



**PARK CITY MUNICIPAL CORPORATION
HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD MEETING
MARSAC MUNICIPAL BUILDING
COUNCIL CHAMBERS
445 MARSAC AVENUE
PARK CITY, SUMMIT COUNTY, UTAH
MINUTES OF NOVEMBER 6, 2024**

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

EX OFFICIO MEMBERS: Rebecca Ward, Planning Director; Mark Harrington, Senior City Attorney; Lillian Zollinger, Planner III

1. ROLL CALL

Chair Randy Scott called the meeting to order at 5:00 p.m. and conducted a roll call. It was noted that Chair Scott and Board Member Alan Long are attending virtually.

2. MINUTES APPROVAL

A. Consideration to Approve the Historic Preservation Board Meeting Minutes from October 2, 2024.

MOTION: Board Member Holmgren moved to APPROVE the Historic Preservation Board Meeting Minutes from October 2, 2024. Board Member Hutchings seconded the motion.

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

3. STAFF AND BOARD COMMUNICATIONS AND DISCLOSURES

Planning Director, Rebecca Ward, shared updates with the Historic Preservation Board. She reported that interviews are continuing to fill the vacancy from Jack Hodgkins. Director Ward noted that the Board previously expressed interest in 1004 Empire Avenue, which is a Significant Historic Site. The Planning and Building Departments have been working with the property owner and their representatives. An update will be provided to the Board at the December 2024 Meeting.

4. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS

There were no public communications.

5. REGULAR AGENDA

A. 2025 Regular Meetings – Consideration to Adopt the Historic Preservation Board Regular Meeting Dates for 2025.

Board Member Stephens noted that some holidays are close to meeting dates and asked if there was an option to set different dates so that all Board Members can attend. Director Ward confirmed this. It was noted that there could be special notice provided in that case.

The 2025 Regular Meetings Schedule was reviewed. Chair Scott believed the suggestion was to have a different meeting date in July 2025. Director Ward reported that the Council Chambers are reserved the 2nd and 4th Wednesdays of the month for the Planning Commission. However, a Board Meeting can be held on July 16, 2025.

It was suggested that the September meeting be changed to September 17, 2025. Senior City Attorney, Mark Harrington, pointed out that there can always be a Special Meeting date. The meeting does not necessarily need to be rescheduled to a Wednesday if it is not convenient.

There was additional discussion about the 2025 Regular Meetings Schedule. Director Ward stated that June 30, 2025, would work for a meeting if there is support for that instead of the July 2, 2025, Historic Preservation Board Meeting. It was also suggested that a meeting be held on September 8, 2025, to account for the Labor Day holiday.

Director Ward pointed out that January 1, 2025, is a holiday. She asked if there was a desire to find an alternate date for that month's Historic Preservation Board Meeting. January 6, 2025, might work if all Board Members are available on that Monday. Board Member Holmgren stated that a meeting on January 13, 2025, could work also.

MOTION: Board Member Beatlebrox moved to APPROVE the Historic Preservation Board Regular Meeting Dates for 2025, with the amendments that there be a Historic Preservation Board Meeting held on Monday, June 30, 2025, Monday, September 8, 2025, and January 6, 2025, if needed. Board Member Holmgren seconded the motion.

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

B. 615 Woodside Avenue – Material Deconstruction – The Applicant Proposes to Lift a Significant Historic Structure to Construct a Basement Addition and Structural Upgrades. PL-23-05838.

Planner III, Lillian Zollinger, presented the Staff Report and stated that the matter relates to Material Deconstruction at 615 Woodside Avenue. This is a Significant Historic Site in the Historic Residential – 1 Zoning District. 615 Woodside Avenue was known as the Woodside Miner's Lodge or Old Miner's Lodge and is an unusual lot accessed off of Woodside Avenue. The Historic Sites Inventory notes that the structure was first used as

a boarding house for miners and does not closely resemble any of the common house types built during the historic Park City mining era. Although it has undergone significant changes, it is still listed as a Significant Historic Site. It was built prior to 1889, but there is not an official date. In 1988, a rear addition was constructed on the back of the historic structure. Additionally, in 2011, an unenclosed parking area was added to the site.

The applicant is proposing to lift the historic structure, add a tandem garage and basement beneath the existing footprint, incorporate structural improvements, and restore the sunroom windows on the front. In the Staff Report, the applicant provided an Engineering Report regarding the existing condition of the site. After some exploratory demolition, the Engineer determined that more exploratory demolition was needed to determine the structural integrity. The applicant is proposing to lift and reinforce the structure to be able to find out what next steps might be needed in this process.

The applicant noted that: "Additional structural analysis will be performed during the demolition phase in order to plan the necessary structural improvements and construction procedures required to excavate the basement/garage and construct structural foundations to support the historic portion of the house." Planner Zollinger reiterated that the proposal is to lift the historic structure. There is a slight concern that the historic portion may need to be panelized at some point, but during the current Historic Preservation Board Meeting, the Board was looking at a proposal to lift the structure. Several Conditions of Approval were reviewed, including Condition of Approval #4:

- The applicant shall obtain Historic District Design Review ("HDDR") approval from the Planning Director, or their Designee, prior to submitting a Building Permit application.

Planner Zollinger noted that this application still needs to go through a design review to ensure that it is compliant with regulations and zoning. Condition of Approval #11 states:

- Historic Structures that are lifted off the foundation must be returned to the completed foundation within 45 days of the date the Building Permit was issued.

Planner Zollinger reviewed Condition of Approval #13, which was as follows:

- If the Significant Historic Structure requires panelization, the Applicant shall return to the Historic Preservation Board for an amendment to this approval.

Planner Zollinger next read Condition of Approval #14, which was:

- Historic materials removed from the Structure that are salvageable or in otherwise good condition shall be used to repair/replace irreparable materials on the Site.

Condition of Approval #15 was read for the Historic Preservation Board, which states:

- The applicant shall provide the City with a Financial Guarantee in accordance with LMC § 15-11-9 *Preservation Policy* in a form to be approved by the City Attorney's Office to be recorded with the Summit County Recorder's Office prior to submitting a Building Permit application.

The applicant's representatives were present to share additional information. Cole Knight was present from Elliott Workgroup, the architectural firm working on the project for Jean and Travis Ault. The Contractor for the project, Kyle Hedman from Sagewood Builders, was also present. Mr. Knight reported that in the Preliminary Structural Report, there was a modest amount of exploratory demolition done to better understand how the structure looks. He shared an image of the existing building. He identified the historic and non-historic elements. The front portion of the house was constructed within a timeframe that makes it historic. During the exploratory demolition, it was discovered that it is only the portion highlighted in blue that is the originally constructed structure on the site. Everything on the northeastern quadrant was an addition.

Mr. Knight explained that during the exploratory demolition, it was discovered that there were no structural foundations. Part of the structural concerns that they have not been able to explore in detail yet had to do with the level is discontinuity between the existing original historic structure and what was later added on. None of the floor is continuous. The dilemma was that it is not possible to do the level of exploratory demolition needed to provide a comprehensive Structural Report without tearing the inside of the house apart. As a result, the proposal was to lift the historic structure so long as it can be done reasonably and safely. However, it was likely that the non-original portion of the home will need to be panelized. Mr. Knight shared images and identified areas of concern.

Regardless of what preservation strategy is selected, the outcome will be the same in that all of the components on-site currently are intended to be preserved, rehabilitated, and reassembled in their current configuration, with the exception of minor cladding elements, such as the window sills in certain locations that are degraded. In addition, there is siding on the south side at ground level that has sustained a lot of moisture damage. Mr. Knight reported that the idea is for the house to be preserved, lifted, potentially panelized, and reassembled in its current configuration.

Chair Scott referenced the Sanborn Map on Page 16 of the Meeting Materials Packet. He wanted to compare what has been shared by the applicant with what is shown on the Sanborn Map. It was noted that the earliest Sanborn Map that exists shows blue and gray, which has a historic addition. Planner Zollinger explained that the earliest Sanborn Map the City has is from 1889. There is no certainty about the exact date the home was constructed. The shape of the structure has changed on the north side where the sunroom bumps out. There is a tax photograph from 1941 showing that. At some point, the north side has been modified but it is still within the historic period of Park City. There was an addition added in the 1960s on the rear and another addition in 1988.

Board Member Hutchings noted that based on the historic record, the front side is historic. Board Member Stephens pointed out that what is currently before the Board is a request to lift the home. Planner Zollinger confirmed that this discussion pertains to lifting and stabilizing the structure. If additional information comes forward, steps and conditions for preservation will be considered.

Mr. Knight reported that the 1988 addition currently has existing foundations. The intention is to leave that structure intact off of its existing foundations while the front portion of the home is lifted. He felt it would be beneficial for there to be a process for a Condition of Approval that would allow for a panelization or partial panelization that conforms to the necessities of the Land Management Code ("LMC"). That could be an administrative approval between Planning Staff and the Chief Building Official.

Mr. Knight explained that there are concerns that progress will be made during the construction and demolition process at which point the historic structure will be exposed for an extended period of time. The clients are either living there or renting it out full-time. There is a desire to minimize the amount of time this process will take. It was anticipated that the project work will begin next spring. Director Ward explained that there is no authority to do what has been requested. She did not believe the Board could delegate what had been requested by Mr. Knight. However, the situation will be taken into consideration and the item can be scheduled for review as quickly as possible.

Board Member Beatlebrox asked for additional details about the timeline. Mr. Knight clarified that the intention is to look at the interior and start work in the spring. Planner Zollinger clarified that the 45 days mentioned in the Conditions of Approval have to do with the time period after the structure is lifted. Mr. Knight further reviewed the map. LMC 15-11-14 deals with the disassembly and reassembly process and there are several conditions that need to be met. One is to return to the Historic Preservation Board and work with the Chief Building Official and Planning Director.

Mr. Knight referenced Condition of Approval #18 and noted that the implications are potentially substantial. The proposed design has a garage beneath the existing footprint, which will be accessed through the existing carport. The carport is non-historic and may need to be rebuilt in order to gain access to the site to excavate. However, it will be rebuilt in its current configuration. The access to the garage will be placed on the back wall.

Condition of Approval #18 states that the garage wall should be inset from the furthest projecting wall of the structure by six inches in order to gain a level of architectural relief to make it less noticeable and diminish the street presence of that garage. The concern was that while the wall could be pushed in another six inches, the street presence of the garage wall is already going to be fairly substantially diminished because it is inset within the carport. The wall directly above it already steps back from where that garage occurs. The intention of Condition of Approval #18 is met well based on the current design.

Board Member Beatlebrox is unclear why there is a desire to do this work now rather than closer to the spring. Mr. Knight clarified that the work will be done in the spring but part of what is being determined tonight is whether there is approval to begin Material Deconstruction that would allow them to obtain the findings needed. The construction documents that will be generated are predicated on this approval. There will be work done through the Historic District Design Review ("HDDR") process so the Material Deconstruction process can begin in the spring. This step is all part of the process.

Board Member Hutchings asked if the retaining wall is historic. Mr. Knight denied this. None of the stairs, retaining, or carport are historic. Board Member Stephens believes the demolition being discussed is exterior demolition and there is no interior demolition contemplated for the analysis of the structure. Mr. Knight reported that it seems likely that they will need to tear into the interior of the house in order to understand how things are put together between the original structure and the different additions.

Mr. Hedman explained that the south and north sides were both assembled at different times. In the attic of the home, there is a roof that was abandoned and then bridged over. There are still a lot of unknown variables, which is why there is a panelization of the north side contemplated. Mr. Knight stated that when the Material Deconstruction starts, a structural engineer will be able to create a suitable plan. It is anticipated that this structure will not be able to be lifted all at once, but in order to start this process, Material Deconstruction is being pursued, with the intention to lift as much as possible and determine the most suitable approach given the conditions. Board Member Stephens informed the representatives that the Historic Preservation Board normally looks for a home to be lifted and not panelized. There is always interest in engineering solutions.

Discussions were had about Condition of Approval #18. Mr. Knight explained that he has some concerns about the condition and does not want it attached to the project if it does not need to be. Director Ward reported that the Condition of Approval will be evaluated as part of the HDDR process. Even if the Historic Preservation Board wants to remove that requirement, it is still a requirement in the next phase as part of the HDDR review.

Board Member Beatlebrox believes the blue portion of the image shown can be lifted. The gray area cannot be lifted and the two cannot be lifted together. Mr. Knight reported that the gray area will likely not be able to be lifted in its entirety. There is still uncertainty about the level of degradation for the wall structure at the base of the building and the floor structure where it intersects the wall. The intention is to move forward with caution. There is optimism that the blue portion shown on the image can be lifted in its entirety and most of the gray portion of the building. Mr. Knight reiterated that there is still some uncertainty about what can be lifted. Additional evaluation of the structure is needed.

Board Member Beatlebrox asked if the Chief Building Official had been to the site. Mr. Knight denied this. Director Ward explained that since the applicant is not yet requesting panelization, that is not one of the requirements. She asked for clarification about the Engineering Report, specifically, whether the conclusion is that it is possible the

structure could be stabilized internally with temporary bracing. That could result in structural support to lift both the gray and blue structures. Mr. Knight noted that the report made a series of structural recommendations about how the overall structure should be improved, including the addition of foundations, improvement to load-bearing walls, and necessary repairs to the floor structure. For lifting, the recommendation is that all floor and wall structural elements be opened up to be assessed prior to a design for a complete lift.

Board Member Stephens wondered when the change to the roof line occurred. Planner Zollinger reported that the images on the Historic Sites Inventory show the pitch change in at least 1995, so it likely occurred between 1941 and 1982. Board Member Beatlebrox asked to review the report. The Mission Structural Physical Conditions Report was shared. Board Member Hutchings asked about the square footage of the area that will be lifted. Mr. Knight is not sure about the footprint of the historic portion. On Page 33 of the Meeting Materials Packet, there is a reference to approximately 3,000 square feet.

Planner Zollinger reminded the Historic Preservation Board that before the Board is a Material Deconstruction of 615 Woodside Avenue with a proposed lift. The applicant is proposing this because in order to determine whether it is possible to lift, there needs to be more information obtained about the structure. If it is possible to stabilize it inside, the lift will occur, as approved by the Board. If additional information is obtained and there needs to be panelization, the applicant will return to the Historic Preservation Board.

Director Ward suggested there be another Condition of Approval to state that modifications to any of the materials are prohibited until the applicant comes before the Historic Preservation Board. That condition would require the stabilization and protection of the structure as it is and nothing beyond that will be allowed or approved until the Board has an opportunity to review an updated Engineering Report for panelization. Director Ward explained that there is a desire to be clear that the approval is to lift the structure, on the condition that it is stabilized in its current state so the lifting does not cause further structural damage to historic materials. Nothing is being approved that would allow modification or removal of those materials. The intention is to protect the structure. The Board could comprehensively review any request for panelization in the future.

Board Member Beatlebrox asked if there would be people living in the home during this exploratory process. Mr. Knight reported that it will be occupied until the actual Material Deconstruction starts. Once Material Deconstruction starts, the priorities will be to make sure the site is safe, the integrity of the historic structure is maintained, and the process is expedited. There is no desire to make the structure unlivable for an extended time.

Board Member Stephens wanted to know if there is a scope of work associated with the amount of exploratory demolition that will be done. Mr. Knight explained that the reason the lift is included as part of the current approval is on the off chance the entire structure can be lifted. Board Member Hutchings noted that applicants usually come with a plan to lift the house and a request to do so. It does not sound like the applicant has that.

Mr. Knight reported that the primary consideration currently is the Material Deconstruction so the engineer can provide a full assessment. Director Ward noted that interior Material Deconstruction does not require Board approval, only when it impacts exterior material.

The current Engineering Report recommends that the continuity of the historic buildings be established and connected to withstand lateral displacement. Director Ward explained that the report outlines what needs to be done to show that it is possible to lift and shore the historic structure. She asked if there is exterior material that will need to be altered to come to the conclusion that panelization may be required. Mr. Knight stated that he would need to consult with the structural engineer. There has been coordination between Mr. Hedman and the structural engineer on the degree of exploratory demolition that needs to be done in order to complete the full structural assessment. He would not rule out that some Material Deconstruction from the exterior would be part of that process, particularly at the bases of the walls where the wall materials meet the ground.

Additional discussions were had about what is before the Historic Preservation Board. Attorney Harrington applauded the transparency from the applicant. He explained that the Board does not want to see the preliminary exploratory work limit future options. Mr. Knight stated that believes in the preservation of historic homes. With other houses he has worked on, he has been very intentional in making sure that all rules are followed.

Chair Scott opened the public hearing. There were no comments. The public hearing was closed.

Board Member Beatlebrox believes it makes sense to do some due diligence to understand the current conditions, with the intention to lift. It is the exterior historic material that the Historic Preservation Board is most worried about. If the applicant is respectful of that, she does not see an issue with work being done to determine whether a lift can occur. Board Member Hutchings does not view this application as approving panelization, as there is a process for panelization. He supports the Material Deconstruction and the lift that has been proposed. Board Member Stephens expressed support and believes that during this process, there will need to be a Demolition Permit obtained. That permit will limit the scope of what is done. Board Member Holmgren agreed with the comments shared by other Board Members and expressed her support. Board Member Long also supports the lift. Chair Scott pointed out that when there is a lift that is then brought back down, the foundation can be two feet higher than what it once was. However, he does not believe that is something relevant to this particular site.

Chair Scott encouraged the applicant not to immediately shift to panelization. The Historic Preservation Board likes options and there is a lot of resistance to panelization. As for the current application before the Board, he expressed support for what has been presented. Director Ward asked if the Board would consider some clarification to Condition of Approval #13. Currently, it states: "If the Significant Historic Structure requires panelization, the Applicant shall return to the Historic Preservation Board for an amendment to this approval." She suggested adding language before that to state: "This

approval requires stabilization and protection of the historic structure for the lifting of the structure.” This would make clear the limitations of this approval and that the applicant, under this approval, is required to go through the stabilization process. Any Material Deconstruction beyond the scope of the Final Action Letter would be prohibited without first obtaining Chief Building Official, Planning Director, and Historic Preservation Board review. Condition of Approval #18 could be removed and addressed at the HDDR level.

Those present discussed the language included in the Final Action Letter. It was determined that the language in Condition of Approval #13 would be amended to state:

- This approval requires the stabilization and protection for the lifting of the historic structure. The Applicant under this approval is required to stabilize the structure for the lift. Any Material Deconstruction beyond the scope of this Final Action Letter is prohibited without obtaining Chief Building Official, Planning Director, and Historic Preservation Board Review.

It was also determined that there would be an additional Finding of Fact listed:

- The analysis of the Staff Report has been incorporated into this letter.

Discussions were had about Condition of Approval #18. Board Member Hutchings asked why it would be removed if it is a requirement. Director Ward explained that it will be addressed through the HDDR process. She shared information about the 45 days mentioned for the lift. There can be a written determination to extend that, but that requires review and consultation with the Chief Building Official and City Engineer.

MOTION: Board Member Hutchings moved to APPROVE the Material Deconstruction and lifting of the Significant Historic Structure at 615 Woodside Avenue subject to the following:

Findings of Fact:

1. 615 Woodside Avenue is a Significant Historic Structure and was constructed sometime before 1889.
2. 615 Woodside Avenue is in the Historic Residential – 1 Zoning District and is Lot 1 of the Walter-Daniels Amended Lot 2 Subdivision.
3. In 1961, an addition was constructed on the rear of the Historic Structure.
4. In 1983, the structure was converted to a bed and breakfast.
5. In 1988, an addition was added to the rear of the Historic Structure.
6. In 1995, the City Council approved the Walter-Daniels Subdivision.

7. In 1996, the Use was a Bed and Breakfast, and the Planning Commission approved a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) for a detached two-car garage addition and Accessory Apartment to support the Bed and Breakfast operations. This work was not completed.
8. On October 16, 1997, the City Council approved a Plat Amendment for the Walter-Daniels Subdivision, which created two Lots. 615 Woodside Avenue is Lot 1 and 621 Woodside Avenue is Lot 2 of the Subdivision.
9. On July 19, 2007, the City Council approved Ordinance No. 07-45, which approved a Plat Amendment to remove a plat note that stated, "So long as the Old Miner's Lodge remains a lodging facility, parking shown on Lot 2 shall be designated for the use and enjoyment of Lot 1, and so as not to have Merger by Deed, Park City Municipal Corporation shall be a third party beneficiary to said easement".
10. The Significant Historic Structure is currently an SFD with an active Business License for a Nightly Rental.
11. On December 20, 2011, the Planning Director approved a Historic District Design Review (HDDR) for an unenclosed parking area below the Significant Historic Structure.
12. On April 19, 2013, Planning Staff approved the replacement of the existing rear non-historic wood deck.
13. The Applicant proposes to lift the Significant Historic Structure and construct a basement and garage and restore sunroom windows.
14. Pursuant to LMC § 15-11-9, a Financial Guarantee is required prior to the issuance of a Building Permit.
15. The Development Review Committee reviewed the proposal on October 15, 2024, and does not require Conditions of Approval.
16. The analysis of the Staff Report has been incorporated into this letter.

Conclusions of Law:

1. The proposal, as conditioned, complies with the Land Management Code requirements pursuant to LMC § 15-11-9, *Preservation Policy*.

2. The proposal, as conditioned, complies with the Land Management Code requirements pursuant to LMC § 15-11.12-5 *Historic Preservation Board Review for Material Deconstruction*.

Conditions of Approval:

1. Final building plans and construction details shall reflect substantial compliance with the Historic Preservation Board's November 6, 2024 approval for the lifting of the Significant Historic Structure and Material Deconstruction of 615 Woodside Avenue. Any changes, modifications, or deviations from the approved plans that have not been approved in advance by the Planning and Building Departments may result in a stop work order.
2. The applicant is responsible for notifying the Planning and Building Departments prior to making any changes to approved plans.
3. Any changes, modifications, or deviations from the approved scope of work shall be submitted in writing for review and approval/denial in accordance with the applicable standards by the Planning Director or their Designee prior to construction.
4. The applicant shall obtain HDDR approval from the Planning Director, or their Designee, prior to submitting a Building Permit application.
5. The basement addition shall not raise or lower the Significant Historic Structure more than two feet from its original floor elevation.
6. The Historic Site shall be returned to its original grade following the construction of a foundation. When the original grade cannot be achieved, generally no more than six inches of the new foundation shall be visible above Final Grade on the primary and secondary facades.
7. The site shall be re-graded so that all water drains away from the Structure and does not enter the foundation.
8. A plinth or trim board at the base of the Historic Structure shall be added to visually anchor the Historic Structure to the new foundation.
9. The form, material, and detailing of a new foundation shall be similar to the foundations of nearby Historic Structures.
10. The applicant shall submit a cribbing and excavation stabilization shoring plan reviewed and stamped by a State of Utah licensed and registered structural engineer prior to issuance of a Building Permit. Cribbing or shoring must be of engineer-specified materials. Screw-type jacks for

raising and lowering the building are not allowed as primary supports once the building is lifted.

11. Historic Structures that are lifted off the foundation must be returned to the completed foundation within 45 days of the date the Building Permit was issued. The Planning Director may make a written determination to extend this period up to 30 additional days if, after consultation with the Historic Preservation Planner, Chief Building Official, and City Engineer, he determines that it is necessary. This would be based upon the need to immediately stabilize an existing Historic property, or specific site conditions such as access, or lack thereof, exist, or in an effort to reduce impacts on adjacent properties. The applicant is responsible for notifying the Building Department if changes are made. If the cribbing and/or shoring plan(s) are to be altered at any time during the construction of the foundation by the contractor, the structural engineer shall submit a new cribbing and/or shoring plan for review. The structural engineer shall be required to reinspect and approve the cribbing and/or shoring alterations within five (5) days of any relocation or alteration to the cribbing and/or shoring.
12. The applicant shall also request an inspection through the Building Department following the modification to the cribbing and/or shoring. Failure to request the inspection will be a violation of the Preservation Plan and enforcement action through the Historic Preservation Financial Guarantee or ACE could take place.
13. This approval requires the stabilization and protection for the lifting of the historic structure. The Applicant under this approval is required to stabilize the structure for the lift. Any Material Deconstruction beyond the scope of this Final Action Letter is prohibited without obtaining Chief Building Official, Planning Director, and Historic Preservation Board Review.
14. Historic materials removed from the Structure that are salvageable or in otherwise good condition shall be used to repair/replace irreparable materials on the Site.
15. The applicant shall provide the City with a Financial Guarantee in accordance with LMC § 15-11-9 *Preservation Policy* in a form to be approved by the City Attorney's Office to be recorded with the Summit County Recorder's Office prior to submitting a Building Permit application.
16. Any required window or egress wells shall be located behind the midpoint of the secondary façade in a location not visible from the primary right-of-way.
17. The garage door shall not exceed nine feet by nine feet.

Board Member Stephens seconded the motion.

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

6. ADJOURN

Director Ward informed those present that there are no items currently scheduled for the next Historic Preservation Board Meeting. As of now, there will not be a meeting.

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 6:20 p.m.

Approved by _____
Randy Scott, Chair
Historic Preservation Board