



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

BOARD MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE: Lola Beatlebrox, Puggy Holmgren, Alan Long, Douglas Stephens, Jack Hodgkins

EX OFFICIO MEMBERS: Gretchen Milliken, Planning Director; Caitlyn Tubbs, Senior Historic Preservation Planner

1. ROLL CALL

In the absence of Chair Randy Scott, the Park City Historic Preservation Board discussed who would fill in as Chair for the current meeting.

MOTION: Board Member Beatlebrox moved that Chair Stephens ACT as Chair during the meeting. Board Member Hodgkins seconded the motion.

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

Chair Stephens called the meeting to order at approximately 5:00 p.m.

2. MINUTES APPROVAL

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

Board Member Beatlebrox referenced Page 9 of the December 7, 2022 minutes. Where the two options were described, it seemed that the Option 1 description was actually the description of Option 2 and vice versa. She read the language as it was currently written. Planning Director, Gretchen Milliken offered to double-check the different options and make that correction, if necessary.

MOTION: Board Member Beatlebrox moved to APPROVE the Meeting Minutes from December 7, 2022, as amended. 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. WORK SESSION

A. 2023 Historic District Grant Program – The Historic Preservation Board will Review the Submitted Applications for the 2023 Fiscal Year Historic District Grant Program Cycle.

Senior Historic Preservation Planner, Caitlyn Tubbs, reported that the Work Session item related to the 2023 Historic District Grant Program. This is the time of year when the Board reviews the annual Historic District Grant Program applications. She clarified that this is only a Work Session item and that the final decision will be made by the Board on March 1, 2023. Planner Tubbs shared background information with those present. The grant program was originally established in 1987 and since then, tens of thousands of dollars had been awarded by the City to local property owners to facilitate the preservation of historic structures. It was a 50/50 matching grant where the property owner would outlay the project costs and then be reimbursed for the grant amount.

This year, there were eight applicants and \$100,506 available for funding. That amount was intended to cover both the competitive and emergency grant funds. Planner Tubbs reported that there was a total of \$215,790 requested in grant funding from the eight applications. Each application would be reviewed. Following review of the eight applications there would be comments from the Board. Planner Tubbs noted that Chair Scott was able to forward his comments and recommendations in advance. Those comments would be read into the record.

The first application was for 690 and 698 Park Avenue. The request was for \$16,290 to re-roof two historic structures. The second application was for 1128 Park Avenue and the request was for \$113,000 to facilitate a basement addition, replace and repair windows, doors, and siding, as well as add interior framing. The third request was for 22 Prospect Avenue to repair and replace the trim and fascia, then sand, prep, caulk, and paint the exterior. The requested amount was \$8,000. The fourth request was for 40 Sampson Avenue for \$15,000. The intention was to prep, sand, and paint the exterior siding, doors, windows, coal shed, and deck railings. The fifth application was for 408 Main Street for \$15,000. The request was for the replacement of exterior lighting, front door replacement, window refurbishment, plumbing, HVAC, electrical and interior improvements. The sixth application was for 517 Park Avenue, which requested \$18,500 for demolition, new windows, carpentry, material preservation and reconditioning, waterproofing, roofing, and paint. The seventh application was for the Thaynes Mine Hoist House for \$15,000 for asbestos and debris removal. The eighth application was for the Silver King Hoist House for \$15,000 for asbestos and debris removal.

Planner Tubbs reported that the 2023 Historic District Grant Program discussions would continue on March 1, 2023. The Historic Preservation Board would review each of the applications in depth and compare them alongside the evaluation criteria the Board developed over previous grant cycles. The Board would select the projects to receive grant funding and make a recommendation to the City Council. According to the City Recorder, there was availability on April 4, 2023, for City Council discussion and approval. The reason it was sent to the City Council for final approval since often grant money is awarded in excess of \$5,000, which requires Council approval.

Board Member Hodgkins wondered if Staff would rate the applications using the evaluation criteria or if it would be done by each Board Member. Planner Tubbs referenced the evaluation rubric. There was a line for a Staff score and a Historic Preservation Board score. Staff would review the applications and then bring that score back to the Board. At that time, the reasoning for the score would be explained. The Board as a collective would then be able to determine its own score. The monies awarded would be determined based on those scores. Board Member Beatlebrox asked if each Board Member would create their own ratings so an average could be created. Planner Tubbs explained that it would depend on how the Board wants to move forward. If there is a desire to create an average based on the individual scores of each Board Member, that could be done. Alternatively, the Historic Preservation Board could discuss the eight applications as a group and then collectively rate each one.

The Board discussed the best way to move forward with the evaluations. Director Milliken shared an option with the Board. While it would be possible for each Board Member to review and score the applications individually, it would also be possible for two Historic Preservation Board representatives to meet with the Planning Department. There could be a more thorough review at that time. It was not possible to meet with the full Board behind closed doors but there could be discussion with Board representatives. Chair Stephens wanted to make sure the most valuable work was being prioritized.

Planner Tubbs noted that there was a gap in the grant program where no funding had been allocated for four or five years. This past year, the grant program was revamped and new evaluation criteria developed based on Board Member feedback. The Board previously expressed that they wanted to be more involved. Rather than a Staff score being presented, it was determined that Staff would provide a preliminary score and the Board would follow up with a finalized project score.

Board Member Beatlebrox asked about the length of the applications. Planner Tubbs reported that there was a one-page project narrative as well as a sheet where the proposed improvements were itemized. Chair Stephens asked if the full application information was available to the Board. Planner Tubbs explained that it was not available at the current time but she would share a copy of each application with the Board Members following the Historic Preservation Board. The original plan was to bring that information to the March 1, 2023 meeting, however, if the Board wanted that information ahead of time to review, it could all be shared in advance.

Board Member Hodgkins asked if Staff envisioned awarding partial grants, for instance, windows but not doors, or if the full application needed to be approved. Planner Tubbs explained that it would depend on how the Board wants to move forward. Based on past discussions about the grant program, the Board wanted to provide a meaningful monetary benefit to various preservation projects. The Board previously asked for more detailed information so it would be possible to award partial grants.

Board Member Hodgkins wondered if the applications included detailed information or if the specifications were vague. He wanted to understand how closely the applications align with the historical designs of the buildings. Planner Tubbs clarified that the narrative itself depended on the applicant. However, there was a requirement that the applicant provide proof of compliance with the design guidelines. That could be in the form of an HDDR Waiver Letter or a Final Action Letter from the Board. Chair Stephens shared additional information about the history of the grant program.

Board Member Beatlebrox believed competitive grants were being discussed and not emergency grants. This was confirmed. She wondered how much Staff wanted to budget for emergency purposes and if there were any emergency requests. Planner Tubbs reported that there were no current requests for emergency funding. The emergency funding came from the same pot as the competitive funds. \$100,506 was to be awarded in 2023. During previous discussions, the Board talked about reserving 20% of that on the off chance there was an emergency need. Chair Stephens asked if the money needed to be spent or allocated by the end of the financial fiscal year. It was important to know if it could carry over. Planner Tubbs explained that money was allocated yearly but it does not carry over.

The Board discussed the application requests. Planner Tubbs mentioned 690 and 698 Park Avenue. They involved two historic structures that were originally built as duplexes. They were currently utilized as commercial buildings. The intention was to reroof both structures. The existing roof was not original to the property but the overall shape and pitch of the roof remained the same. The existing asphalt architectural shingles needed repair but were not the original materials. The property owner was looking for grant money to facilitate the reroofing.

Board Member Beatlebrox wanted to review the full applications and then visit the properties in person. Board Member Hodgkins questioned how much feedback Staff was looking for. Planner Tubbs stated that this is a fairly new application program. Staff was trying to determine if it was best to evaluate the projects based on a total score or if there were segments of the building that should be focused on, such as doors, windows, and so on. Board Member Hodgkins believed the stronger applications that really addressed preservation would have higher scores based on the evaluation criteria. He felt that an application to replace a non-historic roof would likely score lower than some of the other projects submitted.

Board Member Hodgkins asked if each of the subprojects would be scored or if the application as a whole would be scored. It could be difficult to score it all when some aspects seemed more worthy of the grant than others. Planner Tubbs explained that the Board needed to determine which areas of improvement had the most merit. Board Member Hodgkins preferred to fund proactive maintenance. Given the amount of grant money that was available, he felt it should be geared toward ongoing maintenance and upkeep using historic methods and materials. Chair Stephens noted that there was a difference between regular maintenance costs that should fall on a property owner and historic maintenance. Board Member Beatlebrox explained that what the Board valued would become clear as the applications were reviewed. Planner Tubbs believed that information would be helpful for future grant cycles. For instance, if the Board was not that interested in exterior paint but was more interested in rehabilitating front doors, that could be communicated to applicants. Planner Milliken noted that the applications need to be reviewed on a case-by-case basis. When the full application is in front of Board Members, it would be easier to weigh in on the funding.

Chair Stephens believed that by the end of the March 1, 2023, Historic Preservation Board Meeting, it would be clear what the Board was looking for. At that point, all of the applications would have been reviewed in more detail. He reiterated that the full applications would be shared with the Board Members after the meeting for review.

Board Member Hodgkins asked about the Thaynes Mine Hoist House and Silver King Hoist House applications. Those applications wanted to address asbestos. He wondered if these were outside the jurisdiction as the properties were not necessarily within the City limits. Planner Tubbs clarified that the homes were within the City limits, but were outside the Main Street and Lower Park Avenue RDAs, which were two of the grant funding sources. However, it was possible to allocate funding for structures outside of those areas out of the General Fund. There was the General Fund, Lower Park Avenue RDA, and Main Street RDA. There were different amounts available through each.

6. REGULAR AGENDA

A. Cindy Matsumoto Historic Preservation Award 2023 – The Historic Preservation Board will Review Nominees for the Annual Cindy Matsumoto Historic Preservation Award, Select the 2023 Awardees, and Select Members to Serve on the Artist Selection Committee.

Planner Tubbs reported that there were six nominees for the Cindy Matsumoto Historic Preservation Awards. The Historic Preservation Board was able to select one winner and up to four runners-up. The winner would have a piece of art commissioned of the winning structure and the runners-up would each receive a plaque. This was the 10th year that the Board had honored projects and properties were selected based on the following:

- Adaptive Re-Use;
- Infill Development;

- Excellence in Restoration;
- Sustainable Preservation;
- Embodiment of Historical Context; and
- Connectivity of Site.

Once the Board determined the winner and runner-ups, then a Request for Proposals (“RFP”) would be sent out to artists to determine who would create the art piece. In May 2023, the art piece would be unveiled and hung in City Hall. Planner Tubbs reported that the first nominee was for excellence in restoration - Daly West Headframe. The structure collapsed in 2015, but in 2022, the headframe structure was repaired, raised, and placed nearby its original location. Two fire hydrant shacks had also been rehabilitated. The second nominee was also for excellence in restoration – King Con Ore Bin. This included the development of a new floor for the Ore Bin so that when the snow fell through, it would not sit on the wood and continue to rot. The third nominee was for excellence in restoration - 180 Daly Avenue. The vinyl siding on the structure had been removed and replaced with cedar lap siding, which was more historically accurate.

The fourth nominee was 508 Marsac Avenue. Over the past year, there had been rehabilitation to the siding and windows. Additionally, the roof was redone. This was an example of sustainable preservation. The fifth nominee was for infill development and excellence in restoration - 1063 Empire Avenue. Planner Tubbs noted that this was an existing historic home, but a lot of work had been done to raise it and build a historically appropriate basement addition with a garage. The sixth nominee was for excellence in restoration and was located at 803 Norfolk Avenue. The front porch was rehabilitation and the siding was repainted. Some of the windows had also been redone.

Board Member Beatlebrox reported that she nominated 803 Norfolk Avenue, but she had made a mistake. That building was actually given a plaque last year. She was not certain if it could still be nominated for an art piece. Planner Tuggs explained that there were a few nominees from the cycle last year that did not receive awards. It was proposed that those be brought back for reevaluation. Board Member Beatlebrox believed that since a plaque was awarded to 803 Norfolk Avenue, it should be removed from consideration for another plaque. However, it may be possible to consider it for the art piece. Board Member Holmgren noted that there would be one winner and four runner-ups. That meant only one nominee would be without an award of some sort. Board Member Hodgkins pointed out that up to four runner-ups could be awarded.

Board Member Hodgkins pointed out that the nominees were not in a lot of different categories. He suggested that the plaques not be awarded to the same types of projects. Chair Stephens referenced an email from Chair Scott that outlined his preferences. Board Member Beatlebrox felt that the Daly West Headframe was an excellent choice and was different from what was selected last year. It met a lot of the criteria. Chair Stephens noted that a lot of people would see it. Board Member Long agreed with the comments shared. Board Member Hodgkins thought it was a great project but thought the King Con Ore Bin should be ranked higher. The workmanship for the King Con Ore Bin was

impressive and beautifully done. He pointed out that it was done to prevent a collapse. It was also a one-of-a-kind building. Though the Daly West Headframe was well restored, it was not in the exact original location.

Board Member Beatlebrox thought both nominees were worthwhile. Both were outstanding projects. Board Member Holmgren had the King Con Ore Bin ranked first and the Daly West Headframe ranked second. She felt those were the premiere nominees. Board Member Long agreed that both were special. The fact that the King Con Ore Bin was in its original location made it a slightly stronger application.

MOTION: Board Member Beatlebrox moved that the King Con Ore Bin be selected for an artistic rendering that would be hung at City Hall as part of the 2023 Historic Preservation Award. Board Member Holmgren seconded the motion.

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

Planner Tubbs wondered if there were any projects that the Board wanted to award plaques. It was determined that the Daly West Headframe would receive a plaque.

Board Member Beatlebrox asked about 508 Marsac Avenue. It was important to thank and honor residents who had done significant work. At least one residential renovation or repair should be honored. Board Member Long agreed and noted that a nice job had been done on that restoration. It was very true to the original. Board Member Hodgkins asked about 180 Daly Avenue. He liked that it was a simple but notable restoration. Discussions were had about the roof material on 508 Marsac Avenue. Chair Stephens felt better about honoring 180 Daly Avenue with a plaque.

MOTION: Board Member Hodgkins moved to award 180 Daly Avenue with a plaque as part of the 2023 Historic Preservation Award. Board Member Holmgren seconded the motion.

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

MOTION: Board Member Hodgkins moved to award the Daly West Headframe with a plaque as part of the 2023 Historic Preservation Award. Board Member Beatlebrox seconded the motion.

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

Planner Tubbs reported that there would be an Artist Selection Committee. Staff was looking for three members of the Historic Preservation Board to serve on that committee. There would be several meetings held in March 2023. The overall time commitment would be between three and five hours. Committee Members would provide input on the various prospective artists and help conduct artist interviews. Ultimately, an artist would

be selected to create the art piece for the winning project. Board Member Beatlebrox, Board Member Long, and Chair Scott would participate on the Committee.

7. **ADJOURN**

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

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

The Historic Preservation Board Meeting adjourned at 6:04 p.m.

Approved by _____
Randy Scott, Chair
Historic Preservation Board