation Board will award up to five Historic Sites for the 2022 Annual Cindy Matsumoto Historic Preservation Award. GI-21-00481

Planner Lillie explained that the Cindy Matsumoto Historic Preservation Award is held each year and awarded by the HPB. The purpose is to honor Historic Preservation projects that have been completed and which utilized the Design Guidelines for Historic Districts and Historic Sites adopted in the Land Management Code. The HPB would award one site that will have a work of art commissioned that depicts the project and that best illustrates the Design Guidelines and achieves excellence in adaptive reuse, infill development excellence in restoration, sustainable preservation, the embodiment of historic context, or connectivity of site. She added that in addition to the award given for the best example, the HPB could also select up to four additional winners to be awarded a plaque that identifies the site as a recipient of this award, the year it was constructed and the excellence it achieved. Planner Lillie stated that the award that receives the work of art would also receive a plaque.

Planner Lillie stated that the first nominee was the Silver King Spiro Tunnel, which is a Significant Site on the Historic Sites Inventory. She noted that this Tunnel had served many lives beginning as a drainage tunnel for the mines. After it was closed, it was re-opened in the 1960s as a ski carrier. The Tunnel has been used more recently for research and in 2019, the City began a rehabilitation project and constructed a plaza with panels that depict the history of the Tunnel. The interior has been rehabilitated by the Public Works Department, as the Tunnel now serves a large percentage of the City's drinking water.

Planner Lillie stated that the second nominee was 227 Main Street (The Star Hotel). It is a Significant Site that was originally an L cottage built in 1895 and used as a residential home. In the 1920s it underwent major alterations and converted into a hotel in the Spanish-Mission style. The building was in decrepit condition when it was demolished in 2019 before being reconstructed in 2021.

Planner Lillie reported that the third nominee was the Thaynes Mine Conveyor Belt. This is listed as the Thaynes Conveyor Gallery as a Significant Site on the Historic Sites Inventory. This site was in terrible condition, and in 2020 was rehabilitated and restored by the Friends of Ski Mountain Mining History in partnership with the City, which awarded a Historic District grant of $15,000.

The fourth nominee was a residential single-family dwelling constructed in approximately 1903. She noted that it is also a Significant Site. The site previously had an enclosed porch added after construction. In 2017, the porch was removed to allow the original porch to be restored. The owner also made several structural upgrades along with the addition of a basement/garage in keeping with the 2009 Design Guidelines.

Planner Lillie reported that the fifth nominee was a single-family dwelling located at 823 Woodside. It was constructed in 1903 as an L cottage. She noted that it received structural upgrades in 2016, notably a concrete foundation to replace the existing wood framing. The structure was also moved to match the original setbacks. The work also added a basement/garage and rear addition.

The sixth nominee was 1141 Park Avenue. Planner Lillie described this as a pyramid roofed single-family dwelling originally constructed in 1905. It is listed as a Landmark Site on the Historic Sites Inventory. In 2017, an addition was constructed and a horizontal stone wall that had been added in the 1960s was removed as it was detracting from the façade. In addition, aluminum screen doors that were not in keeping with the original building were removed. Material and structural upgrades were also made as approved by the HPB.

Planner Lillie stated that the seventh nominee is located at 839 Woodside Avenue, also known as the James Forsythe House. This home was originally constructed in 1905 and is a Landmark Site on the Historic Sites Inventory. In 2020, this home underwent several structural upgrades as well as a rear addition.

The eighth nominee was 803 Norfolk, which was constructed in 1916 and is a Significant Site. In 2017, several historic features were restored, including the windows on the west and south façades and the second-floor porch.

Planner Lillie announced the ninth and final nominee, located at 1062 Park Avenue, also called the Joseph S. Willis House. It is a Landmark Historic Site and also listed on the National Register of Historic Places. It is a one-story bungalow constructed in 1922. In 2019, the structure was restored, and a rear addition was constructed.

Planner Lillie reiterated that the Board could select up to five of the nine nominees to receive the award, including one winner that best meets the guidelines.

Board Member Hutchings asked if there was a requirement that the projects were completed last year. Planner Lillie noted that at the time the Staff Report was published, she was unable to photograph the completed homes. She stated that each nominated project was identified through an archived permit survey and was completed according to the guidelines. She clarified that some of these projects were completed before this past year, as discussed and allowed for during the last Work Session.

Chair Beatlebrox suggested that everyone write down their top three for the Artists' Award to see if there were nominees that everyone agreed on.

Board Member Hodgkins stated that he would have liked to see before-and-after photographs for each nominee and felt that the ones with less information might be at a disadvantage. It was clarified that the packet included "before" photographs for the residential structures that Planner Lillie took from the 1941 Tax Photographs. Planner Lillie indicated that now that they have more consistent staffing, in the future they would do a better job of taking before-and-after photographs.

Chair Beatlebrox took a poll of each Board Member's top three nominees.

Board Member Hodgkins listed his top three as follows: Star Hotel, 803 Norfolk, 1141 Park Avenue.

Board Member Hutchings listed his top three as follows: Spiro Tunnel, Thaynes Mine Conveyor Gallery, 1062 Park Avenue

Board Member Holmgren listed her top three as follows: 1062 Park Avenue, 839 Woodside Avenue, 1141 Park Avenue

Chair Beatlebrox listed her top three as follows: 1063 Empire, 1141 Park, and 803 Norfolk.

Chair Beatlebrox noted that 803 Norfolk was selected twice as was 1062 Park. 1141 Park was selected three times, and Board Member Hutchings stated that he would be on board with that project.

There was then discussion about 1141 Park Avenue. Board Member Hutchings felt that the owner did a good job of restoring the structure to its original form. He also felt it was a unique, characteristic home. Chair Beatlebrox liked the fact that the home is located on Park Avenue and that it is a Landmark Site.

Board Member Hodgkins commented that 1141 Park was true to its curb appeal when comparing the two photographs. It showed as the same house and the restoration kept its true character. Board Member Holmgren noted that even the chimney was in the same place.

MOTION: Board Member Hutchings moved to nominate 1141 Park Avenue for the Cindy Matsumoto Historic Preservation Award. Board Member Hodgkins seconded the motion.

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

The discussion next turned to the four other awards. Board Member Hodgkins noted that 803 Norfolk and 1062 Park were listed twice in the Board's top three. Chair Beatlebrox asked if the Board wanted to consider at least one of the mines projects be awarded. Board Members Hodgkins and Hutchings agreed.

Board Member Hutchings stated that both of the mine projects were excellent. He reported that he skied around the Thaynes Mine Conveyor site and felt it was a great project. Board Member Hodgkins would support that project as well and noted that the Spiro Tunnel almost looked like window dressing on the outside.

Board Member Holmgren added that Thaynes Canyon was her number four choice. Chair Beatlebrox had no problem including Thaynes as an awardee.

Chair Beatlebrox commented that the Star Hotel was a restoration. Board Member Hodgkins acknowledged that the Star Hotel was a complete teardown and re-build, but he was happy to have the façade on Main Street and the owner went all out to make it look like the original.

Planner Lillie added that the owner was working hard to figure out how to replace the missing pocket holes on the front of the Star Hotel.

Chair Beatlebrox noted that the Star Hotel is a commercial structure, which would add to the residential and mining structures selected. Board Member Hutchings indicated he could get on board with the Star Hotel; his issue was that it looked like they took the shapes of the structure and made it look like another Deer Valley condominium rather than keeping the historic essence. He referenced a comparison to 823 Woodside.

Board Member Hodgkins stated that he could not support a project that added a garage underneath a building because it significantly changes the façade. With respect to the Star Hotel, he recalled the photographs from the 1920s from a prior review and noted that this project was before the Board on two occasions, and they did not approve one of the proposals because it changed the structure. He noted that the packet did not have a photograph of the building after it had transformed to a Mission-style. He felt that this restoration brought it back to that 1920's look.

Planner Lillie noted that she had not been able to locate many images and referenced one photograph from Ancestry.com and one from Summit County.

Board Member Hutchings noted that a lot of work was put into this project and stated he could get on board with the Star Hotel as a nominee.

MOTION: Board Member Hutchings moved to nominate 803 Norfolk, 1062 Park Avenue, Thaynes Canyon, and the Star Hotel for the Cindy Matsumoto Historic Preservation Awards for 2022. Board Member Hodgkins seconded the motion.

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

8. ADJOURN

MOTION: Board Member Hutchings moved to adjourn. Board Member Hodgkins seconded the motion.

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

The Historic Preservation Board Meeting adjourned at approximately 6:50 p.m.

Approved by ________________________________
Acting Chair Lola Beatlebrox, Acting Chair
Historic Preservation Board